

1 STUDY PROTOCOL

2

3 **Protocol for Cerebellar Stimulation for Aphasia Rehabilitation (CeSAR): A randomized,**
4 **double-blind, sham-controlled trial**

5

6 Authors: Becky Lammers¹, Myra J. Sydnor¹ Sarah Cust¹, *Ji Hyun Kim¹, Gayane Yenokyan⁴,
7 Argye E. Hillis^{1,2,3}, Rajani Sebastian¹

8

9 ¹Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins
10 University, Baltimore, MD, ²Department of Neurology, School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins
11 University, Baltimore, MD, ³Department of Cognitive Science, Krieger School of Arts and
12 Sciences, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, ⁴Johns Hopkins Biostatistics Center,
13 Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, *currently
14 affiliated with the School of Medicine, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY

15

16

17 Corresponding Author

18 Rajani Sebastian, PhD

19 Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

20 Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

21

22 600 N Wolfe Street, Phipps 183

23 Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

24 Baltimore, MD 21287, USA

25

26 Email: rsebast3@jhmi.edu

27 Phone: +1 410-502-5012

28 Fax: +1 410-502-2419

29

30 **Abstract**

31 In this randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled trial of Cerebellar Stimulation for Aphasia

32 Rehabilitation (CeSAR), we will determine the effectiveness of cathodal tDCS (transcranial direct

33 current stimulation) to the right cerebellum for the treatment of chronic aphasia (>6 months post

34 stroke). We will test the hypothesis that cerebellar tDCS in combination with an evidenced-based

35 anomia treatment (semantic feature analysis, SFA) will be associated with greater improvement in

36 naming untrained pictures (as measured by the change in Philadelphia Picture Naming Test), 1-

37 week post treatment, compared to sham plus SFA. We will also evaluate the effects of cerebellar

38 tDCS on naming trained items as well as the effects on functional communication, content,
39 efficiency, and word-retrieval of picture description, and quality of life. Finally, we will identify
40 imaging and linguistic biomarkers to determine the characteristics of stroke patients that benefit
41 from cerebellar tDCS and SFA treatment. We expect to enroll 60 participants over five years.
42 Participants will receive 15, 25-minute sessions of cerebellar tDCS (3-5 sessions per week) or
43 sham tDCS combined with 1 hour of SFA treatment. Participants will be evaluated prior to the
44 start of treatment, one-week post-treatment, 1-, 3-, and 6-months post treatment on primary and
45 secondary outcome variables. The long-term aim of this study is to provide the basis for a Phase
46 III randomized controlled trial of cerebellar tDCS vs sham with concurrent language therapy for
47 treatment of chronic aphasia.

48 **Trial registration:** The trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov [NCT05093673](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT05093673).

49

50 **Introduction**

51 Aphasias are a devastating outcome and one of the leading causes of disability following
52 stroke. Aphasia adds substantial costs to the acute [1] and chronic [2] care of individuals with
53 stroke and is an independent predictor of subsequent functional dependence and death [3]. Anomia
54 or difficulty with naming is the most common deficit in individuals with aphasia. Currently, the
55 most widespread rehabilitation approach for aphasia is speech and language therapy (SALT) [4].
56 Although the interventions to improve naming can have benefits [5–9], a substantial number of
57 treatment sessions is usually required to show gains, particularly in individuals with chronic large
58 left hemisphere stroke. Therefore, to address how the treatment of aphasia might be made more
59 effective, researchers are now using an emerging, safe, non-painful, and low-cost brain stimulation
60 method called transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) [10]. There is evidence that tDCS

61 may be useful for enhancing the effects of behavioral aphasia treatment. Evidence is growing that
62 the add-on use of tDCS can aid in the recovery of aphasia as highlighted by international
63 recommendations [11]. However, there is a general lack of consensus regarding the optimal
64 electrode montage for stimulation in post-stroke aphasia. Addressing this barrier is critical for
65 successful clinical translation.

66 Stimulating the residual left hemisphere region is the most common approach based on the
67 observation that optimal recovery involves the functional re-recruitment of the remaining left-
68 hemisphere tissue [12–16]. However, encephalomalacia filled with cerebrospinal fluid at the site
69 of stroke affects the electrical current flow, reducing the exposure of the targeted perilesional tissue
70 to stimulation [17]. This issue makes selection of optimal electrode locations in the left hemisphere
71 difficult. Approaches to address this issue involve advanced electrical field modeling methods [18–
72 20] or individualized electrode placement based on pre-treatment functional magnetic resonance
73 imaging (fMRI) scans so that stimulation targets residual functional tissue [21–24]. However,
74 advanced electrical field modeling and fMRI are cost-intensive and require substantial
75 technological expertise. This would limit the incorporation of tDCS into routine speech language
76 pathology clinical practice. We propose a novel approach to augment aphasia treatment by
77 stimulating the right cerebellum. The right cerebellum is not only involved in cognitive and
78 language functions (see [25–27] for reviews) but is also distant enough from typical stroke locations
79 associated with aphasia that electrical current flow patterns are unlikely to be affected by the
80 encephalomalacia [17]. In addition, this approach is suitable for patients who have large left
81 hemisphere strokes and aphasia associated with bilateral hemispheric strokes.

82 In 2017, our group published the first study showing that cerebellar tDCS has the potential
83 to augment aphasia treatment in a participant with bilateral middle cerebral artery infarct resulting

84 in aphasia [28]. Subsequently, another group, utilizing a crossover study design, showed that 5
85 sessions of cathodal cerebellar tDCS coupled with language treatment improved verb generation
86 immediately post-treatment in chronic post-stroke aphasia [29]. In a follow up study, we conducted
87 a randomized, double-blind, sham controlled, within-subject crossover study in 24 chronic stroke
88 participants with aphasia [30]. We also investigated whether there are any differences in anodal
89 versus cathodal cerebellar tDCS on naming performance as prior studies in healthy controls have
90 shown beneficial language effects for anodal and cathodal cerebellar stimulation [17,31–33].
91 Participants received 15 sessions of anodal (n=12) or cathodal (n=12) cerebellar tDCS +
92 computerized aphasia therapy in Phase 1 followed by sham + computerized aphasia therapy in
93 Phase 2, or the opposite order. The results of our study revealed several important findings, which
94 have significant implications for the proposed study. First, we found that cerebellar tDCS
95 significantly improved naming in trained (Naming 80) and untrained (Philadelphia Naming Test,
96 PNT [34]) items immediately post-treatment, and the significant improvement in untrained naming
97 was maintained at two months post-treatment. Second, we found that participants receiving
98 cathodal stimulation showed significantly greater gains (compared to sham) in naming than
99 participants receiving anodal stimulation, indicating that cathodal stimulation might be more
100 favorable than anodal stimulation to augment aphasia treatment. Thus, these results indicate that
101 cathodal cerebellar tDCS combined with language treatment has the potential to augment aphasia
102 treatment.

103 tDCS is believed to enhance neural plasticity by temporarily modulating resting membrane
104 potentials of neurons in targeted areas [35,36]. Anodal stimulation may lead to depolarization of
105 the neuronal membranes resulting in greater excitability, whereas cathodal stimulation may lead
106 to hyperpolarization resulting in lower excitability. Because the cerebellar cortex is highly

107 convoluted and the neuronal architecture is different from cortical circuits, the polarity of
108 cerebellar tDCS effects is not necessarily the same as the polarity of cortical tDCS effects. Animal
109 and human studies indicate that cerebellar tDCS is most likely to produce its effects by polarizing
110 Purkinje cells - the inhibitory output neurons of the cerebellar cortex - and thereby changing the
111 levels/pattern of activity in the deep cerebellar output nuclei, which are the efferent targets of the
112 Purkinje cells [37,38]. Critically, one of the deep cerebellar nuclei, the dentate nucleus, has a
113 disynaptic excitatory connection through the thalamus to the cortical language areas. Based on this
114 known circuitry, we hypothesize that a single session of right cathodal cerebellar stimulation will
115 result in transient depression of Purkinje cell activity, thereby reducing the inhibitory signals that
116 the cerebellum sends to the cortical language areas. Anodal cerebellar stimulation will exert the
117 opposite effect, i.e., it will increase the discharge from the Purkinje cells, thereby increasing the
118 inhibitory signals the cerebellum sends to the cortical language areas. Thus, it is plausible that
119 multiple sessions of cathodal cerebellar tDCS will provide cortical excitation, thereby facilitating
120 the engagement of the residual left hemisphere language areas.

121 In this proposal, we will combine cerebellar tDCS with semantic feature analysis (SFA)
122 treatment for post-stroke aphasia (see [39–43] for reviews regarding SFA). SFA is a semantically-
123 based treatment approach for naming deficits. SFA was chosen for this study for three main reasons
124 (1) SFA has a strong potential for promoting acquisition and generalization effects for participants
125 with anomia, (2) SFA is an effective therapy for treating naming deficits for individuals with a
126 range of aphasia types and severities, and (3) SFA is a treatment that is frequently used by
127 practicing speech-language pathologists (SLPs). The driving premise of SFA treatment is that
128 when individuals generate semantic features of a target word (i.e., accessing their semantic
129 network), they improve their ability to retrieve the target because they have strengthened access to

130 its conceptual representation [41,44]. The theoretical mechanism by which SFA promotes
131 generalization comes from the spreading activation theory [45] which posits that
132 accessing/activating a particular lemma (or its features) results in activation of the lemmas of
133 semantically related concepts. Prior studies provide strong compelling evidence that the right
134 cerebellum, the target of our tDCS treatment, is a critical structure involved in semantic processing
135 and naming [25–27,46–48].

136 Here we describe a protocol for an ongoing randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled
137 study of cerebellar tDCS for augmenting anomia therapy in chronic aphasia. Participants are
138 enrolled parallelly at two sites within the Johns Hopkins Rehabilitation Network: Johns Hopkins
139 Hospital and Howard County General Hospital. We hypothesize that 15 sessions of cathodal
140 cerebellar tDCS plus SFA will be associated with greater improvement in naming untrained
141 pictures (as measured by the change in Philadelphia Picture Naming Test, PNT [34], 1-week post
142 treatment, compared to sham plus SFA. For secondary outcomes, we hypothesize that cathodal
143 cerebellar tDCS plus SFA will result in greater improvement in discourse (as measured by change
144 in total content units (CU) and syllable per CU in picture description [49] and greater improvement
145 in functional communication skills (as measured by change in Communication Activities of Daily
146 Living–CADL-3 [50] compared to sham plus SFA. We also hypothesize that 15 sessions of
147 cathodal cerebellar tDCS plus SFA will result in greater improvement on the Western Aphasia
148 Battery-Revised (WAB-R) [51], General Health Questionnaire (GHQ)-12 [52], and Stroke and
149 Quality of Life Scale (SAQOL-39) [53] compared to sham plus SFA.

150 A second aim is to identify whether neural (functional and structural) biomarkers and
151 linguistic characteristics can predict response to cerebellar stimulation and SFA treatment. Our
152 prior work in cerebellar tDCS in aphasia has shown that individual response to tDCS treatment is

153 highly variable. However, little is known about how factors related to imaging and linguistic
154 characteristics combine to induce treatment responsiveness. We will carry out resting state
155 functional magnetic resonance imaging (rsfMRI), diffusion tensor imaging (DTI), high resolution
156 structural imaging, and detailed linguistic testing before the start of treatment to determine whether
157 these factors can predict response to cerebellar tDCS and/or SFA. This exploratory aim may
158 identify stroke patients who are mostly likely to benefit from cerebellar tDCS and/or SFA. This
159 result may have significant implications for designing a Phase III randomized controlled trial.

160

161 **Materials and Methods**

162 **Design**

163 This study, Cerebellar Stimulation for Aphasia Rehabilitation (CeSAR), is a Phase II trial
164 of cathodal cerebellar tDCS plus SFA treatment vs. sham plus SFA treatment, evaluated in
165 double-blind, randomized, sham-controlled design in chronic stroke. Participants with chronic
166 aphasia are enrolled at two sites within the Johns Hopkins Rehabilitation Network at least 6
167 months after the onset of stroke. The two sites will be the Johns Hopkins Hospital and Howard
168 County General Hospital. Sixty participants are expected to enroll over five years. The SPIRIT
169 schedule of enrollment, interventions, and assessments is included as Fig 1. The World Health
170 Organization Trial Registration Data Set compiled by ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT05093673) is
171 reproduced in Table 1 (SPIRIT Item 2b). The SPIRIT checklist is included in S1 File. A full
172 accounting of evaluations and unabridged protocol approved by the IRB is available in S2 File
173 (September 15, 2023) and important protocol modifications will be available from the
174 corresponding author and by viewing the ClinicalTrials.gov study entry. A sample consent form
175 is included in S3 File.

176 **Patient population-inclusion and exclusion criteria**

177 Participants must be >6 months post ischemic or hemorrhagic left-hemisphere stroke and
178 diagnosed with post-stroke aphasia and naming impairment using the Western Aphasia Battery-
179 Revised (WAB-R). They must also be 18 years or older, premorbidly right-handed, and English-
180 speaking by self-report with no lesions on the right cerebellum, with no previous neurological
181 disorder other than stroke, or other neurodegenerative or psychiatric disorders. Individuals with
182 seizures within the previous 6 months, those taking medications that lower the seizure threshold
183 (e.g., methylphenidate) or N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) antagonists (e.g., memantine), and
184 those with a history of brain surgery or with any metal in the head will be excluded. We will also
185 exclude those with uncorrected hearing or vision loss by self-report, those who score >80% on
186 the Philadelphia Naming Test (PNT) at baseline, and those with severely impaired auditory
187 comprehension and/or severely limited verbal output (lower than 2 on the Auditory
188 Comprehension subscore on the WAB-R and/or lower than 2 on the Spontaneous Speech rating
189 scale on the WAB-R, respectively). Individuals with severe claustrophobia, cardiac pacemakers
190 or ferromagnetic implants, and pregnant women will be excluded from the MRI portion of the
191 study.

192 **Inclusion Criteria**

- 193 1. Chronic ischemic or hemorrhagic left hemisphere stroke
- 194 2. Fluent speaker of English by self-report
- 195 3. Age 18 or older
- 196 4. Premorbidly right-handed
- 197 5. 6 months post onset of stroke

198 6. Diagnosis of aphasia and naming impairment using the Western Aphasia Battery-
199 Revised

200 **Exclusion Criteria**

- 201 1. Lesion in the right cerebellum
- 202 2. Previous neurological disorder (other than stroke) affecting the brain, or any other
203 neurodegenerative disorder or psychiatric disorder
- 204 3. Seizures during the previous 6 months
- 205 4. Uncorrected visual loss or hearing loss by self-report
- 206 5. Use of medications that lower the seizure threshold (e.g., methylphenidate)
- 207 6. Use of N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) antagonists (e.g., memantine)
- 208 7. >80% correct response on the Philadelphia Naming Testing at baseline
- 209 8. History of brain surgery or any metal in the head
- 210 9. Severely impaired auditory comprehension (lower than 2 on the Comprehension
211 subscore on the Western Aphasia Battery-Revised)
- 212 10. Severely limited verbal output (lower than 2 on the Spontaneous Speech rating scale
213 on the Western Aphasia Battery-Revised)
- 214 11. Individuals with severe claustrophobia, cardiac pacemakers or ferromagnetic
215 implants, and pregnant women will be excluded from the MRI portion of the study.

216

217

218

219

220

221 **Table 1. World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set.**

Data category	Information
Primary registry and trial identifying number	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT05093673
Date of registration in primary registry	October 13, 2021
Secondary identifying numbers	IRB00300301
Source(s) of monetary or material support	National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIH/NIDCD) R56DC019639 R01DC019639 Note: This funding source had no role in the design of this study and will not have any role during its execution, analyses, interpretation of the data, or decision to submit results.
Primary sponsor	Johns Hopkins University
Secondary sponsor(s)	None
Contact for public queries	Rajani Sebastian, PhD, CCC-SLP (410) 502-5012 rsebast3@jhmi.edu
Contact for scientific queries	Rajani Sebastian, PhD, CCC-SLP (410) 502-5012 rsebast3@jhmi.edu
Public title	Cerebellar Stimulation for Aphasia Rehabilitation (CeSAR)
Scientific title	Cerebellar Stimulation for Aphasia Rehabilitation (CeSAR)
Countries of recruitment	United States of America
Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied	Aphasia, Stroke
Intervention(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> tDCS: 2 mA of cathodal tDCS stimulation via Soterix Medical 1x1 Clinical Trials device Placebo: sham tDCS via Soterix Medical 1x1 Clinical Trials device Current will be ramped up over a 15 second interval at onset, then current intensity will be ramped down over a 15 second interval to 0 mA to mimic active tDCS Behavioral: Computer-delivered anomia treatment (SFA) Semantic Feature Analysis (SFA) 15 hour-long sessions of SFA (3-5 sessions per week for 3 to 5 weeks)
Key inclusion and exclusion criteria	<p>Inclusion Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chronic ischemic or hemorrhagic left hemisphere stroke Fluent speaker of English by self-report Age 18 or older Premorbidly right-handed 6 months post onset of stroke Diagnosis of aphasia and naming impairment using the Western Aphasia Battery-Revised <p>Exclusion Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesion in the right cerebellum Previous neurological disorder (other than stroke) affecting the brain, or any other neurodegenerative disorder or psychiatric disorder Seizures during the previous 6 months Uncorrected visual loss or hearing loss by self-report Use of medications that lower the seizure threshold (e.g., methylphenidate) Use of N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) antagonists (e.g., memantine) >80% correct response on the Philadelphia Naming Testing at baseline History of brain surgery or any metal in the head Severely impaired auditory comprehension (lower than 2 on the Comprehension subscore on the Western Aphasia Battery-Revised) Severely limited verbal output (lower than 2 on the Spontaneous Speech rating scale on the Western Aphasia Battery-Revised) Individuals with severe claustrophobia, cardiac pacemakers or ferromagnetic implants, and pregnant women will be excluded from the MRI portion of the study.
Study type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interventional Allocation: Randomized Intervention Model: Parallel

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masking: Quadruple (Participant, Assessment Provider, Treatment Provider, Biostatistician) • Primary Purpose: Treatment • Phase II
Date of first enrollment	12/15/2021
Sample size	Target enrollment total: 60 Current enrollment: 15
Recruitment status	Recruiting: participants are being recruited and enrolled
Primary outcome(s)	Untrained picture naming: Change in Philadelphia Naming Test accuracy. Scores range from 0 to 175 with higher scores meaning better naming ability. [Time Frame: Baseline, 1-week after treatment]
Key secondary outcomes	<p>1. Untrained picture naming: Change in Philadelphia Naming Test accuracy score. Scores range from 0 to 175 with higher scores meaning better naming ability. [Time Frame: Baseline, 1-month after treatment, 3-months after treatment, 6-months after treatment]</p> <p>2. Trained picture naming: Change in naming items trained during treatment. Scores range from 0 to 50 with higher scores indicating better naming ability. Types of naming errors will also be analyzed. Naming errors will be categorized as 1) semantic paraphasias; 2) phonological paraphasias; 3) mixed (phonological and semantic) paraphasias; 4) non-responses; and 5) unrelated responses. [Time Frame: Baseline, 1-week after treatment, 1-month after treatment, 3-months after treatment, 6-months after treatment]</p> <p>3. Discourse: Change in discourse abilities, as measured by change in total Content Units (CU) produced by participants during “Cookie Theft” picture description. Content units are based on a standard scoring template of commonly identified concepts in the left and right regions of the “Cookie Theft” picture. Participants either include or fail to include 53 total concepts on the picture (30 concepts on the left side and 23 concepts on the right side). [Time Frame: Baseline, 1-week after treatment, 1-month after treatment, 3-months after treatment, 6-months after treatment]</p> <p>4. Discourse: Change in discourse abilities, as measured by change in syllables per Content Units (CU) produced by participants during “Cookie Theft” picture description. Syllables produced during the picture description task are counted. Total Content Units included during picture description are counted (53 total; 30 left side; 23 right side). The rate of syllables per Content Unit (syllables/CU) is calculated and interpreted as a measure of efficiency in producing information relevant to the task. [Time Frame: Baseline, 1-week after treatment, 1-month after treatment, 3-months after treatment, 6-months after treatment]</p> <p>5. Functional Communication Skills: Change in everyday functional communication skills as assessed by Communication Activities of Daily Living, third edition (CADL-3). The CADL was developed to assess communication abilities among people with aphasia in a naturalistic and standardized manner. Tasks require a range of abilities, including the use of numbers, reading, writing, nonverbal communication, and humor appreciation. Responses receive a score of 0, 1, or 2 based on the effectiveness of communication in the different contexts, generally allowing for verbal or nonverbal methods of conveying information. [Time Frame: Baseline, 1-week after treatment, 1-month after treatment, 3-months after treatment, 6-months after treatment]</p> <p>6. Three tests from the Research Outcome Measurement in Aphasia-Core Outcome Set (ROMA-COS):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Western Aphasia Battery, Revised (WAB-R) b. Emotional Well-being: General Health Questionnaire (GHQ)-12. Scores range from 0-12; where higher scores indicate more severe symptoms of psychological distress. c. Quality of Life: Stroke and Aphasia Quality of Life Scale (SAQOL-39). Participants respond to questions across four subdomains (physical, psychosocial, communication, energy) with two response formats, each on a 5-point scale: 1=could not do it at all to 5=no trouble at all and 1=definitely yes to 5=definitely no. Overall and subdomain scores can range from 1 to 5; the overall SAQOL score is calculated by summing across the items and dividing by the number of items; subdomain scores are calculated the same way. [Time Frame: Baseline, 1-week after treatment, 1-month after treatment, 3-months after treatment, 6-months after treatment]
Ethics review	Status: Date of approval: Name and contact details of Ethics committee(s):
Completion date	
Summary results	
IPD sharing statement	

223 **Informed consent**

224 A signed and dated informed consent form will be obtained from each participant. For
225 participants who cannot consent for themselves, a legally authorized representative, such as a legal
226 guardian or power of attorney, must sign the consent form. The consent form will describe the
227 purposes, procedures, risks, and benefits of participation in the study, as well as the participant's
228 ability to withdraw consent at any time without retaliation or impact on clinical care. A copy will
229 be given to each participant or legally authorized representative.

230 Once the consent form has been signed, participants will be assigned a temporary identification
231 number for the purposes of initial screening.

232 All research staff authorized to obtain informed consent will have completed the Miami
233 CITI course in the Responsible Conduct of Research and Protection of Human Subjects prior to
234 their involvement with the study. Furthermore, they will be oriented to the study and trained by
235 the study PI and study co-investigators who have all had extensive training and experience in the
236 ethical and practical aspects of informed consent procedures.

237 **Participant confidentiality**

238 Participation in this study should not put participants in any legal risk, even in the case of
239 a breach of confidentiality. We will undertake every effort to keep the information in the study
240 confidential. Participants will be assigned a code number in order to keep protected health
241 information confidential. Consent forms and source documents will be maintained at the PI lab in
242 a locked cabinet. All digital data will be done using participant identification numbers only and
243 will be stored on a password-protected and encrypted format in a manner that is Johns Hopkins
244 IRB compliant. This will include the Clinical Research Management System (CRMS), Research
245 Electronic Data Capture (REDCap), and Johns Hopkins Microsoft One Drive. All are web-based

246 applications designed to organize and streamline clinical research management. CRMS is
247 integrated with Epic, Hopkins enterprise EMR, as well as Johns Hopkins IRB. This integration
248 improves communication among study team members, stores subject enrollment information in a
249 secure location, assists with recruitment, and allows research results to be promptly incorporated
250 into the EMR. Everybody involved in the study will have completed the appropriate HIPAA
251 training and are fully aware of confidentiality issues. No names will be included in any publications
252 resulting from this work.

253 **Randomization**

254 Prior to randomization, all eligible participants will receive comprehensive language and
255 cognitive evaluations as well as MRI for those who consent and who have no contraindication.
256 Participants will be randomly assigned 1:1 (cerebellar cathodal tDCS plus SFA treatment or sham
257 tDCS plus SFA treatment). The randomization is stratified by study site (JHH vs Howard County),
258 aphasia type (fluent vs. non-fluent, classified using WAB-R), and aphasia severity. Aphasia
259 severity will be classified using WAB-R Aphasia Quotient in 4 categories (very severe aphasia:
260 0–25, severe aphasia: 26–50, moderate aphasia: 51–75, and mild aphasia: 76–93.8). Covariate-
261 adaptive randomization method developed by Pocock and Simon, 1975 [54] will be implemented
262 in REDCap. This method ensures balance on important baseline covariates by treatment arm by
263 calculating the difference in these covariates (site, aphasia type and severity) each time a
264 participant needs be randomized and then randomizes with high probability (80%) to the arm that
265 corrects the imbalance on covariates.

266 The SLP will enter the baseline and eligibility information of a participant prior to
267 enrollment on REDCap. If the participant's eligibility is confirmed, then the algorithm
268 implemented in REDCap will evaluate the treatment arm distribution in participants already

269 randomized and then generate treatment allocation group (sham or tDCS) based on the
270 randomization scheme. Each participant will receive a unique six-digit codes (provided by the
271 manufacturer of the tDCS stimulator), which will instruct the stimulator to deliver either active
272 stimulation or placebo (sham). These codes will be entered into REDCap prior to starting the study.
273 The study coordinator will enter the codes in REDCap.

274 Both groups will receive semantic feature analysis treatment, a commonly used treatment
275 for naming deficits in aphasia. It is currently unknown whether or not cerebellar tDCS augments
276 the effect of semantic feature analysis in the chronic phase after stroke. Therefore, a sham group
277 is justified.

278 **Blinding**

279 The study is to be conducted in a double-blind manner. All participants, the members of
280 the study team who administer the assessments, those who administer treatments, as well as the
281 study biostatistician performing the statistical analyses will be blinded.

282 **Imaging**

283 The MRI scans will be performed prior to the start of the study on a 3T Philips system at
284 the F.M. Kirby Center at the Kennedy Krieger Institute. Imaging will be done for patients who
285 have no MRI contraindications. Imaging will include structural and functional scans. Structural
286 scans will include high resolution T1 and T2 weighted images, Fluid Attenuation Inversion
287 Recovery (FLAIR) scans, and Diffusion Weighted Imaging (DWI) images. Functional scan will
288 include resting state functional MRI.

289 **Treatment**

290 Participants will receive 15 sessions of SFA treatment (3-5 sessions per week over the
291 course of 3 to 5 weeks) and each session will be 60 minutes. Prior to the start of treatment,
292 participants will be randomly assigned to receive either sham plus SFA or active tDCS plus SFA.

293 The SLP will start the Semantic Feature Analysis Treatment. Participants will receive SFA
294 treatment for 60 minutes and tDCS for the first 25 minutes. SFA treatment employed in this study
295 will include 50 items and their relevant features from eight semantic categories. Items included in
296 each participant's treatment list will be determined based on performance on a picture-naming task.
297 The naming task will consist of 200 items across eight semantic categories (food [fruits,
298 vegetables], animals, transportation, clothing, furniture, music, sports, toys). The naming task will
299 be administered once. To qualify for treatment, an item must be named incorrectly. To avoid
300 effects of repeated exposure, items included on the naming task will be constrained such that they
301 do not occur in the primary outcome variable (PNT).

302 Therapy tasks will be administered through a computer with clinician assistance using
303 Microsoft Powerpoint. Participants will be trained on 7-12 items per session depending on each
304 participant's aphasia severity. The treatment protocol will be adapted from Doyle, Dickey and
305 colleagues [55,56]. The treatment will proceed according to a series of steps including naming
306 aloud the target picture, generating semantic features, naming aloud the target picture again, and
307 generating a sentence using the target word. Participants will be asked to generate semantic
308 features for each target picture in five categories: group [superordinate category], function
309 [use/action], description [physical properties], context [location], and other/personal [association].
310 A three-level cueing hierarchy will be used to elicit features, consisting of general prompt (e.g.,
311 "How would you describe this?"), followed by a relevant directed question (e.g., "What does this
312 feel like?") and a binary forced-choice question (e.g., "Is this item smooth or rough?").

313 tDCS will be delivered for 25 minutes using the Soterix Medical 1x1 Clinical trials device.
314 Soterix 1×1 CT is the most advanced and customizable system for true double-blind control trials.
315 Consistent with other studies on cerebellar tDCS [28–30,57], the current study will utilize 2 mA
316 of cathodal tDCS stimulation generated between two 5 cm x 5 cm saline-soaked sponges. The
317 active electrode (cathode) will be placed on the right cerebellar cortex, 1 cm under and 4 cm lateral
318 to theinion (approximately comparable to the projection of cerebellar lobule VII onto the scalp
319 [31]. The reference electrode (anode) will be placed over the right shoulder. For both tDCS and
320 sham interventions, current will be ramped up over a 15 second interval at stimulation onset,
321 eliciting a transient tingling sensation that effectively blinds the participant to treatment condition
322 [58]. After the ramp up, in the sham condition, current intensity will be ramped down over a 15
323 second interval to 0 mA. Participants will rate their pain levels at the end of stimulation with the
324 Wong-Baker FACES Pain Rating Scale (wongbakerfaces.org) [59]. In each session, participants
325 will be asked to inform the SLP about any side effects. Participants generally tolerate tDCS well,
326 the main reported side effects being initial tingling or itching sensations at the beginning of the
327 session for some participants [60]. Stimulation (for both tDCS and sham conditions) will start at
328 the same time as the aphasia treatment. Aphasia treatment will continue for another 35 minutes
329 after the completion of 25 minutes of real tDCS or sham tDCS for a total of 60 minutes per session.

330 Intervention for a participant will be discontinued if any of the following criteria are met:
331 Participants will be removed from the study if they are unable to comply with task instructions or
332 tolerate the tDCS procedure.

333 When the study ends, participants will continue to receive management with Dr. Argye
334 Hillis (study neurologist) or their own neurologist as usual (generally follow-up visits
335 approximately every 12 months). If a patient's participation in the study ends prematurely s/he will

336 still receive care as before. In sum, termination of the study or termination of participation in it
337 will not affect regular therapy he or she may be receiving.

338 **Primary outcome**

339 The primary outcome will be defined as the change in accuracy of naming untrained
340 pictures measured by the Philadelphia Naming Test (PNT), one week after the end of semantic
341 feature analysis (SFA).

342 **Secondary outcomes**

343 In addition to the primary outcome, several secondary analyses will be conducted. (1)
344 Trained Picture Naming. We will assess if tDCS has an effect on naming items trained during
345 treatment (trained picture naming). We will assess change in trained picture naming before
346 treatment to within 1 week after the end of treatment. Follow up testing will be done at one month,
347 three months and six months after the completion of the treatment. In addition to assessing changes
348 in correct naming, we will also evaluate treatment-related changes in naming errors to provide
349 additional insight into naming recovery following cerebellar tDCS. Naming errors will be
350 categorized as 1) semantic paraphasias; 2) phonological paraphasias; 3) mixed (phonological and
351 semantic) paraphasias; 4) non-responses; and 5) unrelated responses. (2) Discourse. We will assess
352 change in discourse abilities, as measured by the change in the total Content Units (CU) and
353 syllable per CU produced by the participants during connected speech. Participants will be
354 required to describe the Cookie Theft Picture from the Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination.
355 (3) Functional Communication Skills. We will also measure changes in everyday functional
356 communication skills assessed with the Communication Activities of Daily Living, third edition
357 (CADL-3). (4) Finally, we will administer 3 tests from the Research Outcome Measurement in
358 Aphasia-Core Outcome Set (ROMA-COS) at baseline, 1-week post treatment, and follow up time

359 points. The WAB-R will be administered as a part of the baseline testing. We will also assess
360 changes in emotional wellbeing (measured by General Health Questionnaire (GHQ)-12 and quality
361 of life (measured by Stroke and Aphasia Quality of Life Scale (SAQOL-39)).

362 **Data collection and quality assurance**

363 All research staff authorized to obtain informed consent will have completed the Johns
364 Hopkins University School of Medicine's required training in the Responsible Conduct of
365 Research and Protection of Human Subjects prior to their involvement with the study.
366 Furthermore, they will be oriented to the study and trained by the study PI and study co-
367 investigators who have all had extensive training and experience in the ethical and practical aspects
368 of informed consent procedures.

369 The PI as well as the SLPs who administer baseline testing, treatments, and follow-up
370 testing will be blinded to participant treatment assignments (described in full in the protocol
371 provided in the Supplemental Materials). Participants will be assigned a code number in order to
372 keep protected health information confidential. Consent forms and source documents will be
373 maintained at the PI lab in a locked cabinet. All digital data will be done using participant
374 identification numbers only and will be stored on a password-protected and encrypted format in a
375 manner that is Johns Hopkins IRB compliant.

376 The PI (an ASHA certified SLP) will provide training to the two ASHA certified SLPs for
377 scoring and administration of the assessment materials as well as the SFA treatment protocol. To
378 ensure quality control, all assessment sessions and part of the treatment sessions will be
379 videotaped. The PI will create a written protocol for clinicians regarding assessment and scoring,
380 and to ensure consistency of delivery and adherence to SFA treatment protocol. This will reduce
381 clinician-to-clinician variability, clinician drift, and contamination.

382 With respect to language assessment, the PI will be present for the first few assessment
383 sessions to assure fidelity during assessment. This will be followed by regular monitoring to ensure
384 adherence to assessment administration procedures. All deviations will be reviewed and clarified
385 with the clinician to ensure that adherence is improved in subsequent sessions. Each clinician will
386 have 20% of their total assessment sessions monitored quarterly for accurate implementation.

387 With respect to SFA treatment, the PI will be present for the initial few sessions to assure
388 fidelity during treatment implementation. Following this, treatment fidelity will be monitored on
389 a weekly basis by a member of the study team who is not providing treatment by reviewing short
390 video-recorded segments of treatment for adherence to the SFA protocol using a Treatment
391 Fidelity Checklist. All deviations will be reviewed and clarified with the treating clinician to ensure
392 that adherence is improved in subsequent sessions. When session monitoring detects < 1 deviation
393 across three consecutive samples, sessions will be monitored once bi-weekly for the remainder of
394 the 3–5-week (3-5 sessions per week) treatment period. If session monitoring detects >1 deviations
395 across three consecutive samples, sessions will be monitored daily until deviation is less than one.
396 The PI and research team members meet weekly (or more often) to discuss questions about and
397 implementation of the protocol.

398 To minimize the need for research-only in-person visits, telemedicine visits will be
399 substituted for portions of clinical trial visits where determined to be appropriate and where
400 determined by the investigator not to increase the participants risks. For the current study, we will
401 utilize telemedicine visits when appropriate for consenting and for all the assessments visits (visits
402 1- 3, 20-23). Prior to initiating telemedicine for study visits the study team will explain to the
403 participant what a telemedicine visit entails and confirm that the study participant is in agreement
404 and able to proceed with this method. Telemedicine acknowledgement will be obtained in

405 accordance with the Guidance for Use of Telemedicine in Research. In the event telemedicine is
406 not deemed feasible, the study visit will proceed as an in-person visit. Telemedicine visits will be
407 conducted using HIPAA compliant method approved by the Johns Hopkins Health System and
408 within licensing restrictions.

409 **Sample size estimates**

410 Sample size was determined based on the PI's prior crossover trial data [30]. That data
411 was used to estimate the variability of untrained naming score. Enrolling 52 participants (26 per
412 group) will give us 80% statistical power to detect 0.7 SD difference in change in accuracy of
413 naming untrained items at 1-week post treatment between the study arms. This was done using
414 Wald test for group assignment coefficient in linear regression at 0.1 level of statistical
415 significance. The effect size (0.7SD) is a bit conservative compared to the difference observed on
416 group comparison for 21 participants (10 in tDCS and 11 in sham) in the crossover trial data, when
417 the tDCS was administered in Phase 1. We propose to enroll 60 participants to account for 10%
418 attrition. However, if we have trouble meeting recruitment/retention goals, we will add Johns
419 Hopkins Bayview Medical Center as a site.

420 **Statistical analyses**

421 The primary outcome variable will be change in accuracy of naming untrained items as
422 measured by the PNT within 1 week after semantic feature analysis ends. The analyses will follow
423 the Intention-to-treat (ITT) principle where participants are analyzed based on the group to which
424 they are randomized regardless of early termination, missing data or errors in randomization
425 detected post hoc. The primary hypothesis is $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ versus $H_A: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1
426 is the mean change in accuracy of naming untrained items between baseline and 1-week post-
427 semantic feature analysis in the tDCS group and μ_2 is the mean change in accuracy of naming

428 untrained items between baseline and 1 week post semantic feature analysis in the sham group.
429 Average Treatment Effect (ATE) will be estimated using linear regression model with change in
430 accuracy of naming untrained items at 1 week as the dependent variable and group assignment
431 (real tDCS versus sham) as the independent variable. ATE is estimated by the coefficient for the
432 group assignment.

433 As a secondary analysis, we will consider non-parametric mixed models for analyses of
434 functional response over time. In particular, let $Y_{ijk} = u_{ik} + f_k(j) + e_{ij}$ where Y_{ij} is the the outcome
435 for subject i on occasion j (0, 1, 3, 6) within treatment arm k . (Thus, both i and k are necessary to
436 identify a subject). No covariates are necessary because of the randomization. $f_k(j)$ is a functional
437 model we will estimate using quadratic regression splines with knot points at each of the time
438 points. Given there are so few time points, we will not penalize the spline fit. A non-parametric
439 estimate of a treatment effect is given by $f_2 - f_1$, which can show time-specific treatment effects
440 when evaluated at specific points j . This will also demonstrate the rate (when and if) at which
441 TCDS effects ebb. An overall effect can be estimated by simply taking the integral of $f_2 - f_1$ (i.e.
442 the functional averaged effect over time). A null hypothesis of zero represents no time averaged
443 effect of the treatment. Given that we will use regression splines, every estimator reduces to
444 standard contrasts of regression parameters, and thus can be implemented in any statistical
445 software package. Statistical analysis of secondary outcome variables will follow a similar
446 approach as the primary outcome variable.

447 An additional goal of this project is to identify whether neural (functional and structural)
448 biomarkers and linguistic characteristics can predict response to cerebellar stimulation and SFA
449 treatment. This analysis considers moderation of treatment effects by pre-treatment baseline

450 characteristics. The pre-treatment baseline characteristics include the following: Imaging:
451 Structural (lesion volume, site, FA, MD), Functional (Fisher transformed connectivity values
452 (z scores); Linguistic: (Aphasia Severity score as assessed by WAB-R, Naming severity score
453 assessed by PNT). As in Hypothesis 1, we will consider both a conservative approach, using
454 standard contrasts and median splits on the moderating variables as well as a mixed model
455 functional approach. We will proceed in this order:

- 456 1. T-test comparing the treatment effect across median splits of the moderating variables
457 performed separately, one at a time.
- 458 2. A non-parametric modeling approach using spline based linear models testing
459 whether the potential moderating variables interact with the treatment effect over
460 time. We will consider two variations of this approach:
 - 461 a. One that assumes linearity
 - 462 b. One that assumes non-parametric functions

463 **Data Monitoring body**

464 The DSMB consists of scientists in Neurology and Public Health and will monitor safety
465 at least semi-annually and decide if the study should continue or be terminated early. DSMB
466 members include Kyrana Tsapkini, PhD (School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University), John
467 W. Krakauer, MD (School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University), and Constantine Frangakis,
468 PhD (Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University). The study SLP in
469 consultation with the study biostatistician will generate reports semi-annually or more frequently,
470 as determined by the DSMB, which provide statistics on enrollment, participant status, safety data,
471 and data quality information.

472 **Specification of safety parameters**

473 The participant may stop testing or the intervention at any time. tDCS provides a non-
474 invasive method to stimulate the cortex and cerebellum and modulate cortical/cerebellar activity
475 via continuous, weak polarizing electrical current. This study will use the Soterix Medical 1X1
476 Clinical Trials system to administer tDCS. The Soterix transcranial Direct Current Stimulator
477 Clinical Trials (1x1-CT) system is the most advanced and customizable stimulation for true
478 double-blind control trials. It is powered by four 9-V batteries with an output of 1-2.5 milliamperes
479 (mA). Anodal tDCS (A-tDCS) results in an increase in cortical excitability. Cathodal tDCS results
480 in decrease in cortical excitability. To date, no serious adverse effects of tDCS have been reported
481 in the literature as long as safety guidelines are followed [11,61]. A recent review updated and
482 consolidated the evidence on the safety of tDCS [60]. This review shows that the use of
483 conventional tDCS protocols in human trials (≤ 40 min, ≤ 4 mA) has not produced any reports of a
484 serious adverse effect or irreversible injury across over 33,200 sessions and 1000 subjects with
485 repeated sessions. This includes a wide variety of subjects, including participants with stroke.
486 Very minor side effects such as itching, tingling, burning have been reported, as well as temporary
487 headache, sleepiness, dizziness. However, they were generally indistinguishable from those
488 reported by participants receiving sham stimulation. The current study will only administer 2 mA
489 for 25 minutes per treatment session. It is important to note that tDCS does not cause significant
490 heating effects under the electrodes, alter the blood-brain barrier, or induce edema.

491 Our recent study in chronic post stroke aphasia (20 min, 2mA) in 24 participants did not
492 produce any negative effects associated with tDCS administration beyond mild itching/tingling at
493 the beginning of the treatment session [30]. A recent large crossover trial in 36 participants with
494 Primary Progressive Aphasia (20 min, 2mA) reported no episodes of intolerability and no serious
495 adverse effects [62]. On the Wong-Baker FACES Pain Rating Scale, the mean pain rating for tDCS

496 was 2.21 (standard deviation 2.48, range 0–10) and the mean rating for sham was 2.14 (standard
497 deviation 2.13, range 0–10).

498 Another large, randomized control trial in 74 participants with aphasia reported 8 mild,
499 non-serious adverse events and there were no statistically significant differences between
500 treatment groups for number of adverse events [21]. 2 participants (6%) in the active tDCS group
501 experienced transient scalp redness/irritation (erythema) compared with none in the sham tDCS
502 group. On the Wong-Baker FACES Pain Rating Scale, most often individuals reported no hurt:
503 94% (n = 476) in the active tDCS group vs 86% (n = 511) in the sham group. The highest pain
504 rating reported was 3 (indicating “hurts even more”), which was reported 4 times by 2 individuals
505 (3%), both in the sham group. Taken together, all available research suggests that prolonged
506 application should not pose a risk of brain damage when applied according to safety guidelines.

507 Participants may undergo MRI scanning in the present study. The effects of undergoing
508 MR scanning have been extensively studied and there are no risks associated with an MR exam.
509 The patient may, however, be bothered by feelings of confinement (claustrophobia), and by the
510 noise made by the magnet during the procedure. They will be asked to wear earplugs or earphones
511 while in the magnet.

512 All MRI scans will be reviewed by co-investigator and board-certified neurologist (Dr.
513 Argye Hillis) and any suspicious abnormalities will be referred to a board-certified
514 neuroradiologist. Please note that all of our participants, who will be recruited from the outpatient
515 or stroke clinic, who do not have contraindication for MRI will have had a clinical MRI post-
516 stroke. If unexpected abnormalities - incidental findings - are seen (which is unlikely, as every
517 patient will have had a clinical MRI as part of their evaluation for stroke), the participant will be

518 asked permission to contact the primary care physician about the abnormality, and will be offered
519 a timely appointment with a neurologist (Dt. Argye Hillis, co-investigator) if appropriate.

520 Participants will be carefully screened over the phone prior to being scheduled, to assure
521 that they meet study criteria. tDCS stimulation will be ramped up over the first 15 seconds of
522 stimulation in order to eliminate the sensation of tingling that can occur under the electrodes during
523 the initial moments of tDCS application. The participant may stop testing or the intervention any
524 time. There will be emergency personnel and equipment on hand for safety.

525 Adverse events will be monitored during the entire visit by the study team. The families
526 will be given telephone numbers of the study team as well. The study physician (Dr. Argye Hillis)
527 and the DSMB will be notified immediately if any adverse events are reported. If a significant
528 safety concern arises, participants may be unblinded in order to address it. The DSMB will
529 determine if the adverse event is a serious adverse event. Adverse events will be monitored until
530 they are resolved or clearly determined to be due to a subject's stable or chronic condition or
531 intercurrent illness. In the case of any unexpected adverse events involving risks to participants or
532 others that are related/possibly related to the research, a Protocol Event Report will be prepared by
533 the Study Coordinator, the PI will be informed immediately, and the IRB will be contacted within
534 10 days as per Johns Hopkins Medicine IRB policy; deaths will be reported within 72 hours. Also,
535 as required by IRB policy, any unexpected adverse device effects, potential breaches of
536 confidentiality, unresolved participant complaints will be promptly reported to the IRB. Any other
537 adverse events that do not require prompt reporting will be summarized and reported to the IRB at
538 the time of continuing review.

539 **Summary and concluding remarks**

540 It is our hope that completion of this project will result in better understanding of whether
541 and how cerebellar tDCS coupled with behavioral therapy may help individuals with post stroke
542 aphasia. The cerebellum, which contains more than half of the brain's neurons and a significant
543 source of input to language as well as motor cortical regions, provides a means by which residual
544 cortical tissue can be stimulated in stroke participants without interference from the lesion itself.
545 However, the effect of cerebellar tDCS combined with behavioral therapy remains incompletely
546 understood. Further, little is known about how factors related to imaging and linguistic
547 characteristics combine to induce treatment responsiveness. We will carry out resting state
548 functional magnetic resonance imaging (rsfMRI), diffusion tensor imaging (DTI), high resolution
549 structural imaging, and detailed linguistic testing before the start of treatment to determine whether
550 these factors can predict response to cerebellar tDCS and/or SFA. This exploratory aim may
551 identify stroke patients who are mostly likely to benefit from cerebellar tDCS and/or SFA. This
552 result may have significant implications for designing a Phase III randomized controlled trial. Trial
553 results will be submitted to Clinicaltrials.gov no later than one year after the primary completion
554 date. In addition, regardless of outcome, results will be disseminated in peer reviewed journals and
555 contribute to the growing body of literature on the topic of tDCS in post-stroke aphasia
556 rehabilitation.

557 **Funding:** The trial is fully funded by the National Institute on Deafness and Other
558 Communication Disorders (NIH/NIDCD) R01 DC019639. The funders had and will not have a
559 role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the
560 manuscript.

561 **Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

562 **Supporting Information**

563 **S1 File. SPIRIT checklist.**

564 (DOCX)

565 **S2 File. Protocol.**

566 (DOCX)

567 **S3 File. Consent Form.**

568 (PDF)

569 **Author Contributions**

570 **Conceptualization:** RS, AEH

571 **Data curation:** NA

572 **Formal analysis:** NA

573 **Funding acquisition:** RS

574 **Methodology:** RS AEH GY

575 **Project administration:** BL, MJS, SC, JHK

576 **Supervision:** RS

577 **Writing – original draft:** BL, MJS

578 **Writing – review & editing:** BL, MJS, SC, JHK, GY, AEH, RS

579

580

581

582 **References**

- 583 1. Boehme AK, Martin-Schild S, Marshall RS, Lazar RM. Effect of aphasia on acute stroke
584 outcomes. *Neurology*. 2016;87: 2348–2354. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000003297
- 585 2. Ellis C, Simpson AN, Bonilha H, Mauldin PD, Simpson KN. The One-Year Attributable Cost
586 of Poststroke Aphasia. *Stroke*. 2012;43: 1429–1431.
587 doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.647339
- 588 3. Tsouli S, Kyritsis AP, Tsagalas G, Virvidaki E, Vemmos KN. Significance of Aphasia after

- 589 First-Ever Acute Stroke: Impact on Early and Late Outcomes. *Neuroepidemiology*.
590 2009;33: 96–102. doi:10.1159/000222091
- 591 4. Raymer AM, Gonzalez-Rothi LJ, editors. *The Oxford handbook of aphasia and language*
592 *disorders*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 2018.
- 593 5. Hillis AE. Treatment of naming disorders: New issues regarding old therapies. *J Int*
594 *Neuropsychol Soc*. 1998;4: 648–660. doi:10.1017/S135561779846613X
- 595 6. Nickels L. Therapy for naming disorders: Revisiting, revising, and reviewing. *Aphasiology*.
596 2002;16: 935–979. doi:10.1080/02687030244000563
- 597 7. Raymer AM, Kohen F, Blonder LX, Douglas E, Sembrat JL, Rothi LJG. Effects of gesture
598 and semantic-phonologic treatments for noun retrieval in aphasia. *Brain Lang*. 2007;103:
599 219–220. doi:10.1016/j.bandl.2007.07.014
- 600 8. Wisenburn B, Mahoney K. A meta-analysis of word-finding treatments for aphasia.
601 *Aphasiology*. 2009;23: 1338–1352. doi:10.1080/02687030902732745
- 602 9. Kiran S, Thompson CK. The Role of Semantic Complexity in Treatment of Naming Deficits:
603 Training Semantic Categories in Fluent Aphasia by Controlling Exemplar Typicality. *J*
604 *Speech Lang Hear Res JSLHR*. 2003;46: 773–787.
- 605 10. Crinion JT. Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation as a Novel Method for Enhancing
606 Aphasia Treatment Effects. *Eur Psychol*. 2016;21: 65–77. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000254
- 607 11. Lefaucheur J-P, Antal A, Ayache SS, Benninger DH, Brunelin J, Cogiamanian F, et al.
608 Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of transcranial direct current stimulation
609 (tDCS). *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2017;128: 56–92. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2016.10.087
- 610 12. Fridriksson J, Richardson JD, Fillmore P, Cai B. Left hemisphere plasticity and aphasia
611 recovery. *NeuroImage*. 2012;60: 854–863. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.12.057
- 612 13. Hamilton RH, Chrysikou EG, Coslett B. Mechanisms of aphasia recovery after stroke and
613 the role of noninvasive brain stimulation. *Brain Lang*. 2011;118: 40–50.
614 doi:10.1016/j.bandl.2011.02.005
- 615 14. Fridriksson J. Preservation and Modulation of Specific Left Hemisphere Regions is Vital for
616 Treated Recovery from Anomia in Stroke. *J Neurosci*. 2010;30: 11558–11564.
617 doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2227-10.2010
- 618 15. Hartwigsen G, Saur D. Neuroimaging of stroke recovery from aphasia – Insights into
619 plasticity of the human language network. *NeuroImage*. 2019;190: 14–31.
620 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.11.056
- 621 16. Saur D, Lange R, Baumgaertner A, Schraknepper V, Willmes K, Rijntjes M, et al.
622 Dynamics of language reorganization after stroke. *Brain*. 2006;129: 1371–1384.
623 doi:10.1093/brain/awl090
- 624 17. Turkeltaub PE, Swears MK, D’Mello AM, Stoodley CJ. Cerebellar tDCS as a novel
625 treatment for aphasia? Evidence from behavioral and resting-state functional connectivity
626 data in healthy adults. Hamilton R, editor. *Restor Neurol Neurosci*. 2016;34: 491–505.
627 doi:10.3233/RNN-150633
- 628 18. Datta A, Baker JM, Bikson M, Fridriksson J. Individualized model predicts brain current
629 flow during transcranial direct-current stimulation treatment in responsive stroke patient.
630 *Brain Stimulat*. 2011;4: 169–174. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2010.11.001
- 631 19. Dmochowski JP, Datta A, Huang Y, Richardson JD, Bikson M, Fridriksson J, et al.
632 Targeted transcranial direct current stimulation for rehabilitation after stroke. *NeuroImage*.
633 2013;75: 12–19. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.02.049
- 634 20. Galletta EE, Cancelli A, Cottone C, Simonelli I, Tecchio F, Bikson M, et al. Use of
635 Computational Modeling to Inform tDCS Electrode Montages for the Promotion of
636 Language Recovery in Post-stroke Aphasia. *Brain Stimulat*. 2015;8: 1108–1115.
637 doi:10.1016/j.brs.2015.06.018
- 638 21. Fridriksson J, Rorden C, Elm J, Sen S, George MS, Bonilha L. Transcranial Direct Current
639 Stimulation vs Sham Stimulation to Treat Aphasia After Stroke: A Randomized Clinical

- 640 Trial. *JAMA Neurol.* 2018;75: 1470. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2018.2287
- 641 22. Baker JM, Rorden C, Fridriksson J. Using Transcranial Direct-Current Stimulation to Treat
642 Stroke Patients With Aphasia. *Stroke.* 2010;41: 1229–1236.
643 doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.109.576785
- 644 23. Fridriksson J, Richardson JD, Baker JM, Rorden C. Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation
645 Improves Naming Reaction Time in Fluent Aphasia: A Double-Blind, Sham-Controlled
646 Study. *Stroke.* 2011;42: 819–821. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.600288
- 647 24. Fridriksson J, Basilakos A, Stark BC, Rorden C, Elm J, Gottfried M, et al. Transcranial
648 direct current stimulation to treat aphasia: Longitudinal analysis of a randomized controlled
649 trial. *Brain Stimulat.* 2019;12: 190–191. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2018.09.016
- 650 25. Desmond JE, Fiez JA. Neuroimaging studies of the cerebellum: language, learning and
651 memory. *Trends Cogn Sci.* 1998;2: 355–362. doi:10.1016/S1364-6613(98)01211-X
- 652 26. Murdoch BE. The cerebellum and language: Historical perspective and review. *Cortex.*
653 2010;46: 858–868. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2009.07.018
- 654 27. De Smet HJ, Paquier P, Verhoeven J, Mariën P. The cerebellum: Its role in language and
655 related cognitive and affective functions. *Brain Lang.* 2013;127: 334–342.
656 doi:10.1016/j.bandl.2012.11.001
- 657 28. Sebastian R, Saxena S, Tsapkini K, Faria AV, Long C, Wright A, et al. Cerebellar tDCS: A
658 Novel Approach to Augment Language Treatment Post-stroke. *Front Hum Neurosci.*
659 2017;10. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2016.00695
- 660 29. Marangolo P, Fiori V, Caltagirone C, Pisano F, Priori A. Transcranial Cerebellar Direct
661 Current Stimulation Enhances Verb Generation but Not Verb Naming in Poststroke
662 Aphasia. *J Cogn Neurosci.* 2018;30: 188–199. doi:10.1162/jocn_a_01201
- 663 30. Sebastian R, Kim JH, Brenowitz R, Tippett DC, Desmond JE, Celnik PA, et al. Cerebellar
664 neuromodulation improves naming in post-stroke aphasia. *Brain Commun.* 2020;2:
665 fcaa179. doi:10.1093/braincomms/fcaa179
- 666 31. Pope PA, Miall RC. Task-specific facilitation of cognition by cathodal transcranial direct
667 current stimulation of the cerebellum. *Brain Stimulat.* 2012;5: 84–94.
668 doi:10.1016/j.brs.2012.03.006
- 669 32. Boehringer A, Macher K, Dukart J, Villringer A, Pleger B. Cerebellar Transcranial Direct
670 Current Stimulation Modulates Verbal Working Memory. *Brain Stimulat.* 2013;6: 649–653.
671 doi:10.1016/j.brs.2012.10.001
- 672 33. Ferrucci R, Brunoni AR, Parazzini M, Vergari M, Rossi E, Fumagalli M, et al. Modulating
673 Human Procedural Learning by Cerebellar Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation. *The*
674 *Cerebellum.* 2013;12: 485–492. doi:10.1007/s12311-012-0436-9
- 675 34. Roach A, Schwartz MF, Martin N, Grewal RS, Brecher A. The Philadelphia naming test:
676 scoring and rationale. *Clin Aphasiology.* 1996; 121–33.
- 677 35. Brunoni AR, Nitsche MA, Bolognini N, Bikson M, Wagner T, Merabet L, et al. Clinical
678 research with transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): Challenges and future
679 directions. *Brain Stimulat.* 2012;5: 175–195. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2011.03.002
- 680 36. Nitsche MA, Paulus W. Sustained excitability elevations induced by transcranial DC motor
681 cortex stimulation in humans. *Neurology.* 2001;57: 1899–1901.
682 doi:10.1212/wnl.57.10.1899
- 683 37. Galea JM, Jayaram G, Ajagbe L, Celnik P. Modulation of Cerebellar Excitability by Polarity-
684 Specific Noninvasive Direct Current Stimulation. *J Neurosci.* 2009;29: 9115–9122.
685 doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2184-09.2009
- 686 38. Grimaldi G, Argyropoulos GP, Bastian A, Cortes M, Davis NJ, Edwards DJ, et al.
687 Cerebellar Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (ctDCS): A Novel Approach to
688 Understanding Cerebellar Function in Health and Disease. *The Neuroscientist.* 2016;22:
689 83–97. doi:10.1177/1073858414559409
- 690 39. Maddy KM, Capilouto GJ, McComas KL. The effectiveness of semantic feature analysis:

- 691 An evidence-based systematic review. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med*. 2014;57: 254–267.
692 doi:10.1016/j.rehab.2014.03.002
- 693 40. Oh SJ, Eom B, Park C, Sung JE. Treatment Efficacy of Semantic Feature Analyses for
694 Persons with Aphasia: Evidence from Meta-Analyses. *Commun Sci Disord*. 2016;21: 310–
695 323. doi:10.12963/csd.16312
- 696 41. Boyle M. Semantic Feature Analysis Treatment for Aphasic Word Retrieval Impairments:
697 What’s in a Name? *Top Stroke Rehabil*. 2010;17: 411–422. doi:10.1310/tsr1706-411
- 698 42. Efstratiadou EA, Papathanasiou I, Holland R, Archonti A, Hilari K. A Systematic Review of
699 Semantic Feature Analysis Therapy Studies for Aphasia. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*.
700 2018;61: 1261–1278. doi:10.1044/2018_JSLHR-L-16-0330
- 701 43. Quique YM, Evans WS, Dickey MW. Acquisition and Generalization Responses in Aphasia
702 Naming Treatment: A Meta-Analysis of Semantic Feature Analysis Outcomes. *Am J*
703 *Speech Lang Pathol*. 2019;28: 230–246. doi:10.1044/2018_AJSLP-17-0155
- 704 44. Boyle M, Coelho CA. Application of Semantic Feature Analysis as a Treatment for Aphasic
705 Dysnomia. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol*. 1995;4: 94–98. doi:10.1044/1058-0360.0404.94
- 706 45. Collins AM, Loftus EF. A spreading-activation theory of semantic processing. *Psychol Rev*.
707 1975;82: 407–428. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.82.6.407
- 708 46. Ackermann H, Wildgruber D, Daum I, Grodd W. Does the cerebellum contribute to
709 cognitive aspects of speech production? A functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI)
710 study in humans. *Neurosci Lett*. 1998;247: 187–190. doi:10.1016/s0304-3940(98)00328-0
- 711 47. Strick PL, Dum RP, Fiez JA. Cerebellum and nonmotor function. *Annu Rev Neurosci*.
712 2009;32: 413–434. doi:10.1146/annurev.neuro.31.060407.125606
- 713 48. Argyropoulos GPD. The cerebellum, internal models and prediction in “non-motor” aspects
714 of language: A critical review. *Brain Lang*. 2016;161: 4–17.
715 doi:10.1016/j.bandl.2015.08.003
- 716 49. Goodglass H, Kaplan E, Barresi B. BDAE-3: Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination–
717 Third Edition. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2001.
- 718 50. Holland AL, Fromm D, Wozniak L. CADL-3: Communication Activities of Daily Living-Third
719 Edition. Pro-ed; 2018.
- 720 51. Kertesz A. WAB-R: Western Aphasia Battery-Revised. Pearson; 2007.
- 721 52. Goldberg DP, Hillier VF. A scaled version of the General Health Questionnaire. *Psychol*
722 *Med*. 1979;9: 139–145. doi:10.1017/S0033291700021644
- 723 53. Hilari K, Byng S, Lamping DL, Smith SC. Stroke and Aphasia Quality of Life Scale-39
724 (SAQOL-39): Evaluation of Acceptability, Reliability, and Validity. *Stroke*. 2003;34: 1944–
725 1950. doi:10.1161/01.STR.0000081987.46660.ED
- 726 54. Pocock SJ, Simon R. Sequential treatment assignment with balancing for prognostic
727 factors in the controlled clinical trial. *Biometrics*. 1975;31: 103–115.
- 728 55. Gravier ML, Dickey MW, Hula WD, Evans WS, Owens RL, Winans-Mitrik RL, et al. What
729 Matters in Semantic Feature Analysis: Practice-Related Predictors of Treatment Response
730 in Aphasia. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol*. 2018;27: 438–453. doi:10.1044/2017_AJSLP-16-
731 0196
- 732 56. Evans WS, Cavanaugh R, Gravier ML, Autenreith AM, Doyle PJ, Hula WD, et al. Effects of
733 Semantic Feature Type, Diversity, and Quantity on Semantic Feature Analysis Treatment
734 Outcomes in Aphasia. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol*. 2021;30: 344–358.
735 doi:10.1044/2020_AJSLP-19-00112
- 736 57. DeMarco AT, Dvorak E, Lacey E, Stoodley CJ, Turkeltaub PE. An Exploratory Study of
737 Cerebellar Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation in Individuals With Chronic Stroke
738 Aphasia. *Cogn Behav Neurol*. 2021;34: 96–106. doi:10.1097/WNN.0000000000000270
- 739 58. Gandiga PC, Hummel FC, Cohen LG. Transcranial DC stimulation (tDCS): a tool for
740 double-blind sham-controlled clinical studies in brain stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol Off J*
741 *Int Fed Clin Neurophysiol*. 2006;117: 845–850. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2005.12.003

- 742 59. Garra G, Singer AJ, Domingo A, Thode HC. The Wong-Baker pain FACES scale
743 measures pain, not fear. *Pediatr Emerg Care*. 2013;29: 17–20.
744 doi:10.1097/PEC.0b013e31827b2299
- 745 60. Bikson M, Grossman P, Thomas C, Zannou AL, Jiang J, Adnan T, et al. Safety of
746 Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation: Evidence Based Update 2016. *Brain Stimulat*.
747 2016;9: 641–661. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2016.06.004
- 748 61. Fregni F, El-Hagrassy MM, Pacheco-Barrios K, Carvalho S, Leite J, Simis M, et al.
749 Evidence-Based Guidelines and Secondary Meta-Analysis for the Use of Transcranial
750 Direct Current Stimulation in Neurological and Psychiatric Disorders. *Int J*
751 *Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2021;24: 256–313. doi:10.1093/ijnp/pyaa051
- 752 62. Tsapkini K, Webster KT, Ficek BN, Desmond JE, Onyike CU, Rapp B, et al. Electrical brain
753 stimulation in different variants of primary progressive aphasia: A randomized clinical trial.
754 *Alzheimers Dement Transl Res Clin Interv*. 2018;4: 461–472.
755 doi:10.1016/j.trci.2018.08.002
756
757

	Study Period							
	Baseline Testing, Enrollment, & Allocation			Treatment	Post-Treatment Testing			
	Visit 1 >6 months post-stroke	Visits 2-3	Visit 4	Visits 5-19 (3-5 weeks)	Visit 20 1-week post- treatment	Visit 21 1-month post- treatment	Visit 22 3-months post- treatment	Visit 23 6-months post- treatment
ENROLLMENT								
Informed Consent	X							
Review inclusion/exclusion criteria	X							
MRI & tDCS safety screening	X							
Medical history	X							
Current medications	X							
Neurological examination	X							
Structural MRI								
Allocation/Randomization			X					
INTERVENTIONS								
Active tDCS or sham tDCS condition				X				
Semantic Feature Analysis (SFA) Treatment over 3-5 weeks				X				
ASSESSMENTS								
Western Aphasia Battery – Revised (WAB-R)**	X				X	X	X	X
Computerized Philadelphia Naming Test (PNT)*		X			X	X	X	X
Communication Activities of Daily Living (CADL)**		X			X	X	X	X
BDAE Cookie Theft**		X			X	X	X	X
General Health Questionnaire (GHQ)**		X			X	X	X	X
Stroke and Aphasia Quality of Life Scale (SAQOL)**		X			X	X	X	X
Boston Naming Test 2 nd Edition (BNT)		X						
Apraxia of Speech Rating Scale with speech sample		X						
Pyramids and Palm Trees Test Short Form (PPTT)		X						
Cognitive Linguistic Quick Test (CLQT)		X						
Record Adverse Events (AE)				X				
Record Wong-Baker FACES Pain Rating				X				

Figure 1. CeSAR schedule of enrollment, interventions, and assessments.

*primary outcome measure **secondary outcome measures

Figure1-schedule-tif