

1 **Repeated net-tDCS of the hypothalamus appetite-control network**
2 **reduces inhibitory control and sweet food intake in persons with**
3 **overweight or obesity**

4 Theresa Ester-Nacke^{1,2,3*}, Ralf Veit^{1,2,3}, Julia Thomanek^{1,2,3}, Magdalena Book^{1,2,3},
5 Lukas Tamble^{1,2,3}, Marie Beermann^{1,2,3}, Dorina Löffler^{1,2,3}, Ricardo Salvador⁴,
6 Giulio Ruffini⁴, Martin Heni^{1,2,3,5,6}, Andreas L. Birkenfeld^{1,2,3}, Christian
7 Plewnia^{7,8}, Hubert Preissl^{1,2,3,8,9}, Stephanie Kullmann^{1,2,3}


8 ¹Institute for Diabetes Research and Metabolic Diseases (IDM) of the Helmholtz Center
9 Munich at the University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany; ²Department of Internal Medicine,
10 Division of Endocrinology, Diabetology and Nephrology, Eberhard Karls University Tübingen,
11 Tübingen, Germany; ³German Center of Diabetes Research (DZD), Tübingen, Germany;
12 ⁴Neuroelectrics Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain; ⁵Institute for Clinical Chemistry and
13 Pathobiochemistry, Department for Diagnostic Laboratory Medicine, Eberhard Karls
14 University Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany; ⁶Division of Endocrinology and Diabetology,
15 Department of Internal Medicine 1, University Hospital Ulm, Ulm, Germany; ⁷Department of
16 Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Neurophysiology & Interventional Neuropsychiatry, University
17 Hospital Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany; ⁸German Center for Mental Health (DZPG), Partner
18 Site Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany; ⁹Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Department of
19 Pharmacy and Biochemistry; Interfaculty Centre for Pharmacogenomics and Pharma Research
20 at the Eberhard Karls University Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany.

21 -----

22 * Corresponding author. Institute for Diabetes Research and Metabolic Diseases (IDM) of the
23 Helmholtz Center Munich at the University of Tübingen. Otfried Müller Str. 47, 72076
24 Tübingen.

25 *E-mail address:* Theresa.ester@med.uni-tuebingen.de (T. Ester-Nacke).

26



29 **Highlights**

- 30 • Active net-tDCS groups showed better inhibitory control compared to the sham group.
- 31 • Stronger increase in hypothalamic functional connectivity associated with better
32 inhibitory control after active net-tDCS.
- 33 • No differences were found between the active net-tDCS and sham groups for total
34 kilocaloric intake.
- 35 • Anodal net-tDCS showed lower sweet food intake compared to the sham group.

36 **Abstract**

37 **Background** Reduced inhibitory control is associated with obesity and neuroimaging studies
38 indicate that diminished prefrontal cortex activity influence eating behavior and metabolism.
39 The hypothalamus regulates energy homeostasis and is functionally connected to cortical and
40 subcortical regions especially the frontal areas.

41 **Objectives** We tested network-targeted transcranial direct current stimulation (net-tDCS) to
42 influence the excitability of brain regions involved in appetite control.

43 **Methods** In a randomized, double-blind parallel group design, 44 adults with overweight or
44 obesity (BMI 30.6 kg/m², 52.3 % female) received active (anodal or cathodal) or sham 12-
45 channel net-tDCS on the hypothalamus appetite-control network for 25 minutes on three
46 consecutive days while performing a Stop-Signal-Task to measure response inhibition. Before
47 and after stimulation, state questionnaires assessed changes in desire to eat and food craving.
48 Directly after stimulation, participants received a breakfast buffet to evaluate *ad-libitum* food
49 intake. An oral glucose tolerance test was conducted at follow-up. Resting-state functional MRI
50 was obtained at baseline and follow-up.

51 **Results** The Stop-Signal Reaction Time (SSRT) was shorter in both active groups versus sham,
52 indicating improved response inhibition. Additionally, a stronger increase in hypothalamic
53 functional connectivity was associated with shorter SSRT. Caloric intake of sweet food was
54 lower in the anodal group versus sham, but no main effects between groups were observed on
55 total and macronutrient intake, food craving ratings and desire to eat. At follow-up, no
56 differences were observed between groups on peripheral metabolism.

57 **Conclusion** Our study suggests that modulating hypothalamic functional network
58 connectivity patterns via net-tDCS may improve food choice and inhibitory control.

59
60 **Keywords** eating behaviour, food intake, functional connectivity, hypothalamus, obesity,
61 response inhibition, transcranial direct current stimulation

62 **Abbreviations**

- 63 AIC – Akaike Information Criterion
- 64 BMI – Body Mass Index
- 65 CANTAB – Cambridge Neuropsychological Test Automated Battery
- 66 dlPFC – Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex
- 67 FC – Functional Connectivity
- 68 FCQ-S – Food Craving Questionnaire State
- 69 fMRI – Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging
- 70 GIP – Glucose-Dependent Insulinotropic Polypeptide
- 71 GIRs – Glucose Infusion Rates
- 72 GLM – General Linear Model
- 73 GLP1 – Glucagon-like Peptide 1
- 74 HbA1c – Glycohemoglobin A1c
- 75 HD-tDCS – High-definition Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation
- 76 IFG – Interior Frontal Gyrus
- 77 ISI – Insulin Sensitivity Index
- 78 Kcal – Kilocalories
- 79 LMER – Linear Mixed Effects Model
- 80 mA – Milliampere
- 81 MRI – Magnetic Resonance Imaging
- 82 Net-tDCS – Network Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation
- 83 NIBS – Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation
- 84 oGTT – Oral Glucose Tolerance Test
- 85 μ A – Microampere
- 86 PANAS – Positive and Negative Affect Scale
- 87 PFC – Prefrontal Cortex
- 88 SBC – Seed-Based Connectivity Maps
- 89 SD – Standard Deviation
- 90 SSRT – Stop-Signal Reaction Time
- 91 SST – Stop-Signal Task
- 92 T2DM – Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus
- 93 tDCS – Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation
- 94 VAS – Visual Analogue Scale
- 95 WHR – Waist-to-Hip Ratio

96 **1. Introduction**

97 The prevalence of obesity nearly tripled between 1975 and 2016, representing one of the leading
98 causes of morbidity and mortality [1]. Obesity is highly linked with an increased risk for
99 numerous health conditions, notably cardiovascular diseases, insulin resistance and the
100 development of type-2 diabetes (T2DM) [2]. Its etiology is complex and includes genetic,
101 environmental, social and behavioral factors and the interactions among those [3] with a
102 suspected significant contribution of the brain [4; 5].

103 In the long run, various obesity prevention and treatment approaches have demonstrated only
104 limited success [2]. Among current interventions, bariatric surgery and pharmacological
105 therapies represent the most effective approaches for significant weight loss and weight
106 maintenance. Moreover, recent pharmacological therapies, particularly glucagon-like peptide 1
107 (GLP1) receptor agonists and glucose-dependent insulintropic polypeptide (GIP)/GLP1
108 receptor co-agonists have shown promising results by targeting brain circuits involved in
109 appetite control [6]. However, these interventions are not universally applicable and do not
110 serve a preventive role, highlighting the need for new prevention approaches reducing obesity
111 rates and maintain long-term weight management.

112 Thereby, the brain plays a pivotal role in regulating eating behavior wherein its altered response
113 to peripheral hormones and external food cues increases the vulnerability to obesity [5; 7].
114 Central to this regulation is the hypothalamus, a key regulator of energy homeostasis, which is
115 functionally connected to brain areas important for reward processing, food perception and
116 cognitive control such as the prefrontal cortex (PFC), hippocampus and the striatum [8].

117 Neuroimaging studies in persons with overweight or obesity have identified modifications in
118 these areas on a local and network level [for review [9–11]]. Specifically, the hypothalamus
119 exhibits attenuated functional connectivity (FC) to brain regions crucial for cognitive control
120 over food intake and increased FC to areas involved in reward [12; 13]. Moreover, persons with
121 obesity show elevated food cue reactivity in brain regions important for reward and gustatory
122 processing [14].

123 Inhibitory control refers to the ability to suppress a prepotent response (e.g. [15; 16]).
124 Accordingly, impairments in dorsolateral PFC (dlPFC) activity are associated with reduced
125 inhibitory control and higher impulsivity, which plays a role in the development and
126 maintenance of obesity [17–19]. For instance, individuals with overweight or obesity showed
127 lower FC between the hypothalamus and the dlPFC [13] and exhibit poorer performance in an
128 inhibitory control task [20–22]. On the other hand, evidence from a functional magnetic

129 resonance imaging (fMRI) study showed that increasing FC of the dIPFC enhanced control
130 mechanisms related to food intake [23] and is related to better food choices [24]. Taken
131 together, findings suggest that the brain activation is a predictor for dietary success [25] and
132 understanding these connections offers profound insights into the neurobiological
133 underpinnings of dietary habits and obesity.

134 Changing excitability of these brain areas may result in the modulation of food intake behavior
135 and cognitive functions. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) serves as a non-invasive
136 tool for neurostimulation to alter spontaneous firing rate and excitability of cortical neurons in
137 the brain [26] to increase (anodal) or decrease (cathodal) resting membrane potential in neurons
138 [27].

139 Several studies have shown that tDCS enhanced inhibitory control [28–30] reduced food
140 craving and binge-eating episodes [31–37], especially for sweet foods [33; 35; 36; 38], lowered
141 food intake [31; 39] and improved glucose metabolism [40–42]. Despite encouraging results,
142 not all studies showed an effect of tDCS on food-related outcomes [for review see [43]],
143 possibly due to inconsistency of stimulation parameters, large variation in experimental settings
144 [44; 45] and inter-subject variations [46]. Moreover, previous efforts have mainly focused on
145 stimulating isolated brain region, usually the dIPFC [43], without taking the interplay among
146 various brain regions into account.

147 The hypothalamic FC network could be an ideal target for influencing eating behavior, reward
148 and inhibitory control due to its functional connections to striatal and prefrontal regions. Using
149 multiple small-sized electrodes, it is possible to target an entire brain network. This is referred
150 to as network (net)-tDCS [47; 48]. Our recent pilot study [49] showed promising results with
151 enhanced inhibitory control after anodal net-tDCS stimulation of this hypothalamus appetite-
152 control network. This network covered areas of the dIPFC, ventromedial PFC, inferior frontal
153 gyrus (IFG) and limbic regions that are critical for reward processes and decision making.

154 The current study examined net-tDCS targeting the hypothalamus appetite-control network to
155 modify inhibitory control, food intake, food craving, and desire to eat in individuals with
156 overweight or obesity and at high risk to develop T2DM. Given limited research on cathodal
157 stimulation in this context, both anodal and cathodal forms were included. We hypothesized
158 that the anodal net-tDCS group will show: (i) higher inhibitory control, as measured by the
159 Stop-Signal Task (SST); (ii) lower caloric intake, food craving and desire to eat and; (iii) higher
160 peripheral insulin sensitivity derived from an oral glucose tolerance test (oGTT) compared to
161 those receiving sham or cathodal stimulation. For this purpose, we conducted a randomized,
162 double-blind, placebo-controlled trial in parallel group design with resting-state fMRI as well

163 as nutritional and psychometric evaluations before and after the 3-day net-tDCS stimulation
164 and an oGTT at follow-up.

165 **2. Materials and Methods**

166 **2.1 Study population**

167 Men and women with overweight or obesity were recruited via email at the University Clinic
168 Tübingen in Germany. Volunteers were eligible to participate if they met the following
169 inclusion criteria: age between 20 to 65 years; body mass index (BMI) between 25.5 and 39
170 kg/m² with a waist circumference of ≥ 80 cm in women and ≥ 94 cm in men; stable body weight
171 (weight gain or loss ≤ 5 kg within 3 months). The exclusion criteria were: manifest T2DM;
172 insufficient knowledge of the German language; pregnancy or lactation; history of severe
173 mental or somatic disorders including neurological disease; drug or alcohol abuse; hemoglobin
174 values ≤ 12 g/dl for women and ≤ 14 g/dl for men; magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) contra-
175 indications; participation in a lifestyle intervention or pharmaceutical study. Written informed
176 consent was obtained from all participants. The ethics committee of the University Hospital
177 Tübingen approved the study protocol (project number: 243/2019BO1) and it was registered on
178 ClinicalTrials.gov (registration number: NCT04420650). The trial was carried out from May
179 26, 2020, until September 28, 2023, according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki.

180 **2.2 Experimental design and procedure**

181 The study was conducted as a double-blind, parallel-group design, sham-controlled trial
182 comparing active (anodal or cathodal) net-tDCS versus sham. The experimental design is
183 depicted in **Fig. 1** (reporting checklist for tDCS studies is shown in **Suppl. Table 1**). In short,
184 participants attended a total of five visits and were screened for eligibility criteria via phone
185 prior to the baseline visit. At baseline, participants were interviewed for pre-existing psychiatric
186 and neurological conditions during a detailed medical history assessment, followed by
187 determination of body weight, body size, waist circumference and hip circumference.
188 Participants underwent a resting-state fMRI and completed a series of psychometric
189 questionnaires (see **Suppl. Methods** for questionnaire information). Following, three
190 consecutive visits were conducted 7 to 76 days after the baseline visit. Participants were
191 assigned using a block randomization method into either the anodal net-tDCS, cathodal net-
192 tDCS or sham group. At the visits, participants, who were instructed to fast for 4-6 hours
193 beforehand, arrived between 11:00 am and 3:00 pm and completed a battery of state
194 questionnaires, namely Food Craving Questionnaire – State (FCQ-S), Desire to eat Visual
195 Analogue Scale (VAS) and positive and negative affect schedule (PANAS) (pre net-tDCS, see

196 **Suppl. Methods** for questionnaire information). This was followed by 25 minutes of either
197 anodal, cathodal, or sham net-tDCS. During stimulation, participants completed a SST for 20
198 minutes. Subsequently, they repeated the state questionnaire battery (post net-tDCS) and filled
199 out a questionnaire evaluating any side effects that may have occurred during stimulation. After
200 the net-tDCS treatment, participants were left alone in an examination room where an *ad libitum*
201 buffet was provided for 30 minutes. The follow-up took place one day after the last visit and
202 included the same procedures as the baseline visit, followed by a 75-g oGTT.

203 **2.3 Network transcranial direct current stimulation**

204 Stimulation aimed to modulate the hypothalamus appetite control network and stimulation
205 montage was derived as described previously [49]. In brief, electrode position and current
206 strength were determined using the StimweaverTM algorithm [50], which resulted in a 12-
207 channel optimization. The target network was defined based on the correlation strength of the
208 resting-state FC network of the hypothalamus on the Neurosynth website
209 (https://neurosynth.org/locations/6_2_-10_6/). Stimulation was applied using a network-
210 targeted multichannel tDCS device (Starstim® 32, Neuroelectrics Barcelona S.L.U., Barcelona,
211 Spain) controlled by the corresponding NIC 2.0 software (NIC2 v2.0.11,
212 <https://www.neuroelectrics.com/resources/software>). Twelve circular Ag/AgCl gelled
213 electrodes were fitted into a neoprene cap (Neoprene Headcap, Neuroelectrics Barcelona S.L.U.,
214 Barcelona, Spain) at positions defined by the international 10-20 EEG system (see **Suppl.**
215 **Table 2** for details on electrode placement, current intensities and current density). Prior
216 stimulation, the scalp at the electrode positions was gently rubbed with a cotton swab soaked in
217 alcohol in order to increase current conductivity. Net-tDCS was aimed to activate (anodal) or
218 inhibit (cathodal) the functional connected brain areas of the hypothalamus. Active net-tDCS
219 was delivered for 25 min, including a 15 s ramp-up and 60 s ramp-down at the beginning and
220 end of the session. The maximum total injected current was limited to 4 mA, with each electrode
221 delivering up to 2 mA (in absolute value). A reference electrode for the return current was
222 attached to the participant's ear. In the sham stimulation, the procedures were identical except
223 that the current was only active during the ramp-up and ramp-down phases using the anodal
224 protocol to simulate the sensation of stimulation. Impedance was kept below 10 k Ω to reduce
225 skin sensation.

226 **2.3.1 Blinding and Tolerability of net-tDCS**

227 Blinding was ensured by using the NIC 2.0 software (Neuroelectrics Barcelona S.L.U.,
228 Barcelona, Spain), with both the investigator and participant unaware of the particular protocol

229 being used, which was generically named and activated with a password by a third party in
230 ‘double-blind’ mode. At follow-up, participants were asked what stimulation (active or sham)
231 they believed was delivered during the sessions.

232 Side effects during net-tDCS were evaluated using a 100 mm VAS directly after the session.
233 Questions included the specification of common possible side effects (itching, tingling, pain,
234 exhaustion and nausea). Moreover, participants were asked on a 100 mm VAS, ‘Overall, how
235 uncomfortable was the stimulation for you?’ (i.e., discomfort). A blank line was included for
236 any other side effects not mentioned as VAS.

237 **2.4 Stop-Signal task**

238 For measuring response inhibition during net-tDCS, the SST by CANTAB (Cambridge
239 Neuropsychological Test Automated Battery) was applied simultaneously to the stimulation for
240 20 minutes.

241 The Stop Signal Reaction Time (SSRT) was used as the primary outcome parameter. For the
242 task, participants were instructed to press a button on the left or right edge of a tablet computer
243 screen using their corresponding index finger, reacting as swiftly as possible, every time an
244 arrow in the screens’ center pointed to the left or right site. In 25 % of the cases, an additional
245 auditory signal (beep sound) was presented, signalling the participant to withhold the pre-potent
246 response (response inhibition). The experiment includes a 16-item trial block and a total of five
247 test blocks, each block consisting of 64 trials. The task uses a staircase design to dynamically
248 adjust to the participants’ performance, leading to a success rate of 50 % for inhibition. The
249 SSRT is calculated by a stochastic model that takes into account the average reaction time in
250 runs without a stop signal, as well as the time interval between visual and auditory signal in
251 which the participant is still able to successfully inhibit in 50 % of cases [51].

252 **2.5 Oral glucose tolerance test**

253 All participants underwent during follow-up an oGTT with a standardized 75 g glucose solution
254 (ACCU-Check® Dextro, Roche, Germany). At six timepoints (pre and 30, 60, 90, 120, and 150
255 min), blood samples were taken to determine glucose and insulin. Blood glucose was measured
256 via the glucose dehydrogenase method using a HemoCue blood glucose photometer
257 (HemoCueAB, Aengelholm, Sweden). Levels of plasma insulin were determined by using
258 chemiluminescence assays for ADVIA Centaur (Siemens Medical Solutions, Fernwald,
259 Germany).

260 **2.6 Ad-libitum food buffet**

261 Ad libitum food consumption was measured using a standardized buffet, which comprised of a
262 vast collection of food items (**Suppl. Table 3** for weight and nutritional information).
263 Participants were instructed to eat as much as they liked within 30 minutes. During this time,
264 they were not allowed to interact with their mobile phone or comparable devices to avoid
265 distractions. Participants were told that they could take left over bakery goods home. Food items
266 were weighted before and after buffet. For calorie intake evaluation, total calorie intake and
267 kilocalories (kcal) intake from macronutrients were used. Caloric intake by sweet food was
268 separately analyzed, with the analysis being based on the percentage of calories from sweet
269 foods relative to the total kcal intake from each participant. The analysis included the following
270 items: apple filled pastry, chocolate croissant, pastry with with poppy seed filling, cocoa powder
271 for chocolate milk, sugar, apple juice, apple, banana, honey, strawberry jam, hazelnut spread
272 (Nutella), raspberry yoghurt, chocolate and vanilla pudding.

273 **2.7 Functional magnetic resonance imaging data acquisition**

274 Functional fMRI data of the whole brain were collected at baseline and follow-up using a 3.0
275 T scanner (Magnetom Prisma, Siemens Healthcare GmbH, Erlangen, Germany) with a 20-
276 channel head coil. Functional resting-state data were obtained by using simultaneous multi-
277 band sequence. The following sequence parameters were used: Acceleration factor = 4; TR =
278 1.18s; TE = 34ms; FOV = 205 mm²; flip angle 65°; voxel size 2.5 x 2.5 x 2.5 mm³; slice
279 thickness 2.5 mm; The images were acquired in an interleaved order. The total scan period was
280 3 minutes and 56 seconds, with each brain volume consisting of 60 slices and each functional
281 run containing 200 image volumes. Moreover, high-resolution T1 weighted anatomical images
282 (MP2RAGE: 192 slices, matrix: 256 x 240, 1 x 1 x 1 mm³) of the brain were acquired.

283 **2.8 Resting-state fMRI Data preprocessing and analyses**

284 Analyses of resting state fMRI data were performed using CONN [52] release 22.a [53] and
285 SPM [54] release 12.7771 (see **Suppl. Material**). First-level analysis: Seed-based connectivity
286 maps (SBC) were estimated characterizing the patterns of functional connectivity with the
287 hypothalamus seed and the rest of the brain. The hypothalamus seed was defined as MNI
288 coordinate x = 6, y = 2, z = -10, including a 4 mm sphere according to our previous published
289 research [49]. Functional connectivity strength was represented by Fisher-transformed bivariate
290 correlation coefficients from a weighted general linear model (weighted-GLM), modeling the
291 association between their BOLD signal timeseries. The regions of the hypothalamic FC network
292 were defined based on the hypothalamic resting-state FC pattern

293 (https://neurosynth.org/locations/6_2_-10_6/) thresholded at $r < - 0.005$ and $r > 0.005$. The
294 thresholded mask was binarized and SBC with the hypothalamus seed and the mask was
295 computed. The values were extracted from the participant's first level SBC analysis.

296 **2.9 Statistical analysis**

297 Data is presented as mean and standard deviation [SD] unless otherwise stated. Statistical
298 analysis was performed using the program R (R version 4.3.3 (2024-02-29 ucrt), [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/bin/windows/base/)
299 [project.org/bin/windows/base/](https://cran.r-project.org/bin/windows/base/)) for statistical computing and graphics. Statistical significance
300 was set at $p \leq 0.05$. The normality of the data distribution was tested using the Shapiro–Wilk
301 test. When data was not normally distributed, parameters were log-transformed prior analysis
302 or non-parametrical analyses were conducted.

303 Blinding efficiency as well as differences in side effects between study visits were analyzed
304 using a Friedman-test and Kruskal-Wallis test. For post-hoc comparisons, Dunn-Bonferroni
305 corrections were used.

306 To compare demographics and scores of psychological questionnaires, an ANOVA or a
307 Kruskal-Wallis test was used. A Fisher's exact test was examined to compare sex ratio.

308 To analyze the effect of net-tDCS on eating behavior (state questionnaires and food intake) and
309 response inhibition, we conducted linear mixed effects models (LMER) employing the *lmer*
310 function of the *lme4* package in R. Net-tDCS visits (visit 1, visit 2, visit 3) and net-tDCS group
311 (sham, anodal, cathodal) were entered as fixed effects in all of these models. We used the
312 extracted FC values to evaluate whether changes in resting-state FC of the hypothalamus
313 appetite-control network (follow-up minus baseline) show an interaction with the changes in
314 SSRT. In this exploratory analysis, the changes in hypothalamic FC from baseline to follow-up
315 were considered as fixed effects. Sham and visit 1 were defined as reference category.
316 Participants were included as random factor to account for varying intercepts between
317 participants. To evaluate the effects on peripheral metabolism, we used the *lm* function of the
318 *stats* package in R. Here, condition (sham, anodal, cathodal) were entered as fixed effects in all
319 models and sham was defined as reference category.

320 To identify the best-fitting model, we employed a stepwise model approach with the Akaike
321 Information Criterion (AIC) as basis for the selection. See **Suppl. Table 4** for the model
322 selection procedures. The general covariates tested across different analyses included age and
323 sex. In more specific analyses, the following covariates were tested: For macronutrient intake,
324 considered covariates were BMI, total kcal intake, and the time period since the last meal (in
325 minutes) prior to net-tDCS. For sweet food intake, the covariates tested were BMI, total kcal
326 intake, and the time period since the last meal (in minutes) prior to net-tDCS. For state

327 questionnaires, baseline values were considered. For total kcal intake, BMI and the time period
328 since the last meal (in minutes) prior to net-tDCS were tested. Residuals of the models were
329 investigated to assess normality and homoscedasticity. To check multicollinearity, we used the
330 *check_collinearity* function in the *performance* package. Results were printed via the *tab_model*
331 function in the *sjPlot* package. Figures were created using the *ggplot2* and *ggeffects* packages.

332 **3. Results**

333 **3.1 Participants**

334 Sixty-six men and women were eligible for the study and forty-four participants were included
335 in the final analysis (36.3 years, BMI 30.6 kg/m², 52.3 % female). The CONSORT flow
336 diagram for the recruitment process is shown in **Suppl. Fig. 1**. Participants' baseline and
337 anthropometric characteristics are reported in **Table 1**. No significant difference between net-
338 tDCS groups were observed in sex ratio, age, weight, BMI, waist circumference, hip
339 circumference, waist-to-hip ratio (WHR), body-fat content and number of days between
340 baseline and follow-up. In addition, there were no statistical differences in eating behavior trait
341 profiles between stimulation groups (**Suppl. Table 5**).

342 **3.2 Blinding and tolerability**

343 Participants were not able to distinguish active net-tDCS from sham net-tDCS ($\chi^2(4) = 2.28$, p
344 $= 0.685$). **Suppl. Table 6** gives an overview of the net-tDCS groups and the participants' guess.
345 Active and sham net-tDCS was well tolerated and no participant withdrew from the study due
346 to side effects. There was no significant difference with respect to side effects between net-
347 tDCS groups (see **Suppl. Results** and **Suppl. Table 7** for statistical analysis). We found
348 significant effects of visit; There was a significant difference for the anodal group regarding
349 discomfort ($\chi^2(2) = 7.35$, $p = 0.025$) with higher values at visit 2 compared to visit 1 ($p_{\text{adjust}} =$
350 0.043). Moreover, there was a significant difference in the cathodal group ($\chi^2(2) = 7.00$, $p =$
351 0.030) showing post-hoc higher itching values at visit 1 compared to visit 3 ($p_{\text{adjust}} = 0.024$).

352 **3.3 Response inhibition**

353 There was a significant main effect of net-tDCS on the SSRT for sham vs. anodal net-tDCS
354 (Estimate = -0.12, 95%, CI [-0.19 – -0.04], $p = 0.004$) and sham vs. cathodal net-tDCS
355 (Estimate = -0.12, 95%, CI [-0.20 – -0.04], $p = 0.005$), indicating a greater response inhibition
356 for active net-tDCS. Age was a significant predictor, indicating a higher SSRT with increasing

357 age (Estimate = 0.04, 95%, CI [0.01 – 0.06], $p = 0.004$). No effects of sex was observed. The
358 raw values of the SSRT for all visits and net-tDCS groups are available in **Suppl. Table 8**.
359 Since we recently reported that net-tDCS effects on SSRT are associated with hypothalamic FC
360 [49], we investigated in an exploratory analysis whether the change in hypothalamic FC from
361 baseline to follow-up interacts with the net-tDCS induced effect on SSRT. As in the
362 aforementioned model, we found a significant main effect for sham vs. anodal net-tDCS
363 (Estimate = -0.13, 95%, CI [-0.20 – -0.06], $p < 0.001$) and sham vs. cathodal net-tDCS
364 (Estimate = -0.12, 95%, CI [-0.19 – -0.04], $p = 0.002$). Moreover, we found a significant
365 interaction for anodal net-tDCS \times change in hypothalamic FC (Estimate = -1.27, CI [-2.07 – -
366 0.48], $p = 0.002$) and cathodal net-tDCS \times change in hypothalamic FC (Estimate = -0.67, CI [-
367 1.31 – -0.03], $p = 0.039$; **Fig. 2a-c** and **Suppl. Table 9**). This indicates that an increase in
368 hypothalamic FC from baseline to follow-up was related to better response inhibition in the
369 active net-tDCS groups compared to sham.

370 **3.4 Food consumption**

371 No significant main effect of net-tDCS group on total intake (kcal) was observed for sham vs.
372 anodal net-tDCS (Estimate = -108.64, CI = [-519.61 – 302.32], $p = 0.602$) or sham vs. cathodal
373 net-tDCS (Estimate = 72.19, [CI = -346.20 – 490.58], $p = 0.733$); **Suppl. Table 10**). There was
374 no effect of visit. Sex was a significant predictor with male participants showing a higher kcal
375 intake compared to women (Estimate = 752.14, [CI = 412.28 – 1092.00], $p < 0.001$). Food
376 intake in kcal for all three visits and net-tDCS groups are shown in **Suppl. Table 11** and **Fig.**
377 **3a-d**.

378 For macronutrient intake, no main effect for sham vs. anodal net-tDCS and sham vs. cathodal
379 net-tDCS was observed (all $p > 0.05$; **Suppl. Table 12**). For carbohydrate intake, there was a
380 significant interaction effect of cathodal net-tDCS \times visit 3 (Estimate = -65.15, [CI = -128.09 –
381 -2.20], $p = 0.043$, **Fig. 3e**). Hence participants of the sham net-tDCS group consumed more
382 calories during visit 3 compared to visit 1, while the cathodal stimulated group showed no rise
383 in kcal over time. Moreover, for protein intake, there was a significant interaction effect of
384 anodal net-tDCS \times visit 3 (Estimate = 18.06, [CI = 0.56 – 35.56], $p = 0.043$) and cathodal net-
385 tDCS \times visit 3 (Estimate = 25.90, [CI = 8.10 – 43.71], $p = 0.005$, **Fig. 3f**). Hence, participants
386 in the sham group consumed less protein during visit 3 compared to visit 1, while the active
387 tDCS groups showed no reduction in comparison. Anodal tDCS has previously been reported
388 to decrease craving or appetite for sweet foods [33; 35; 36; 38]. Therefore, as an exploratory
389 analysis, we evaluated if sham vs. active net-tDCS was related to lower sweet food intake.
390 Results showed a significant main effect for sham vs. anodal net-tDCS (Estimate = -8.06, [CI

391 = -15.61 – -0.50], $p = 0.037$; **Fig. 4a-b**) but not for sham vs. cathodal net-tDCS (Estimate = -
392 7.56, [CI = -15.25 – 0.13], $p = 0.054$; **Suppl. Table 13**), indicating a higher sweet food intake
393 for sham vs. anodal but not cathodal net-tDCS. Moreover, total intake (kcal) was a significant
394 predictor (Estimate = 0.01, [CI = 0.00 – 0.01], $p = 0.006$).

395 **3.5 State questionnaires**

396 Baseline ratings for desire to eat, FCQ-S values and PANAS did not differ between groups (see
397 **Suppl. Table 14** for baseline values and analysis). No main effects for sham vs. anodal net-
398 tDCS and sham vs. cathodal net-tDCS for desire to eat ratings, FCQ-S and positive and negative
399 affect of the PANAS questionnaire were found (all $p > 0.05$; **Suppl. Table 15**).

400 **3.6 Glucose metabolism**

401 There was no significant main effect of net-tDCS groups on metabolic parameters (all $p > 0.05$).
402 The raw metabolic values (insulin sensitivity index (ISI) Matsuda, glycohemoglobin A1c
403 (HbA1c), fasting insulin/glucose, oGTT-derived 2 hour glucose/insulin and triglycerides)
404 divided by net-tDCS groups are shown in **Table 2**. Parameter estimates for the fixed effects,
405 based on the linear models are presented in **Suppl. Table 16**.

406 **4. Discussion**

407 Non-invasive brain stimulation (NIBS) such as tDCS is an emerging tool for improving
408 cognitive control over eating in individuals with overweight or obesity. Unlike earlier studies
409 focusing on single brain areas, net-tDCS targets entire brain networks. Our study examined net-
410 tDCS effects on the hypothalamus appetite-control network. Stimulation was effectively
411 blinded and well tolerated. Our results suggest enhanced inhibitory control and lower caloric
412 intake from sweet food after active net-tDCS compared to sham, with strongest effects after
413 anodal stimulation. Additionally, increased hypothalamic FC predicted better inhibitory control
414 performance in both anodal and cathodal net-tDCS groups.

415 Overall, our findings imply that especially anodal net-tDCS of the hypothalamus appetite
416 control network can modulate eating behavior and cognitive control. The association between
417 increased hypothalamic FC and enhanced inhibitory control further substantiates the specificity
418 of the stimulation for the intended brain network.

419 **4.1 Active net-tDCS related to better inhibitory control**

420 We previously showed in a pilot study an improved response inhibition after anodal net-tDCS
421 compared to sham in a within-subject design in persons with overweight or obesity [49]. Here,
422 we could replicate these effects for anodal net-tDCS, supporting our hypothesis that net-tDCS

423 targeting the hypothalamus appetite-control network can result in better cognitive functions
424 related to inhibitory control. Notably, in contrast to our earlier trial, we also revealed better
425 inhibitory control in the cathodal net-tDCS group compared to sham. In fact, previous research
426 questioned the simple dichotomy of anodal-excitation and cathodal-inhibition effects, which is
427 rarely seen in cognitive studies [55] and cognitive performance was shown to be improved
428 using cathodal tDCS [for overview [56]]. Moreover, Batsikadze et al. [57] demonstrated that
429 low current of 1 mA cathodal tDCS decreased corticospinal excitability while higher current (2
430 mA) was associated with excitatory effects. The present study stimulated with a total injected
431 current of 4 mA and was aimed to stimulate a brain network, potentially leading to excitatory
432 effects during the cathodal stimulation. Future studies should consider implementing varying
433 levels of injected currents or perform brain imaging measurements to further investigate the
434 effects of different strength of cathodal stimulation.

435 Resting-state FC was shown to be a predictor for individual variances in cognitive performance
436 and impairments [58; 59]. Thereby, lower resting-state FC in brain regions related to cognition
437 were found in individuals with obesity [9]. Enhancing FC between the dlPFC and ventromedial
438 PFC (vmPFC) was shown to increase food intake-related control mechanisms in participants
439 with overweight or obesity [23], emphasizing the critical role of FC between brain areas in
440 inhibitory control processes. Both the dlPFC and vmPFC are part of the hypothalamic FC
441 network targeted in this study; hence, modulating hypothalamic FC to strengthen control
442 mechanisms might in the long run promote weight loss and support weight maintenance. The
443 current trial showed that higher increase in hypothalamus resting-state FC is associated with
444 better cognitive performance during anodal and cathodal net-tDCS. Evidence from a previous
445 study showed that tDCS can affect FC, which is associated with enhanced response inhibition
446 [60]. In conclusion, our study provides evidence that net-tDCS influences response inhibition
447 with hypothalamus network connectivity playing a crucial role. These findings advance our
448 understanding of the neural mechanisms underlying cognitive enhancement through tDCS.

449 **4.2 Anodal net-tDCS does not reduce total caloric intake but associates with** 450 **lower sweet food intake**

451 In the present study, total kcal intake was not different between anodal, cathodal net-tDCS and
452 sham. This is in contrast to the hypothesized calorie-reducing effects of active stimulations
453 previously reported in overweight and obese participants [35; 39; 61]. For macronutrient intake,
454 however, we found a significant interaction between stimulation group and visit. Active net-
455 tDCS groups maintained a stable intake of protein and carbohydrates over the study visits. The
456 sham group, on the other hand, shifted to an unhealthier eating pattern after repeated exposure

457 to the breakfast buffet, by increasing carbohydrate intake and decreasing protein intake on the
458 third visit. Hence, active net-tDCS may facilitate inhibitory control during exposure to an
459 obesogenic environment. While only few previous studies investigated tDCS effects on
460 macronutrient intake, Jauch-Chara et al. [38] attributed the calorie-reducing effect after anodal
461 tDCS to a reduced carbohydrate intake. Concomitantly, anodal tDCS over the right dlPFC has
462 been previously shown to reduce appetite and cravings for highly palatable foods [33–36; 38],
463 and left dlPFC stimulation decreased actual sweet food intake [39]. On the other hand, tDCS of
464 the right IFG has been linked to increased chocolate consumption [62]. Indeed, variations in
465 stimulation parameters such as stimulation site [63] can contribute to the varied outcomes. In
466 the present study, we observed lower caloric intake by sweet food with anodal, but not cathodal
467 net-tDCS compared to sham. Unlike previous studies focusing on one brain area [43], our
468 design targeted regions functionally connected to the hypothalamus, which is crucial for the
469 regulation of hunger and satiety signals [8]. Stimulation therefore might have followed other
470 mechanisms compared to previous research targeting the dlPFC or IFG solely. In fact, targeting
471 a whole network has been shown to increase excitability twofold compared to bipolar tDCS
472 [47]. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that successful dietary self-control requires the
473 synchronized activation of the dlPFC and vmPFC [23; 24], whereby our target network included
474 both lateral and medial PFC regions. More specifically, the anodal stimulation was aimed to
475 increase excitability of positive functional connections of the hypothalamus as part of the
476 vmPFC, hippocampus and posterior cingulate cortex, while simultaneously decreasing negative
477 functional connections as the striatum and insula cortex. This suggests that stimulating the
478 hypothalamus appetite-control network may more effectively influence hedonic food intake by
479 integrating key brain regions for cognitive control and reward. Further investigation of this
480 specific network is crucial to better understand the underlying processes.

481 **4.3 Net-tDCS does not influence subjective rating of food cravings**

482 While previous studies have reported effects of tDCS on food craving [31–36], this was widely
483 questioned in the last years. In the present study, no significant differences were found, which
484 aligns with more recent research. For instance, studies in healthy participants could not show
485 beneficial effects on food craving [64; 65], which was also concluded in a meta-analysis [66].
486 However, studies in persons with frequent food cravings or persons with binge eating disorders
487 reported reduced food cravings after anodal tDCS [31–36], whereas studies with non-selective
488 samples reported no effect on food craving or desire to eat ratings [67]. Beaumont et al. [68]
489 observed no impact of anodal tDCS over the right dlPFC on craving or appetite in normal and
490 overweight females with mild-to-moderate binge eating, attributing this to the subclinical

491 severity of conditions. In this study, we included individuals with overweight or obesity without
492 eating disorders. Our findings therefore support recent findings suggesting that tDCS does not
493 significantly impact food cravings or desire to eat in a non-clinical population.

494 **4.4 Net-tDCS does not affect glucose metabolism 20 hours after last** 495 **stimulation**

496 In the present study, active net-tDCS did not affect glucose metabolism and peripheral insulin
497 sensitivity, as no effects were detectable at the 20-hour follow-up. During stimulation, previous
498 research has shown improved glucose tolerance. Specifically, anodal tDCS over the primary
499 motor cortex improved systemic glucose tolerance, demonstrated by higher glucose infusion
500 rates (GIRs) derived from a standard hyperinsulinaemic-euglycaemic glucose clamp procedure
501 [40; 42]. Moreover, Kistenmacher et al. [41] found that anodal tDCS lowered blood glucose
502 levels compared to sham, with effects lasting more than 50 minutes post stimulation onset.
503 Given that tDCS is able to increase neuronal excitability [27] and energy levels of the brain [40;
504 42], it is conceivable that the brain could regulate its own glucose uptake from the periphery as
505 needed. Indeed, a positive correlation has been shown between overall cerebral energy
506 consumption and systemic glucose tolerance [42]. Moreover, the brain and specifically the
507 hypothalamus controls outflows to the periphery that control systemic glucose metabolism [69].
508 In the present study, the oGTT was conducted more than 20 hours after the third net-tDCS
509 session. Thus, the direct effects of net-tDCS, such as an increased neuronal excitability, are no
510 longer present. Hence, it is not possible to evaluate whether net-tDCS acutely influenced
511 glucose metabolism during stimulation. Further studies are needed to investigate the effects of
512 tDCS on glucose metabolism in a more detailed and time-dependent manner.

513 **4.5 Limitations and further directions**

514 In interpreting our findings, several limitations and methodological considerations needs to be
515 acknowledged. First, the present study used a stimulation design, based on fixed electrode
516 positions according to the international 10-20 EEG system. This reflects a standard
517 configuration, individual anatomical differences were not considered. Therefore, it is possible
518 that for some individuals we did not target the optimal stimulation points. Future trials should
519 evaluate the possibility of personalized electrode arrangements, according to their unique brain
520 anatomy and fMRI network dynamics.

521 Moreover, it is crucial to acknowledge that fMRI measurements and the oGTT were conducted
522 one day after the last visit. Consequently, we cannot decipher direct acute effects of net-tDCS
523 compared to sham on neural activity and functional connectivity as well as metabolism. The

524 excitatory effects of anodal tDCS measured based on changes in motor evoked potential amplitudes
525 haven been shown to be present up to 90 minutes after completion of tDCS [57]. Hence, future
526 studies should implement fMRI recordings directly after stimulation to identify regional and
527 network related changes in response to net-tDCS. Additionally, the time span between baseline and
528 follow-up ranged from 7-76 days which could have influenced outcomes.
529 Furthermore, hormonal fluctuations, which are known to influence food cravings and brain control
530 on metabolism, as during the menstrual cycle or menopause in women [70; 71], were not taken into
531 account in the present work and should be investigated in future studies.

532 **5. Conclusion**

533 In conclusion, these findings demonstrate that anodal and cathodal net-tDCS targeting the
534 hypothalamus appetite-control network is a suitable approach for enhancing inhibitory control.
535 Anodal stimulation shows a greater potential to ameliorate hedonic food intake than cathodal
536 or sham net-tDCS. Furthermore, our results demonstrate the influence of active anodal and
537 cathodal network tDCS on hypothalamic functional connectivity 20 hours after stimulation and
538 its potential link to inhibitory control.

539 **Acknowledgments**

540 We thank all participants for their participation in this project. We thank Ronan Le Gleut,
541 Aaditya Sharma, and Elmar Spiegel from the Core Facility Statistical Consulting at Helmholtz
542 for their statistical consulting. The authors also thank Maike Borutta (University of Tübingen,
543 Tübingen, Germany) for her excellent technical assistance. The study was supported in parts by
544 a grant (01GI0925) from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) to the
545 German Center for Diabetes Research (DZD e.V.). Figures were created with BioRender.com.

546 **Data availability**

547 The datasets generated and analysed during the current study are not publicly available due to
548 being used in further work which is not yet published, but are available from the corresponding
549 author on reasonable request.

550 **CRedit authorship contribution statement**

551 TEN: Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Formal analysis, Data Curation, Writing –
552 original draft, Writing – Review & Editing. RV: Formal Analysis, Methodology, Writing –
553 original draft, Writing – Review & Editing. MB/LT/MG/JT: Investigation, Data Curation. DL:
554 Data Curation. GR/RS: Software, Writing – Review & Editing. MH: Conceptualization,

555 Writing – Review & Editing. ALB: Writing – Review & Editing. CP: Writing – Review &
556 Editing. HP: Conceptualization, Resources, Writing – Review & Editing. SK:
557 Conceptualization, Project administration, Methodology, Validation, Supervision, Funding
558 acquisition, Writing – Review & Editing.

559 **Declaration of competing interest**

560 GR is a co-founder and shareholder and works for Neuroelectrics, a company developing
561 medical devices for NIBS. RS works for Neuroelectrics. Outside of the current work, MH
562 reports participation in advisory board for Boehringer Ingelheim, Sanofi and Amryt, and lecture
563 fees from Amryt, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Sanofi, Eli Lilly, Novartis, Novo Nordisk and
564 Boehringer Ingelheim. TEN, RV, MB, LT, MG, JT, DL, ALB, CP, HP and SK report no conflict
565 of interest.

566 **References**

- 567 1 World Health Organization. *Obesity*. [https://www.who.int/news-room/facts-in-](https://www.who.int/news-room/facts-in-pictures/detail/6-facts-on-obesity)
568 [pictures/detail/6-facts-on-obesity](https://www.who.int/news-room/facts-in-pictures/detail/6-facts-on-obesity) (16 July 2024, date last accessed).
- 569 2 Blüher M. Obesity: global epidemiology and pathogenesis. *Nat Rev Endocrinol*
570 2019;**15**:288–98.
- 571 3 Hill JO. Understanding and addressing the epidemic of obesity: an energy balance
572 perspective. *Endocr Rev* 2006;**27**:750–61.
- 573 4 Shefer G, Marcus Y, Stern N. Is obesity a brain disease? *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*
574 2013;**37**:2489–503.
- 575 5 Kullmann S, Kleinridders A, Small DM *et al*. Central nervous pathways of insulin action
576 in the control of metabolism and food intake. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*
577 2020;**8**:524–34.
- 578 6 Müller TD, Blüher M, Tschöp MH *et al*. Anti-obesity drug discovery: advances and
579 challenges. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2022;**21**:201–23.
- 580 7 Belfort-DeAguiar R, Seo D. Food Cues and Obesity: Overpowering Hormones and
581 Energy Balance Regulation. *Curr Obes Rep* 2018;**7**:122–29.
- 582 8 Kullmann S, Veit R. Resting-state functional connectivity of the human hypothalamus.
583 *Handb Clin Neurol* 2021;**179**:113–24.
- 584 9 Li G, Hu Y, Zhang W *et al*. Brain functional and structural magnetic resonance imaging
585 of obesity and weight loss interventions. *Mol Psychiatry* 2023;**28**:1466–79.

- 586 10 Morys F, Tremblay C, Rahayel S *et al.* Neural correlates of obesity across the lifespan.
587 *Commun Biol* 2024;**7**:656.
- 588 11 Lowe CJ, Reichelt AC, Hall PA. The Prefrontal Cortex and Obesity: A Health
589 Neuroscience Perspective. *Trends Cogn Sci (Regul Ed)* 2019;**23**:349–61.
- 590 12 Le TM, Liao D-L, Ide J *et al.* The interrelationship of body mass index with gray matter
591 volume and resting-state functional connectivity of the hypothalamus. *Int J Obes (Lond)*
592 2020;**44**:1097–107.
- 593 13 Kullmann S, Veit R, Crabtree DR *et al.* The effect of hunger state on hypothalamic
594 functional connectivity in response to food cues. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2023;**44**:418–28.
- 595 14 Devoto F, Zapparoli L, Bonandrini R *et al.* Hungry brains: A meta-analytical review of
596 brain activation imaging studies on food perception and appetite in obese individuals.
597 *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2018;**94**:271–85.
- 598 15 Miyake A, Friedman NP, Emerson MJ *et al.* The unity and diversity of executive
599 functions and their contributions to complex "Frontal Lobe" tasks: a latent variable
600 analysis. *Cogn Psychol* 2000;**41**:49–100.
- 601 16 Verbruggen F, Aron AR, Band GP *et al.* A consensus guide to capturing the ability to
602 inhibit actions and impulsive behaviors in the stop-signal task. *Elife* 2019;**8**.
- 603 17 Bartholdy S, Dalton B, O'Daly OG *et al.* A systematic review of the relationship between
604 eating, weight and inhibitory control using the stop signal task. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*
605 2016;**64**:35–62.
- 606 18 Klerk MT de, Smeets PAM, La Fleur SE. Inhibitory control as a potential treatment
607 target for obesity. *Nutr Neurosci* 2023;**26**:429–44.
- 608 19 Veit R, Schag K, Schopf E *et al.* Diminished prefrontal cortex activation in patients with
609 binge eating disorder associates with trait impulsivity and improves after impulsivity-
610 focused treatment based on a randomized controlled IMPULS trial. *Neuroimage Clin*
611 2021;**30**:102679.
- 612 20 Price M, Lee M, Higgs S. Food-specific response inhibition, dietary restraint and snack
613 intake in lean and overweight/obese adults: a moderated-mediation model. *Int J Obes*
614 (Lond) 2016;**40**:877–82.
- 615 21 Nederkoorn C, Smulders FTY, Havermans RC *et al.* Impulsivity in obese women.
616 *Appetite* 2006;**47**:253–56.
- 617 22 Chamberlain SR, Derbyshire KL, Leppink E *et al.* Obesity and dissociable forms of
618 impulsivity in young adults. *CNS Spectr* 2015;**20**:500–07.

- 619 23 Kohl SH, Veit R, Spetter MS *et al.* Real-time fMRI neurofeedback training to improve
620 eating behavior by self-regulation of the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex: A randomized
621 controlled trial in overweight and obese subjects. *Neuroimage* 2019;**191**:596–609.
- 622 24 Hare TA, Camerer CF, Rangel A. Self-control in decision-making involves modulation
623 of the vmPFC valuation system. *Science* 2009;**324**:646–48.
- 624 25 Szabo-Reed AN, Martin LE, Hu J *et al.* Modeling interactions between brain function,
625 diet adherence behaviors, and weight loss success. *Obes Sci Pract* 2020;**6**:282–92.
- 626 26 Stagg CJ, Antal A, Nitsche MA. Physiology of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation.
627 *J ECT* 2018;**34**:144–52.
- 628 27 Nitsche MA, Paulus W. Excitability changes induced in the human motor cortex by weak
629 transcranial direct current stimulation. *J Physiol (Lond)* 2000;**527 Pt 3**:633–39.
- 630 28 Stinson EJ, Travis KT, Magerowski G *et al.* Improved food Go/No-Go scores after
631 transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) to prefrontal cortex in a randomized trial.
632 *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2022;**30**:2005–13.
- 633 29 Schroeder PA, Farshad M, Svaldi J. Anodal stimulation of inhibitory control and craving
634 in satiated restrained eaters. *Nutr Neurosci* 2023;**26**:403–13.
- 635 30 Hogeveen J, Grafman J, Abozeria M *et al.* Effects of High-Definition and Conventional
636 tDCS on Response Inhibition. *Brain Stimul* 2016;**9**:720–29.
- 637 31 Lapenta OM, Di Sierve K, Macedo EC de *et al.* Transcranial direct current stimulation
638 modulates ERP-indexed inhibitory control and reduces food consumption. *Appetite*
639 2014;**83**:42–48.
- 640 32 Fregni F, Orsati F, Pedrosa W *et al.* Transcranial direct current stimulation of the
641 prefrontal cortex modulates the desire for specific foods. *Appetite* 2008;**51**:34–41.
- 642 33 Goldman RL, Borckardt JJ, Frohman HA *et al.* Prefrontal cortex transcranial direct
643 current stimulation (tDCS) temporarily reduces food cravings and increases the self-
644 reported ability to resist food in adults with frequent food craving. *Appetite* 2011;**56**:741–
645 46.
- 646 34 Ljubisavljevic M, Maxood K, Bjekic J *et al.* Long-Term Effects of Repeated Prefrontal
647 Cortex Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) on Food Craving in Normal and
648 Overweight Young Adults. *Brain Stimul* 2016;**9**:826–33.
- 649 35 Burgess EE, Sylvester MD, Morse KE *et al.* Effects of transcranial direct current
650 stimulation (tDCS) on binge eating disorder. *Int J Eat Disord* 2016;**49**:930–36.


- 651 36 Kekic M, McClelland J, Campbell I *et al.* The effects of prefrontal cortex transcranial
652 direct current stimulation (tDCS) on food craving and temporal discounting in women
653 with frequent food cravings. *Appetite* 2014;**78**:55–62.
- 654 37 Giel KE, Schag K, Max SM *et al.* Inhibitory Control Training Enhanced by Transcranial
655 Direct Current Stimulation to Reduce Binge Eating Episodes: Findings from the
656 Randomized Phase II ACCElect Trial. *Psychother Psychosom* 2023;**92**:101–12.
- 657 38 Jauch-Chara K, Kistenmacher A, Herzog N *et al.* Repetitive electric brain stimulation
658 reduces food intake in humans. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2014;**100**:1003–09.
- 659 39 Heinitz S, Reinhardt M, Piaggi P *et al.* Neuromodulation directed at the prefrontal cortex
660 of subjects with obesity reduces snack food intake and hunger in a randomized trial. *Am J*
661 *Clin Nutr* 2017;**106**:1347–57.
- 662 40 Wardzinski EK, Friedrichsen L, Dannenberger S *et al.* Double transcranial direct current
663 stimulation of the brain increases cerebral energy levels and systemic glucose tolerance
664 in men. *J Neuroendocrinol* 2019;**31**:e12688.
- 665 41 Kistenmacher A, Manneck S, Wardzinski EK *et al.* Persistent blood glucose reduction
666 upon repeated transcranial electric stimulation in men. *Brain Stimul* 2017;**10**:780–86.
- 667 42 Binkofski F, Loebig M, Jauch-Chara K *et al.* Brain energy consumption induced by
668 electrical stimulation promotes systemic glucose uptake. *Biol Psychiatry* 2011;**70**:690–
669 95.
- 670 43 Ester T, Kullmann S. Neurobiological regulation of eating behavior: Evidence based on
671 non-invasive brain stimulation. *Rev Endocr Metab Disord* 2021.
- 672 44 Hall PA, Vincent CM, Burhan AM. Non-invasive brain stimulation for food cravings,
673 consumption, and disorders of eating: A review of methods, findings and controversies.
674 *Appetite* 2018;**124**:78–88.
- 675 45 To WT, Hart J, Ridder D de *et al.* Considering the influence of stimulation parameters on
676 the effect of conventional and high-definition transcranial direct current stimulation.
677 *Expert Rev Med Devices* 2016;**13**:391–404.
- 678 46 Tremblay S, Lepage J-F, Latulipe-Loiselle A *et al.* The uncertain outcome of prefrontal
679 tDCS. *Brain Stimul* 2014;**7**:773–83.
- 680 47 Fischer DB, Fried PJ, Ruffini G *et al.* Multifocal tDCS targeting the resting state motor
681 network increases cortical excitability beyond traditional tDCS targeting unilateral motor
682 cortex. *Neuroimage* 2017;**157**:34–44.

- 683 48 Mencarelli L, Menardi A, Neri F *et al.* Impact of network-targeted multichannel
684 transcranial direct current stimulation on intrinsic and network-to-network functional
685 connectivity. *J Neurosci Res* 2020;**98**:1843–56.
- 686 49 Ester-Nacke T, Berti K, Veit R *et al.* Network-targeted transcranial direct current
687 stimulation of the hypothalamus appetite-control network: a feasibility study. *Sci Rep*
688 2024;**14**:11341.
- 689 50 Ruffini G, Fox MD, Ripolles O *et al.* Optimization of multifocal transcranial current
690 stimulation for weighted cortical pattern targeting from realistic modeling of electric
691 fields. *Neuroimage* 2013;**89**:216–25.
- 692 51 Logan GD, Schachar RJ, Tannock R. Impulsivity and Inhibitory Control. *Psychol Sci*
693 1997;**8**:60–64.
- 694 52 Whitfield-Gabrieli S, Nieto-Castanon A. Conn: a functional connectivity toolbox for
695 correlated and anticorrelated brain networks. *Brain Connect* 2012;**2**:125–41.
- 696 53 Nieto-Castanon A, Whitfield-Gabrieli S. *CONN functional connectivity toolbox: RRID*
697 *SCR_009550, release 22*. Hilbert Press, 2022.
- 698 54 Friston KJ. Statistical Parametric Mapping. In: Kötter R (ed.). *Neuroscience Databases*. .
699 Boston, MA: Springer US, 237–50.
- 700 55 Jacobson L, Koslowsky M, Lavidor M. tDCS polarity effects in motor and cognitive
701 domains: a meta-analytical review. *Exp Brain Res* 2012;**216**:1–10.
- 702 56 Schroeder PA, Plewnia C. Beneficial Effects of Cathodal Transcranial Direct Current
703 Stimulation (tDCS) on Cognitive Performance. *J Cogn Enhanc* 2017;**1**:5–9.
- 704 57 Batsikadze G, Moliadze V, Paulus W *et al.* Partially non-linear stimulation intensity-
705 dependent effects of direct current stimulation on motor cortex excitability in humans. *J*
706 *Physiol (Lond)* 2013;**591**:1987–2000.
- 707 58 Corriveau A, Yoo K, Kwon YH *et al.* Functional connectome stability and optimality are
708 markers of cognitive performance. *Cereb Cortex* 2023;**33**:5025–41.
- 709 59 Lin Q, Rosenberg MD, Yoo K *et al.* Resting-State Functional Connectivity Predicts
710 Cognitive Impairment Related to Alzheimer's Disease. *Front Aging Neurosci*
711 2018;**10**:94.
- 712 60 Yu J, Tseng P, Hung DL *et al.* Brain stimulation improves cognitive control by
713 modulating medial-frontal activity and preSMA-vmPFC functional connectivity. *Hum*
714 *Brain Mapp* 2015;**36**:4004–15.


- 715 61 Gluck ME, Heinitz S, Alonso-Alonso M *et al.* Decreased Snack Food Intake in Obesity
716 Following Noninvasive Neuromodulation Targeted to the Left Dorsolateral Prefrontal
717 Cortex (LDLPFC). *Brain Stimul* 2017;**10**:e37.
- 718 62 To C, Falcone M, Loughhead J *et al.* Got chocolate? Bilateral prefrontal cortex stimulation
719 augments chocolate consumption. *Appetite* 2018;**131**:28–35.
- 720 63 Beaumont JD, Smith NC, Starr D *et al.* Effective Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation
721 Parameters for the Modulation of Eating Behavior: A Systematic Literature Review and
722 Meta-Analysis. *Psychosom Med* 2022;**84**:646–57.
- 723 64 Sedgmond J, Lawrence NS, Verbruggen F *et al.* Prefrontal brain stimulation during food-
724 related inhibition training: effects on food craving, food consumption and inhibitory
725 control. *R Soc Open Sci* 2019;**6**:181186.
- 726 65 Sedgmond J, Chambers CD, Lawrence NS *et al.* No evidence that prefrontal HD-tDCS
727 influences cue-induced food craving. *Behavioral neuroscience* 2020;**134**:369–83.
- 728 66 Lowe CJ, Vincent C, Hall PA. Effects of Noninvasive Brain Stimulation on Food
729 Cravings and Consumption: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Psychosom Med* 2017;**79**:2–13.
- 730 67 Georgii C, Goldhofer P, Meule A *et al.* Food craving, food choice and consumption: The
731 role of impulsivity and sham-controlled tDCS stimulation of the right dlPFC. *Physiol*
732 *Behav* 2017;**177**:20–26.
- 733 68 Beaumont JD, Dalton M, Davis D *et al.* No effect of prefrontal transcranial direct current
734 stimulation (tDCS) on food craving, food reward and subjective appetite in females
735 displaying mild-to-moderate binge-type behaviour. *Appetite* 2023;**189**:106997.
- 736 69 Heni M. The insulin resistant brain: impact on whole-body metabolism and body fat
737 distribution. *Diabetologia* 2024.
- 738 70 Bryant M, Truesdale KP, Dye L. Modest changes in dietary intake across the menstrual
739 cycle: implications for food intake research. *Br J Nutr* 2006;**96**:888–94.
- 740 71 Hummel J, Benkendorff C, Fritsche L *et al.* Brain insulin action on peripheral insulin
741 sensitivity in women depends on menstrual cycle phase. *Nat Metab*
742

743 **Figures**


a Experimental Design




b Electrode Setup



c Normal electric field (V/m)




744
 745 **Fig. 1.** Experimental design, electrode setup and resulting normal electric field. (a) Experimental design.
 746 Participants were randomly assigned to either the anodal, cathodal, or sham-net-tDCS group and completed five
 747 study days: one baseline assessment, three consecutive visits during which the net-tDCS was administered, and
 748 the follow-up. (b) Electrode setup for net-tDCS: The electrode assembly consists of 12 circular Ag/AgCl
 749 electrodes. Orange dots show electrodes where the current entered into the cortex; blue dots indicate electrodes
 750 where the current dissipated. (c) Normal electric field (V/m) induced by the net-tDCS montage aimed at
 751 stimulating the hypothalamus appetite-control network. Figure (c) from [49], originally provided from
 752 Neuroelectronics Barcelona S.L.U. Abbreviations: fMRI, functional magnetic resonance imaging; net-tDCS,
 753 network-transcranial direct current stimulation; oGTT, oral glucose tolerance test.




754

755 **Fig. 2.** Response inhibition results. (a) Raw data of the SSRT for each condition and each visit. Boxplots display
 756 median and 1.5 x interquartile range. The half-violin plots show the distribution of the data and the dotted lines
 757 display changes of mean values across visits. (b) Results indicate a greater response inhibition for active net-tDCS.
 758 P values are for main effect of active net-tDCS group compared to sham by two-sided linear mixed model adjusted
 759 for age and sex, with change in hypothalamus functional connectivity (FC) as fixed effects. (c) Results indicate
 760 that a stronger increase in hypothalamic FC from baseline to follow-up is associated with shorter SSRT (better
 761 inhibitory control) in the active net-tDCS groups compared to the sham group. P values are for change in
 762 hypothalamus FC by net-tDCS group interactions. Shaded areas around the line are depicting the 95% confidence
 763 interval. Full results output can be found in **Suppl. Table 9**. N = 44.



764
 765 **Fig. 3.** Food consumption results. Raw data of (a) total intake, (b) fat intake, (c) carbohydrate intake and (d)
 766 protein intake in kcal for each condition and visit. Boxplots display median and 1.5 x interquartile range. The half-
 767 violin plots show the distribution of the data and the dotted lines display changes of mean values across visits. (e-
 768 f) For carbohydrates, participants of the sham group showed a greater consumption during visit 3 compared to visit
 769 1, while the cathodal net-tDCS group showed no increase across visits. For protein consumption, participants of
 770 the sham group showed a reduction in protein intake during visit 3 compared to visit 1, while the active net-tDCS
 771 groups maintained a consistent protein intake. *P* values are for active net-tDCS group by visit interactions using a
 772 two-sided linear mixed model adjusted for sex and total caloric intake. Full results output of all models can be
 773 found in **Supp. Table 10, 12.** *N* = 44.



774
 775 **Fig. 4.** Sweet food intake results. (a) Raw data of the percentage of caloric intake by sweet food to total caloric
 776 intake for each condition and each visit. Boxplots display median and 1.5 x interquartile range. The half-violin
 777 plots show the distribution of the data and the dotted lines display changes of mean values across visits. (b) Results
 778 show a significantly lower sweet food intake in the anodal net-tDCS group compared to the sham group. *P* value
 779 is for main effect of anodal net-tDCS group compared to sham by two-sided linear mixed model adjusted for total
 780 caloric intake. Full results output can be found in **Supp. Table 13**. *N* = 44.

781 Tables

782 **Table 1.** Participant baseline and anthropometric characteristics of net-tDCS groups.

		sham (N=15)	anodal (N=15)	cathodal (N=14)	p-value	Total (N=44)
Sex	Women	8 (53.3%)	8 (53.3%)	7 (50.0%)	0.979	23 (52.3%)
	Men	7 (46.7%)	7 (46.7%)	7 (50.0%)		
Age (years)	Mean (SD)	36.5 (13.0)	34.6 (12.0)	37.8 (15.1)	0.997	36.3 (13.1)
BMI (kg/m²)	Mean (SD)	30.4 (3.06)	30.9 (3.86)	30.6 (2.80)	0.922	30.6 (3.21)
Waist circumference (cm)	Mean (SD)	94.0 (8.43)	95.6 (10.3)	95.1 (10.3)	0.902	94.9 (9.50)
WHR	Mean (SD)	0.880 (0.0714)	0.885 (0.0582)	0.861 (0.0866)	0.651	0.876 (0.0717)
Body fat content (% , BIA-derived)	Mean (SD)	34.4 (10.5)	34.9 (9.71)	34.5 (10.2)	0.999	34.6 (9.89)
Number of days between baseline and follow-up visit	Mean (SD)	32.2 (21.0)	24.3 (16.4)	27.5 (18.0)	0.611	28.0 (18.4)

783 Mean values from variables between net-tDCS groups were compared using an ANOVA or a Kruskal-Wallis test.
 784 A Fisher's exact test was used to compare sex ratio. Abbreviations: BIA, Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis; BMI,
 785 Body Mass Index; WHR, Waist-to-Hip Ratio.

786 **Table 2.** Participant glucose metabolism values at follow-up.

		sham (N=15)	anodal (N=15)	cathodal (N=14)	total (N=44)
ISI Matsuda, oGTT-derived (AU)	Mean (SD)	12.2 (5.64)	12.6 (8.80)	10.5 (3.95)	11.8 (6.41)
HbA1c (mmol/mol)	Mean (SD)	34.9 (2.89)	34.2 (3.75)	35.3 (4.94)	34.8 (3.85)
HbA1c (%)	Mean (SD)	5.35 (0.261)	5.29 (0.352)	5.39 (0.437)	5.34 (0.349)
Fasting glucose (mmol/L)	Mean (SD)	4.95 (0.419)	4.93 (0.363)	5.16 (0.336)	5.01 (0.382)
Fasting insulin (pmol/L)	Mean (SD)	78.7 (28.8)	83.9 (50.4)	79.4 (28.6)	80.7 (36.7)
Glucose, 2 hour (mmol/L)	Mean (SD)	5.08 (1.19)	5.16 (1.45)	5.31 (0.935)	5.18 (1.19)
Insulin, 2 hour (pmol/L)	Mean (SD)	338 (389)	385 (205)	352 (209)	359 (277)
Fasting Triglycerides (mg/dL)	Mean (SD)	111 (66.6)	101 (39.5)	97.4 (39.9)	104 (49.7)

787 Abbreviations: AU, arbitrary units; HbA1c, glycohemoglobin A1c; ISI, insulin sensitivity index; oGTT, oral
788 glucose tolerance test.