Dry tDCS: Tolerability of a novel multilayer hydrogel composite non-adhesive electrode for transcranial direct current stimulation
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ABSTRACT

Background: The adoption of transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) is encouraged by portability and ease-of-use. However, the preparation of tDCS electrodes remains the most cumbersome and error-prone step. Here, we validate the performance of the first “dry” electrodes for tDCS. A “dry electrode” excludes 1) any saline or other electrolytes, that are prone to spread and leaving a residue; 2) any adhesive at the skin interface; or 3) any electrode preparation steps except the connection to the stimulator. The Multilayer Hydrogel Composite (MHC) dry-electrode design satisfied these criteria.

Objective/Hypothesis: Over an exposed scalp (supraorbital (SO) regions of forehead), we validated the performance of the first “dry” electrode for tDCS against the state-of-the-art conventional wet sponge-electrode to test the hypothesis that whether tDCS can be applied with a dry electrode with comparable tolerability as conventional “wet” techniques?

Methods: MHC dry-electrode performance was verified using a skin-phantom, including mapping voltage at the phantom surface and mapping current inside the electrode using a novel biocompatible flexible printed circuit board current sensor matrix (fPCB-CSM). MHC dry-electrode performance was validated in a human trial including tolerability (VAS and adverse events), skin redness (erythema), and electrode current mapping with the fPCB-CSM. Experimental data from skin-phantom stimulation were compared against a finite element method (FEM) model.

Results: Under the tested conditions (1.5 mA and 2 mA tDCS for 20 min using MHC-dry and sponge-electrode), the tolerability was improved, and the erythema and adverse-events were comparable between the MHC dry-electrode and the state-of-the-art sponge electrodes.

Conclusion: Dry (residue-free, non-spreading, non-adhesive, and no-preparation-needed) electrodes can be tolerated under the tested tDCS conditions, and possibly more broadly used in non-invasive electrical stimulation.

© 2018 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) is a non-invasive brain stimulation tool used in healthy and patient populations where a weak direct current (1–2 mA) is applied through two or more electrodes placed on the scalp [1,2]. A major contributor to the rapid and broad adoption of tDCS is portability and ease-of-use. tDCS is well tolerated with common mild side-effects such as transient cutaneous sensations (e.g., as warmth, itching, and tingling) and erythema [3–7]. However, when (and only when) established standard protocols are not followed [8], tDCS can produce significant skin irritation [9–12]. Given that cutaneous sensation and irritation are the primary risks of tDCS [3,7,13], [14], proper electrode preparation and monitoring are vital for tolerability and reproducibility [4,6,15]. Yet, the preparation and placement of tDCS electrodes remain the most cumbersome and prone-to-error steps [7]. For example, both the level of sponge fluid saturation and head-gear tightness need to be titrated to balance good skin contact while avoiding of saline spread, and sponges can dehydrate or move [16] over an extended time. Thus, despite success with current research/clinical grade equipment and
accessories, even for remote-supervised home use [17], there is an interest to continue to enhance technology to deploy tDCS.

The sponge-pocket style electrode (25–35 cm²) with conductive rubber insert, pin connectors, and saline application by the operator is the most traditional tDCS electrode used [16][18], but most prone to preparation error, notably when poor materials are used by insufficiently trained users [19]. Circular sponges do not appear to provide an advantage [14],[20]. The introduction of pre-saline-saturated snap-connector sponge electrodes [21] automates most of the sponge electrode preparation process. Electrolyte gel or paste is used in specialized tDCS application (e.g. in MRI [22]). Specialized adhesive hydrogels electrodes can support tDCS [4]. High-Definition electrodes with a distinct small form factor (~1 cm diameter [23]) use specialized hydrogels [24]. What all these electrodes design share, is a “wet” electrode-skin-interface, where a fluid or viscous electrolyte is assumed to saturate the skin [25], which in turn result in some residue on the skin.

Here, we validate the performance of the first “dry” electrodes for tDCS. Dry electrodes exclude: 1) any saline or other conductive hydrogel-based gel or paste, that are prone to leak or spread, and that leave a residue; 2) any adhesive at the skin, either around the electrode or part of the hydrogel; or 3) any electrode preparation steps by the operator except connection to the stimulator. A novel Multilayer Hydrogel Composite (MHC) electrode design fulfills these criteria. FEM models and a skin-phantom were used to verify electrode performance followed by tolerability validation in healthy subjects. Adverse events, erythema, and VAS pain were scored using established protocols [4][7][10],[13],[26]. In addition, we developed a biocompatible flexible printed circuit board current sensor matrix (fPCB-CSM) to map current distribution inside the electrode during phantom or subject stimulation. In all experiments, MHC dry-electrode performance was compared against a state-of-the-art sponge electrode to address the hypothesis: can tDCS be applied with a dry electrode with comparable tolerability as conventional “wet” techniques.

2. Materials and methods

This study involves experimental measures in phantom (voltage) and participants (via VAS and adverse events reporting questionnaire), computational FEM simulation in phantom, current mapping in the electrode, and an algorithm based image processing of erythema distribution.

2.1. Participants

The study was conducted in accordance with the protocols and procedures approved by the Institutional Review Board of the City College of New York, CUNY. Twenty healthy participants (13 males and 7 females; age 19–34 years; mean age 24.7 ± 4.9) completed this study. Volunteers with any sign of skin disorder/sensitive skin (ex. eczema, severe rashes), blisters, open wounds, burn including sunburns, cuts or irritation (e.g. due to shaving), or other skin defects which compromise the integrity of the skin at or near stimulation locations were excluded from this study. However, participants on mild acne medication with non-irritating skin disorders were not excluded. Similarly, prospective volunteers with any neuropsychiatric disorders or receiving medication for such disorders were excluded from this study. Participants volunteered in four different tDCS sessions using 1.5 mA and 2 mA current intensities plus an additional two sessions at 2 mA with the fPCB-CSM for both MHC dry and sponge-electrodes in a randomized order. All participants provided written informed consent to participate in the study. Participants were seated in an upright relaxed position and performed a lexical decision task throughout the duration of the stimulation.

2.2. Novel sensor array

The current sensor made up of a novel biocompatible flexible printed circuit board current sensor matrix (fPCB-CSM) comprises...
Fig. 2. Electrical performance of conventional sponge-electrode and MHC dry electrode verified using a skin-phantom and FEM simulations. Phantom voltages and electrode currents were measured using the Ag/AgCl array or PCB-CSM, respectively, with corresponding FEM prediction. (A) Architecture of a phantom model showing expanded cut off view of rubber electrode, sensor array, and sponge-electrode assembly on the phantom-gel surface. (A1) Illustration of PCB-CSM sensor unit positioned over sponge pad. (A2) Voltage distribution measured experimentally and predicted by FEM simulation at the sensor-electrode interface and phantom bulk surface. Phantom voltages and electrode currents were measured using the Ag/AgCl array or PCB-CSM, respectively, with corresponding FEM prediction. (A1) Voltage distribution measured experimentally and predicted by FEM simulation at the sensor-electrode interface and phantom bulk surface. The leftmost panel of A1 illustrates side-view of the electrode-sensor and phantom assembly, and predicted voltage distribution at the sensor-electrode interface (dorsal), within-sponges (medial), and phantom bulk surface (ventral). Middle row of A1 shows FEM prediction of voltage distribution at the sensor-electrode interface and phantom bulk surface using simulation result (A1a, A1b) and false voltage distribution map at each small squared surface that resemble the shape of the experimental sensor arrays (A1ai, A1bi) and the measured voltage from experimental measures (A1ci). Peak FEM predicted voltage at the sensor-electrode interface was 0.126 V and 0.122 V at the phantom bulk surface. Experimental voltage measurement at the phantom bulk surface was 0.22 V (peak). (A1d) Graphical representation of voltage line plots of diagonal voltage components at the sensor-electrode interface and phantom bulk surface (FEM prediction results), and an experimental measure. Position of the sensors is represented as numbers in a diagonal fashion as illustrated in A1ai, A1bi, and A1ci. Results represents an overall distribution map of voltage. (A2) represents current density measured experimentally and predicted by the FEM simulation at the sensor-electrode interface and phantom bulk surface. Panel at the left of A2 shows stacked view of current density distribution from sensor-electrode interface (dorsal), within-sponges (medial), and phantom bulk surface (ventral). FEM prediction of current density measured experimentally and experimental measurement of current are shown in the middle panel of A2. Peak current of 5 A/m² (A2a) and a peak current of 0.135 mA (A2aii) was predicted at the sensor-electrode interface, whereas at the phantom bulk surface FEM predicted a peak current density of 0.47 A/m² (A2bi) and a peak current of 0.0164 mA (A2bii). Current measured experimentally (A2c) at the sensor-electrode interface was almost uniform. (A2d) Representation of line plots of diagonal current components at the sensor-electrode interface and phantom bulk surface. (B) Illustration of MHC dry electrode positioning over the phantom-gel surface. (B1) Illustration of MHC dry electrode positioning over the phantom-gel surface.
two units: 1) measuring unit (top view) and 2) sensor unit (bottom view) (Fig. 1, Fig. 2A and B). The measuring unit (rubber electrode positioning side) of the novel sensor array has an exposed gold (Au) plated uniform copper (Cu) metal surface, whereas on its distal side, there are twenty-five 50Ω soldered resistors (5 rows and 5 columns of resistors) and five common grounds for each row. The sensor unit underneath the measuring unit (sponge/MHC-dry electrode side) has a high heat resistance polyimide insulating substrate that divides the conductive metal into twenty-five small sensor electrode arrays. Each of these twenty-five sensor arrays is connected independently to the twenty-five test resistors located at the measuring unit. Each end of the sensor array has a dimension of 5 cm x 5 cm x 0.03 cm (Fig. 1). The entire sensor array is assembled into one compound unit using a biocompatible polyimide substrate.

2.3. Voltage sensor array for phantom study

Twenty-Five Ag/Agcl pellet shaped electrodes (diameter = 1 mm) were embedded inside an agar phantom (based on [27] [28]) such that the planar assembly mimics the shape of an overlaid 5 x 5 cm² tDCS electrode, and the position of each electrode corresponds to the center of the 25-small fPCB-CSM sensor arrays. An embedded reference electrode placed 5 cm away from the twenty-five electrode array was used as a ground for voltage measurement across the recording electrodes.

2.4. MHC dry-electrode

The dual layer structure of the MHC dry-electrode includes independently optimized mechanical, electrical, and chemical properties of the hydrogel. The top layer (thickness, 0.6 mm) of the MHC dry-electrode was composed of an adhesive polymer hydrogel, whereas the bottom layer (thickness, 1 mm) had a non-adhesive bio-compatible polymer hydrogel containing Poly-Vinyl Alcohol (PVA) (Fig. 1). Both layers were optimized in a way that the top layer becomes less resistive to redistribute the injected current across the electrode plane, whereas the bottom layer becomes highly resistive layer and minimizes current clustering at the skin [18]. Furthermore, any electrochemical produced (e.g. pH changes) at the electrode (non-ionic/conduction) interface within the electrodes were optimized using the top layer as a diffusion barrier [25]. The electrode components weight by percentage were: crossed-linked acrylic resin (top layer: 15–25%; bottom layer: 15–25%); polyhydric alcohol (top layer: 40–60%; bottom layer: 30–60%); NaCl as an electrolytic salt (top layer: < 10; bottom layer: < 8%); additives/stabilizers (top layer: < 0.5; bottom layer: < 0.5); deionized water (top layer: 20–40; bottom layer: 20–40%); polyvinyl alcohol resin (top layer: none; bottom layer: 1–5%)

The effectiveness of the MHC dry-electrode was successfully evaluated not only as a current re-distribution layer but also as a diffusion barrier layer [29]. In the diffusion barrier test, pH changes were measured at the entire conductive silicone rubber/top hydrogel layer, top/bottom hydrogel layer, and bottom hydrogel layer/skin interface after 2 mA 30min stimulation. There was no pH change at the bottom/skin hydrogel interface. Only less than 0.3% of the total electrode area showed pH change at the top/bottom hydrogel layer interface (n = 30).

2.5. Electrode preparation and placement

The experiment was conducted on rectangular phantom bulks (15 cm x 8 cm x 5 cm; prepared using established standard protocols as discussed in Ref. [27] [28]). Prior to the electrode placement, a thin coat (~0.5 cm) of conductive electrode gel (Signa gel, Parker Laboratories Inc., NJ, USA) was applied over the agar phantom bulk. Conductive gel was used to maintain a consistent contact between the stimulation electrodes and the phantom. For the phantom study, the conventional sponge-electrode (5 x 5 cm) were first soaked with saline (0.9% NaCl) and a conductive carbon rubber (5 x 5 cm, Carbon Rubber Electrode, Soterix medical Inc., NY, USA) was inserted inside the sponge pocket. While the whole assembly is often referred as an electrode in tDCS, the electrode is technically the conductive rubber and the saline/gel is technically the electrolyte [19]. Two electrodes (anode and cathode; 5 x 5 cm each) were then positioned on the phantom with an interelectrode distance of 10 cm and connected to a tDCS stimulator (1 x 1 tDCS, Soterix Medical Inc., NY, USA). The non-adhesive bottom layer of the MHC dry-electrode was placed over the phantom bulk and a conductive silicone rubber was positioned on the top adhesive layer of the MHC-dry electrode which was connected to the tDCS device.

For the human study, a bifrontal montage (anode left and cathode right on the supraorbital (SO) region of a forehead) was used to place both type of electrodes. Note that we selected this particular montage to overcome the major limitation of the MHC dry-electrode- not applicable in hairy regions of scalp unlike the conventional “wet” sponge-electrode. Electrodes were positioned and secured over the brain region using an elastic fastener (Soterix Medical Elastic Fastener, Soterix Medical Inc., NY, USA).

When current at the electrode was measured, the fPCB-CSM array was placed in between the sponge or MHC dry-electrode (bottom) and the conductive carbon/silicone rubber electrode (top). Together they formed a stacked electrode configuration of rubber electrode, fPCS-CSM array, and sponge/MHC dry-electrode respectively.

2.6. Stimulation and current/voltage measurement

A weak 1.5 or 2 mA direct current (with an additional linear ramp up and down of 30 s at the beginning and at the end of stimulation) from a tDCS stimulator was applied in both human and phantom studies through sponge or MHC dry-electrodes. In the human study, voltage was measured across each test resistor located at the measuring unit of the fPCB-CSM using a digital multimeter (Fluke 87 V Industrial Multimeter, Fluke Corporation, WA, USA) and the corresponding current was calculated using the Ohm’s law. In the phantom bulk experiment, voltage was measured across the twenty-five embedded recording electrodes using a low power instrumentation amplifier (AD620, Analogue Devices, MA,
cases. The conventional sponge-electrode and MHC dry-electrode simulation values. An adaptive tetrahedral meshing algorithm was implemented in ScanIP software (Synopsys, Exeter, UK). Dimensions of rubber electrode, MHC dry-electrode, and sensor arrays were based on the experimental (phantom) and measured experimentally (phantom gel and in vivo study) using both conventional sponge-electrode and MHC dry-electrode. In addition, VAS score, lexical decision task response, and adverse event analysis based on participants’ rating and response were analyzed.

3. Results

Voltage and current density/current distribution at the sensor-electrode interface and phantom bulk surface during direct current stimulation (2 mA, 20 min) were predicted by FEM simulation (phantom) and measured experimentally (phantom gel and in vivo study) using both conventional sponge-electrode and MHC dry-electrode. On an individual basis, hot spots (e.g. 6× average) were detected but with no consistent pattern suggesting that it reflect idiosyncratic contact of the electrode with the skin surface or internal skin or electrode inhomogeneities. In any case, there was no average or individual electrode observation of current concentration at the electrode edge (at sensors around the perimeter) as much be predicted based on prior models [14] [18], [30–32].

3.2. Erythema distribution

Erythema was diffused across the skin-electrode contact area in both MHC dry-electrode and sponge-electrode for both stimulation intensities as indicated by the probability heat map. For the MHC dry-electrode, the peak cumulative probability of erythema distribution for 1.5 mA was 50%; 41.2% for mild and 17.65% for strong (Fig. 4B1) whereas for 2 mA (Fig. 4B2), the cumulative erythema percentage was 73.53%; 52.9% for mild and 32.35% for strong. Conventional sponge-electrode had the peak probability of 50% erythema distribution for 1.5 mA (Fig. 4B3); 50% for mild and 18.9% for strong, and for 2 mA (Fig. 4B4), the peak cumulative erythema was 71.1%; 57.9% for mild and 26.32% for strong. The mean probability of erythema distribution yielded by MHC dry-electrode and conventional sponge-electrode were comparable (Fig. 4).

Performance of conventional sponge-electrode and MHC dry-electrode with variations: FEM prediction and Experimental Measures.
Table 1: Representation of adverse events as intensity and relationship to tDCS based on subjective reporting before and after stimulation (pre- and post). Reporting of adverse events (mean ± SD) were comparable across electrode types and stimulation intensities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electrode Type</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Headache (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Neck pain (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Scalp pain (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Tingling (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Burning Sensation (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Itching (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Sleepiness (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Trouble concentrating (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Dizziness (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Nausea (mean ± SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponge-electrode</td>
<td>1.5 mA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.10 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.90 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.50 ± 0.20</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.10 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHC dry-electrode</td>
<td>1.5 mA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.10 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.90 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.50 ± 0.20</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.10 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHC dry-electrode</td>
<td>2.0mA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.90 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.50 ± 0.20</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.10 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.00</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Sponge-electrode, the FEM model predicted a peak voltage of 0.126 V at the sensor-electrode interface (Fig. 2A1a, 2A1a2) and 0.122 V (peak) at the phantom bulk surface (Fig. 2A1b, 2A1b2). An embedded electrode array positioned at the phantom bulk surface measured a maximum voltage of 0.22 V (Fig. 2A1c). Predicted voltage and experimentally measured voltage (Mean ± SD) distribution line plots were almost even across diagonal direction (Fig. 2A1d), however at the center of the phantom bulk surface, it was slightly higher. The FEM model of sponge-electrode predicted a peak current density of 5 A/m² and a peak current of 0.135 mA at the sensor-electrode interface, whereas at the phantom bulk surface, the predicted peak current density and peak current were 0.47 A/m² (Fig. 2A2a) and 0.0164 mA (Fig. 2A2b). Maximum current measured experimentally at the sensor-electrode interface for sponge-electrode was 0.10 mA and the overall current distribution was uniform (Fig. 2A2c). However, the FEM model predicted somewhat higher current density/current at the edges (Fig. 2A2d). For MHC dry-electrode, the predicted peak voltage at the sensor-electrode interface was 3.2 V (Fig. 2B1a, 2B1a2) and 0.16 V at the phantom bulk surface (Fig. 2B1b, 2B1b2), higher than the conventional sponge-electrode. The experimental voltage measured at the phantom bulk surface during MHC dry-electrode stimulation was comparable to that of sponge-electrode (Fig. 2B1c and 2A1c). The FEM model predicted peak current density and current were 5 A/m² and 0.082 mA at the sensor-electrode interface and 0.41 A/m² and 0.0198 mA at the phantom bulk surface (Fig. 2B2a and 2B2a2, Fig. 2B2b and 2B2b2) for the MHC dry-electrode. Overall current distribution at the phantom bulk surface was almost uniform, with peaks around the center (Fig. 2B2b). Current distribution measured experimentally during MHC was comparable to that of conventional sponge-electrode (Max: 0.10 mA, Fig. 2B2c).

In MHC dry-electrode Variation I, the FEM predicted similar voltage and current density/current distribution as that of the original MHC dry-electrode (Figs. 2 and 3). However, results from MHC variation II were lower than that of the original configuration of dual hydrogel layers. In MHC variation II, the peak voltages at the sensor electrode interface and phantom bulk surface were 0.19 V and 0.15 V (Fig. 3B1a, 3B1a2, and 3B1b, 3B1b2) and the predicted peak current density and current at the sensor electrode interface and phantom bulk surface were 5 A/m² and 0.0855 mA, and 0.35 A/m² and 0.0168 mA respectively (Fig. 3B2a, 3B2a2, and 3B2b2).

3.3. Tolerability

A total of 120 treatment sessions were conducted, including the in vivo current mapping study. No serious adverse events were reported. Eight participants withdrew from the study: six participants withdrew due to scheduling issues (i.e. inability to meet scheduling criterion for a minimum of four sessions), one participant withdrew due to itching during a 2 mA MHC dry session (the only withdrawal during a session), and one participant withdrew without stating a reason. Thus, all but one withdrawal were during sessions. In total, twenty subjects completed the entire study and group level analysis were conducted on only these 20 subjects. tDCS adverse events were assessed by a self-report questionnaire immediately post-stimulation period (session-wise data, Table 1). The most common adverse events with the highest incidence across all treatment groups were skin tingling, burning, and itching sensations. The cumulative adverse events across stimulation intensities (1.5 mA (Mdn = 1) Vs 2 mA (Mdn = 1)) when analyzed using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test (non-parametric test) were not significantly different (Z = -0.003, P = 0.997).
whereas across electrode types (MHC dry-electrode (Mdn = 1) Vs sponge-electrode (Mdn = 1)), the adverse events were higher for the sponge-electrode ($Z = 2.344, P = 0.019$) (Fig. 5). When analyzed the interaction between the electrode types and stimulation intensities in relationship to the tDCS, the adverse events were comparable ($Z = -1.760, P = 0.078; Z = -0.439, P = 0.660$). The median for stimulation intensities and the electrode types was 1 (Fig. 6). Since there was no significant time effect ($P > 0.05$) on the VAS data (VAS collected every 2 min during each stimulation session), the time data sets were collapsed together and analyzed for

![Diagram](image-url)

**Fig. 3.** Performance of MHC dry electrode with variations in electrical conductivities of the dual layers. Voltage and current/current density distribution as predicted by FEM at the sensor-electrode interface and the phantom bulk surface are represented. (A) Illustration of voltage distribution at the sensor-electrode interface and phantom bulk surface when the conductivities of the dual layers are reversed (MHC dry-electrode Variation I: top layer: 0.001 S/m and bottom layer: 0.1 S/m). Stacked slice view of voltage distribution from dorsal to ventral end of the MHC Variation I electrode-phantom assembly (left panel). FEM model predicted a comparable voltage at the sensor-electrode interface ($A1_{ai}-A1_{aii}$) and phantom bulk surface ($A1_{bi}-A1_{bii}$) as that of the actual MHC dry electrode. (A2) represents current density and current distribution with MHC dry-electrode Variation II (top layer and bottom layer: 0.1 S/m). The left panel of B1 represents a distribution of voltage at the sensor-electrode interface and phantom bulk surface. FEM simulation predicted slightly lower peak voltage (0.19 V) at the sensor-electrode interface compared to the actual MHC dry-electrode ($B1_{ai}-B1_{aii}$), whereas peak voltage at the phantom bulk was comparable ($B1_{bi}-B1_{bii}$). Representation of current density distribution at different interfaces (B2). The simulation predicted comparable current density ($B2_{ai}$) and current ($B2_{aii}$) at the sensor-electrode interface, however, at the phantom bulk surface, current density ($B2_{bi}$) and current ($B2_{bii}$) was slightly lower than that of MHC dry electrode. (B2c) represents variation in current at the sensor-electrode interface and phantom bulk surface.
Fig. 4. Graphical representation of skin redness (erythema) distribution over the site of stimulation after tDCS (20 min, 1.5 mA, and 2 mA). (A1) depicts the image analysis steps where photographs of participants taken immediately after stimulation were passed through series of filters to isolate erythema region from the site of stimulation by defining a region of interest (ROI). (A2) represents a binary mask of erythema image traced by the rater. (A3) shows steps of computing the probability of erythema distribution by stacking all binary erythema mask. (A4) illustrates the mean heatmap of erythema distribution across subjects represented as a percentage across the ROI. Peak represent 100% probability in the color bar and probability was depicted as mild, strong, and combined heatmaps. (B1, B2) are erythema heatmaps of 1.5 mA and 2 mA using MHC dry electrode and (B3, B4) represents heatmaps for sponge-electrode. Combined erythema distribution was widely diffused with a comparable peak probability of erythema in both electrode types. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)

Fig. 5. Representation of adverse events for both MHC dry-electrode and sponge-electrode across stimulation intensities (1.5 mA and 2 mA) on a scale of 1–5; 1: none, 5: max. Participants are color-coded. The highest incidence of adverse events across all treatment groups were skin tingling, burning, and itching sensations (A1, A2, B1, B2). There was no statistically significant difference (P > 0.05) in adverse events between stimulation intensities, however between the electrode types, there was a significant difference (P < 0.05): less adverse events reported in the MHC dry-electrode. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)
statistical significance. The VAS pain score was higher in the sponge-electrode (Mdn = 2) than the MHC dry-electrode (Mdn = 1.5) ($Z = 5.341, P = 1.41 \times 10^{-7}$), whereas across the stimulation intensities (1.5 mA (Mdn = 2), 2 mA (Mdn = 2)), the VAS pain score was comparable ($Z = -0.567, P = 0.571$) (Fig. 7).

4. Discussion

We first defined a dry-electrode as 1) excluding any liquid of viscous electrolyte (as typical for conventional tDCS and HD-tDCS electrodes [8]) with the benefit of no accidental spread and no residue; 2) excluding any adhesive at the skin interface (common in...
TENS but rare for tDCS [4]) either integrated into or around the electrolyte; and 3) excluding any electrode preparation steps, even just saturation, except connection to the stimulator (which is an implicit step for a swapping disposable electrodes). A Multilayer Hydrogel Composite (MHC) dry-electrode design which satisfied these basic criteria was developed and then the electrode performance was verified in terms of current delivery and tolerability. For the conditions tested here, the MHC-electrodes performed sufficiently based on the improved VAS and comparable adverse event reporting, when compared to the conventional sponge-electrodes.

Focused on tDCS technology, we did not test any additional stimulation waveforms in this study. But tDCS is considered demanding from an electrode design standpoint [25] - for example, charge balanced pulses waveforms can be applied with conventional adhesive hydrogel electrodes while tDCS requires specialized electrodes [4] - so our success with tDCS is encouraging for additional waveforms. Still, only empirical testing can ultimately validate tolerability for each waveform and electrode design. In addition, we evaluated performance only below the hair line (SO positions) whereas tDCS is typically applied with at least one electrode above the headline (e.g. the common M1–SO montage). At a minimum, the MHC dry-electrodes may already be used below the hair line (e.g. SO) and a wet electrode above (e.g. M1). Noting the diffusivity of tDCS, other common montages, such as bifrontal positions [33][34], may be emulated by lowering the electrode below the hairline, without necessarily compromising brain current flow [35]. Notwithstanding these questions, our results may encourage future work on the design and applications of dry-electrode stimulation.
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