



# **Efficacy of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation to Improve Insight in Patients With Schizophrenia: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials**

Ondine Adam, Martin Blay, Andre R Brunoni, Hsin-An Chang, July S Gomes, Daniel C Javitt, Do-Un Jung, Joshua T Kantrowitz, Sanne Koops, Jean-Pierre Lindenmayer, et al.

## **► To cite this version:**

Ondine Adam, Martin Blay, Andre R Brunoni, Hsin-An Chang, July S Gomes, et al.. Efficacy of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation to Improve Insight in Patients With Schizophrenia: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 2022, 48 (6), pp.1284-1294. 10.1093/schbul/sbac078 . hal-04011980

**HAL Id: hal-04011980**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04011980>**

Submitted on 16 Mar 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1     **Title**

2     Efficacy of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation to Improve Insight in Patients with Schizophrenia:  
3     A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials

4     **Running title**

5     Effects of tDCS on Insight in Schizophrenia

6

7     **Authors**

8     Ondine ADAM<sup>1,2</sup>, MSc; Martin BLAY<sup>1</sup>, BSc; Andre R. BRUNONI<sup>3,4</sup>, MD, PhD; Hsin-An CHANG<sup>5</sup>,  
9     MD; July S. GOMES<sup>6</sup>, PhD; Daniel C. JAVITT<sup>7,8,9</sup>, MD, PhD; Do-Un JUNG<sup>10</sup>, MD, PhD; Joshua T.  
10    KANTROWITZ<sup>7,8,9</sup>, MD; Sanne KOOPS<sup>11</sup>, PhD; Jean-Pierre LINDENMAYER<sup>9,12,13</sup>, MD; Ulrich  
11    PALM<sup>14,15</sup>, MD, PhD; Robert C. SMITH<sup>9,12</sup>, MD, PhD; Iris E. SOMMER<sup>11</sup>, MD, PhD; Leandro do  
12    Costa Lane VALIENGO<sup>3,4</sup>, MD, PhD; Thomas W. WEICKERT<sup>16,17,18</sup>, PhD; Jérôme BRUNELIN<sup>1,2,†</sup>,  
13    PhD; Marine MONDINO<sup>1,2,†,\*</sup>, PhD

14

15    **Affiliations**

16    <sup>1</sup> Centre Hospitalier Le Vinatier, Bron, France

17    <sup>2</sup> INSERM U1028; CNRS UMR5292; PSYR2 Team; Lyon Neuroscience Research Center; Université  
18    Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Université Jean Monnet, Lyon, France

19    <sup>3</sup> Laboratório de Neurociências (LIM-27), Departamento e Instituto de Psiquiatria, Hospital das  
20    Clínicas HCFMUSP, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de São Paulo, SP, Brazil

21    <sup>4</sup> Serviço Interdisciplinar de Neuromodulação (SIN), Departamento e Instituto de Psiquiatria, Hospital  
22    das Clínicas HCFMUSP, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de São Paulo, SP, Brazil

23    <sup>5</sup> Department of Psychiatry, Tri-Service General Hospital, National Defense Medical Center, Taipei,  
24    Taiwan

25 <sup>6</sup> Interdisciplinary Laboratory of Clinical Neurosciences, Federal University of Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo,  
26 Brazil

27 <sup>7</sup> Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

28 <sup>8</sup> New York State Psychiatric Institute, New York, NY, USA

29 <sup>9</sup> Nathan Kline Institute, Orangeburg, NY, USA

30 <sup>10</sup> Department of Psychiatry, Busan Paik Hospital, Inje University, Busan, Republic of Korea

31 <sup>11</sup> Department of Biomedical Sciences of Cells & Systems, Cognitive Neurosciences, University of  
32 Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen (UMCG), Groningen, The Netherlands

33 <sup>12</sup> New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY, USA

34 <sup>13</sup> Manhattan Psychiatric Center, New York, NY, USA

35 <sup>14</sup> Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Hospital of the University of Munich, Munich.  
36 Germany

37 <sup>15</sup> Medical Park Chiemseeblick, Bernau-Felden, Germany

38 <sup>16</sup> Department of Neuroscience and Physiology, SUNY Upstate Medical University, Syracuse, NY,  
39 USA

40 <sup>17</sup> School of Psychiatry, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia

41 <sup>18</sup> Neuroscience Research Australia, Sydney, NSW, Australia

42 <sup>†</sup> shared last authorship

43

44 **\*Corresponding author**

45 Marine Mondino, PsyR2 team, Centre Hospitalier le Vinatier, batiment 416, 1st floor, 95 boulevard  
46 Pinel, 69678 Bron, Cedex BP 30039, FRANCE

47 email: [marine.mondino@ch-le-vinatier.fr](mailto:marine.mondino@ch-le-vinatier.fr)

48

49 Abstract word count: 238

50 Text body word count: 3993

## Abstract

Background and Hypothesis: Impaired insight into the illness and its consequences is associated with poor outcomes in schizophrenia. While transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) may represent a potentially effective treatment strategy to relieve various symptoms of schizophrenia, its impact on insight remains unclear. To investigate whether tDCS would modulate insight in patients with schizophrenia, we undertook a meta-analysis based on results from previous RCTs that investigated the clinical efficacy of tDCS. We hypothesize that repeated sessions of tDCS will be associated with insight improvement among patients.

Study Design: PubMed and ScienceDirect databases were systematically searched to identify RCTs that delivered at least 10 tDCS sessions in patients with schizophrenia. Primary outcome was the change in insight score, assessed by the PANSS item G12 following active tDCS sessions as opposed to sham stimulation. Effect sizes were calculated for all studies and pooled using a random-effects model. Meta-regression and subgroup analyses were conducted.

Study Results: Thirteen studies (587 patients with schizophrenia) were included. A significant pooled effect size ( $g$ ) of -0.46 (95% CI [-0.78; -0.14]) in favor of active tDCS was observed. Age and G12 score at baseline were identified as significant moderators, while change in total PANSS score was not significant.

Conclusions: Ten sessions of active tDCS with either frontotemporoparietal or bifrontal montage may improve insight into the illness in patients with schizophrenia. The effect of this treatment could contribute to the beneficial outcomes observed in patients following stimulation.

**Key words:** tDCS, psychosis, neuromodulation

## Introduction

Lack of patient insight into the illness is a key characteristic of many psychiatric disorders, including bipolar disorder,<sup>1</sup> obsessive-compulsive disorder,<sup>2</sup> and dementias.<sup>3</sup> Among patients with schizophrenia, the estimated prevalence of poor insight, corresponding to a general unawareness of illness, can be up to 50%.<sup>4,5</sup> Insight deficit includes lack of awareness of the symptoms of the illness, the need for and willingness to undergo treatment, and the consequences of the illness on the patient's life.<sup>6</sup> Poor insight has been regularly associated with negative attitudes toward medication<sup>7</sup> and nonadherence to antipsychotic treatment.<sup>8-11</sup> Treatment nonadherence in schizophrenia represents a heavy economic cost, estimated between \$13.92 and \$18.36 million a year in the United States,<sup>12</sup> since it increases the risk of relapse, rehospitalization rates, and suicide attempts.<sup>12,13</sup> Poor insight is directly associated with a higher risk of relapse,<sup>14</sup> which further emphasizes the importance of fostering better insight into the illness. Unfortunately, available treatments such as antipsychotic medication and psychotherapy provide either little or no improvement in patients' insight into their illness.<sup>15</sup>

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) is a safe, low-cost tool for modulating the activity and connectivity of targeted brain regions and related neural networks.<sup>16,17</sup> tDCS consists of applying weak electric currents through two electrodes placed over the scalp, with polarity-dependent effects on cortical excitability: currents entering the brain at the anode site are thought to increase cortical excitability while currents exiting the brain at the cathode site are thought to decrease cortical excitability.<sup>18</sup> For clinical purposes, repeated sessions of tDCS show promising results in alleviating some of the symptoms of schizophrenia and may also improve cognition in these patients.<sup>19</sup> The means by which tDCS alleviates symptoms remains unclear, and one can hypothesize that a beneficial effect on metacognitive processes, and especially on insight capacities, could be considered to explain tDCS's clinical effect since insight impairments have been associated with alteration in the activity of brain regions regularly targeted by tDCS (frontal and temporoparietal regions for example).<sup>20</sup>

Nevertheless, to date, only 5 articles from 3 different randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have studied the effect of tDCS on insight in patients with schizophrenia using different scales;<sup>21-25</sup> thus, drawing firm conclusions remains difficult.<sup>26</sup> An underutilized source of informative data on the impact of

tDCS on insight is a widely used psychiatric assessment scale:<sup>27</sup> the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) and its item G12.<sup>28</sup> This item assesses the lack of judgment and insight into the illness using a 7-level scale (ranging from 1, no impairment, to 7, extreme lack of insight). Gathering these often-unexamined data would provide a new source of evidence in establishing the potential benefits of treatment with tDCS on insight.

Since insight deficits are a major problem in the management of patients with schizophrenia, we conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized, sham-controlled clinical trials to evaluate the association between tDCS treatment and improvement in PANSS G12 scores in patients with schizophrenia. We hypothesized that, compared to sham tDCS, active tDCS will be associated with a decrease in G12 scores, which corresponds to an improvement in patient insight.

## **Methods**

The methodology followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) reporting guidelines.<sup>29</sup> The protocol was registered on the PROSPERO database (CRD42021243147).

### *Literature search and selection criteria*

Two authors (OA and MM) searched independently for articles in the PubMed and ScienceDirect databases with no restriction of date for eligible studies using the following keywords: (“tDCS” OR “transcranial direct current stimulation”) AND (“PANSS” OR “positive and negative syndrome scale”) AND “schizophrenia”). The search was conducted between November 2020 and March 2021. In ScienceDirect, research was refined using *research articles*, *book chapters* and *other* limits. Selected studies met the following inclusion criteria: (1) inclusion of patients with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder; (2) comparison between active and sham stimulation; and (3) assessment of symptoms before and after tDCS sessions using the PANSS. The selection procedure was repeated on the full text of eligible studies. We excluded studies that were not RCTs, that combined tDCS with a therapy other than antipsychotic treatments, and that did not offer at least 10 sessions of tDCS. This

choice was based on three recent meta-analyses that found a significantly greater clinical effect of tDCS in studies that delivered at least 10 sessions compared to those that delivered fewer than 10 sessions.<sup>30–32</sup>

#### *Data extraction and main outcome*

Age, sex, diagnosis, illness duration, antipsychotic dose, PANSS total scores and G12 score at baseline, stimulation parameters (including the electrode placements), sham and blinding procedures were extracted from included studies. Authors who reported using the PANSS were contacted to provide the mean change in G12 score, defined as the score assessed immediately after completion of tDCS treatment minus the score assessed before the treatment, that was our main outcome. Additionally, they were asked to check extracted data from articles for accuracy.

#### *Quality and risk of bias assessments*

The quality of the included studies was measured independently by one author (OA) and by the contacted authors of each study using the Jadad scale.<sup>33</sup> These two scores were averaged to assess overall quality.

Risk of bias was evaluated independently by two authors (OA and MB) using a Traffic Light plot and a Summary plot,<sup>34</sup> constructed in accordance with the guidelines from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.<sup>35</sup>

#### *Statistical analysis*

All statistical analyses were performed with R software, version 4.1.2 (R Core Team, 2021), using the *metafor*, *meta* and *dmetar* packages. The significant  $\alpha$  level was set at 0.05. Hedges'  $g$  effect size (ES $g$ ) along with the 95% confidence interval was computed based on mean (SD) scores of G12. The overall ES $g$  was pooled from each study using a random-effects model and was interpreted according to Cohen's guidelines (0.2=small; 0.5=medium; 0.8=large effect).<sup>36</sup> Global heterogeneity significance was calculated from Cochran's Q-test and quantified using the  $I^2$  and  $\tau^2$  statistics.<sup>37</sup>



To explore the causes of the heterogeneity, meta-regression analyses were conducted individually for each moderator, such as electrode montage (studies were grouped into bifrontal montage when both electrodes were placed over prefrontal areas at F3, F4 or FP2, and frontotemporoparietal montage when the anode was placed over prefrontal areas at F3-FP1, F3 or F4 and the cathode over temporoparietal areas at T3-P3), current density (intensity divided by electrode size), total charge per session (intensity by session duration) and per tDCS regimen (intensity by session duration by number of session), G12 score at baseline, changes in PANSS total score, PANSS total score at baseline, age of patient, illness duration, and antipsychotic dose. Age and illness duration can impact insight in patients<sup>20,38,39</sup> and antipsychotic dose may influence the response to tDCS.<sup>40</sup> In addition, we proceeded to exploratory separate subgroup analyses in cases of significance after FDR correction for multiple tests. Since no clear hypothesis on the relationship between a specific age and response to tDCS or insight could be generated from the literature, we divided studies into one group with a below-average age (<40 years) and one group with an above-average age ( $\geq 40$  years), based on the mean age of participants included in the studies combined (mean split of age). Concerning G12 scores, we divided studies into a group with, on average, an absence of or minimal lack of insight (<3); and a group with, on average, at least a mild lack of insight ( $\geq 3$ ). This division was based on the hypothesis that there would have to be an already marked impairment of insight for tDCS to influence it.

Finally, publication bias was assessed by visual examination of the funnel plot and using Egger's regression test. Potential outlier studies were controlled by visual examination of QQ plots and Baujat plots. Meta-outlier detection and leave-one-out meta-analyses were conducted to investigate the effect of potential outliers on the pooled effect size.

## **Results**

### *Search results*

The initial search strategy identified 116 records. After the removal of duplicate studies and the exclusion of ineligible studies, 21 full texts were assessed, of which 17 met our inclusion criteria

(Figure 1). Among them, three studies presented the same sample<sup>21,24,25</sup> and two studies had partially overlapping samples;<sup>41,42</sup> in these cases, we chose the record with the largest sample size. One eligible study was excluded because the data could not be provided upon request.<sup>43</sup> A total of 13 RCTs from 12 independent groups were included in our meta-analysis.<sup>21,23,41,44–53</sup>

#### *Characteristics of studies*

These studies included 587 participants, 297 of whom received active tDCS and 290 of whom received sham tDCS. Details of these studies are provided in Table 1 & 2 and in *Supplementary Materials Appendix 1*. All included RCTs showed a high range of quality scores (scores $\geq$ 3) on the Jadad scale, except for 1 study which had a low-quality score (score=2).<sup>52</sup> Visual inspection of the traffic light plot revealed that most studies showed a low overall risk of bias and that only 2 studies<sup>46,47</sup> showed a potential moderate risk of bias (Supplementary Figure 1). The main risk of bias was the bias arising from the randomization process (Supplementary Figure 2).

#### *Insight and tDCS treatment*

A forest plot of the distribution of effect sizes is presented in Figure 2. The overall ESg was -0.46 (medium effect, 95% CI [-0.78; -0.14]) and reached statistical significance ( $P=0.005$ ), indicating a greater decrease in G12 scores among patients who received active tDCS than among those who received sham tDCS. The individual ES ranged from -1.94 to 0.19. We found significant heterogeneity ( $Q=41.9$ ,  $P<0.001$ ), which was moderate-to-high ( $I^2=71.4\%$ ,  $\tau^2=0.23$ ).

#### *Moderator and subgroup analyses*

Post hoc analyses were conducted to explore potential sources of global heterogeneity (individual results of meta-regression shown in Supplementary Table 1). Only the age of participants and baseline G12 score model reached significance, therefore influencing ESg.

Next, we conducted exploratory subgroup analyses to further investigate the influence of age of participants and baseline G12 score on the association between tDCS and insight improvement (Supplementary Table 2). Regarding age, studies including patients with an average age over 40 years

showed a significantly larger ESg compared to those including patients with an average age below 40 years ( $Q=4.11$ ,  $P=0.04$ ). No significant difference was found between studies with on average at least a mild lack of insight ( $\text{average} \geq 3$ ) and those with on average an absence of or minimal lack of insight ( $\text{average} < 3$ ,  $Q=0.62$ ,  $P=0.43$ ).

### *Sensitivity analyses*

No outlier study could be identified by the QQ plot (Supplementary Figure 3) but the study of Chang and colleagues<sup>23</sup> substantially influenced the overall ESg, as indicated by the Baujat plot (Supplementary Figure 4). In that respect, meta-outlier detection led to exclusion of the Chang and colleagues' study. Leave-one-out meta-analysis showed that the estimated ES as well as the between-study heterogeneity were stable by excluding a single study with the exception of Chang et al., 2020: range of SMDs -0.40 to -0.53 compared to -0.31 (Supplementary Table 3). When excluding the Chang et al.' study, the ESg remained significant at -0.31 (small effect, 95% CI [-0.54; -0.09],  $P=0.006$ ) and no significant heterogeneity was observed ( $Q=16.92$ ,  $P=0.11$ ). Additional sensitivity exploratory analyses without the study of Chang and colleagues were conducted (Supplementary Table 4). Only meta-regression for baseline G12 score changed dramatically when excluding Chang et al. 2020 ( $P=0.02$  vs.  $P=0.84$ ).

Publication bias was unlikely since the funnel plot and Egger's regression test did not indicate any significant asymmetry ( $P=0.38$ , Supplementary Figure 5).

## **Discussion**

Our meta-analysis indicated that tDCS treatment was significantly associated with improvement in insight among patients with schizophrenia. Indeed, we observed a significant, moderate effect size ( $ESg=-0.46$ ) in favor of a decrease in G12 scores after repeated sessions of tDCS (at least ten), associated with moderate-to-high heterogeneity ( $I^2=71.4\%$ ). Our results are consistent with those reported by 5 articles investigating the effect of tDCS using other insight measures that showed significant improvement in insight after active tDCS compared to sham tDCS.<sup>21-25</sup> Although our findings highlighted a statistically significant effect on insight, it remains to be determined whether

this effect is clinically meaningful and translates into a functional improvement. To do so, several recent studies have recommended to test the clinical meaning of treatment-induced changes against clinicians' subjective perception of clinical improvement, as measured with the scores at the Clinical Global Impression Scales.<sup>54-56</sup> We recommend future tDCS studies to systematically evaluate and report such measures.

Improvements in insight should be considered a mechanism underlying the clinical efficacy of tDCS by leading to better medication adherence<sup>38</sup> and compliance with treatment.<sup>57</sup> Improvements in insight could also benefit patients' quality of life, as insight improvements correlate with reductions in symptoms<sup>57</sup> and with enhancement of social functioning.<sup>4</sup> Finally, awareness of illness and symptoms could enhance prognosis by improving the involvement of patients in their own recovery.<sup>58</sup> Impaired insight is a transdiagnostic construct, since it is found in many psychiatric disorders<sup>1-3</sup>, and it is underpinned by several commonalities among them.<sup>59</sup> It is therefore important to focus on insight because it represents a therapeutic target that can affect many patients.

In view of the tDCS parameters, we note that all the electrode setups used targeted the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC). Several neuroimaging studies support the role of the DLPFC as a key region for insight into the illness. For instance, insight has been inversely correlated with gray matter volume deficits in the right DLPFC, bilateral cerebellum, and posterior part of the right temporal inferior gyrus in schizophrenia.<sup>60</sup> Lack of insight has also been associated with white matter deficits in the frontal, temporal and parietal regions,<sup>61</sup> and structural hemispheric asymmetry in the DLPFC.<sup>20</sup> Additionally, a functional magnetic resonance imaging study in patients with schizophrenia highlighted the implication of the DLPFC in both unawareness of symptoms and misattribution of symptoms.<sup>62</sup> The combination of structural and functional abnormalities of frontal, parietal and temporal areas of the brain and dysfunction in their connectivity may lead to the impairment of insight.<sup>59</sup> Stimulating the DLPFC using either a bifrontal tDCS montage with the anode placed over the left DLPFC or a frontotemporoparietal montage with the anode over the left or right DLPFC may promote its excitability<sup>18</sup> and re-establish the proper functioning of such networks, since tDCS can modulate the activity of networks associated with the targeted regions.<sup>17</sup> Given that targeting the

DLPFC with transcranial alternating current stimulation has led to improvements in retrospective self-evaluations and metacognition among healthy subjects,<sup>63</sup> one could hypothesize that in patients with schizophrenia, stimulating the DLPFC with the anode will also enhance these cognitive functions, thereby improving insight into their illness. Our moderator analyses did not reveal the superiority of any particular electrode arrangement between bifrontal and frontotemporoparietal montages. However, Chang and colleagues' study (2020) which was identified as a significant outlier because of its large ESg was the only one using a bi-anodal montage, *i.e.*, with two anodes targeting the left and right DLPFC and two extracephalic cathodes. These findings nevertheless suggest a potential influence of the electrode arrangement on the observed effect.

In addition to the DLPFC stimulation, it seems also likely that the improvement of insight into illness result from cathodal tDCS-induced inhibition<sup>18</sup> of left temporoparietal/posterior parietal areas. Indeed, almost half of the included studies used a frontotemporoparietal montage with the cathode placed at T3-P3, which can partially cover the temporoparietal areas and adjacent posterior parietal areas. These regions, namely the left angular gyrus and posterior parietal areas, have been reported to be hyperactive in patients with schizophrenia who present impairment in insight.<sup>64,65</sup> Furthermore, an alteration in interhemispheric balance, characterized particularly by a left hemispheric dominance of the temporoparietal areas and prefrontal regions, has been associated with poor insight<sup>65</sup> and could be related to alterations in the white matter tracts of the posterior part of the corpus callosum.<sup>66</sup> The association between the stimulation of the left temporoparietal/posterior parietal areas and improved insight is also supported by two studies that delivered cathodal stimulation to these regions. A single biparietal tDCS session with the cathode over the left posterior parietal area has been reported to reduce the interhemispheric imbalance in patients with impaired insight and this mechanism has been proposed to contribute to improved insight.<sup>22</sup> In addition, a study investigating the impact of high-definition tDCS targeting the left temporoparietal area with the cathode described a significant improvement in insight in patients with schizophrenia.<sup>67</sup>

Exploratory moderator analyses showed a significant influence of participant's age and G12 score at baseline on the improvement of insight after tDCS treatment. First, it appears that the higher the G12

score at baseline, the greater the improvement in insight following tDCS. However, these findings are mainly driven by Chang et al., 2020's study, in which patients had the highest mean G12 score at baseline. Indeed, sensitivity analysis revealed that the influence of G12 score at baseline did not remain significant after the exclusion of this study. Since a significant overall ESg is still observed even after excluding Chang et al., 2020's study, G12 score at baseline does not appear to be a determinant factor of the improvement in insight induced by tDCS. Second, the older the patient the greater the improvement. These results are surprising since recent meta-analyses showed a negative association between age and the tDCS-induced reduction of hallucinations and negative symptoms in patients with schizophrenia.<sup>30,68</sup> In addition, age has been associated with an alteration of the efficiency of tDCS to induce brain plasticity.<sup>69</sup> The opposite association found here between age and tDCS-induced improvement in insight could be related to the complex interaction between age and insight: the course of insight impairment follows a U-shaped trajectory where insight impairment increases with the first episode of psychosis, decreases over midlife, and increases again in late life, with fluctuations depending on the other episodes occurring throughout the patient's life.<sup>70</sup> The complex interaction between age, insight and tDCS-induced neural plasticity deserves further investigations.

We identified a moderate risk of bias associated with the randomization process in about half of the studies. This risk seems to be mainly due to a lack of reporting sufficient random sequence generation description in the published articles. It is noteworthy that the lack of reporting sufficient details does not necessarily reflect a bias in the randomization process itself but may be related to a lack of awareness of the importance of reporting such information, or a lack of space related to the inherent space limitation of scientific articles. The second questionnaire on the study quality<sup>33</sup> we used helps to mitigate this bias since the authors were given the opportunity to rate their studies themselves, so as not to penalize the study for aspects that were merely not mentioned in the published article. Nevertheless, it is critical to report details about the randomization process since this process prevents the influence of potentially confounding factors, whether known or not.<sup>71</sup> The potential risk found in

some of the included studies is therefore difficult to interpret but could be responsible for the existence of unidentified biases that were not subsequently controlled for.

Finally, one could question the specificity of tDCS effects on insight compared to other symptoms. However, adding the change in PANSS total score as a moderator in our main analysis revealed no significant influence of this parameter on tDCS-induced insight changes. These findings suggest that, although tDCS was associated with improvements in insight (current study) and other symptoms of schizophrenia (e.g.,<sup>30–32</sup>), these effects may occur independently and result from nonrelated mechanisms. A large prospective RCT or a meta-analysis based on individual participant data is needed to properly address this question of specificity of the effect of tDCS on insight vs. other symptoms, and to investigate the causal relationship and temporality between these improvements.

#### *Limitations*

Some methodological limitations must be emphasized. First, most of the included studies had small sample sizes, which could be responsible for inflated individual ES estimation. Second, using a single item to assess modifications in insight into the illness could limit the interpretations of current results and their clinical significance. Nevertheless, a high correlation of G12 scores with detailed scales of insight has repeatedly been observed,<sup>61,72</sup> suggesting that G12 scores can be considered a good indicator of changes in insight. It should be noted that despite its correlation with the total scores of detailed scales of insight, G12 score does not systematically correlate with the subscales of those insight scales and therefore does not present the same subtlety in the assessment of insight. However, a recent article highlighted a high variability in insight dimensions between those detailed scales, questioning their respective interpretation.<sup>73</sup> Third, exploratory post hoc analyses identified some variables that significantly influenced our primary outcome. These results enable us to establish new working hypotheses that should be investigated in further studies, but they do not allow us to draw firm conclusions about the effect of moderators on the association between improvement in insight and tDCS. Fourth, PANSS interrater reliability measures were not systematically reported (Supplementary Table 5), thus this potential bias could be not controlled. Fifth, we were interested in the short-term effect of tDCS. Just as the improvement of positive or negative symptoms is maintained

over time after repeated tDCS sessions, it is reasonable to assume that improvement in insight, as measured by a decrease in G12 scores, will be observed over a few months. Further studies should nevertheless investigate this question. Finally, controversies exist regarding the effects of tDCS, mostly arising from meta-analyses that find no reliable effects of tDCS on behaviour (e.g.,<sup>74 75</sup> for a review of the key points of controversy). The most notable criticisms raised are the lack of reproducibility of the effects of tDCS and the large inter-individual variability, restricting the generalizability of the results. Several factors have been pointed out as plausible reasons for the variability of the findings including differences in stimulation settings and parameters such as stimulation intensity and duration, size of electrodes, location and orientation of electrodes (Table 2), as well as differences in experimental design including sample sizes, choices of control conditions and blinding procedures (i.e., procedures implemented to ensure that participants/tDCS operators/outcome assessors are not aware of the type of stimulation they are receiving/delivering). Namely, control conditions and blinding procedures are of paramount importance in clinical tDCS studies since they could bias the adequate estimation of tDCS effects through the occurrence of a “placebo effect”. In the reviewed studies, control conditions all consisted of sham stimulations supposed to only mimic transient effects of active tDCS on the scalp but not to induce physiological effects (Supplementary Table 6). Not only are these sham conditions questionable when successful blinding is not achieved, but they could also mask a differential effect of active stimulation by causing cerebral changes and therefore be a hidden source of variability<sup>76</sup>. In addition, the effectiveness of the chosen blinding strategy was not systematically assessed or reported by the authors (Supplementary Table 7). When done, a post-stimulation questionnaire was generally used in which participants and providers had to guess whether they had received active or sham stimulation, and the validity of such method for measuring blinding effectiveness has recently been questioned<sup>77</sup>. Efforts should be made to improve blinding and sham procedures and their evaluation through the development of new methods.



## Conclusion

The results of the current systematic review and meta-analysis revealed a significant association, with a moderate effect size, between tDCS treatment and improvement in the PANSS G12 score for insight into the illness among patients with schizophrenia. Participants who received at least ten sessions of active tDCS displayed greater improvements in insight than patients who received sham tDCS. It is important to note that although the effect is statistically significant, it is unclear whether this effect would transfer into clinical meaningful improvement in real life. Further randomized controlled studies are needed to investigate the role of different variables of tDCS-induced changes in insight.

**Acknowledgments:** We thank Dr Fröhlich for providing data, Dr Fitzgerald, Dr Shiozawa and Dr Trevizol for responding to our requests.

**Contributors:** MM and OA had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. MM and JB conceived and designed the study and shared last authorship. OA, MB, JB, and MM contributed to the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data. OA drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to the critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content. OA, JB, and MM contributed to the statistical analysis.

**Conflict of interest:** UP received speaker honoraria from NeuroCare Group, Munich, Germany.

ARB reports grants from Sao Paulo Research State Foundation (2018/10861-7, 2019/06009-6), Brazilian National Council of Scientific Development productivity support (PQ-1B), the UK Academy of Medical Sciences (NAFR 12/1010-2), and University of Sao Paulo Medical School productivity support (PIPA-A). LV reports grants from Narsad (2020/28755) and the SIRS Research Fund Award 2020-2021.

384     **Funding:** None.

## References

1. Yen CF, Chen CS, Ko CH, Yen JY, Huang CF. Changes in insight among patients with bipolar I disorder: a 2-year prospective study. *Bipolar Disorders*. 2007 May;9(3):238–42.
2. Matsunaga H, Kiriike N, Matsui T, Oya K, Iwasaki Y, Koshimune K, et al. Obsessive-compulsive disorder with poor insight. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*. 2002 Mar;43(2):150–7.
3. Wilson RS, Sytsma J, Barnes LL, Boyle PA. Anosognosia in Dementia. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep*. 2016 Sep;16(9):77.
4. Erol A, Delibas H, Bora O, Mete L. The impact of insight on social functioning in patients with schizophrenia. *Int J Soc Psychiatry*. 2015 Jun;61(4):379–85.
5. Li W, Zhang HH, Wang Y, Zhang L, Ungvari GS, Cheung T, et al. Poor Insight in Schizophrenia Patients in China: a Meta-Analysis of Observational Studies. *Psychiatr Q*. 2020 Dec;91(4):1017–31.
6. Lysaker PH, Pattison ML, Leonhardt BL, Phelps S, Vohs JL. Insight in schizophrenia spectrum disorders: relationship with behavior, mood and perceived quality of life, underlying causes and emerging treatments. *World Psychiatry*. 2018 Feb;17(1):12–23.
7. Medina E, Salvà J, Ampudia R, Maurino J, Larumbe J. Short-term clinical stability and lack of insight are associated with a negative attitude towards antipsychotic treatment at discharge in patients with schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. *Patient Prefer Adherence*. 2012 Aug 29;6:623–9.
8. Jónsdóttir H, Opjordsmoen S, Birkenaes AB, Simonsen C, Engh JA, Ringen PA, et al. Predictors of medication adherence in patients with schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 2013;127(1):23–33.
9. Velligan DI, Sajatovic M, Hatch A, Kramata P, Docherty JP. Why do psychiatric patients stop antipsychotic medication? A systematic review of reasons for nonadherence to medication in patients with serious mental illness. *Patient Prefer Adherence*. 2017 Mar 3;11:449–68.
10. Zhou Y, Rosenheck R, Mohamed S, Ning Y, He H. Factors associated with complete discontinuation of medication among patients with schizophrenia in the year after hospital discharge. *Psychiatry Research*. 2017 Apr 1;250:129–35.
11. Clifford L, Crabb S, Turnbull D, Hahn L, Galletly C. A qualitative study of medication adherence amongst people with schizophrenia. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*. 2020 Aug 1;34(4):194–9.
12. Sun SX, Liu GG, Christensen DB, Fu AZ. Review and analysis of hospitalization costs associated with antipsychotic nonadherence in the treatment of schizophrenia in the United States. *Current Medical Research and Opinion*. 2007 Oct;23(10):2305–12.
13. Novick D, Haro JM, Suarez D, Perez V, Dittmann RW, Haddad PM. Predictors and clinical consequences of non-adherence with antipsychotic medication in the outpatient treatment of schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Research*. 2010 Apr 30;176(2):109–13.
14. Drake RJ, Dunn G, Tarrier N, Bentall RP, Haddock G, Lewis SW. Insight as a Predictor of the Outcome of First-Episode Nonaffective Psychosis in a Prospective Cohort Study in England. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2007 Jan 15;68(1):81–6.
15. Pijnenborg GHM, van Donkersgoed RJM, David AS, Aleman A. Changes in insight during treatment for psychotic disorders: A meta-analysis. *Schizophrenia Research*. 2013 Mar 1;144(1):109–

- 17.
16. Antal A, Alekseichuk I, Bikson M, Brockmöller J, Brunoni AR, Chen R, et al. Low intensity transcranial electric stimulation: Safety, ethical, legal regulatory and application guidelines. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2017 Sep;128(9):1774–809.
17. Stagg CJ, Antal A, Nitsche MA. Physiology of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation. *The Journal of ECT.* 2018 Sep;34(3):144–52.
18. Nitsche MA, Paulus W. Excitability changes induced in the human motor cortex by weak transcranial direct current stimulation. *The Journal of Physiology.* 2000;527(3):633–9.
19. Lindenmayer JP, Fitapelli B. Noninvasive direct current stimulation for schizophrenia: a review. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry.* 2021 May;34(3):253–9.
20. Gerretsen P, Chakravarty MM, Mamo D, Menon M, Pollock BG, Rajji TK, et al. Frontotemporoparietal asymmetry and lack of illness awareness in schizophrenia. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2012 Jan 3;34(5):1035–43.
21. Chang CC, Tzeng NS, Chao CY, Yeh CB, Chang HA. The Effects of Add-on Fronto-Temporal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) on Auditory Verbal Hallucinations, Other Psychopathological Symptoms, and Insight in Schizophrenia: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Sham-Controlled Trial. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol.* 2018 Aug 9;21(11):979–87.
22. Kim J. Modulation of brain activity with transcranial direct current stimulation: Targeting regions implicated in impaired illness awareness in schizophrenia. *European Psychiatry.* 2019;9.
23. Chang CC, Kao YC, Chao CY, Tzeng NS, Chang HA. Examining bi-anodal transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) over bilateral dorsolateral prefrontal cortex coupled with bilateral extracephalic references as a treatment for negative symptoms in non-acute schizophrenia patients: A randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled trial. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry.* 2020 Jan;96:109715.
24. Chang CC, Kao YC, Chao CY, Chang HA. Enhancement of cognitive insight and higher-order neurocognitive function by fronto-temporal transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) in patients with schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research.* 2019 Jun;208:430–8.
25. Kao YC, Tzeng NS, Chao CY, Chang CC, Chang HA. Modulation of self-appraisal of illness, medication adherence, life quality and autonomic functioning by transcranial direct current stimulation in schizophrenia patients. *Clinical Neurophysiology.* 2020 Aug;131(8):1997–2007.
26. Blay M, Adam O, Bation R, Galvao F, Brunelin J, Mondino M. Improvement of Insight with Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation in Patients with Schizophrenia: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Clinical Medicine.* 2022 Jan;11(1):40.
27. Suzuki T. Which rating scales are regarded as “the standard” in clinical trials for schizophrenia? A critical review. *Psychopharmacol Bull.* 2011 Jan 1;44(1):18–31.
28. Kay SR, Fiszbein A, Opler LA. The Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) for Schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin.* 1987 Jan 1;13(2):261–76.
29. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ.* 2021 Mar 29;372:n71.
30. Cheng PWC, Louie LLC, Wong YL, Wong SMC, Leung WY, Nitsche MA, et al. The effects of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) on clinical symptoms in schizophrenia: A systematic

review and meta-analysis. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2020 Oct 1;53:102392.

31. Kim J, Iwata Y, Plitman E, Caravaggio F, Chung JK, Shah P, et al. A meta-analysis of transcranial direct current stimulation for schizophrenia: “Is more better?” *Journal of Psychiatric Research*. 2019 Mar;110:117–26.

32. Jiang WL, Cai DB, Sun CH, Yin F, Goerigk S, Brunoni AR, et al. Adjunctive tDCS for treatment-refractory auditory hallucinations in schizophrenia: a meta-analysis of randomized, double-blinded, sham-controlled studies. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2022 Apr 6;103100.

33. Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, Jenkinson C, Reynolds DJM, Gavaghan DJ, et al. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: Is blinding necessary? *Controlled Clinical Trials*. 1996 Feb;17(1):1–12.

34. McGuinness LA, Higgins JP. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package and Shiny web app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. *Res Syn Meth*. 2020;1–7.

35. Viswanathan M, Patnode CD, Berkman ND, Bass EB, Chang S, Hartling L, et al. Assessing the Risk of Bias of Individual Studies in Systematic Reviews of Health Care Interventions. *Methods Guide for Comparative Effectiveness Reviews*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2021 Mar 26];18(17). Available from: <https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/topics/methods-bias-update/methods/>

36. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd Edition). Hillsdale, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates; 1988. 567 p.

37. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2003 Sep 6;327(7414):557–60.

38. Mohamed S, Rosenheck R, McEvoy J, Swartz M, Stroup S, Lieberman JA. Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Relationships Between Insight and Attitudes Toward Medication and Clinical Outcomes in Chronic Schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull*. 2009 Mar;35(2):336–46.

39. Braw Y, Sitman R, Sela T, Erez G, Bloch Y, Levkovitz Y. Comparison of insight among schizophrenia and bipolar disorder patients in remission of affective and positive symptoms: Analysis and critique. *European Psychiatry*. 2012 Nov;27(8):612–8.

40. Agarwal SM, Bose A, Shivakumar V, Narayanaswamy JC, Chhabra H, Kalmady SV, et al. Impact of antipsychotic medication on transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) effects in schizophrenia patients. *Psychiatry Research*. 2016 Jan;235:97–103.

41. Brunelin J, Mondino M, Gassab L, Haesebaert F, Gaha L, Suaud-Chagny MF, et al. Examining transcranial direct-current stimulation (tDCS) as a treatment for hallucinations in schizophrenia. *AJP*. 2012 Jul 1;169(7):719–24.

42. Mondino M, Jardri R, Suaud-Chagny MF, Saoud M, Poulet E, Brunelin J. Effects of Fronto-Temporal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation on Auditory Verbal Hallucinations and Resting-State Functional Connectivity of the Left Temporo-Parietal Junction in Patients With Schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull*. 2016 Mar;42(2):318–26.

43. Fitzgerald PB, McQueen S, Daskalakis ZJ, Hoy KE. A Negative Pilot Study of Daily Bimodal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation in Schizophrenia. *Brain Stimulation*. 2014 Nov;7(6):813–6.

44. Palm U, Keeser D, Hasan A, Kupka MJ, Blautzik J, Sarubin N, et al. Prefrontal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation for Treatment of Schizophrenia With Predominant Negative Symptoms: A Double-Blind, Sham-Controlled Proof-of-Concept Study. *SCHBUL*. 2016 Sep;42(5):1253–61.

510 45. Gomes JS. Effects of transcranial direct current stimulation on working memory and negative  
511 symptoms in schizophrenia\_ a phase II randomized sham-controlled trial. *Schizophrenia Research*.  
512 2018;9.

513 46. Jeon DW, Jung DU, Kim SJ, Shim JC, Moon JJ, Seo YS, et al. Adjunct transcranial direct  
514 current stimulation improves cognitive function in patients with schizophrenia: A double-blind 12-  
515 week study. *Schizophrenia Research*. 2018 Jul;197:378–85.

516 47. Koops S, Blom JD, Bouachmir O, Slot MI, Neggers B, Sommer IE. Treating auditory  
517 hallucinations with transcranial direct current stimulation in a double-blind, randomized trial.  
518 *Schizophrenia Research*. 2018 Nov;201:329–36.

519 48. Mellin JM, Alagapan S, Lustenberger C, Lugo CE, Alexander ML, Gilmore JH, et al.  
520 Randomized Trial of Transcranial Alternating Current Stimulation for Treatment of Auditory  
521 Hallucinations in Schizophrenia. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2018 Jun;51:25–33.

522 49. Kantrowitz JT, Sehatpour P, Avissar M, Horga G, Gwak A, Hoptman MJ, et al. Significant  
523 improvement in treatment resistant auditory verbal hallucinations after 5 days of double-blind,  
524 randomized, sham controlled, fronto-temporal, transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): A  
525 replication/extension study. *Brain Stimulation*. 2019 Jul;12(4):981–91.

526 50. Lindenmayer JP, Kulsa MKC, Sultana T, Kaur A, Yang R, Ljuri I, et al. Transcranial direct-  
527 current stimulation in ultra-treatment-resistant schizophrenia. *Brain Stimulation*. 2019 Jan;12(1):54–  
528 61.

529 51. Weickert TW, Salimuddin H, Lenroot RK, Bruggemann J, Loo C, Vercammen A, et al.  
530 Preliminary findings of four-week, task-based anodal prefrontal cortex transcranial direct current  
531 stimulation transferring to other cognitive improvements in schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Research*. 2019  
532 Oct;280:112487.

533 52. Smith RC, Md WL, Wang Y, Jiang J, Wang J, Szabo V, et al. Effects of transcranial direct  
534 current stimulation on cognition and symptoms in Chinese patients with schizophrenia. *Psychiatry  
535 Research*. 2020 Feb;284:112617.

536 53. Valiengo L da CL, Goerigk S, Gordon PC, Padberg F, Serpa MH, Koebe S, et al. Efficacy and  
537 Safety of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation for Treating Negative Symptoms in Schizophrenia:  
538 A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2020 Feb 1;77(2):121.

539 54. Fusar-Poli P, Papanastasiou E, Stahl D, Rocchetti M, Carpenter W, Shergill S, et al.  
540 Treatments of Negative Symptoms in Schizophrenia: Meta-Analysis of 168 Randomized Placebo-  
541 Controlled Trials. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*. 2015 Jul 1;41(4):892–9.

542 55. Lepping P, Schönfeldt-Lecuona C, Sambhi RS, Lanka SVN, Lane S, Whittington R, et al. A  
543 systematic review of the clinical relevance of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Acta  
544 Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 2014;130(5):326–41.

545 56. Leucht S. Measurements of Response, Remission, and Recovery in Schizophrenia and  
546 Examples for Their Clinical Application. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2014 Feb 21;75(suppl 1):11378.

547 57. Bajaj V, Sengupta S, Gupta DK. Psychopathology, insight and compliance in schizophrenia. *Ir  
548 j psychol Med*. 2009 Mar;26(1):12–5.

549 58. Lysaker PH, Vohs J, Hillis JD, Kukla M, Popolo R, Salvatore G, et al. Poor insight into  
550 schizophrenia: contributing factors, consequences and emerging treatment approaches. *Expert Review  
551 of Neurotherapeutics*. 2013 Jul;13(7):785–93.

552 59. Shad MU, Keshavan MS, Tamminga CA, Munro Cullum C, David A. Neurobiological

553 underpinnings of insight deficits in schizophrenia. *International Review of Psychiatry*. 2007  
554 Jan;19(4):437–46.

555 60. Bergé D, Carmona S, Rovira M, Bulbena A, Salgado P, Vilarroya O. Gray matter volume  
556 deficits and correlation with insight and negative symptoms in first-psychotic-episode subjects. *Acta*  
557 *Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 2011;123(6):431–9.

558 61. Antonius D, Prudent V, Rebani Y, D’Angelo D, Ardekani BA, Malaspina D, et al. White  
559 Matter Integrity and Lack of Insight in Schizophrenia and Schizoaffective Disorder. *Schizophr Res*.  
560 2011 May;128(1–3):76–82.

561 62. Shad MU, Keshavan MS. Neurobiology of Insight Deficits in Schizophrenia: An fMRI Study.  
562 *Schizophr Res*. 2015 Jul;165(0):220–6.

563 63. Meiron O, Lavidor M. Prefrontal oscillatory stimulation modulates access to cognitive control  
564 references in retrospective metacognitive commentary. *Clinical Neurophysiology*. 2014 Jan  
565 1;125(1):77–82.

566 64. Gerretsen P, Menon M, Mamo DC, Fervaha G, Remington G, Pollock BG, et al. Impaired  
567 insight into illness and cognitive insight in schizophrenia spectrum disorders: Resting state functional  
568 connectivity. *Schizophr Res*. 2014 Dec;160(0):43–50.

569 65. Gerretsen P, Menon M, Chakravarty MM, Lerch JP, Mamo DC, Remington G, et al. Illness  
570 denial in schizophrenia spectrum disorders. *Human Brain Mapping*. 2015;36(1):213–25.

571 66. Gerretsen P, Rajji TK, Shah P, Shahab S, Sanches M, Graff-Guerrero A, et al. Impaired illness  
572 awareness in schizophrenia and posterior corpus callosal white matter tract integrity. *NPJ Schizophr*.  
573 2019 Apr 29;5:8.

574 67. Sreeraj VS, Dinakaran D, Parlikar R, Chhabra H, Selvaraj S, Shivakumar V, et al. High-  
575 definition transcranial direct current stimulation (HD-tDCS) for persistent auditory hallucinations in  
576 schizophrenia. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2018 Oct;37:46–50.

577 68. Kim J, Iwata Y, Plitman E, Caravaggio F, Chung JK, Shah P, et al. A meta-analysis of  
578 transcranial direct current stimulation for schizophrenia: “Is more better?” *Journal of Psychiatric*  
579 *Research*. 2019 Mar;110:117–26.

580 69. Ridding MC, Ziemann U. Determinants of the induction of cortical plasticity by non-invasive  
581 brain stimulation in healthy subjects. *The Journal of Physiology*. 2010;588(13):2291–304.

582 70. Gerretsen P, Plitman E, Rajji TK, Graff-Guerrero A. The effects of aging on insight into  
583 illness in schizophrenia: a review. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2014 Nov;29(11):1145–61.

584 71. Higgins J, Thomas J. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version  
585 6.3 [updated 2022]. The Cochrane Collaboration. 2011;

586 72. Sanz M, Constable G, Lopez-Ibor I, Kemp R, David AS. A comparative study of insight  
587 scales and their relationship to psychopathological and clinical variables. *Psychol Med*. 1998  
588 Mar;28(2):437–46.

589 73. Capdevielle D, Norton J, Aouizerate B, Berna F, Chereau I, D’Amato T, et al. Comparison of  
590 three scales (BIS, SUMD and BCIS) for measuring insight dimensions and their evolution after one-  
591 year of follow-up: Findings from the FACE-SZ Cohort. *Psychiatry Research*. 2021 Sep;303:114044.

592 74. Horvath JC, Forte JD, Carter O. Quantitative Review Finds No Evidence of Cognitive Effects  
593 in Healthy Populations From Single-session Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS). *Brain*  
594 *Stimulation*. 2015 May 1;8(3):535–50.

- 595 75. Filmer HL, Mattingley JB, Dux PE. Modulating brain activity and behaviour with tDCS:  
596 Rumours of its death have been greatly exaggerated. *Cortex*. 2020 Feb 1;123:141–51.
- 597 76. Fonteneau C, Mondino M, Arns M, Baeken C, Bikson M, Brunoni AR, et al. Sham tDCS: A  
598 hidden source of variability? Reflections for further blinded, controlled trials. *Brain Stimulation*. 2019  
599 May;12(3):668–73.
- 600 77. Turner C, Jackson C, Learmonth G. Is the “end-of-study guess” a valid measure of sham  
601 blinding during transcranial direct current stimulation? *Eur J Neurosci*. 2021 Mar;53(5):1592–604.
- 602



603 **Figure legends**

604

605 **Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of included studies.**

606 Abbreviations: RCTs, randomized controlled trials; tDCS, transcranial direct current stimulation.

607

608 **Figure 2. Forest plot showing comparison of insight, as measured by the G12 score, among**  
609 **patients with schizophrenia who received either active or sham tDCS.**

610 Abbreviations: ES, effect size; CI, confidence interval; RE, random effect.

**Table 1.** Sociodemographic and Clinical Characteristics of Included Studies.

Authors, year	Jadad score <sup>a</sup>	Diagnosis	Treatment condition	n	Age (y)	Female n (%)	Illness duration (y)	Antipsychotic dose (CPZE, mg/day)	PANSS total score at baseline	G12 score at baseline	Mean changes in total PANSS score after tDCS treatment	Mean changes in G12 score after tDCS treatment
Brunelin et al., 2012	3	SZ	Active	15	40.4 (9.9)	3 (20)	NR	994 (714)	76.9 (16.4)	2.3 (1.4)	-9.2 (8.1)	-0.53 (1.33)
			Sham	15	35.1 (7.0)	5 (33)	NR	1209 (998)	82.8 (15.4)	2.2 (1.2)	-2.3 (10.1)	-0.13 (0.83)
Palm et al., 2016	5	SZ	Active	10	38.4 (12.9)	5 (50)	7.1 (6.1)	559 (304)	79.5 (20.0)	2.7 (1.2)	-14.2 (21.1)	-0.333 (1.00)
			Sham	10	34.1 (10.7)	0 (0)	13.8 (12.1)	481 (226)	85.6 (6.8)	2.4 (1.4)	0.8 (7.1)	-0.125 (0.354)
Chang et al., 2018	4	SZ - SZAff	Active	30	46.4 (10.3)	16 (53)	19.7 (10.4)	494 (307)	72.3 (13.2)	4.2 (1.2)	-2.6 (3.8)	-0.87 (1.14)
			Sham	30	42.2 (10.3)	17 (57)	13.9 (7.5)	493 (284)	66.7 (12.5)	3.7 (0.8)	-0.3 (1.2)	-0.03 (0.18)
Gomes et al., 2018	5	SZ	Active	12	39.2 (9.3)	2 (17)	16.0 (11.6)	NR	81.6 (16.0)	3.1 (1.2)	-10.7 (6.1)	-0.42 (0.90)
			Sham	12	33.7 (12.1)	5 (42)	10.0 (7.3)	NR	71.0 (19.9)	3.3 (1.4)	-0.8 (6.1)	-0.42 (1.08)
Jeon et al., 2018	5	SZ	Active	26	40.0 (9.4)	13 (50)	12.8 (9.8)	546 (403)	85.8 (21.1)	3.6 (1.3)	-13.8 (27.1)	0.07 (0.48)
			Sham	28	39.9 (12.4)	15 (54)	14.3 (10.5)	614 (430)	79.1 (16.6)	3.4 (1.3)	-7.0 (19.6)	0.25 (0.80)
Koops et al., 2018	4	Mixed sample <sup>b</sup>	Active	28	44.0 (11)	14 (50)	NR	NR	68.0 (16.0)	2.7 (1.3)	-5.4 (8.1)	-0.32 (0.94)
			Sham	26	44.0 (12)	15 (58)	NR	NR	64.0 (17.0)	3.5 (1.3)	-2.2 (7.5)	0.08 (0.81)
Mellin et al., 2018	4	SZ - SZAff	Active	7	29.6 (11.0)	3 (43)	6.4	NR	58.9 (14.7)	2.9 (2.3)	-4.1 (3.7)	0.14 (0.38)
			Sham	7	38.9 (10.0)	3 (43)	14.3	NR	57.0 (11.6)	2.6 (1.5)	-1.7 (4.4)	0.71 (1.11)
Kantrowitz et al., 2019	5	SZ - SZAff	Active	47	38.2 (9.9)	15 (32)	NR	806 (768)	75.3 (12.9)	3.3 (1.4)	-3.3 (9.4)	-0.149 (1.23)
			Sham	42	40.1 (8.6)	7 (17)	NR	628 (466)	73.2 (14.4)	3.0 (1.3)	-2.1 (9.0)	0.075 (1.28)
Lindenmayer et al., 2019	4	SZ - SZAff	Active	12	41.4 (11.3)	2 (17)	NR	958 (364)	81.5 (7.5)	3.6 (1.1)	-8.2 (7.3)	0.083 (0.515)
			Sham	13	39.9 (10.5)	2 (15)	NR	896 (275)	82.8 (9.4)	3.6 (1.2)	-2.3 (6.6)	0.077 (0.760)
Weickert et al., 2019	4	SZ - SZAff	Active	6	45.5 (1.9)	4 (67)	22 (0.9)	555 (249)	59.5 (NR)	2.5 (1.6)	-5.0 (5.7)	-1.6 (1.5)
			Sham	6	31.3 (3.6)	2 (33)	8.3 (3.4)	1009 (261)	65.3 (NR)	3.0 (1.3)	-0.5 (15.9)	-0.6 (0.9)
Chang et al., 2020	5	SZ - SZAff	Active	30	44.7 (10.7)	11 (37)	14.7 (9.5)	532 (348)	67.4 (13.0)	4.5 (1.0)	-10.8 (7.1)	-2.00 (1.17)
			Sham	30	45.0 (10.9)	19 (63)	15.8 (10.6)	523 (332)	73.3 (10.3)	4.7 (0.9)	-1.4 (4.4)	-0.23 (0.50)
Smith et al., 2020	2	SZ	Active	24	43.7 (14.1)	15 (62)	17.9 (11.7)	NR	62.0 (15.6)	3.6 (1.2)	-3.3 (13.8)	-0.381 (0.921)
			Sham	21	47.1 (11.9)	12 (57)	19.7 (11.1)	NR	58.7 (9.9)	3.7 (1.2)	-4.4 (9.9)	0.0833 (1.06)
Valiengo et al., 2020	5	SZ	Active	50	34.6 (8.4)	9 (18)	14.2 (8.1)	475 (225)	73.6 (15.8)	2.8 (1.4)	-5.3 (10.2)	0 (1.30)
			Sham	50	35.9 (10.1)	11 (22)	14.1 (8.7)	500 (400)	73.9 (13.4)	3.0 (1.4)	-3.1 (7.9)	-0.24 (1.25)

Otherwise specified, results are given as mean (SD).

<sup>a</sup>Jadad scores correspond to the average of the scores given by the author OA and by the main author of the associated article.

<sup>b</sup>Koops et al. (2018) included 21 patients with SZ, 4 patients with psychosis NOS, 1 patient with schizoaffective disorder, 1 patient with affective disorder, and 1 patient with borderline personality disorder.

<sup>c</sup>Chang et al. (2020) used a bi-anodal montage over the left and right dorsolateral prefrontal cortices, with extracephalic cathodes as reference electrodes.

Abbreviations: CPZE, chlorpromazine equivalent; NR, not reported; PANSS, positive and negative symptom scale; SZ, schizophrenia; SZAff, schizoaffective disorder.

**Table 2.** Characteristics of Included Studies.

Authors, year	Electrode montage (anode/cathode)	Electrode size (cm <sup>2</sup> )	Intensity (mA)	Session duration (min)	Number of tDCS session	Current density (mA/cm <sup>2</sup> )	Total charge per session <sup>b</sup> (C/cm <sup>2</sup> )	Total charge per regimen <sup>c</sup> (C/cm <sup>2</sup> )
Brunelin et al., 2012	F3-FP1/T3-P3	35	2	20	10	0.06	0.068	0.68
Palm et al., 2016	F3/FP2	35	2	20	10	0.06	0.068	0.68
Chang et al., 2018	F3-FP1/T3-P3	35	2	20	10	0.06	0.068	0.68
Gomes et al., 2018	F3/F4	25	2	20	10	0.08	0.096	0.96
Jeon et al., 2018	F3/F4	25	2	30	10	0.08	0.144	1.44
Koops et al., 2018	F3-FP1/T3-P3	35	2	20	10	0.06	0.068	0.68
Mellin et al., 2018	F3-FP1/T3-P3	25	2	20	10	0.08	0.096	0.96
Kantrowitz et al., 2019	F3-FP1/T3-P3	38.81	2	20	10	0.05	0.062	0.62
Lindenmayer et al., 2019	F3-FP1/T3-P3	35	2	20	40	0.06	0.068	2.74
Weickert et al., 2019	F4/T3-P3	35	2	20	20	0.06	0.068	1.37
Chang et al., 2020	F3-FP1 + F4-FP2 /forearms <sup>a</sup>	35	2	20	10	0.06	0.068	0.68
Smith et al., 2020	F3/FP2	5.08	2	20	10	0.39	0.472	4.72
Valiengo et al., 2020	F3/T3-P3	35	2	20	10	0.06	0.068	0.68

<sup>a</sup>Chang et al. (2020) used a bi-anodal montage targeting the left and right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex with extracephalic cathodes. <sup>b</sup>Total charge per

session(C/cm2) = stimulation intensity (A)/electrode size (cm2) x duration (s). <sup>c</sup>Total charge per tDCS regimen (C/cm2) = stimulation intensity (A)/electrode size (cm2) x duration (s) x number of sessions.