

1 **Unilateral cathodal transcranial direct current stimulation over the**  
2 **parietal area modulates on postural control depending with eyes open**  
3 **and closed**

4 Shinichiro Oka<sup>1</sup>, Takuro Ikeda<sup>2</sup>, Tsubasa Mitsutake<sup>2</sup>, Katsuya Ogata<sup>3</sup>, Yoshinobu Goto<sup>4</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup> Department of Physical Therapy, Faculty of Rehabilitation, Reiwa Health Sciences University

7 <sup>2</sup> Department of Physical Therapy, School of Health Science, Fukuoka International University of  
8 Health and Welfare

9 <sup>3</sup> Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, School of Pharmacy at Fukuoka, International University  
10 of Health and Welfare

11 <sup>4</sup> School of Medicine, International University of Health and Welfare

12

13 Key words: cathodal transcranial direct current stimulation, parietal area, postural control

14

15 +81-92-687-8700

16 Okastudy1023@gmail.com

17 2-1-12, Wajirogaoka, Higashi-ku, Fukuoka city, Fukuoka, Japan

18 **Abstract**

19 Cathodal transcranial direct current stimulation (C-tDCS) is generally assumed to inhibit cortical  
20 excitability. The parietal cortex contributes to multisensory information processing in the postural  
21 control system, and this processing is proposed to be different between the right and left hemispheres  
22 and sensory modality. However, previous studies did not clarify whether the effects of unilateral C-  
23 tDCS of the parietal cortex on the postural control system differ depending on the hemisphere. We  
24 investigated the changes in static postural stability after unilateral C-tDCS of the parietal cortex. Ten  
25 healthy right-handed participants were recruited for right- and left-hemisphere tDCS and sham  
26 stimulation, respectively. The cathodal electrode was placed on either the right or left parietal area,  
27 whereas the anodal electrode was placed on the contralateral forehead. We evaluated static standing  
28 balance by measuring the sway path length, mediolateral (ML) sway, anteroposterior (AP) sway,  
29 sway area, and the sway path length per unit area (L/A) after 15-minute C-tDCS under eyes open  
30 (EO) and closed (EC) conditions. C-tDCS over the right hemisphere significantly increased the sway  
31 path length, ML sway, and sway area in the EO condition. In contrast, C-tDCS over the left  
32 hemisphere significantly increased the L/A in both the EC and EO condition. These results suggest  
33 that the right parietal region contributes to static standing balance through chiefly visual information  
34 processing during the EO condition. On the other hand, L/A increase during EC and EO by tDCS  
35 over the left parietal region depends more on somatosensory information to maintain static standing  
36 balance during the EC condition.

37

## 38 **Introduction**

39 Postural stability depends on the integration of multisensory inputs, such as vision, vestibular,  
40 and somatosensory perception, to produce motor output (1). These sensory systems are integrated by  
41 the vestibular nuclei and parietal association area of the cerebral cortex to induce postural reflexes  
42 and voluntary movements to adapt to the external environment (1).

43 Brain imaging studies have shown that the parietal lobe is activated by various stimuli,  
44 including visual, vestibular, and somatosensory stimuli. The posterior parietal cortex (PPC) has been  
45 reported to be involved in information processing in the brain in relation to the integration of these  
46 multisensory systems (2). In previous studies, the right parietal area was reported to be activated by  
47 visual inputs such as optokinetic stimulation and fixation of visual targets (3) (4), while the left PPC  
48 was activated by somatosensory inputs such as light touch from a stable external spatial reference (5),  
49 vestibular inputs such as caloric stimulation (6), or galvanic vestibular stimulation (GVS) (7).  
50 Sensory processing and integration in the PPC have been shown to be dominated by the right  
51 hemisphere (3, 8-10).

52 In clinical studies, strokes that affect one or more postural control networks (visual, vestibular,  
53 and somatosensory) are known to present with lateropulsion (pusher syndrome) (11). Lateropulsion  
54 is characterized by a contralesional bias in posture with stroke, active resistance to postural correction  
55 to upright vertical (12), and weight-bearing asymmetry (WBA) (13). In particular, patients with  
56 lateropulsion and right parietal lesions show delayed functional recovery, necessitating prolonged  
57 rehabilitation efforts (14). This is attributable to the fact that WBA in lateropulsion patients is related  
58 to many factors, including motor deficits, sensory deficits, and spatial neglect (15). Therefore,  
59 clinical studies investigating the relationship between parietal lobe dysfunction and standing postural  
60 control in patients with lateropulsion are limited.

61 Transcranial electrical stimulation (tDCS) has been recently used to investigate the pathogenesis  
62 of brain dysfunction and develop neurorehabilitation programs. tDCS, a non-invasive electrical  
63 stimulation method that induces excitatory changes in the corticospinal circuitry, can be used to  
64 modulate cortical excitability by applying a weak current to an electrode attached to the head (16). In  
65 a previous study, bilateral tDCS to the parietal area modulated postural adaptation after tilting,  
66 suggesting that brain information processing in the parietal cortex contributes to standing posture  
67 control (17). However, there was no difference in the effects on postural control depending on the  
68 polarity of stimulation by bilateral tDCS in the parietal region in that study (17). That results might  
69 be due to bilateral stimulation. Therefore, transient functional inhibition by unilateral tDCS may  
70 clarify the relationship between left and right parietal functions and standing posture control. In  
71 addition, the influence of the sensory system on standing posture control has been investigated by  
72 varying visual conditions(18). Therefore, the differences in the effect of brain information processing  
73 in the left and right parietal cortices on standing posture control could be compared between eyes  
74 open (EO) or closed (EC) conditions. Clarification of the functional relationship between brain  
75 dominance and standing posture control can reveal the influence of brain dysfunction on WBA in  
76 lateropulsion patients and lead to the development of neurorehabilitation protocols for parietal lobe  
77 dysfunction.

78 In previous studies, unilateral cathodal (C)-tDCS has been used to modify information  
79 processing in the hemisphere (9) (19). On the other hand, bilateral tDCS has been used in studies of  
80 bilateral cerebral hemispheric effects (9) (20). Therefore, we aimed to induce transient functional  
81 suppression of the unilateral parietal cortex by C-tDCS and investigate the relationship between  
82 sensory information processing in the brain and postural control under the EO and EC conditions to  
83 differentiate the dependence of visual information.

## 84 **Methods**

## 85 Participants

86 A total of ten right-handed healthy young adults (5 females; mean  $\pm$  SD,  $21.4 \pm 0.8$  years old)  
87 participated in this study. None of the participants had a history of neurological, orthopedic, or other  
88 medical problems. All participants gave written informed consent in accordance with the Declaration  
89 of Helsinki. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of International University of Health  
90 and Welfare (15-Ifh-18).

## 91 tDCS

92 The participants sat on a comfortable chair in a quiet room during stimulation. C-tDCS was  
93 delivered using a battery-driven current stimulator (DC Stimulator-Plus; NeuroConn GmbH,  
94 Ilmenau, Germany) through two rubber electrodes with sponge pads soaked in saline solution and  
95 affixed using a Velcro support. C-tDCS was applied at 1.5 mA for 15 minutes (the impedance was  
96 maintained below  $5 \text{ k}\Omega$ ), with 5 s of ramping up and down, in accordance with the protocol  
97 described in previous studies (9) (17). The positions of the stimulation electrodes were adopted from  
98 previous studies (9, 19, 20). The tDCS cathodal electrode (surface area:  $35 \text{ cm}^2$ ,  $7 \times 5 \text{ cm}$ ) was placed  
99 at P3 or P4 according to the International 10-20 system, and the anodal electrode (surface area:  $35$   
100  $\text{cm}^2$ ,  $7 \times 5 \text{ cm}$ ) was placed in the contralateral orbit. These electrode positions were selected to affect  
101 the parietal cortex (9). For sham stimulation, tDCS was applied for 30 s at the beginning of the 15-  
102 min period. After stimulation, all the participants were asked to report whether they experienced any  
103 tDCS-induced sensations.

## 104 Postural control task

105 Postural control was assessed under bipedal static stance conditions by using a stabilometer  
106 (Twingravicoder G-6100; Anima Co. Ltd., Chofu, Japan). The system recorded the center of foot

107 pressure (COP) trajectories over time, in both the mediolateral (COP-X) and anteroposterior (COP-  
108 Y) directions, at a sampling frequency of 20 Hz for one minute. The measurements were performed  
109 under EO or EC conditions. The participants stood without shoes or feet together. Each participant  
110 was instructed to stand as still as possible while looking forward and keeping the arms relaxed at the  
111 sides. In the EO condition, participant was instructed to fixate on the fixation point with a with a  
112 diameter of about 2 cm was placed 2 m in front of the them at the eye level.

### 113 Experimental procedures

114 In this randomized, single-blind study, sessions with different C-tDCS conditions were separated  
115 by at least two days. The experimental procedure is shown in Fig. 1. C-tDCS intervention was tested  
116 under three conditions: sham, right:P4 cathodal, and left:P3 cathodal. The participants were seated on  
117 a chair, and tDCS electrodes were placed on the parietal area and contralateral orbit. They  
118 subsequently underwent COP measurement without stimulation (baseline) followed by COP  
119 measurements in each intervention. During intervention the subjects involved sitting on the chair for  
120 about 20 minutes. The order of interventions was randomized, but the COP measurements were  
121 performed in the EO condition first, followed by the EC condition.

### 122 Analysis of the postural control task

123 The locus in the COP was converted to values of statistical indices such as sway path length,  
124 mediolateral (ML) sway, anteroposterior (AP) sway, sway area, and sway path length per unit area  
125 (L/A). The ML sway integrated the movement of the COP in the left-right direction. The AP sway  
126 integrated the amount of COP movement in the front-back direction. L/A is considered a parameter  
127 for fine control of standing posture by proprioceptive reflexes (21) (22).

### 128 Statistical analyses

129 The sway path length, ML sway, AP sway, sway area, and L/A were calculated at baseline (Pre)  
130 and after stimulation (Post) in each condition. To evaluate the effects of C-tDCS on pre- and post-  
131 offline trials, each parameter was compared using two-way repeated-measures analysis of variance  
132 (ANOVA) with factors of intervention (right, left, and sham) and time (pre, post). Preliminary testing  
133 for normality with the Shapiro–Wilk test showed that the data were normally distributed in all  
134 assessments. Sphericity was assessed using Mauchly's test. When a significant difference was  
135 observed in the interaction in repeated-measures ANOVA, a post-hoc evaluation was performed  
136 using a paired t-test. Comparisons of baseline values among the experimental conditions were  
137 analyzed using one-way repeated-measures ANOVA. The data are presented as the mean  $\pm$  standard  
138 error of the mean. Moreover, the effect sizes were evaluated according to standardized size-effect  
139 indices of partial eta-squared ( $\eta_p^2$ ) and Cohen's d. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS  
140 statistics (version 25.0 for Windows, IBM, Armonk, NY, USA). Statistical significance was set at  $p <$   
141 0.05. The EO and EC data were analyzed separately.

## 142 **Results**

143 The results of the two-way repeated-measures ANOVA for EO are shown in Table 1 and Figure  
144 1. No significant differences were observed in baseline sway path length, ML sway, AP sway, sway  
145 area, or L/A among the experimental sessions (sway path length,  $p = 0.925$ ; ML sway,  $p = 0.831$ ; AP  
146 sway,  $p = 0.930$ ; sway area,  $p = 0.431$ ; L/A,  $p = 0.938$ ). A significant interaction was observed between  
147 intervention and time for sway path length ( $F(2, 27) = 4.740$ ,  $p = 0.017$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.260$ ). ML sway ( $F$   
148 ( $2, 27) = 4.926$ ,  $p = 0.015$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.267$ ), and sway area ( $F(2, 27) = 9.624$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.416$ ).  
149 Post-hoc comparisons with paired t-tests revealed that sway path length, ML sway, and sway area  
150 increased significantly only after right hemisphere stimulation (sway path length,  $p < 0.01$ ,  $d = 0.51$ ;  
151 ML sway,  $p < 0.01$ ,  $d = 0.52$ ; sway area,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $d = 0.83$ ). L/A increased significantly after left-

152 hemisphere stimulation ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $d = 0.67$ ), but no differences were observed in the sham  
153 stimulation (Fig. 1).

154 The results of the two-way repeated-measures ANOVA for EC are shown in Table 2. No  
155 significant differences were observed in baseline sway path length, ML sway, AP sway, sway area,  
156 and L/A between the experimental sessions (sway path length,  $p = 0.390$ ; ML sway,  $p = 0.246$ ; AP  
157 sway,  $p = 0.743$ ; sway area,  $p = 0.853$ ; L/A,  $p = 0.807$ ). A significant interaction was observed between  
158 the intervention and time for L/A ( $F(2, 27) = 3.429$ ,  $p = 0.047$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.203$ ). Post-hoc comparisons  
159 with paired t-tests revealed that L/A increased significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $d = 0.57$ ) after left-hemisphere  
160 stimulation, but not after the right hemisphere or sham stimulation (Fig. 1).

## 161 **Discussion**

162 In the present study, C-tDCS on the right parietal area increased sway path length, ML sway,  
163 and sway area during the EO condition. In contrast, C-tDCS to the left parietal area increased the L/A  
164 during the EO and EC conditions. A previous study reported that bilateral tDCS to the parietal area  
165 modulates postural adaptation after tilting (Young 2020), indicating that information processing in  
166 the parietal cortex contributes to control of the standing posture. The modulation of standing posture  
167 control by unilateral C-tDCS to the parietal area in the present study supports the findings of a  
168 previous study and extends our knowledge by revealing the differential effect of C-tDCS depending  
169 on the stimulus side of the parietal area and the visual condition (EO or EC). Therefore, the current  
170 study indicates a hemispheric difference in the effects of the parietal lobe on postural control through  
171 the integration of multisensory information.

## 172 **C-tDCS on the right parietal area impaired postural control during EO**

173 C-tDCS on the right parietal area increased the sway path length, ML sway, and sway area  
174 during the EO condition but not during EC. Therefore, C-tDCS over right parietal area is assumed to  
175 impair postural control in a state of higher dependence on visual information processing. Static EO  
176 standing is controlled by inputs from the visual, somatosensory, and vestibular senses. However,  
177 cortical activity during visual and vestibular input has been shown to have a reciprocal inhibitory  
178 effect (Naito et al., 2003, Dietrich et al., 2003). Therefore, EO static standing balance is considered to  
179 be controlled by the visual and somatosensory systems, as vestibular information processing in the  
180 brain is suppressed. The visuospatial information related to standing posture control during EO is  
181 processed in the PPC, with a predominance on the right hemisphere (10) (2). A previous fMRI study  
182 reported that vertical/horizontal lines increased neural activity in the superior and inferior parietal  
183 cortices bilaterally, although the increase was observed predominantly on the right (23).

184 Bilateral t-DCS over the parietal areas (left-anodal, right-cathodal) induced visual  
185 mislocalization to the right (20). TMS of the right PPC has been reported to inhibit the coding of  
186 positional information obtained by gazing to visual stability (24). We speculate that C-tDCS to the  
187 right parietal may have increased ML-sway by suppressing the processing of the vertical line from  
188 the floor to the fixed viewpoint at eye level. In addition, stroke patients with right PPC lesions have  
189 been reported to show general spatial memory impairments (25). Visuospatial information requires a  
190 dynamic spatial map that integrates information sampled from retinal images, and is maintained and  
191 updated for each new gaze position (remapping process) (10). Above all, these studies suggest that  
192 C-tDCS to the right parietal area were suppressed right parietal cortex and modulated the vertical line  
193 perception by the fixation point leading visual instability to update spatial information during  
194 standing, which resulted in the sway path length and ML-sway increase.

195 The sway area reflects not only visual but also proprioceptive function during postural control,  
196 and in the EO condition, the contribution of the sway area has been shown to be higher for

197 proprioceptive function than visual field testing scores (18). An fMRI study on foot positional  
198 perception suggested that the significant regions responsible for position sense are in the right  
199 parietal and frontal cortices (26). In a combined visual and proprioceptive sensory stimulation task  
200 experiment, Christensen et al. reported that visually guided self-generated ankle movements activated  
201 the PPC (27). Convento et al. revealed that anodal tDCS to the right temporoparietal junction (TPJ)  
202 modulates proprioceptive sensory alignment and illusory perception, suggesting that the right TPJ  
203 and related areas contribute to the integration of vision and touch (8). Therefore, the increase in sway  
204 area with EO after C-tDCS to the right parietal area in the present study may be also due to  
205 modulation of the integration of visual and proprioceptive information.

#### 206 **C-tDCS on the left parietal area impaired postural control during EC and EO**

207 We found that C-tDCS on the left parietal area showed a significant interaction (time ×  
208 intervention) and large effects on L/A in the EC condition. The L/A ratio in the EO and EC  
209 conditions increased after C-tDCS on the left parietal area, which suggested that postural instability  
210 by C-tDCS on the left parietal area is not dependent on visual information processing. Sway area in  
211 standing balance with EO and EC in healthy older adults was reported to be contributed by  
212 somatosensory rather than age(18), indicating that somatosensory perception plays an important role  
213 in standing postural control at firm surface with or without vision. Furthermore, L/A, sway length  
214 divided by sway area, is considered a parameter reflecting the fine control of standing posture by  
215 proprioceptive reflexes (21) (22). L/A is used as an indicator of somatosensory-derived fine body  
216 sway(28) (29). In clinical studies, L/A has been used to assess body sway in postoperative patients  
217 with cervical myelopathy (28), and preventing the potential risk of falls and body sway  
218 after taking antidepressants (29). In addition, the frequency band of body sway has been shown  
219 to be related to sensory information processing for standing posture control. The frequency of body  
220 sway during static standing has been reported to have an average frequency of  $0.11 \pm 0.07$  Hz during

221 the EO condition (30), and the median frequency increases during the EC condition (31). In the  
222 standing balance task, a reflex response coherent with perturbation was seen in the soleus EMG at  
223 frequencies up to 5 Hz, with maximal coherence at 1.0-2.0 Hz (32), and highest for the 1- to 2-Hz  
224 stochastic vestibular stimulation signal (33). In particular, participants with higher L/A had a higher  
225 power spectrum at 2-5 Hz (21), which is considered a parameter of fine control of standing posture  
226 by proprioceptive reflexes (32). The static standing posture in the EC condition is controlled by  
227 somatosensory and vestibular information (34). However, postural instability due to vestibular  
228 dysfunction is assessed by the COP in the foam rubber (35). Therefore, L/A represents postural  
229 control in a proprioceptive manner and is likely to be less influenced by the vestibular function.  
230 Furthermore, previous studies on somatosensory information processing in the brain showed that the  
231 left PPC is activated during a crossed-hand posture (36) and light touch with EC (5). C-tDCS of the  
232 left PPC was also reported to increase the limb position drift away from the defined target without  
233 visual feedback (19). The left inferior parietal lobule was activated during both hand-object illusions  
234 with the right and left hands, and the activity was greater than that in the right corresponding parietal  
235 region, suggesting a dominant role for the left hemisphere (37). Therefore, the L/A increase after C-  
236 tDCS of the left parietal lobe may be attributed to suppression of somatosensory information  
237 processing, contributing to high frequency of posture control independent of in the EC and EO.

## 238 **Limitations**

239 This study had several limitations. First, the effects of tDCS on vision, vestibular perception, and  
240 somatosensory perception in the left and right parietal regions have not been investigated. Further  
241 studies are needed to clarify the effects of tDCS on the left and right parietal areas on vision,  
242 vestibular perception, and somatosensory perception. Second, the sample size was relatively small.  
243 Variability between individuals in response to transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) is a  
244 commonly reported issue in tDCS literature in recent years (38). However, the sample size was

245 within the average range reported in other studies (39) (40) (41). In addition, the effect sizes in the  
246 current study were medium to large, implying that the effects of unilateral C-tDCS on postural  
247 control were robust. The differences between the C-tDCS and sham conditions were also not  
248 significant for all items. Finally, we used rectangular stimulation electrodes ( $5 \times 7$  cm), which did not  
249 allow focal stimulation (42). Therefore, co-stimulation of the cortical areas adjacent to the PPL is  
250 difficult to rule out.

251

## 252 **Conclusions**

253 This study investigated the effects of unilateral C-tDCS on the parietal area during postural  
254 control. C-tDCS on the right parietal area significantly increased sway length, ML sway, and sway  
255 area during the EO conditions, while that over the left hemisphere increased L/A during the EO and  
256 EC conditions. Thus, the right parietal area controls body sway using visual and proprioceptive  
257 information, whereas the left parietal area controls high-frequency body sway using proprioceptive  
258 information during the EC condition. In future studies, we hope to clarify the relationship between  
259 information processing in the brain of the parietal cortex and sensory systems and develop  
260 neurorehabilitation protocols to improve balance based on the function of the parietal cortex.

## 261 **Funding**

262 This research was supported by the JSPS KAKENHI Grant numbers 18K17684  
263 (SO).

264

## 265 **Conflicts of Interest**

266 None.

267



269 **References**

- 270 1. Peterka RJ. Sensorimotor integration in human postural control. *Journal of neurophysiology*.  
271 2002;88(3):1097-118.
- 272 2. Whitlock JR. Posterior parietal cortex. *Curr Biol*. 2017;27(14):R691-R5.
- 273 3. Dieterich M, Bucher SF, Seelos KC, Brandt T. Horizontal or vertical optokinetic stimulation  
274 activates visual motion-sensitive, ocular motor and vestibular cortex areas with right hemispheric  
275 dominance. *An fMRI study. Brain : a journal of neurology*. 1998;121 ( Pt 8):1479-95.
- 276 4. Naito Y, Tateya I, Hirano S, Inoue M, Funabiki K, Toyoda H, et al. Cortical correlates of  
277 vestibulo-ocular reflex modulation: a PET study. *Brain : a journal of neurology*. 2003;126(Pt  
278 7):1562-78.
- 279 5. Ishigaki T, Ueta K, Imai R, Morioka S. EEG frequency analysis of cortical brain activities induced  
280 by effect of light touch. *Experimental brain research*. 2016;234(6):1429-40.
- 281 6. Dieterich M, Bense S, Lutz S, Drzezga A, Stephan T, Bartenstein P, et al. Dominance for  
282 vestibular cortical function in the non-dominant hemisphere. *Cerebral cortex (New York, NY :  
283 1991)*. 2003;13(9):994-1007.
- 284 7. Bense S, Stephan T, Yousry TA, Brandt T, Dieterich M. Multisensory cortical signal increases  
285 and decreases during vestibular galvanic stimulation (fMRI). *Journal of neurophysiology*.  
286 2001;85(2):886-99.
- 287 8. Convento S, Romano D, Maravita A, Bolognini N. Roles of the right temporo-parietal and  
288 premotor cortices in self-location and body ownership. *The European journal of neuroscience*.  
289 2018;47(11):1289-302.

- 290 9. Arshad Q, Nigmatullina Y, Roberts RE, Bhrugubanda V, Asavarut P, Bronstein AM. Left  
291 cathodal trans-cranial direct current stimulation of the parietal cortex leads to an asymmetrical  
292 modulation of the vestibular-ocular reflex. *Brain stimulation*. 2014;7(1):85-91.
- 293 10. Pisella L, Alahyane N, Blangero A, Thery F, Blanc S, Pelisson D. Right-hemispheric dominance  
294 for visual remapping in humans. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London*  
295 *Series B, Biological sciences*. 2011;366(1564):572-85.
- 296 11. Babyar SR, Smeragliuolo A, Albazron FM, Putrino D, Reding M, Boes AD. Lesion Localization  
297 of Poststroke Lateropulsion. *Stroke*. 2019;50(5):1067-73.
- 298 12. Karnath HO, Johannsen L, Broetz D, Ferber S, Dichgans J. Prognosis of contraversive pushing.  
299 *Journal of neurology*. 2002;249(9):1250-3.
- 300 13. Birnbaum M, Brock K, Clark R, Muir S, Burton E, Hill KD. Standing weight-bearing asymmetry  
301 in adults with lateropulsion following stroke. *Gait & posture*. 2021;90:427-33.
- 302 14. Nolan J, Godecke E, Spilsbury K, Singer B. Post-stroke lateropulsion and rehabilitation  
303 outcomes: a retrospective analysis. *Disability and rehabilitation*. 2021:1-9.
- 304 15. Barra J, Oujamaa L, Chauvineau V, Rougier P, Pérennou D. Asymmetric standing posture after  
305 stroke is related to a biased egocentric coordinate system. *Neurology*. 2009;72(18):1582-7.
- 306 16. Nitsche MA, Paulus W. Sustained excitability elevations induced by transcranial DC motor  
307 cortex stimulation in humans. *Neurology*. 2001;57(10):1899-901.
- 308 17. Young DR, Parikh PJ, Layne CS. Non-invasive Brain Stimulation of the Posterior Parietal  
309 Cortex Alters Postural Adaptation. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*. 2020;14:248.
- 310 18. Anson E, Bigelow RT, Swenor B, Deshpande N, Studenski S, Jeka JJ, et al. Loss of Peripheral  
311 Sensory Function Explains Much of the Increase in Postural Sway in Healthy Older Adults.  
312 *Frontiers in aging neuroscience*. 2017;9:202.

- 313 19. Ventura de Oliveira JR, Romano-Silva MA, Ugrinowitsch H, Apolinário-Souza T, Fernandes  
314 LA, Parma JO, et al. Cathodal tDCS of the Left Posterior Parietal Cortex Increases  
315 Proprioceptive Drift. *Journal of motor behavior*. 2019;51(3):272-80.
- 316 20. Wright JM, Krekelberg B. Transcranial direct current stimulation over posterior parietal cortex  
317 modulates visuospatial localization. *Journal of vision*. 2014;14(9).
- 318 21. Okawa T, Tokita T, Shibata Y, Ogawa T, Miyata H. Stabilometry-Significance of Locus Length  
319 Per Unit Area (L/A)-. *Equilibrium Research*. 1995;54(3):296-306.
- 320 22. Akabane H, Shimada Y, Ogawa R. Usefulness of posturography after epidural block. *Journal of*  
321 *Nippon Medical School = Nippon Ika Daigaku zasshi*. 2004;71(1):35-43.
- 322 23. Fink GR, Marshall JC, Weiss PH, Zilles K. The neural basis of vertical and horizontal line  
323 bisection judgments: an fMRI study of normal volunteers. *NeuroImage*. 2001;14(1 Pt 2):S59-67.
- 324 24. Collins T, Jacquet PO. TMS over posterior parietal cortex disrupts trans-saccadic visual stability.  
325 *Brain stimulation*. 2018;11(2):390-9.
- 326 25. Ten Brink AF, Fabius JH, Weaver NA, Nijboer TCW, Van der Stigchel S. Trans-saccadic  
327 memory after right parietal brain damage. *Cortex; a journal devoted to the study of the nervous*  
328 *system and behavior*. 2019;120:284-97.
- 329 26. Iandolo R, Bellini A, Saiote C, Marre I, Bommarito G, Oesingmann N, et al. Neural correlates of  
330 lower limbs proprioception: An fMRI study of foot position matching. *Human brain mapping*.  
331 2018;39(5):1929-44.
- 332 27. Christensen MS, Lundbye-Jensen J, Petersen N, Geertsen SS, Paulson OB, Nielsen JB. Watching  
333 your foot move--an fMRI study of visuomotor interactions during foot movement. *Cerebral*  
334 *cortex (New York, NY : 1991)*. 2007;17(8):1906-17.

- 335 28. Tanishima S, Nagashima H, Ishii H, Fukata S, Dokai T, Murakami T, et al. Significance of  
336 Stabilometry for Assessing Postoperative Body Sway in Patients with Cervical Myelopathy.  
337 Asian spine journal. 2017;11(5):763-9.
- 338 29. Miyata S, Noda A, Iwamoto K, Takahashi M, Hara Y, Kojima J, et al. The effects of acute  
339 treatment with paroxetine, amitriptyline, and placebo on the equilibrium function in healthy  
340 subjects: a double-blind crossover trial. International journal of psychiatry in clinical practice.  
341 2014;18(1):32-6.
- 342 30. Loughlin PJ, Redfern MS. Spectral characteristics of visually induced postural sway in healthy  
343 elderly and healthy young subjects. IEEE transactions on neural systems and rehabilitation  
344 engineering : a publication of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society.  
345 2001;9(1):24-30.
- 346 31. Sozzi S, Nardone A, Schieppati M. Specific Posture-Stabilising Effects of Vision and Touch Are  
347 Revealed by Distinct Changes of Body Oscillation Frequencies. Frontiers in neurology.  
348 2021;12:756984.
- 349 32. Fitzpatrick RC, Gorman RB, Burke D, Gandevia SC. Postural proprioceptive reflexes in standing  
350 human subjects: bandwidth of response and transmission characteristics. The Journal of  
351 physiology. 1992;458:69-83.
- 352 33. Pavlik AE, Inglis JT, Lauk M, Oddsson L, Collins JJ. The effects of stochastic galvanic  
353 vestibular stimulation on human postural sway. Experimental brain research. 1999;124(3):273-  
354 80.
- 355 34. Gupta A, Ledin T, Larsen LE, Lenmarken C, Odkvist LM. Computerized dynamic  
356 posturography: a new method for the evaluation of postural stability following anaesthesia.  
357 British journal of anaesthesia. 1991;66(6):667-72.


- 358 35. Fujimoto C, Kamogashira T, Kinoshita M, Egami N, Sugasawa K, Demura S, et al. Power  
359 spectral analysis of postural sway during foam posturography in patients with peripheral  
360 vestibular dysfunction. *Otology & neurotology* : official publication of the American Otological  
361 Society, American Neurotology Society [and] European Academy of Otology and Neurotology.  
362 2014;35(10):e317-23.
- 363 36. Wada M, Takano K, Ikegami S, Ora H, Spence C, Kansaku K. Spatio-temporal updating in the  
364 left posterior parietal cortex. *PloS one*. 2012;7(6):e39800.
- 365 37. Naito E, Ehrsson HH. Somatic sensation of hand-object interactive movement is associated with  
366 activity in the left inferior parietal cortex. *The Journal of neuroscience* : the official journal of the  
367 Society for Neuroscience. 2006;26(14):3783-90.
- 368 38. Pellegrini M, Zoghi M, Jaberzadeh S. Genetic Polymorphisms Do Not Predict Interindividual  
369 Variability to Cathodal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation of the Primary Motor Cortex.  
370 *Brain connectivity*. 2021;11(1):56-72.
- 371 39. Zaehle T, Rach S, Herrmann CS. Transcranial alternating current stimulation enhances individual  
372 alpha activity in human EEG. *PloS one*. 2010;5(11):e13766.
- 373 40. Paquette C, Sidel M, Radinska BA, Soucy JP, Thiel A. Bilateral transcranial direct current  
374 stimulation modulates activation-induced regional blood flow changes during voluntary  
375 movement. *Journal of cerebral blood flow and metabolism* : official journal of the International  
376 Society of Cerebral Blood Flow and Metabolism. 2011;31(10):2086-95.
- 377 41. Batsikadze G, Moliadze V, Paulus W, Kuo MF, Nitsche MA. Partially non-linear stimulation  
378 intensity-dependent effects of direct current stimulation on motor cortex excitability in humans.  
379 *The Journal of physiology*. 2013;591(7):1987-2000.

- 380 42. Datta A, Truong D, Minhas P, Parra LC, Bikson M. Inter-Individual Variation during  
381 Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation and Normalization of Dose Using MRI-Derived  
382 Computational Models. *Frontiers in psychiatry*. 2012;3:91.

EO

Sway path length (cm)

EC



Figure

Table1 Effect of C-tDCS in sway path length, ML-sway, AP-sway, and L/A with EO condition

Average±SE	Pre(right)	Post(right)	d	Pre(left)	Post(left)	d	Pre(sham)	Post(sham)	d
Sway path length (cm)	76.3±6.7	90.3±10.3**	0.51	78.5±4.5	74.2±4.7	0.29	75.0±7.4	72.6±5.9	0.12
ML sway (cm)	54.5±4.5	65.0±7.8**	0.52	55.7±3.7	51.7±3.9	0.33	51.6±6.0	49.6±4.9	0.12
AP sway (cm)	41.8±4.3	49.2±5.5	0.48	43.4±2.5	42.3±2.9	0.13	43.5±3.6	42.1±2.8	0.14
Sway area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	3.7±0.4	5.6±0.9**	0.83	4.3±0.5	3.4±0.7	0.54	5.1±1.0	4.2±0.7	0.32
L/A (1/cm)	21.5±1.9	18.9±2.8	0.34	20.1±1.9	25.0±2.9*	0.67	21.2±4.4	20.8±2.8	0.03
Two-way repeated measures ANOVA	Time			Intervention			Time × Intervention		
	F(df)	$\eta_p^2$	p	F(df)	$\eta_p^2$	p	F(df)	$\eta_p^2$	p
Sway path length	0.829(1,27)	0.030	0.371	0.579(2,27)	0.041	0.567	4.740(2,27)	0.260	0.017
ML sway	0.528(1,27)	0.019	0.474	0.854(2,27)	0.059	0.437	4.926(2,27)	0.267	0.015
AP sway	0.817(1,27)	0.029	0.347	0.210(2,27)	0.015	0.812	2.550(2,27)	0.159	0.097
Sway area	0.021(1,27)	0.001	0.886	0.474(2,27)	0.034	0.628	9.624(2,27)	0.416	0.001
L/A	0.243(1,27)	0.009	0.626	2.853(2,27)	0.015	0.821	2.853(2,27)	0.174	0.075

Multiple comparison (Intervention): Bonferroni, ns, simple main effect: \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$

Effect size :  $\eta_p^2 = 0.010$  ~small effect,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.060$  ~medium effect, and  $\eta_p^2 = 0.140$  ~large effect

$d = 0.20$  ~small effect,  $d = 0.50$  ~medium effect, and  $d = 0.80$  ~large effect

ANOVA: analysis of variance, AP: antrio-posterior, ML: medio-lateral, L/A: sway path length per unit area

Table2 Effect of C-tDCS in sway path length, ML-sway, AP-sway, and L/A with EC condition

Average±SE	Pre(right)	Post(right)	d	Pre(left)	Post(left)	d	Pre(sham)	Post(sham)	d
Sway path length (cm)	109.6±11.1	111.4±12.6	0.05	96.9±7.1	97.0±5.4	0.02	90.9±10.4	96.2±11.9	0.15
ML sway (cm)	81.4±8.7	82.3±10.3	0.03	68.5±5.1	67.8±5.3	0.04	63.3±8.6	66.4±10.2	0.11
AP sway (cm)	57.3±5.5	58.1±5.6	0.05	53.7±4.1	54.4±2.5	0.07	52.1±4.8	55.2±4.9	0.21
Sway area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	5.6±1.0	6.9±1.2	0.35	5.7±1.0	4.5±1.1	0.45	5.0±1.1	4.8±1.2	0.04
L/A (1/cm)	21.6±2.0	18.4±1.9	0.53	20.5±2.6	25.8±3.2*	0.57	23.1±3.6	25.8±4.1	0.22
Two-way repeated measures ANOVA	Time			Intervention			Time × Intervention		
	F(df)	$\eta_p^2$	p	F(df)	$\eta_p^2$	p	F(df)	$\eta_p^2$	p
Sway path length	1.184(1,27)	0.042	0.286	0.825(2,27)	0.058	0.449	0.704(2,27)	0.050	0.503
ML sway	0.467(1,27)	0.017	0.500	1.208(2,27)	0.082	0.314	0.462(2,27)	0.033	0.635
AP sway	1.576(1,27)	0.055	0.220	0.234(2,27)	0.017	0.793	0.409(2,27)	0.029	0.668
Sway area	0.015(1,27)	0.001	0.903	0.557(2,27)	0.040	0.579	2.959(2,27)	0.180	0.069
L/A	1.350(1,27)	0.048	0.255	0.700(2,27)	0.049	0.505	3.429(2,27)	0.203	0.047

Multiple comparison (Intervention): Bonferroni, ns, simple main effect: \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$

Effect size :  $\eta_p^2 = 0.010$  ~small effect,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.060$  ~medium effect, and  $\eta_p^2 = 0.140$  ~large effect

d = 0.20 ~small effect, d = 0.50 ~medium effect, and d = 0.80 ~large effect

ANOVA: analysis of variance, AP: antrio-posterior, ML: medio-lateral, L/A: sway path length per unit area