**Enhancing Cognitive Restructuring with Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation: A Proof of Concept Study**

***Supplemental Information***

## Supplemental Methods and Materials

**Participants**

Participants were recruited between 4/27/2016 and 1/3/2019 through online websites (e.g., Craigslist), flyers, and physician referrals. Interested participants completed an online screen and were subsequently called for additional screening if they did not report meeting any exclusion criteria. We aimed to recruit 20 participants in each condition to align with other neurostimulation studies where 6-20 individuals per condition were sufficient to demonstrate proof of concept for novel treatments (1-3). Of 63 treatment-seeking community participants who were screened and eligible, 47 participants were intent to treat (ITT; i.e., they presented to the intervention session). ITT participants were 8 men and 39 women between the ages of 18 and 65 (M = 30.02; SD = 10.73) who met criteria for any DSM-5 disorder (excluding active substance use, psychotic disorders, and Bipolar I) and who self-reported below average use of cognitive restructuring when upset. Participants were transdiagnostic and met criteria for at least one of the following diagnoses according to the Structured Clinical Interview (SCID-5) for *DSM-5* Disorders (4): major depressive disorder (MDD; *n* = 9), persistent depressive disorder (PDD; *n* = 5), premenstrual dysphoric disorder (PMDD; *n =* 6), bipolar II disorder (*n* = 1), other depressive disorder (*n* = 2), social anxiety disorder (SAD; *n* = 17), generalized anxiety disorder (GAD; *n* = 18), specific phobia (SP; *n =* 10), other specified anxiety disorder (OASD; *n* = 6), obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD; *n* = 2), body dysmorphic disorder (BDD; *n =* 3), hoarding disorder (*n* = 1), trichotillomania (*n* = 1), excoriation disorder (*n* = 4), bulimia nervosa (BN; *n* = 1), other eating disorder (*n* = 2), somatic symptom disorder (*n* = 1), illness anxiety disorder (*n* = 1), adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD; *n* =7), intermittent explosive disorder (IEE; *n* = 3), acute stress disorder (*n* = 2), posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD; *n* = 1), other stress disorder (*n*  = 6), adjustment disorder (*n*  = 5). Participants met criteria for an average of 2.53 (*SD =* 1.65) current diagnoses and 4.20 (*SD* = 1.94) lifetime diagnoses, and 15 participants (31.92%) met criteria for at least one personality disorder according to the SCID-5-PD (5).

Low use of CR was operationally defined as a mean score lower than 4.7 on the cognitive reappraisal subscale (range: 1-7) of the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ)(6) at the intake assessment. This cutoff was computed by pooling ERQ reappraisal means from 18 studies (N = 4331 participants) published before 2014 that examined the ERQ on US samples (6-23). The pooled mean across these studies was 4.70 (*SDpooled* = 0.99). We considered adults who scored below this pooled mean to have “low use” of CR strategies and therefore to be the optimal candidates for a one-time CR intervention. ITT participants scored an average of 3.35 (SD = 0.81) on the ERQ cognitive reappraisal subscale, with no significant difference in scores between treatment conditions (*F*(2, 43) = 0.29, *p*  = .75).

Participants were excluded if they were younger than 18 and older than 65; scored above the ERQ reappraisal cutoff; did not report any mental health difficulties; endorsed current substance or alcohol abuse or a history of psychosis; were currently in (or planning to start) CBT; needed immediate hospitalization; were at high risk for suicide; or were at increased risk for seizure during neuromodulation because of medication, neurological disorder, brain injury, or family history. Pregnant women, homeless individuals, individuals who could not travel to Duke, who did not understand English, or who had low verbal IQ (24) and could not understand the intervention were also excluded. Participants unwilling to answer the ambulatory calls were also excluded. (See Figure 1 for additional details.) Participants received $150 to complete all study procedures. The study was approved by the Duke University Health System Institutional Review Board and pre-registered on ClinicalTrials.gov. Additional funds were awarded after the study start for a supplement which was reported under the same clinical trial ID but was conducted as an independent study. The data from the supplement are not included in this paper. The study enrollment and follow up was closed on 1/14/2019, at the conclusion of the funding period.

## Procedures

This study involved a total of three sessions: an intake session, the intervention session combining rTMS with skills training, and a follow-up session one month after intervention. Participants also completed an ambulatory assessment of distress and CR use for a week following the intervention (8x per day for 7 days), and a battery of self-reports remotely via an online link at the end of that week. The following sections describe each of these sessions.

### Intake Session

After providing voluntary, written informed consent, participants completed diagnostic assessments (SCID-5) and a questionnaire packet. Qualified participants underwent an interview to identify four autobiographical stressors to be used for emotional induction. Using the method developed by Pitman and colleagues (25) and used in studies of adults with affective disorders (26), we created four negative emotional arousal scripts, three of which were used in a random order during the intervention day and one during the 1-month follow-up assessment. In brief, the assessor asked the participant to describe three moderate stressors from the past month, as well as a stressor that tended to reoccur for them. Participants wrote a description of each event, and the assessor worked with the participant to establish a clear story for each event that could be recited in 30-40 seconds. Following the assessment, these scripts were narrated by the PI and digitally recorded into .wav audio files to be presented during the subsequent testing sessions. The PI decided whom to enroll in the study and was kept blind to treatment condition assignment until the end of the study.

#### **Randomization**

Following intake, participants were randomly assigned to active right dlPFC stimulation (*n* = 18), active left dlPFC stimulation (*n* = 19), or sham stimulation (*n* = 22). Participants were matched according to sex and use of psychotropic medication as dichotomous variables. When a participant withdrew before the intervention, they were unrandomized and their randomized condition reassigned to a new participant with the same matching specifications to maintain balance between the ITT groups. Randomization was done using a minimization algorithm (27, 28) using the QMinim software (<http://rct.mui.ac.ir/q/index.php>) by an independent staff member (Ms. Kelley) and kept blind from the assessor, PI and participant. A parallel clinical trial design was used with equal ratio assignment to each condition. The randomization information was saved in a password protected database to which only Ms. Kelley had the password. Two sealed envelopes were created for each participant, one to be opened at the end of the study by the assessor and participant to discuss randomization, and one to be opened by the TMS technician who set up the coil before the intervention for either the sham or active paradigm. Sham participants were further randomized to receive TMS to either the right or left DLPFC. From the 15 participants in the sham treatment condition, 8 had the TMS coil placed over the left dlPFC and 7 over the right dlPFC.

### Intervention Session

Participants returned for the 3.5-hour intervention session within a month of intake.

**Behavioral Intervention.** The first 45-60 min of this session was spent on skills training, one-on-one with the first author or a trained psychologist, and was focused on learning CR and practicing on standardized and personal examples. Skills training used standardized procedures blending psychotherapeutic approaches (29, 30) with instructions in CR that matched prior neuroimaging studies (31). Participants were told that one validated way to change emotional experiences is by thinking differently about the situation that prompts the emotion (30, 32-34) or by reorganizing the cognitive elements involved in the emotion (35).

Following Gross’s model (36), we defined CR as interpreting emotional stimuli in a way in which the target emotional relevance is de-emphasized or the interpretation leads to a different emotion(37). First, participants were taught to adopt a detached and unemotional attitude as they thought about their autobiographical situation (38). Detachment was instructed by examining the situation with objectivity or putting spatial or temporal distance between the current moment and the situation. We called this strategy **distancing** (39).

Second, participants were taught **reframing** using an adapted version of existing paradigms (31, 40, 41). Specifically, we emphasized with pictures and examples the relationship between thoughts and emotions, identified helpful ways of thinking, and instructed participants to find interpretations that are less toxic in order to be effective rather than right when upset. Participants learned to ask about elements of the situation that they did not pay attention to or information that was missing, and to reframe their cognitions based on the full picture with an eye towards reducing distress. Participants were also taught to examine the worst-case scenario, the probability of it occurring, and the likelihood of survival if it occurred.

Functional neuroimaging studies examining CR have found activation distributed throughout the frontolimbic emotion regulation network, including the dlPFC, vlPFC, ACC, mPFC/frontal pole, amygdala, and insula (39, 42, 43). Of these regions, the dlPFC is a critical node in the effective use of cognitive emotion regulation (44) that is also the most accessible site for neuromodulation with good demonstration of patient tolerance (45).

The CR training ended with a quiz that included definitions as well as hypothetical scenarios for practice purposes.

#### **rTMS Parameters.** Active or sham rTMS was performed with a figure-8 coil (A/P Cool-B65) and a MagPro X100 stimulator with MagOption (MagVenture, Denmark). The TMS device was configured to biphasic pulses with the electric field current flowing in the normal direction (AP-PA). Stimulation was delivered over the left or right dlPFC (depending on randomization), defined according to the 10-20 system (46). A stereotaxic neuronavigation system was used (Brainsight, Rogue Research), and a template brain (MNI) was registered to each participant’s head using anatomical landmarks. These procedures allowed for online monitoring and adjustment of TMS coil position throughout the session to ensure proper targeting.

 rTMS was performed with standard FDA-approved parameters (47, 48). Twenty trains of 10 Hz stimulation were delivered over 4 s with a 26-s inter-train interval at 120% of the resting motor threshold (rMT). To determine rMT, electrodes (Neuroline 720, Ambu) were placed in a belly-tendon montage on the participant’s opposite from the site of stimulation hand to record activity in the first dorsal interosseous (FDI) muscle, and motor evoked potentials (MEP) were recorded in Brainsight. The motor hot spot was defined as the position over the left/right motor cortex that elicited the largest MEP, and rMT was then defined as the TMS pulse intensity that induced, on average, a MEP of 50 µV amplitude, using a maximum likelihood estimator (TMS Motor Threshold Assessment Tool, MTAT 2.0, clinicalresearcher.org /software.html). If the participant could not tolerate full intensity of the intervention, we dropped the intensity to rMT and ramped up during habituation to target intensity. Only participants who received the majority of stimulation above rMT were included in the analyses leading to 5 participants (including the pilot participant) to be excluded.

Each TMS session was conducted by the principal investigator (PI; first author) with the assistance of a TMS technician. The PI led the participant through the session, decided on dose adjustments and course of action for any protocol deviations, and stayed blinded to the condition. The technician was not blind to the assigned condition and prepared the coil but did not influenced the course of the session in any way.

Sham stimulation was delivered using the opposite face of the same A/P coil, which included a magnetic shield to greatly attenuate the induced field. When positioned in the sham configuration, the coil also produced electrical current through two electrodes placed approximately one centimeter apart near the participant’s hairline on the side of the stimulation. This electrical current was matched in intensity to create a somatosensation similar to the active stimulation, thereby creating a reliable sensory blinding to the two conditions. The electrodes were put near the hairline for all participants and were only activated for sham participants. Therefore, the presence of the sham electrodes, the scalp stimulation, the sounds and the coil position over the identified target, and the pre-determination of the motor threshold were all elements of the neurostimulation procedure that were identical between the treatment conditions. The difference was the presence or absence of HF rTMS.

**Combined rTMS-CR Intervention.**First, a 600 s habituation period was performed when participants received active or sham rTMS alone while listening to white noise via headphones. Participants were not instructed to think of anything in particular during this time. Then, the intervention proceeded as follows: (1) participants sat quietly for a 300 s baseline while listening to white noise, (2) participants were instructed to imagine as vividly as possible one of the stressful experiences constructed at intake, (3) the stressor was heard via headphones followed by silence when participants were instructed to continue to imagine the stressful situation (120 s total), and (4) instructions in reducing distress using CR followed. The rTMS began within 10 s after the CR instructions appeared. Reminders of reframing and distancing appeared in random order 180 s and 360 s post-stimulation onset. White noise was played throughout when instructions were not presented. After 600 s, there was a break, followed by a second and third administration of the stressor task using the procedures outlined above, but with a different personalized stressor recording each time presented in a randomized order. After each baseline, stress induction, and regulation period, the participant was asked to rate subjective units of distress (SUDS; 0-9 scale). At the end of the intervention, manipulation check questions ensuring compliance with the instructions and asking participants to guess the blinded condition assignment were administered.

#### **Physiological Measurements.** Psychophysiological measurements were collected continuously during the intervention using the BIOPAC MP-150 recording system (Goleta, CA). Electrodes recording heart rate (HR) were placed on the participant’s wrist, ankle, and fingers. Amplified analog data recorded with a 200 Hz sampling rate were converted to digital recording and filtered using BIOPAC’s AcqKnowledge 4.1 software.

### Ambulatory Assessment and Follow-Up Visit

Following the intervention participants received 8 calls/day for 7 days, starting the day after the intervention, at pseudo-random times to examine SUDS and use of CR. On each call they were asked if they had used CR since the previous call (yes/no) and what was their current level of distress (0- no distress at all to 9- extreme distress). At the end of the week the battery of self-reports from intake was administered again via an online link.

Participants returned to the research office a month later to complete a stressor task without neurostimulation, an acceptability and feasibility interview, and the battery of self-reports. The stressor task included measuring HR while the participant stood still for a 300-s baseline, underwent a 120-s stress induction using a fourth stressor, and engaged in prompted CR for 300 s. Physiological data collection and processing was identical to the intervention procedures. SUDS were rated after each experimental task. After the exit interview, the blind was broken and the experimenter and the subject were debriefed about the study.

**Measures**

***Diagnostic Assessment***

The SCID-5 (4) and SCID-PD (5) were used to assess DSM-5 disorders. Participants were led through both structured interviews by either the first author (76.4% of cases) or one of three trained diagnostic assessors under the supervision of the first author. In the cases where the first author did not conduct the interview, she reviewed in detail with the assessor the questions asked to confirm diagnostic profile. In case of disagreement, she reassessed the disorder at the next visit.

***Self-reports***

**Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ).** The ERQ (6) is a 10‐item self‐report inventory that assesses the routine use of two cognitive emotion regulation strategies: expressive suppression and cognitive reappraisal. The items use a 7‐point Likert scale with responses ranging from one (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). In our study, Cronbach alpha at intake for ERQ Reappraisal was .87. The correlation between phone screen and intake reappraisal scores for 98 participants was .57. ERQ suppression scale scores were collected but not examined for the current study.

**Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS).** The DERS (49) is a 36-item self-reportmeasure of individuals’ typical levels of emotion dysregulation across six domains. Participants respond on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*almost never*) to 5 (*almost always*), and the total sum score indicates high dysregulation. In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha for the total score at intake was .89. The correlation between phone screen and intake total DERS scores for 93 participants was .66.

**Outcome Questionnaire-45 (OQ-45).**The OQ-45 (50)is a 45-item self-report measure used to track severity of psychopathology throughout treatment. It consists of subscales that identify three types of problems that lead to general stress: psychological symptoms, interpersonal conflicts, and problems with social roles (51). Items are rated on a Likert scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*almost always*). At pretreatment, Cronbach’s alpha for the total score was .83.

**The Work and Social Adjustment Scale (WSAS).** The WSAS (52) is a 5-item self-report inventory examining the functional impairment attributable to an identified problem. In this study, we asked participants to rate the level of impairment that was related to their emotional dysregulation (e.g., “Because of my difficulties managing emotions, my ability to work is impaired”). These questions are rated on a 9-point Likert scale (0 = my problem does not affect this at all; 8 = my problem affects this very seriously) A total WSAS score above 10 suggests clinical levels of functional impairment. At pretreatment, Cronbach’s alpha for the total score was .71.

**Subjective Units of Distress Scale (SUDS).** During the experimental sessions and ambulatory assessments we asked participants to rate their current distress on a scale from 0 – no distress to 9 – extreme distress (53).

**Manipulation Check.** After each baseline and regulation period we examined dissociation during that segment using a 4-item scale (54). At the end of the intervention and at the 1-week and 1-month follow-up assessments, participants rated their confidence in the assigned condition to which they were kept blind (1 = “I am certain I received sham stimulation” to 9 = “I am certain I received active stimulation”). We also asked after the intervention for participants to give their best guess whether they received real or sham neurostimulation (forced- choice question).

**Tolerability Questionnaire.** Before and after the intervention session, participants rated on a scale from 0–3 (absent, mild, moderate, severe) the intensity of their headache, neck pain, scalp pain, seizure (as observed by technician), hearing impairment and any other side effect that they might have experienced from the TMS treatment.

**Exit Interview.** We refined a previously developed in-house interview (55) to examine feasibility and acceptability as directly relevant to the study and to collect participant feedback (available upon request). The interview was administered at the 1-month follow up, and it included open-ended questions about the overall experience, positives, and issues with the current treatment, as well as Likert-type questions about feasibility of the intervention (e.g., difficulty with limiting movement, level of comfort, ability to concentrate given the TMS noise, distress about the procedures, ease to hear and understand clinician, connection with clinician, and session engagement), acceptability (of session length, skills training, TMS procedures, personalized stressors use, ambulatory phone assessment) and overall satisfaction (i.e., likelihood to recommend to someone else). Feasibility and acceptability questions were rated on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 9 (extremely) and averaged to compute an overall feasibility and acceptability score. Satisfaction was rated on a 0 (low) to 100 (high) continuous scale.

***Psychophysiological Measures***

Raw ECG data were visually inspected and artifacts cleaned prior to calculation of HF-HRV following established guidelines (56, 57). The AcqKnowledge software tool detects R-waves in the cleaned ECG to create a series of inter-beat intervals that is converted to a continuous, time-domain representation of HR using cubic-spline interpolation, which is resampled at 8 Hz. Spectral analysis yields summary report values for HRV frequency bands. Each session period (e.g., baseline, habituation, stressor, regulation) was divided into 120 s bins, and HF-HRV was extracted from each bin. The bin size was chosen because the stressor induction portion was 120s long, and segments were intended to be equivalent in length across the experiment. Therefore, two HF-HRV values for each baseline, one for each stressor, and five values for each regulation period and habituation were computed. HF-HRV was intended to be a primary outcome measure but was added later to clinicaltrials.gov record as primary because of an administrative omission at the beginning.

#### The ‘Find Rate’ function of AcqKnowledge was used to transform the ECG signal into beats per minute or heart rate (HR), using a moving average with a window of 15 s. For each baseline, HR was averaged from the last 240 of the total 300 s. We excluded the first 60 s from each baseline because often during this time participants were still settling into their chair and task and therefore, we considered the first minute not a true representation of physiological baseline. In cases where there was a clear spike in HR (e.g., because the participant coughed, talked, moved abruptly, etc), the average baseline HR was calculated from the maximum time available excluding any amount of time with disruptions.

#### **Regulation Duration.** Time to return to one’s heart rate baseline (regulation duration) was defined for each regulation period as the amount of time it took from the beginning of regulation for the continuously monitored HR to reach a value that was lower or equal to the average baseline HR. If the person started the regulation period below the average baseline, we coded the return to baseline as “never stressed” and did not include it in analyses. If the participant never returned to baseline in the 600 s allocated to the regulation period, we set the return to baseline time to be 600. This data was analyzed with mixed models ANOVA which requires covarying the baseline measurement of the outcome. To create a baseline value for regulation duration, we measured the time it took during the habituation period for the person to return to HR baseline after increased arousal induced by neurostimulation. If the person was not above HR baseline at the beginning of neurostimulation, this covariate was set to 0. If the person never returned to HR baseline during habituation, the covariate was set to 600. At follow up, regulation duration was defined identically. Because only one measurement of regulation duration was achieved, a simpler ANOVA model was planned and a baseline value for this outcome was not needed. An additional difference was that the maximum value the variable could take was 300 s.

**Statistical Analyses**

All analyses compared the effect of sham to active rTMS over the left and right dlPFC. Preliminary analyses including analysis of variance (ANOVA) and chi square tests were conducted to assess demographic differences between groups. We also examined any differences between groups on randomization variables (gender, use of medication) and other potential confounding variables like presence of a depressive disorder, dissociation during regulation, or arousal induced by rTMS alone. Significant differences were included in subsequent analyses as covariates. Planned covariates included baseline measurements of the outcomes. Analyses were conducted using SPSS version 25.0.

Mixed-effects hierarchical linear models (MMANOVA) with analytically determined covariance structures were used to analyze the repeated measures data (58). All MMANOVA models used a restricted estimated maximum likelihood model to account for missing data (59) (i.e., cases with missing data were not discarded, but slopes for each participant were computed with the data available). Estimated marginal means (EMMs) were compared using LSD corrections for significant main and interaction effects. Effect sizes for these models were computed using Feingold’s formula (60) and interpreted using Cohen’s (61) specifications.

To test immediate effects of the intervention, we conducted three analyses examining HF-HRV, regulation duration, and SUDS. The treatment condition (active left, active right, or sham), the experimental condition (regulation 1, 2, and 3), the time within each experimental condition (coded 0-4 for each 120 s segment within that period) were used to predict HF-HRV. Baseline HF-HRV was measured at the beginning of the experiment (session baseline) and right before each autobiographical stressor presentation (pre-stimulus baseline). Because active rTMS may have cumulative effects (62) that could influence the pre-stimulus baselines we included both session baseline and pre-stimulus baseline as covariates in the analyses. Because the two HF-HRV values extracted from each baseline (one from the last 120 s, one from the middle 120s) were very highly correlated (*r*s ranging from .93 to .98, *p*s < .001), we only included one of the values for each session and pre-stimulus baseline, corresponding to the last 120 s of the baseline. A MMANOVA examining regulation duration during each regulation period was also conducted using treatment condition, experimental condition, and return to emotional baseline during habituation as predictors.

SUDS data were collected and analyzed with two main questions in mind: (a) were the procedures successful in getting participants to feel increased distress after the autobiographical stressors presentation and decreased distress after regulation, and (b) did participants experience lower distress after rTMS enhanced CR when compared to CR alone. Therefore, all SUDS values collected after each pre-stimulus baseline, stressor, and regulation period during the combined intervention were included in the analysis. SUDS after habituation were covaried as the closest ‘baseline’ measurement before the intervention began. Treatment condition, time period of the experiment (post-baseline, post-habituation, post-stressor 1, post-regulation 1, etc.), were used to predict SUDS throughout the experiment. Two generalized estimated equations models (GEE) (63) using ordinal logistic models and an independent covariance structure examined differences between treatment conditions in side effects.

To test near-term effects of the intervention two hierarchical linear models (HLM) (64) were used to examine condition differences in SUDS and use of CR during the ambulatory assessments. Data was aggregated by either obtaining a mean (SUDS) or a sum (use of CR – yes/no) for that day’s data. To include a baseline covariate in the SUDS model, we utilized the SUDS rating at the beginning of the intervention day (before any procedures were conducted) which was also the day before the ambulatory assessment started. We used intake ERQ reappraisal as the baseline for the ambulatory CR use analysis.

To test the long-term effects of the intervention, six MMANOVA models were conducted: four examining between-condition differences at the 1-week and 1-month follow-up assessments in ERQ, DERS, OQ-45, and WSAS; and two examining HF-HRV and SUDS during the follow-up stressor task. An ANCOVA examined differences in time period to return to baseline at follow up. For the longitudinal self-reports (DERS, OQ-45, WSAS, and ERQ Reappraisal), intake measurements were used as covariates in the analyses. HF-HRV was extracted from the first 120 s period and the next 120 s period out of the total 300 s regulation period. The treatment condition and baseline HF-HRV (extracted from the last 2-min of baseline) were added as covariates. Treatment condition, time period in the follow-up stressor task (post-baseline, post stressor, post regulation), SUDS baseline (collected at the beginning of the 1-month follow-up day) were used to predict SUDS at follow up. In addition, we conducted a univariate general linear model examining differences between conditions in the time it took to return to baseline during the regulation period at follow up. No covariates were included.

**Missing data**

One participant had incomplete HF-HRV data for the last regulation period during intervention because the participant wanted to finish early. One participant did not complete the 1-week follow-up battery of self-reports, and one participant missed filing in the WSAS at intake. Two people completed their one-month follow-up assessment online and therefore do not have HF-HRV and regulation duration data for this assessment point. Two participants were lost to contact by the one-month follow-up and did not complete self-reports. Of the 2133 calls placed during the ambulatory assessment, participants did not answer 735 calls, provided invalid data on 5 calls, and were not called because of administrative problems in 4 instances (29.50% of calls). Three participants missed a full day of calls (i.e., did not answer any call), and one participant missed 2 full days of calls.
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