



International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	ELECTROTHERAPY AND NEUROMODULATION MODALITIES IN MODERN PSYCHIATRY
----------------------	--

DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(51).2026.6624
------------	---

RECEIVED	21 June 2026
-----------------	--------------

ACCEPTED	17 September 2026
-----------------	-------------------

PUBLISHED	21 September 2026
------------------	-------------------

LICENSE	
----------------	--



The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**.

© The author(s) 2026.

This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

ELECTROTHERAPY AND NEUROMODULATION MODALITIES IN MODERN PSYCHIATRY

Radosław Swędrak (Corresponding Author, Email: ralph00063@gmail.com)

Private practice, Zgierz, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0007-0991-1088

Zuzanna Dobrakowska

Private practice, Wrocław, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0009-2413-6627

Jakub Klepacz

Private practice, Łódź, Poland

ORCID ID: 0009-0009-2448-6790

ABSTRACT

Psychiatric disorders, led by major depressive disorder, bipolar affective disorder, treatment-resistant depression (TRD), and severe anxiety spectrum conditions, constitute a foremost contributor to global disease burden and societal disability. While monoaminergic psychopharmacology and evidence-based psychotherapies remain foundational therapeutic pillars, up to one-third of clinical cohorts fail to achieve functional remission, presenting with persistent chronicity, pharmacoresistance, and debilitating side-effect profiles. Electrotherapy and bioelectrical neuromodulation have re-emerged as critical, biologically targeted interventions capable of directly modulating aberrant neural circuitry and network dysconnectivity. This comprehensive review synthesizes empirical and technological developments (2019–2026) across the spectrum of psychiatric brain stimulation modalities. We evaluate hospital-based interventions—specifically the refinement of Electroconvulsive Therapy (ECT) through ultra-brief pulse paradigms and cognitive-sparing geometries—alongside non-invasive transcranial electrical stimulation (tES) modalities, including transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS), transcranial Alternating Current Stimulation (tACS), and transcranial Random Noise Stimulation (tRNS). Furthermore, we examine peripheral neuromodulation via transcutaneous auricular Vagus Nerve Stimulation (taVNS), the synergistic integration of neurostimulation with Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (neural priming), and the decentralization of care toward home-based, remotely monitored tele-tDCS platforms. By evaluating neurobiological mechanisms, synaptic plasticity, health economics, regulatory hurdles, and persistent societal stigma, this review demonstrates that modern electrotherapy represents a precise, scalable, and indispensable domain in contemporary interdisciplinary psychiatry.

KEYWORDS

Electrotherapy, Neuromodulation, Electroconvulsive Therapy, Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation, Transcutaneous Vagus Nerve Stimulation, Treatment-Resistant Depression, Neuroplasticity, Tele-Psychiatry.

CITATION

Swędrak, R., Dobrakowska, Z., & Klepacz, J. (2026). Electrotherapy and neuromodulation modalities in modern psychiatry. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*, 3(51). [https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3\(51\).2026.6624](https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(51).2026.6624)

COPYRIGHT

© The author(s) 2026. This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

1. Introduction

Mental health conditions represent a critical public health and socioeconomic challenge across contemporary global societies. Major Depressive Disorder (MDD), Bipolar Affective Disorder (BD), Treatment-Resistant Depression (TRD), Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD), and severe anxiety and trauma-related conditions impose substantial long-term functional impairment, cognitive decline, reduced life expectancy, and escalating direct and indirect economic costs (American Psychiatric Association, 2022; Bandelow et al., 2023). For over six decades, clinical psychiatry has relied primarily on psychopharmacology centered on monoaminergic neurotransmission alongside evidence-based modalities such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT). However, systemic delivery hurdles, persistent pharmacoresistance, severe systemic adverse effects, and substantial treatment non-adherence highlight the urgent requirement for alternative, network-level neurobiological interventions (Brunoni et al., 2017a).

1.1. The Therapeutic Void: Pharmacoresistance and the Limits of Monoaminergic Models

The foundational paradigm of modern psychopharmacology—the monoamine hypothesis—posits that depressive and affective symptomatology stems primarily from absolute or functional deficits in central serotonergic, noradrenergic, and dopaminergic neurotransmission. While selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs), and atypical antipsychotics provide substantial therapeutic relief for many patients, a critical proportion of individuals fail to attain full symptom remission (Brunoni et al., 2017b).

Data derived from landmark real-world longitudinal trials, such as the Sequenced Treatment Alternatives to Relieve Depression (STAR*D) trial and subsequent modern meta-analyses, demonstrate that:

- Approximately 30% to 35% of individuals presenting with major depressive episodes do not achieve clinical remission despite multiple sequential, adequately dosed pharmacotherapeutic trials combined with evidence-based augmentation strategies, thereby meeting criteria for Treatment-Resistant Depression (TRD) (Kellner et al., 2020b).
- Each successive pharmacological trial is associated with progressively lower remission probabilities and heightened rates of treatment discontinuation due to adverse side effects, including metabolic dysfunction, sexual dysfunction, weight gain, gastrointestinal disturbances, and cognitive blunting.
- Prolonged untreated or partially treated affective morbidity leads to cumulative neurostructural damage, marked by hippocampal volume loss, prefrontal cortical thinning, neuroinflammatory cascade activation, and progressive reduction in brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) signaling (Abbott et al., 2021).

These clinical realities demonstrate that psychiatric disorders are not merely neurochemical imbalances localized to synaptic clefts, but complex, distributed network channelopathies and dysregulations of large-scale functional brain circuits (such as the default mode network, central executive network, and salience network) (Fregni et al., 2021). Modulating these complex circuitries requires modalities capable of exerting direct, spatial, and temporal electrophysiological influence over cortical excitability and neural oscillations.

1.2. The Renaissance of Electrotherapy and Bioelectrical Medicine

In response to the limitations of systemic pharmacological approaches, the field of psychiatric medicine is experiencing a major renaissance in electrotherapy and bioelectrical neuromodulation. Rather than relying exclusively on chemical ligands to cross the blood-brain barrier and diffuse non-specifically throughout the entire central nervous system, electroceuticals and brain stimulation technologies utilize controlled electrical fields, ionic currents, and frequency-specific oscillations to target pathological neural circuits directly (Bikson et al., 2018).

Historically, electrotherapy in psychiatry was largely synonymous with classical Electroconvulsive Therapy (ECT). While ECT remains the gold-standard acute intervention for severe, life-threatening, catatonic, or acutely suicidal psychiatric presentations, early implementations were encumbered by high cognitive adverse-effect burdens and intense public stigmatization (Lisanby, 2007). Over the past two decades, profound engineering innovations, computerized pulse titration, and advanced electrode montage configurations have dramatically refined hospital-based convulsive therapy (Kellner et al., 2020a).

Simultaneously, the development of sub-convulsive, non-invasive transcranial electrical stimulation (tES) techniques—encompassing transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS), transcranial alternating current stimulation (tACS), and transcranial random noise stimulation (tRNS)—alongside peripheral neuromodulation modalities like transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation (taVNS), has introduced low-cost, exceptionally well-tolerated, and portable tools into the psychiatric armamentarium (Brunoni et al., 2017a).

1.3. Technological Transitions: From Hospital Suites to Home-Based Digital Health Ecosystems

The field of electroceutical psychiatry is undergoing a profound structural shift: transitioning from centralized, highly specialized hospital-based operating suites to outpatient clinics, and increasingly into decentralized, patient-administered domestic environments (Home-Based / Tele-Neuromodulation) (Charvet et al., 2020).

This decentralization is enabled by several concurrent engineering and digital health breakthroughs:

- The development of miniaturized, lightweight, battery-operated stimulation hardware equipped with automated current limiters and impedance-monitoring biosensors (Bikson et al., 2016).
- The integration of digital telemedicine platforms and cloud-based clinician dashboards that allow psychiatrists to remotely program stimulation parameters, enforce strict session-to-session compliance limits (dose control), and monitor patient symptom progression in real time (Charvet et al., 2020).
- The combination of electrical stimulation with concurrent behavioral interventions, such as digital Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (dCBT) and cognitive remediation tasks, exploiting stimulation-induced windows of enhanced synaptic plasticity (neural priming) (Cates et al., 2021).

1.4. Objective and Scope of the Review

Despite rapid clinical and technological progress, the contemporary psychiatric literature frequently compartmentalizes electrotherapy—separating hospital-based convulsive procedures from ambulatory transcranial currents and emerging peripheral nerve stimulation platforms.

Therefore, this comprehensive review provides an integrated, translational synthesis of the literature published between 2019 and 2026 across the full spectrum of electrotherapeutic modalities in modern psychiatry. The review is structured around key thematic pillars:

- Conventional Inpatient Electrotherapy: Evaluating modern optimizations in Electroconvulsive Therapy (ECT), specifically ultra-brief pulse width parameters, unilateral vs. bilateral lead placements, and cognitive protection strategies.
- Transcranial Electrical Stimulation Modalities: Synthesizing clinical efficacy and neurobiological mechanisms of tDCS, tACS, and tRNS in major depressive disorder, bipolar depression, anxiety spectra, and neurocognitive deficits.
- Peripheral and Cranial Nerve Neuromodulation: Exploring the mechanistic and clinical applications of transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation (taVNS) and its modulation of ascending brainstem-limbic circuits.
- Multimodal and Combinatorial Paradigms: Analyzing the synergistic integration of electrical brain stimulation with psychotherapeutic and cognitive training protocols.
- Decentralization and Digital Tele-Stimulation: Reviewing home-based tele-tDCS architectures, safety frameworks, device security, and compliance monitoring.
- Socioeconomic, Regulatory, and De-Stigmatization Dimensions: Evaluating health economic cost-utility profiles, medical device reimbursement pathways, and strategies to overcome historical societal stigma.

By bridging clinical neuropsychiatry, computational neuroscience, biomedical engineering, and health economics, this review articulates a cohesive framework for electrotherapy as an essential pillar of modern, evidence-based psychiatric practice.

2. Methodology

This review follows an interdisciplinary, structured evidence synthesis framework designed to evaluate the clinical efficacy, neurobiological mechanisms, biomedical engineering principles, and socioeconomic impact of electrotherapeutic and bioelectrical neuromodulation modalities across psychiatric conditions (Page et al., 2021). The methodology bridges experimental neuroscience, clinical psychiatry, medical device engineering, and health economics.

2.1. Search Strategy and Information Sources

A systematic literature search was executed across five primary electronic databases to ensure comprehensive multidisciplinary coverage:

- **PubMed/MEDLINE:** For randomized controlled trials (RCTs), open-label clinical investigations, meta-analyses, and neurobiological studies on central and peripheral brain stimulation.
- **PsycINFO (American Psychological Association):** For behavioral outcomes, cognitive-affective metrics, psychotherapeutic combination protocols, and psychological adherence measures.
- **IEEE Xplore:** For biomedical instrumentation, current density modeling, electrode-tissue impedance dynamics, waveform engineering, and wireless tele-neuromodulation architectures.
- **Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL):** For high-quality clinical trial data, systematic reviews, and meta-analytic evidence across psychiatric indications.
- **Scopus & Web of Science:** For health economics, cost-effectiveness analyses, quality of life (QALY) assessments, medical device regulatory frameworks, and societal stigma research.

The search window encompassed peer-reviewed literature published between **January 1, 2019, and August 2026**. This timeframe was established to capture contemporary advances in ultra-brief pulse electroconvulsive therapy, modern multi-channel and high-definition transcranial current stimulation (HD-tES), closed-loop algorithmic systems, and the post-2020 transition toward home-based, decentralized tele-neuromodulation.

2.2. Eligibility Criteria and PICO Framework

Study selection was guided by a rigorous PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome) framework (Page et al., 2021):

- **Population (P):** Clinical populations (adolescents and adults) diagnosed with major psychiatric disorders according to validated diagnostic criteria (DSM-5, DSM-5-TR, ICD-10, or ICD-11), including Major Depressive Disorder (MDD), Treatment-Resistant Depression (TRD), Bipolar Affective Disorder (depressive, mixed, or manic episodes), Schizophrenia spectrum disorders, Catatonia, Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD), or severe Anxiety/Trauma-related disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 2022).
- **Intervention (I):** Non-invasive, minimally invasive, or convulsive bioelectrical neuromodulation therapies, including:
 - Electroconvulsive Therapy (ECT) with quantified pulse-width parameters (brief pulse, ultra-brief pulse) and documented lead geometries (bitemporal, right unilateral, bifrontal).
 - Transcranial Electrical Stimulation (tES), encompassing tDCS, tACS, and tRNS delivered via clinic-based or home-based/tele-monitored platforms.
 - Peripheral cranial nerve stimulation, specifically transcutaneous auricular Vagus Nerve Stimulation (taVNS).
 - Combinatorial paradigms pairing electrical stimulation with concurrent psychotherapy (CBT) or cognitive remediation.
- **Comparator (C):** Sham stimulation controls (active or inactive sham), active pharmacological comparators, standard psychotherapy, treatment-as-usual (TAU), baseline pre-post comparisons, or alternative stimulation dosing/montage parameters.
- **Outcomes (O):** Primary outcomes included changes in validated psychiatric symptom severity scales (e.g., HAM-D, MADRS, YMRS, PANSS, Y-BOCS, HAM-A). Secondary outcomes comprised response and remission rates, neurocognitive performance metrics (working memory, executive function, retrograde/anterograde amnesia indices), safety and tolerability profiles, treatment adherence/compliance rates, and health economic endpoints (cost-utility, ICERs, hospital readmission rates).

Inclusion Criteria:

- Peer-reviewed original research articles, randomized controlled trials (RCTs), prospective cohort studies, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and high-impact biomedical engineering proceedings.
- Studies published in the English language.
- Interventions delivering quantifiable electrical currents (milliamperes or millicoulombs) directly to the scalp or auricular branches with clear dosimetric reporting (Bikson et al., 2018).

Exclusion Criteria:

- Non-peer-reviewed commentaries, editorials, letters lacking primary empirical data, and non-scientific web reports.
- Exclusively non-electrical neuromodulation techniques (e.g., standard transcranial magnetic stimulation [TMS] or deep brain stimulation [DBS] hardware trials), except where used as direct comparative benchmarks for electrotherapy.
- Preclinical animal studies lacking direct translational clinical modeling.
- Studies with unverified or uncalibrated stimulation parameters failing basic electrical safety standards (Antal et al., 2017).

2.3. Data Extraction and Thematic Synthesis

Identified records underwent systematic screening, de-duplication, and multi-stage appraisal (title/abstract screening followed by full-text evaluation). Data extraction was organized across six translational thematic domains:

1. **Inpatient and Hospital-Based Refinements:** Dosimetric optimization in ECT, pulse-width modulation (brief vs. ultra-brief), charge titration, and cognitive-sparing electrode placements.
2. **Transcranial Sub-Threshold Modalities:** Cortical excitability shifts, long-term potentiation-like (LTP-like) neuroplasticity, oscillatory entrainment, and clinical trial outcomes in tDCS, tACS, and tRNS.
3. **Peripheral Autonomic Modulation:** Brainstem-to-cortex ascending pathways engaged by taVNS, locus coeruleus-norepinephrine activation, and neuroinflammatory modulation.
4. **Multimodal Combinations (Neural Priming):** Mechanistic synergies between electrical cortical polarization and concurrent cognitive-behavioral or neurocognitive interventions.
5. **Decentralized and Remote Neurostimulation:** Device engineering, automated cloud-based compliance architectures, safety limiters, and real-world viability of home-based tele-tDCS.
6. **Health Economics, Regulation, and Societal Stigma:** Cost-effectiveness modeling, medical device clearance pathways, reimbursement frameworks, and the de-stigmatization of psychiatric electrotherapy.

3. Conventional and Hospital-based Electrotherapy: Optimizing Electroconvulsive Therapy (Ect)

Electroconvulsive Therapy (ECT) remains the most rapid, robust, and empirically validated acute intervention across interventional psychiatry (Lisanby, 2007). Primarily indicated for severe Treatment-Resistant Depression (TRD), acute suicidal crises, bipolar mania, and life-threatening catatonic states, ECT achieves response rates between 70% and 85% in cohorts where multiple lines of psychopharmacotherapy have failed (Kellner et al., 2020a). Despite its unparalleled clinical potency, the historical trajectory of ECT has been complicated by neurocognitive side effects—predominantly retrograde amnesia, anterograde memory impairment, and executive dysfunction—alongside persistent socio-cultural stigma (Semkovska & McLoughlin, 2010). Over the past decade, bioengineering innovations and dosimetric modeling have fundamentally transformed ECT into a precision neurostimulation tool, shifting clinical practice from empirical high-charge delivery toward customized, cognitive-sparing seizure induction (Prudic, 2019).

3.1. Waveform Engineering: From Sine Waves to Brief and Ultra-Brief Pulse Protocols

The physiological objective of ECT is to deliver an electrical current across the scalp that surpasses the individual's seizure threshold (ST), triggering a generalized, therapeutic cerebral seizure lasting at least 20 to 25 seconds of electroencephalographic (EEG) activity. Historically, legacy machines utilized uninterrupted sinusoidal alternating currents (sine-wave ECT). While effective at inducing generalized convulsions, sine waves deliver electrical energy continuously during both the absolute refractory period and the hyperpolarized phases of neuronal membranes, causing substantial suprathreshold electrical dispersion and profound neurocognitive toxicity (Prudic, 2019).

Contemporary clinical practice relies exclusively on square-wave brief-pulse and ultra-brief-pulse stimulation engines:

- **Brief-Pulse ECT (0.5 to 1.5 milliseconds):** Brief-pulse parameters deliver discrete rectangular waveforms that closely match the chronaxie of human cortical neuronal axons. Compared to sine-wave paradigms, brief-pulse delivery achieves equivalent seizure duration and clinical remission rates while decreasing the total delivered electrical energy by up to 50%, significantly reducing the duration of post-ictal disorientation and the severity of anterograde memory deficits (Sackeim et al., 2020).

- **Ultra-Brief-Pulse ECT (0.25 to 0.3 milliseconds):** Ultra-brief pulse stimulation utilizes extremely narrow electrical pulses that fire within the physiological depolarizing window of cortical pyramidal neurons. By avoiding electrical delivery during the relative and absolute neuronal refractory periods, ultra-brief ECT markedly minimizes cumulative intracerebral current density (Tor et al., 2015).

Clinical trials and prospective cohort studies indicate that ultra-brief ECT—particularly when applied via right unilateral (RUL) lead geometries—substantially preserves retrograde autobiographical memory and minimizes anterograde learning impairment compared to standard brief-pulse bitemporal delivery (Sackeim et al., 2020). While some meta-analytic evaluations note that ultra-brief protocols may require a slightly higher number of total treatment sessions (1 to 2 additional treatments) to achieve full clinical remission, the cognitive-sparing advantage makes ultra-brief ECT the preferred first-line configuration for maintenance of occupational and daily memory functioning (Tor et al., 2015).

3.2. Electrode Montage Geometries and Current Distribution Modeling

Alongside pulse-width engineering, the spatial arrangement of stimulating electrodes dictates the anatomical distribution of the induced electric field (SE-field) and the relative engagement of cognitive versus therapeutic brain regions. Modern computational finite element method (FEM) modeling has clarified how distinct electrode montages influence current shunting through the skull and cerebrospinal fluid (Saturnino et al., 2015):

- **Bitemporal (BT) Placement:** Electrodes are placed bilaterally on the frontotemporal scalp regions, centered 2 to 3 cm above the midpoint of an imaginary line between the external auditory meatus and the outer canthus of the eye. While BT placement remains the gold standard for immediate emergency stabilization (e.g., severe psychotic depression or malignant catatonia) due to rapid therapeutic onset, the high current concentration delivered directly across the medial temporal lobes, hippocampi, and entorhinal cortices accounts for its higher incidence of transient amnesia (Kolshus et al., 2017).

- **Right Unilateral (RUL) d'Elia Placement:** To spare the language-dominant left cerebral hemisphere, RUL placement positions one electrode over the right frontotemporal region and the second electrode on the right centroparietal vertex. Delivering high-dose RUL stimulation (typically 5 to 6 times the initial seizure threshold) matches the antidepressant response rates of bitemporal ECT while sparing left-hemispheric verbal memory networks (Sackeim et al., 2020).

- **Bifrontal (BF) Placement:** Electrodes are positioned symmetrically 4 to 5 cm above the outer canthus of each eye on the lateral aspects of the forehead. This geometry directs the maximum electrical vector toward the anterior prefrontal cortices while minimizing current penetration into the deeper temporal and hippocampal structures. Controlled trials show that bifrontal ECT provides comparable clinical remission rates to bitemporal placement with significantly faster cognitive recovery times (Prudic, 2019).

3.3. Neurobiological Mechanisms: Synaptogenesis, BDNF Signaling, and Network Resetting

The therapeutic mechanism of ECT extends far beyond non-specific seizure discharge. Modern molecular psychiatry and neuroimaging reveal that ECT induces multi-scale neurobiological cascades that restore disrupted neurocircuitry:

- **Neurotrophic Priming and Structural Plasticity:** Generalized seizure activity triggers a surge in circulating and central Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor (BDNF) and vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF). Longitudinal magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI and volumetric MRI) demonstrates transient, significant volume increases in the hippocampus, amygdala, and anterior cingulate cortex following a standard index course (8 to 12 sessions) (Abbott et al., 2021). This neurogenesis and dendritic spine proliferation directly reverse the stress-induced atrophy characteristic of chronic treatment-resistant depression.

- **The Neuroendocrine and Anticonvulsant Hypothesis:** Successful ECT courses lead to a paradoxical elevation in the seizure threshold over time, accompanied by enhanced gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA)-mediated cortical inhibition and elevated neuropeptide Y concentrations. This enhanced inhibitory tone dampens hyperactive cortico-limbic circuits (Abbott et al., 2021).

- **Functional Connectome Reconfiguration:** High-resolution connectomic studies demonstrate that ECT normalizes hyper-connectivity within the Default Mode Network (DMN)—a circuit linked to depressive rumination and self-referential distress—while restoring functional coupling between the Central Executive Network (CEN) and the Salience Network (SN) (Abbott et al., 2021).

3.4. Maintenance ECT (mECT) and Continuation Protocols

Because Major Depressive Disorder and bipolar depression are recurrent disorders, achieving acute remission with an index course of ECT is frequently followed by high relapse rates (up to 40–50% within six months) if active continuation strategies are not deployed (Kellner et al., 2020b).

Modern continuation (cECT) and maintenance (mECT) protocols combine scheduled outpatient treatments (titrated from weekly to biweekly, and eventually monthly sessions) with concurrent pharmacotherapy (such as lithium or nortriptyline). Maintenance ECT prevents affective recurrence, preserves functional independence, and significantly lowers psychiatric re-hospitalization rates over multi-year follow-up intervals without producing cumulative or progressive cognitive decline (Valle, 2020).

4. Transcranial Electrical Stimulation: tDCS, tACS, and tRNS

Non-invasive transcranial electrical stimulation (tES) encompasses sub-threshold neuromodulatory techniques that deliver weak electrical currents, typically ranging from 0.5 to 2.5 milliamperes, directly through the intact scalp to alter cortical excitability and modulate distributed neural network dynamics (Fertonani & Miniussi, 2017). Unlike Electroconvulsive Therapy, tES techniques do not directly elicit action potentials or trigger seizure activity. Instead, they modulate resting membrane potentials and entrain endogenous oscillatory rhythms, inducing long-lasting neuroplastic modifications via mechanisms analogous to Long-Term Potentiation (LTP) and Long-Term Depression (LTD) (Lefaucheur et al., 2017). This chapter evaluates the electrophysiological foundations, biophysical mechanisms, and clinical evidence underpinning the three primary tES modalities.

4.1. Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS): Polarity-Dependent Excitability and Clinical Efficacy

Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation utilizes constant, low-amplitude direct electrical current delivered via surface electrodes. The primary mechanism relies on sub-threshold polarization of neuronal transmembrane potentials. Under the anode, inward electrical currents generate sub-membrane depolarization, increasing the spontaneous firing rate of cortical pyramidal neurons and heightening regional excitability (Nitsche & Paulus, 2000). Conversely, beneath the cathode, outward currents induce hyperpolarization, dampening spontaneous neuronal discharge. Prolonged stimulation induces neuroplastic after-effects driven by calcium-dependent glutamatergic signaling and the upregulation of Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor (BDNF) (Bikson et al., 2016).

Clinical applications of tDCS are primarily focused on reversing focal hypoactivity across distinct psychiatric presentations:

- **Major Depressive Disorder (MDD):** The standard therapeutic configuration targets the hypoactive left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (L-DLPFC) with the anodal electrode. Clinical trials confirm that a standard course of tDCS yields significant antidepressant efficacy with response rates between 40% and 55%, demonstrating non-inferiority to standard second-generation antidepressants (Brunoni et al., 2017b; Razza et al., 2020).

- **Bipolar Depression:** Growing evidence supports the utility of tDCS in bipolar depression, where manic switch rates remain exceedingly low and are statistically comparable to sham stimulation (Razza et al., 2020).

- **Cognitive Remediation:** Anodal prefrontal tDCS consistently enhances executive functioning, working memory accuracy, and psychomotor processing speed across both affective and schizophrenia-spectrum cohorts (Dedoncker et al., 2016; Kuo & Nitsche, 2012).

4.2. Transcranial Alternating Current Stimulation (tACS): Entraining Endogenous Neural Oscillations

While tDCS delivers constant polarity to shift baseline excitability, Transcranial Alternating Current Stimulation (tACS) administers sinusoidal electrical currents at specific frequencies, alternating polarity at predetermined temporal intervals. Rather than inducing tonic membrane shifts, tACS directly interacts with endogenous, frequency-matched rhythmic neural firing through the principles of phase-locking and spike-timing-dependent plasticity (Herrmann et al., 2016). Because pathological brain states are often characterized by disruptions in large-scale electrophysiological oscillatory communication, tACS allows clinicians to precisely target and entrain specific cortical rhythms (Frohlich, 2015):

- **Theta-Band tACS (4–8 Hz):** Applied over the fronto-parietal axis, theta stimulation synchronizes working memory circuits, improves cognitive control, and facilitates the retrieval of extinguished fear memories in anxiety disorders (Herrmann et al., 2016).
- **Alpha-Band tACS (8–12 Hz):** Depression and chronic anxiety are marked by frontal alpha asymmetry. Applying 10 Hz alpha-tACS across bilateral prefrontal regions normalizes hemispheric asymmetry, decreases rumination, and promotes emotional regulation.
- **Gamma-Band tACS (30–80 Hz):** Gamma oscillations facilitate local information binding and attentional gating. High-frequency fronto-temporal tACS has demonstrated preliminary efficacy in mitigating auditory verbal hallucinations in schizophrenia (Frohlich, 2015).

4.3. Transcranial Random Noise Stimulation (tRNS): Stochastic Resonance and Cortical Desensitization

Transcranial Random Noise Stimulation represents a specialized form of alternating current stimulation wherein electrical currents are delivered at randomly alternating frequencies across a wide acoustic spectrum following a Gaussian distribution. The core mechanism underlying tRNS is stochastic resonance—a non-linear physical phenomenon wherein the introduction of an optimal level of background electrical noise enhances the detection and throughput of weak sub-threshold physiological signals within neural networks (Inukai et al., 2016). High-frequency tRNS repeatedly disrupts the cell membrane potential, preventing the complete closing of voltage-gated sodium channels. This increases the total influx of intracellular sodium ions, facilitating sustained membrane depolarization and boosting cortical excitability without generating polarity-dependent directional biases. Clinically, tRNS produces rapid behavioral effects with exceptionally low perceptual skin sensations, minimizing cutaneous tingling and optimizing double-blind sham protocols. It has shown significant promise in improving visual attention, arithmetic learning, and acute symptom reduction in treatment-resistant obsessive-compulsive disorder (Inukai et al., 2016).

4.4. High-Definition tES (HD-tES) and Computational Current Density Modeling

A historical limitation of conventional tES lies in its spatial diffuseness. Standard sponge electrodes induce broad electrical current shunting through the scalp and cerebrospinal fluid, dispersing the maximum electrical field across non-targeted cortical structures. High-Definition tES (HD-tES) resolves this spatial limitation by replacing large pads with miniature sintered silver/silver chloride ring electrodes arranged in specific multi-channel arrays, most commonly a 4x1 montage (Saturnino et al., 2015). In this architecture, a central active electrode is surrounded by four return electrodes that constrain the electrical field strictly to the targeted gyral crown. Utilizing individualized structural MRI scans, computational finite element method (FEM) modeling constructs three-dimensional anatomical head models (Truong et al., 2013). This allows clinicians to deliver focal electrical currents directly to specific nodes within the Central Executive Network or Salience Network, minimizing off-target stimulation and maximizing clinical precision (Bikson et al., 2018).

5. Peripheral and Transcutaneous Neuromodulation: Transcutaneous Auricular Vagus Nerve Stimulation (taVNS)

While transcranial modalities apply electric fields directly across the scalp to engage cerebral cortical layers, neuromodulation of peripheral cranial nerves provides an indirect, bottom-up pathway to alter central neurocircuitry. The tenth cranial nerve (Vagus Nerve, CN X) represents the primary neural conduit of the parasympathetic autonomic nervous system, transmitting bidirectional visceral, inflammatory, and emotional regulatory signals between somatic organ systems and the brainstem. Historically, Vagus Nerve Stimulation (VNS) required invasive surgical implantation of a subclavicular pulse generator. While surgically implanted VNS received regulatory clearance for Treatment-Resistant Depression (TRD), its clinical adoption was severely constrained by perioperative risks, surgical morbidity, and high hardware costs. Over the past decade, the emergence of Transcutaneous Auricular Vagus Nerve Stimulation (taVNS) has established a non-invasive, cost-effective, and safe bioelectrical interface capable of engaging ascending vagal pathways without surgical intervention (Rong et al., 2016).

5.1. Anatomical Foundations and the Auricular Gateway

The human ear represents the sole surface location on the body where the cutaneous sensory branch of the vagus nerve—the Auricular Branch of the Vagus Nerve (ABVN)—projects directly to superficial epithelial layers. Detailed micro-dissection and functional neuroimaging studies confirm that the highest concentration of ABVN sensory axons innervates the cyma conchae, with mixed vagal-trigeminal innervation present in the cavum conchae and tragus (Sclocco et al., 2019). taVNS utilizes customized, ergonomic silicone ear-clips or intra-auricular earbud-style electrodes applied directly to the left cyma conchae. The left ear is universally selected in clinical protocols to prevent cardiac chronotropic adverse effects, as cardiac parasympathetic efferents controlling sinoatrial nodal firing originate primarily from the right vagal trunk. Standard clinical taVNS protocols deliver biphasic rectangular pulse waveforms with pulse widths of 200 to 500 microseconds, continuous or burst frequencies of 20 to 30 Hz, and current amplitudes titrated individually to a perceived strong, non-painful tingling sensation, typically ranging from 0.5 to 4.0 milliamperes (Badran et al., 2018).

5.2. Ascending Central Pathways: From Brainstem Nuclei to Limbic-Cortical Circuits

Unlike cortical stimulation, which exerts localized top-down influence, taVNS engages an ascending, bottom-up neuroarchitectural cascade. Afferent somatosensory action potentials elicited by electrical stimulation of the ABVN travel via the jugular ganglion directly into the brainstem, initiating a sequence of widespread neuromodulatory network activations:

- **Nucleus Tractus Solitarius (NTS):** Acting as the central gateway, the NTS receives the primary afferent signals and maintains dense excitatory glutamatergic projections to downstream monoaminergic hubs.
- **Locus Coeruleus (LC) Activation:** Projections to the LC, the principal noradrenergic synthesis hub, elevate widespread central norepinephrine turnover. This fundamentally modulates arousal, vigilance, and the cortical signal-to-noise ratio.
- **Limbic and Cortical Target Engagement:** Concurrent functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) demonstrates that active taVNS induces acute deactivation in the amygdala and hippocampus, paired with marked activation of the anterior insula, anterior cingulate cortex, and prefrontal cortices, effectively reversing the pathological cortico-limbic disconnectivity seen in chronic affective disorders (Fang et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2022).

5.3. Anti-Inflammatory Signaling: The Cholinergic Anti-Inflammatory Pathway (CAP)

A critical transdiagnostic pathophysiological feature of treatment-resistant depression, bipolar disorder, and trauma-related conditions is systemic low-grade neuroinflammation, manifested by elevated circulating pro-inflammatory cytokines (such as IL-6 and TNF- α) and microglial hyperactivity. taVNS combats this through the Cholinergic Anti-Inflammatory Pathway (Tracey, 2009). Stimulation of the vagal motor nucleus and celiac ganglion leads to splenic nerve activation and acetylcholine release. This acetylcholine binds to $\alpha 7$ nicotinic acetylcholine receptors expressed on the surface of splenic macrophages and monocytes. The resulting intracellular signaling cascade inhibits NF- κ B nuclear translocation, suppressing the systemic transcription and exocytosis of pro-inflammatory cytokines. By lowering circulating cytokine loads, taVNS dampens blood-brain barrier permeability, reduces central microglial activation, and preserves central monoamine synthesis and BDNF expression.

5.4. Clinical Efficacy Across Major Psychiatric Spectra

Clinical trials published between 2019 and 2026 have expanded the empirical evidence for taVNS across several core psychiatric indications, leveraging its dual capacity for autonomic recalibration and neuroinflammatory suppression:

- **Treatment-Resistant Depression (TRD):** Multi-center randomized sham-controlled trials utilizing daily home-administered or clinic-based taVNS demonstrate significant reductions on standard depression rating scales, achieving clinical response rates between 40% and 52% in mild-to-moderate and pharmacoresistant cohorts (Hein et al., 2013; Rong et al., 2016).
- **Generalized Anxiety Disorder and PTSD:** By dampening sympathetic hyperarousal and restoring vagal parasympathetic tone (often indexed by increases in High-Frequency Heart Rate Variability), taVNS significantly decreases somatic anxiety, panic scores, and hyperarousal clusters in post-traumatic stress cohorts.
- **Insomnia and Sleep Architecture:** Polysomnographic studies indicate that evening administration of taVNS enhances slow-wave sleep duration and deep non-rapid eye movement (NREM) stability by suppressing sympathetic tone and directly modulating hypothalamic sleep-wake centers (Garcia et al., 2017).

6. Multimodal Synergy: Combining Electrical Stimulation with Psychotherapy and Cognitive Training

While single-modality electrotherapy demonstrates substantial clinical efficacy, administering non-invasive neurostimulation in isolation does not fully exploit the state-dependent nature of human neuroplasticity. Modern cognitive neuroscience establishes that the functional consequences of electrical current delivery depend heavily on the baseline activation state of the targeted neural circuitry. Delivering sub-threshold electrical currents alters the neural environment, opening a temporal window of heightened synaptic malleability known as neural priming. By systematically pairing transcranial electrical stimulation (tES) or transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation (taVNS) with structured behavioral interventions—predominantly Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), exposure protocols, and computerized cognitive remediation—clinicians can achieve synergistic, multiplicative treatment effects that surpass the outcomes of either modality administered alone (Cates et al., 2021).

6.1. Neurobiological Principles of State-Dependency and Neural Priming

The physiological rationale for combining electrical brain stimulation with psychological interventions rests on the concept of activity-dependent synaptic plasticity and Hebbian learning rules. Transcranial direct current stimulation does not trigger *de novo* action potentials; rather, it shifts neuronal resting membrane potentials closer to the firing threshold (Bikson et al., 2013). When a patient concurrently engages in a specific cognitive or emotional task, such as reappraising a depressogenic thought, the specific neural ensembles dedicated to that task fire actively. The concurrent electrical field selectively amplifies synaptic throughput and NMDA receptor-mediated calcium influx within those actively firing circuits, facilitating robust long-term potentiation-like memory consolidation (Miniussi et al., 2013).

Furthermore, metaplasticity—the rule governing how prior synaptic activity sets the threshold for subsequent plasticity—dictates that applying tDCS prior to or during psychotherapeutic training lowers the induction threshold for adaptive cognitive restructuring. In treatment-resistant depression and anxiety, severe prefrontal hypoactivity impairs executive cognitive control, preventing patients from successfully applying top-down cognitive reframing techniques taught in traditional CBT. Anodal tDCS pre-activates the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, actively overcoming this hypofrontality and providing the neural capacity required for active cognitive engagement (Nejati et al., 2018).

6.2. Synergistic Protocols: tDCS-Augmented Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)

The integration of tDCS with standard CBT protocols has demonstrated significant clinical advantages across mood, anxiety, and obsessive-compulsive spectra by structurally reinforcing the specific neural pathways activated during psychological exercises (Rabany et al., 2022):

- **Depression and Cognitive Restructuring:** In randomized controlled trials comparing standard CBT alone, sham tDCS plus CBT, and active anodal L-DLPFC tDCS plus CBT, the combined active arm achieved significantly faster onset of antidepressant response and higher overall clinical remission rates (Bajbouj et al.,

2018). Stimulation applied during active CBT exercises enhances working memory capacity, enabling patients to identify automatic negative thoughts and execute cognitive reappraisal more effectively.

- **Fear Extinction and Exposure Therapy:** In anxiety disorders and PTSD, the therapeutic core is fear extinction, which relies on inhibitory learning mediated by the ventromedial prefrontal cortex. Applying anodal tDCS over the prefrontal cortex or pairing exposure with taVNS strengthens the consolidation of newly formed safety memories, significantly reducing fear reinstatement and spontaneous recovery (Cates et al., 2021).

- **Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD):** In severe OCD, combining cathodal inhibitory tDCS over the hyperactive Supplementary Motor Area (SMA) or orbitofrontal cortex with concurrent Exposure and Response Prevention (ERP) protocols leads to significant symptom reductions, neurobiologically assisting patients in resisting compulsive rituals during exposure (Cates et al., 2021).

6.3. Electro-Cognitive Remediation and Chronometry

Beyond affective regulation, cognitive deficits—including impaired executive functioning, reduced psychomotor processing speed, and compromised working memory—represent core residual symptoms in major depressive disorder and schizophrenia that frequently persist even after full affective symptom remission. Combining anodal L-DLPFC tDCS with computerized dual-task working memory training yields significant near-transfer improvements on the trained task and far-transfer generalization to overall fluid intelligence and daily occupational functioning (Dedoncker et al., 2016). Similarly, applying high-frequency tRNS across bilateral prefrontal cortices during attentional training accelerates learning acquisition rates via stochastic resonance, yielding cognitive enhancements that persist for several months post-intervention.

A fundamental parameter in designing these multimodal electro-behavioral protocols is temporal chronometry, defining the exact timing of stimulation relative to the psychological intervention. Delivering stimulation simultaneously ("online") during the execution of a cognitive task maximizes task-specific network engagement, guiding the electric field directly to the active synaptic connections involved in the therapeutic process (Martin et al., 2014). Conversely, sequential ("offline") protocols apply stimulation immediately prior to the session to prime resting cortical excitability, or immediately following an intensive exposure task to enhance memory consolidation cascades during the early protein-synthesis-dependent phase of long-term memory formation. While both approaches demonstrate clinical utility, comparative meta-analyses suggest that online simultaneous stimulation generally yields larger effect sizes in executive function and emotional regulation (Martin et al., 2014).

7. The Decentralization of Neurostimulation: Home-based and TELE-tDCS

Ecosystems

A persistent challenge in psychiatric neuromodulation is the necessity for frequent, daily clinic visits over extended durations, typically requiring twenty to thirty sessions over four to six weeks. This clinical workflow imposes significant travel burdens, scheduling disruptions, and financial costs on patients and caregivers, leading to high attrition rates among individuals with severe depression, mobility limitations, or geographic isolation. Advances in digital health technologies, secure cloud architectures, and biomedical hardware miniaturization have enabled the transition of non-invasive brain stimulation from specialized hospital suites directly into patients' domestic environments. Home-based, remotely supervised transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (Home-Based / Tele-tDCS) represents a decentralized model designed to scale clinical delivery while maintaining rigorous safety and treatment adherence (Palm et al., 2018).

7.1. Technical Architecture and Hardware Safety Engineering

Transitioning an electrical medical device to an unmonitored home environment introduces critical safety and compliance challenges. Unsupervised administration requires specialized hardware engineered with strict fail-safe mechanisms to prevent skin burns, over-stimulation, or parameter tampering. Clinical-grade home-tDCS devices integrate digital lockouts that prevent unauthorized current delivery (Bikson et al., 2020). Following a remote pre-session evaluation, the supervising clinician generates a unique, time-sensitive numeric code or encrypted authorization token transmitted via a secure mobile application. Once entered, the device delivers a single prescribed stimulation dose and locks automatically until the next scheduled session.

Furthermore, skin-electrode contact quality is critically maintained through automated, real-time dynamic impedance tracking. If impedance exceeds a strict safety threshold (typically $> 10\text{--}15\text{ k}\Omega$) due to drying sponge pads or poor scalp contact, the device alerts the user, ramps the current down, or aborts the session automatically (Kasschau et al., 2016). To prevent self-placement errors that could alter the targeted electric field, specialized pre-configured headstraps with integrated, keyed electrode receptacles ensure that anodal and cathodal pads are reliably positioned over designated cortical targets without requiring manual scalp measurements from the patient.

7.2. Clinical Protocols: Remotely Supervised Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (RS-tDCS)

To maintain the rigor of clinic-based interventions, standardized Remotely Supervised tDCS (RS-tDCS) frameworks govern the home administration workflow (Charvet et al., 2020). In synchronous tele-tDCS protocols, patients connect with a trained neurostimulation technician via HIPAA- and GDPR-compliant video conferencing. The clinician visually inspects electrode placement, confirms correct electrolyte wetting, and monitors the patient for adverse sensations throughout the 30-minute session. In contrast, for stable, long-term maintenance cohorts, asynchronous workflows allow patients to complete sessions independently following comprehensive baseline in-clinic training. In these asynchronous models, session completion logs, electrode impedance curves, and subjective side-effect ratings are transmitted automatically to a secure cloud-based electronic clinical registry for regular clinician review. These sessions are always preceded by mandatory digital symptom screeners that act as a safety gatekeeper, withholding stimulation authorization and triggering a clinician alert if red-flag symptoms are detected (Bikson et al., 2020).

7.3. Clinical Efficacy, Adherence, and Trial Evidence in Domestic Settings

Randomized sham-controlled and open-label clinical trials published between 2020 and 2026 have evaluated home-based tele-tDCS across major psychiatric indications, yielding robust real-world data that supports its widespread clinical adoption (Woodham et al., 2022):

- **Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) and TRD:** Multi-center trials evaluating fully remote or hybrid tele-tDCS demonstrate clinical response rates (45–55%) and remission rates (30–40%) equivalent to standard in-clinic tDCS protocols. Reductions on standard depression rating scales, such as the HAM-D and MADRS, remain stable during multi-month maintenance phases (Alonzo et al., 2019; Palm et al., 2018).
- **High Treatment Adherence:** Real-world compliance rates in remotely supervised home-based trials consistently exceed 85% to 90%, significantly outperforming traditional daily outpatient clinic attendance models by effectively eliminating daily transit and geographic barriers (Woodham et al., 2022).
- **Tolerability and Safety Profile:** Systematic reviews confirm that adverse events in home environments are mild, transient, and entirely comparable to clinic-based administration. The most frequently reported side effects include mild tingling, transient itching beneath the electrode pads, and minor scalp erythema, with zero reported incidents of severe electrical burns or induced seizures when standardized, locked-dosing hardware is utilized (Kasschau et al., 2016).

7.4. Integration with Mobile Health (mHealth) and Concurrent Digital Therapeutics

Finally, the home-based neurostimulation model enables seamless integration with broader digital health and mobile health (mHealth) ecosystems. Patients can engage in structured interactive digital cognitive-behavioral modules (dCBT) during the stimulation window, maximizing state-dependent neural priming in an accessible, home-delivered format. Concurrently, continuous digital phenotyping utilizing smartphone sensors and wearable biometrics—such as actigraphy, sleep tracking, voice acoustics, and heart rate variability—can passively monitor behavioral metrics throughout the treatment course. This provides clinicians with objective, real-world indicators of functional recovery and early warning signs of affective relapse, effectively closing the loop between decentralized neurostimulation delivery and precision outcome tracking (Charvet et al., 2020).

8. Socioeconomic, Regulatory, and Stigma Dimensions

The widespread translation of electrotherapy and neuromodulatory modalities from academic clinical research into routine public mental health infrastructures depends not only on empirical neurobiological efficacy but equally on macroeconomic cost-effectiveness, streamlined medical device regulatory pathways, and proactive public health strategies to dismantle historical societal stigma. Psychiatric illnesses impose massive direct medical costs alongside substantial indirect societal burdens resulting from chronic disability, workplace absenteeism, presenteeism, and premature mortality. While modern bioelectrical technologies—ranging from hospital-based convulsive therapy to decentralized home-use stimulators—offer direct mechanisms to bypass pharmacoresistance, their integration into clinical practice requires clear alignment with health economics, legal frameworks, and patient-centered bioethics (Chakrabarti, 2020).

8.1. Health Economic Evaluation: Cost-Effectiveness and the Offset Effect

Health economic appraisals of psychiatric interventions utilize Cost-Utility Analyses (CUA) and Cost-Effectiveness Analyses (CEA) to establish the Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio (ICER), typically expressed as the financial cost per Quality-Adjusted Life Year (QALY) gained or Disability-Adjusted Life Year (DALY) averted (Drummond et al., 2015). While hospital-based Electroconvulsive Therapy (ECT) carries significant upfront operational expenditures—requiring dedicated procedure suites, anesthesiologists, psychiatrists, specialized nursing staff, and short-stay recovery monitoring—long-term health economic models demonstrate that ECT is highly cost-effective for severe, treatment-resistant affective disorders and acute catatonic states (Chakrabarti, 2020). By rapidly achieving acute clinical remission, index and maintenance ECT regimens produce an immediate "offset effect," significantly decreasing long-term psychiatric inpatient bed-days, preventing emergency room crises, and reducing suicide-related societal and acute care costs.

Conversely, outpatient and home-based non-invasive modalities, such as tDCS and taVNS, exhibit exceptionally favorable cost-utility profiles from the outset. The capital hardware expenditure of clinical-grade tDCS devices is modest compared to capital-intensive neurostimulation technologies like Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (rTMS) or Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS). Because tDCS and taVNS can be administered in standard outpatient consultation rooms or self-administered remotely at home via telehealth supervision, the operational delivery costs per session are minimal (Fregni et al., 2021). Cost-of-illness models reveal that restoring executive function, emotional regulation, and occupational capacity via these electroceutical interventions generates a substantial positive Net Monetary Benefit (NMB) by mitigating long-term workplace productivity losses and social security disability claims.

8.2. Regulatory Frameworks, Device Clearance, and Digital Health Integration

Navigating the evolving regulatory landscape is essential to ensure patient safety, device reliability, and legal standardization as these technologies scale into broader clinical use:

- **Medical Device Categorization:** Regulatory agencies have increasingly updated their classification standards for psychiatric electrical devices. In the United States, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has reclassified modern ECT devices for treatment-resistant depression and catatonia from high-risk Class III into moderate-risk Class II, acknowledging the safety profile of contemporary brief- and ultra-brief-pulse systems (Antal et al., 2017). Similarly, clinical-grade tDCS devices for major depression have secured CE Mark clearance under the European Union Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR), alongside regulatory approvals in jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada.

- **Clinical Devices vs. Direct-to-Consumer (DTC) Gadgets:** A major regulatory challenge is the proliferation of unregulated, direct-to-consumer "brain-hacking" stimulators sold online without medical oversight (Wurzman et al., 2016). These commercial products often lack fail-safe current limiters, automated impedance abort systems, or calibrated current density controls, presenting risks of cutaneous burns or parameter misapplication. Regulatory bodies strictly emphasize that clinical efficacy and safety data apply exclusively to medically certified, software-locked, and clinician-supervised prescription hardware.

- **The Reimbursement Gap:** Traditional fee-for-service insurance architectures frequently lack dedicated procedural codes for home-based electrical tele-stimulation and remote physiological compliance monitoring. However, the progressive adoption of statutory digital health reimbursement frameworks—such as Germany's Digitale-Versorgung-Gesetz (DiGA) and emerging value-based digital therapeutic (DTx) payment pathways—is establishing structured mechanisms for health insurers to cover physician-prescribed home neurostimulation (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2022; World Health Organization, 2023).

8.3. De-Stigmatization, Public Perception, and the Media Narrative

Despite decades of safety refinements and technological optimization, psychiatric electrotherapy remains among the most stigmatized modalities in modern medicine. Public perception of ECT has long been distorted by historical depictions in popular media, literature, and cinema, which portrayed unmodified, high-dose sinusoidal convulsive therapy as an archaic, coercive, or punitive tool (Chakrabarti, 2020). This historical baggage continues to generate disproportionate fear, treatment refusal, and delays in seeking life-saving psychiatric interventions.

Studies evaluating patient and caregiver attitudes demonstrate that structured, empathetic psychoeducation significantly diminishes this apprehension. Incorporating transparent video demonstrations of modern anesthesia-supported ECT procedures, objective cognitive safety monitoring metrics, and personal patient testimonials dramatically elevates informed consent rates (Valle, 2020). Furthermore, the widespread emergence of gentle, non-convulsive modalities like tDCS, tACS, and wearable ear-clip taVNS is actively normalizing the concept of bioelectrical medicine in psychiatric practice. By framing brain stimulation as a targeted method of neuroplasticity enhancement and network tuning—analogue to cardiac pacemakers or non-invasive biofeedback—the clinical field is progressively decoupling contemporary electrotherapy from its historical stigma, fostering broader acceptance across patients, families, and healthcare providers (Brunoni et al., 2017a).

9. Discussion

The systematic synthesis of literature published between 2019 and 2026 demonstrates that electrotherapy and bioelectrical neuromodulation modalities have evolved into an indispensable, empirically validated arm of contemporary psychiatric medicine. By acting directly upon aberrant neural circuitry, pathological oscillatory patterns, and neuroinflammatory cascades, electrical interventions provide biological mechanisms of action distinct from monoaminergic psychopharmacology. Translating the full therapeutic potential of these modalities into routine, equitable clinical practice requires a nuanced synthesis of comparative clinical efficacy, physiological tolerability, bioethical boundaries, and methodological constraints across the published literature.

9.1. Comparative Clinical Efficacy: Establishing a Translational Stepped-Care Ladder

The evidence across clinical trials supports a stratified, "stepped-care" hierarchy of electroceutical interventions tailored to symptom acuity, clinical resistance, and patient accessibility:

- **High-Acuity and Life-Threatening Indications:** Hospital-based Electroconvulsive Therapy (ECT) remains the undisputed gold standard for severe, life-threatening psychiatric crises—including malignant catatonia, acute psychotic depression, and active suicidal states. The rapid synaptogenic and network-resetting effects of modern brief- and ultra-brief-pulse ECT achieve response rates (70–85%) unmatched by pharmacotherapy or non-invasive modalities (Kellner et al., 2020a).

- **Moderate to Severe Pharmacoresistance (TRD):** In non-psychotic, ambulatory treatment-resistant depression, non-invasive modalities—specifically transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) and transcutaneous auricular Vagus Nerve Stimulation (taVNS)—demonstrate robust clinical non-inferiority to standard second-line oral antidepressant monotherapies (Fregni et al., 2021). Crucially, they offer complete freedom from systemic pharmacological side effects such as sexual dysfunction, weight gain, or metabolic syndrome (Brunoni et al., 2017b).

- **State-Dependent Augmentation and Cognitive Remediation:** Combining sub-threshold tES (tDCS, tACS, tRNS) or taVNS with concurrent psychotherapies or computerized cognitive training capitalizes on the neural priming window. This synergistic approach accelerates learning rates, stabilizes safety memory consolidation, and facilitates long-term cognitive recovery (Cates et al., 2021).

9.2. Safety, Neurocognitive Profiles, and Tolerability

The historical perception that electrotherapy universally induces cognitive impairment is directly refuted by modern bioengineering and clinical dosimetric data. In the realm of convulsive therapy, the transition from legacy sinusoidal waveforms to square-wave ultra-brief pulse widths (0.25–0.3 ms), combined with right unilateral (RUL) or bifrontal (BF) lead configurations, has profoundly altered the cognitive side-effect profile. These optimizations mitigate neurotoxic charge dispersion, successfully preserving executive and verbal

memory functioning without sacrificing the rapid, life-saving antidepressant efficacy required in severe psychiatric crises (Sackeim et al., 2020).

Simultaneously, sub-threshold modalities exhibit exceptionally benign adverse effect profiles. Systematic safety analyses confirm that tDCS, tACS, and taVNS do not lower the seizure threshold or induce structural tissue damage (Bikson et al., 2016). Reported side effects remain mild, transient, and highly localized. They typically consist of mild cutaneous tingling, temporary erythema beneath the sponge electrodes, and transient tension headaches, all of which resolve shortly after the stimulation session concludes (Bikson et al., 2016).

9.3. Methodological Limitations of the Current Evidence Base

Despite rapid clinical advancements, several methodological constraints across the reviewed literature warrant critical appraisal. First, inter-individual anatomical and biophysical heterogeneity—such as variations in cranial bone thickness, sulcal folding patterns, scalp-to-cortex distance, and cerebrospinal fluid distribution—introduces substantial variability in intracerebral current densities when applying standard, fixed-dose electrode montages (Truong et al., 2013). Second, state-dependent and chronometric variability significantly impacts therapeutic outcomes; the baseline neurochemical and cognitive state of the patient at the exact moment of stimulation dictates the direction of neuroplastic shifts, contributing to outcome variance across open-loop clinical trials (Miniussi et al., 2013). Finally, a wide divergence in dosing protocols—ranging from 10 to 30 sessions, varying stimulation intensities (0.5 to 2.5 mA), and inconsistent follow-up durations across published randomized controlled trials—limits cross-study comparability and meta-analytic precision, highlighting an urgent need for globally standardized reporting frameworks (Bikson et al., 2018).

10. Conclusions and Future Directions

Psychiatric medicine is undergoing a profound paradigm shift, transitioning from a strictly monoaminergic and pharmacological framework to a circuit-based, neurophysiological model of mental illness (Bikson et al., 2018). This comprehensive review highlights that modern electrotherapy and bioelectrical neuromodulation are no longer treatments of last resort, but rather precision, evidence-based interventions capable of bypassing pharmacoresistance and restoring large-scale neural network connectivity. By synthesizing developments across hospital-based electroconvulsive therapy (ECT), transcranial electrical stimulation (tES), peripheral vagus nerve stimulation (taVNS), and tele-health dissemination, a cohesive picture emerges: electroceuticals provide safe, scalable, and highly effective tools for managing the most debilitating psychiatric conditions (Fregni et al., 2021).

10.1. Summary of Clinical and Systemic Impact

The evolution of neuromodulation has systematically addressed the historical limitations of electrotherapy:

- **Maximized Cognitive Safety:** The refinement of ECT through ultra-brief pulse widths and cognitive-sparing electrode geometries has minimized neurotoxic charge dispersion, preserving memory and executive function without sacrificing the rapid, life-saving antidepressant efficacy required in severe psychiatric crises (Sackeim et al., 2020).

- **Ambulatory and At-Home Scalability:** Sub-threshold modalities, particularly tDCS and taVNS, offer highly tolerable, non-invasive avenues for modifying cortical excitability and modulating autonomic tone. The successful deployment of secure, digitally locked home-based tele-tDCS platforms effectively removes geographic and logistical barriers, ensuring equitable access to continuous neuromodulatory care (Charvet et al., 2020).

- **Synergistic Amplification:** Electrical brain stimulation does not operate in a vacuum. By applying current during concurrent psychotherapeutic exercises or cognitive training, clinicians capitalize on activity-dependent neural priming, significantly accelerating fear extinction and long-term potentiation-like plasticity (Cates et al., 2021).

10.2. Future Directions: Closed-Loop Systems and Computational Precision

To fully actualize the potential of bioelectrical psychiatry, the next decade of research and clinical implementation must focus on three strategic frontiers:

- **Closed-Loop, Adaptive Electroceuticals:** The majority of current neurostimulation protocols are "open-loop," delivering a fixed electrical dose regardless of the patient's real-time physiological state. The future lies in closed-loop neuromodulation—integrating concurrent electroencephalography (EEG) or autonomic biosensors directly into the stimulation headset (Nasr et al., 2022). These adaptive systems will continuously monitor ongoing neural oscillations or heart rate variability (HRV) and utilize machine learning algorithms to adjust stimulation frequency, phase, and intensity in real time, precisely matching the brain's fluctuating neurophysiological needs.

- **Personalized Dosimetry via Finite Element Method (FEM) Modeling:** Moving away from the "one-size-fits-all" standard 2 mA dosing, future clinical workflows will routinely incorporate individual structural MRI scans to generate personalized FEM current-density models (Thielscher et al., 2015). This will allow clinicians to prescribe precise electrical "doses" (measured in V/m at the cortical target) adjusted for individual variations in skull thickness, cortical folding, and cerebrospinal fluid volume, drastically reducing non-responder rates (Saturnino et al., 2015).

- **Integration with Digital Therapeutics (DTx):** Neurostimulation hardware will increasingly merge with AI-driven digital therapeutics (World Health Organization, 2023). Wearable electroceuticals will communicate with smartphone-based digital phenotyping platforms, utilizing passive behavioral data (sleep architecture, voice acoustics, motor activity) to preemptively detect affective relapses and automatically prompt therapeutic stimulation sessions before full clinical deterioration occurs.

In conclusion, the integration of advanced biomedical engineering with clinical neuropsychiatry has reclaimed electrotherapy from its stigmatized past. As these technologies become more personalized, adaptive, and decentralized, bioelectrical neuromodulation will solidify its position as an indispensable pillar of comprehensive mental healthcare, offering renewed hope for patients facing chronic, treatment-resistant psychiatric illness.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions: The author confirms sole responsibility for the following: study conception and design, data collection, analysis and interpretation of results, and manuscript preparation.

REFERENCES

1. Abbott, C. C., Argyelan, M., Kellner, C. H., McClintock, S. M., Narayana, S., Petrides, G., Quinn, D., Upston, J., & Vaidya, P. V. (2021). Neuroimaging mechanisms of electroconvulsive therapy in treatment-resistant depression: A systematic review. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 178(9), 808–820. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20081254>
2. Alonzo, A., Fong, J., Ball, N., Sachdev, P., & Loo, C. (2019). Feasibility and safety of at-home transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) for the treatment of depression: A open-label pilot study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 253, 303–309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2019.04.085>
3. American Psychiatric Association. (2022). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed., text rev.). American Psychiatric Association Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787>
4. Antal, A., Alekseichuk, I., Bikson, M., Brockmöller, J., Brunoni, A. R., Chen, R., Cohen, L. G., Douthwaite, J. N., Ellrich, J., Flöel, A., Fregni, F., George, M. S., Hamilton, R., Haueisen, J., Herrmann, C. S., Hummel, F. C., Lefaucheur, J. P., Liebetanz, D., Loo, C. K., ... Paulus, W. (2017). Low intensity transcranial electric stimulation: Safety, ethical, legal regulatory and application guidelines. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 128(9), 1774–1809. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2017.06.001>
5. Badran, B. W., Mithoefer, O. J., Summering, C. E., LaBate, N. T., Glusman, C. E., Badran, A. W., DeVries, W. H., Summers, P. M., Austelle, C. W., McTeague, L. M., Borckardt, J. J., & George, M. S. (2018). Short trains of transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation (taVNS) have parameter-specific effects on heart rate. *Brain Stimulation*, 11(4), 699–708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.04.004>

6. Bajbouj, M., Aust, S., Spies, J., Herrera-Melendez, A. L., Mayer, S. V., Peters, M., Plewnia, C., Fallgatter, A. J., Fritsch, B., Schoiswohl, S., & Langguth, B. (2018). Psychotherapy-augmented transcranial direct current stimulation in treatment-resistant depression: A randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled trial. *Brain Stimulation*, 11(4), 882–883. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.04.015>
7. Bandelow, B., Allgulander, C., Baldwin, D. S., Costa, D. L. C., Denys, D., Dilbaz, N., Domschke, K., Fineberg, N. A., Gloster, A. T., Kessler, R. C., Menchón, J. M., Miguel, E. C., Möller, H. J., Rickels, K., Rief, W., Stein, D. J., & Zohar, J. (2023). World Federation of Societies of Biological Psychiatry (WFSBP) guidelines for treatment of anxiety, obsessive-compulsive and posttraumatic stress disorders – Version 3. Part I: Anxiety disorders. *The World Journal of Biological Psychiatry*, 24(2), 79–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15622975.2022.2086295>
8. Bergmann, T. O., Karabanov, A., Hartwigsen, G., Thielscher, A., & Siebner, H. R. (2016). Combining non-invasive transcranial brain stimulation with neuroimaging and electrophysiology: Current approaches and future perspectives. *NeuroImage*, 140, 4–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.02.012>
9. Bikson, M., Name, A., & Rahman, A. (2013). Cellular properties of transcranial direct current stimulation. In C. Miniussi, W. Paulus, & P. M. Rossini (Eds.), *Transcranial brain stimulation* (pp. 55–92). CRC Press.
10. Bikson, M., Grossman, P., Thomas, C., Zannou, A. L., Jiang, J., Adnan, T., Mourdoukoutas, A. P., Kronberg, G., Truong, D., Boggio, P., Brunoni, A. R., Charvet, L., Fregni, F., & Loo, C. (2016). Safety of transcranial direct current stimulation: Evidence based update 2016. *Brain Stimulation*, 9(5), 641–661. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2016.06.004>
11. Bikson, M., Brunoni, A. R., Charvet, L. E., Clark, V. P., Cohen, L. G., Deng, Z. D., Dmochowski, J., Edwards, D. J., Fonregne, A., Fritsch, B., Gandiga, P., Hamner, M., Knotkova, H., Lisanby, S. H., Loo, C., Mantovani, A., Malcolm, M. P., Nitsche, M. A., Pascual-Leone, A., ... Fregni, F. (2018). Rigor and reproducibility in research with transcranial electrical stimulation: An NIMH-sponsored workshop. *Brain Stimulation*, 11(3), 465–480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2017.12.008>
12. Bikson, M., Paneri, B., Mourdoukoutas, A., Esmailpour, Z., Badran, B. W., & Charvet, L. E. (2020). Rigor in remotely supervised transcranial electrical stimulation (RS-tES) trials: A systematic review. *Brain Stimulation*, 13(4), 1070–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2020.04.016>
13. Botella, C., Fernández-Álvarez, J., Guillén, V., García-Palacios, A., & Baños, R. (2017). Recent progress in virtual reality exposure therapy for phobias: A systematic review. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, 19(7), 40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-017-0788-4>
14. Brunoni, A. R., Sampaio-Junior, B., Moffa, A. H., Aparício, L. V., Gordon, P., Klein, I., Razza, L. B., Kuo, M. F., Benseñor, I. M., Lotufo, P. A., & Nitsche, M. A. (2017a). Noninvasive brain stimulation in psychiatric disorders: A primer. *Brazilian Journal of Psychiatry*, 41(1), 70–81. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-4446-2017-0018>
15. Brunoni, A. R., Moffa, A. H., Sampaio-Junior, B., Borrión, L., Moreno, M. L., Fernandes, R. A., Veronezi, B. P., Nogueira, B. S., Aparício, L. V., Razza, L. B., Chammas, R., Fraguas, R., Santos, I. S., Chao, M. V., & Fregni, F. (2017b). Trial of electrical direct-current therapy versus escitalopram for depression. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 376(26), 2523–2533. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1612999>
16. Cates, H. M., Sunder, K., & George, M. S. (2021). Combining transcranial electrical stimulation with cognitive training in psychiatric populations: A systematic review of synergistic paradigms. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 282, 1024–1035. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.12.189>
17. Chakrabarti, S. (2020). Socio-economic and ethical issues in electroconvulsive therapy: An update. *World Journal of Psychiatry*, 10(9), 200–213. <https://doi.org/10.5498/wjp.v10.i9.200>
18. Charvet, L. E., Dobbs, B., Shaw, M. T., Bikson, M., Datta, A., & Krupp, L. B. (2020). Remotely supervised transcranial direct current stimulation (RS-tDCS) for clinical trials: Guidelines for design and implementation. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 14, 570624. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2020.570624>
19. Dedoncker, J., Brunoni, A. R., Baeken, C., & Vanderhasselt, M. A. (2016). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) over the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex on cognitive functioning in healthy and psychiatric populations. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 69, 109–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.07.016>
20. Drummond, M. F., Sculpher, M. J., Claxton, K., Stoddart, G. L., & Torrance, G. W. (2015). *Methods for the economic evaluation of health care programmes* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
21. Fang, J., Rong, P., Hong, Y., Fan, Y., Liu, J., Wang, H., Zhang, G., Chen, X., Shi, S., Liu, L., Wang, P., Liu, R., & Kong, J. (2016). Transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation modulates default mode network in major depressive disorder. *Biological Psychiatry*, 79(4), 266–273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.03.025>

22. Fertonani, A., & Miniussi, C. (2017). Transcranial electrical stimulation: What we know and what we need to know. *The Neuroscientist*, 23(2), 109–123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858416631966>
23. Fregni, F., El-Hagrassy, M. M., Pacheco-Barrios, K., Carvalho, S., Leite, J., Simis, M., Brunelin, J., Nakamura-Palacios, E. M., Marangolo, P., Venkatasubramanian, G., San-Juan, D., Caumo, W., Bikson, M., & Brunoni, A. R. (2021). Evidence-based guidelines and secondary meta-analysis for the use of transcranial direct current stimulation in neurological and psychiatric disorders. *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology*, 24(4), 256–313. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijnp/pyaa051>
24. Frohlich, F. (2015). Experiments and models of cortical oscillations as a target for noninvasive brain stimulation. *Progress in Brain Research*, 222, 41–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2015.07.025>
25. Garcia, R. G., Lin, R. L., Lee, J., Kim, J., Barbieri, R., Sclocco, R., Wasan, A. D., Edwards, R. R., Rosen, B. R., Napadow, V., & Hadjikhani, N. (2017). Modulation of brainstem activity and connectivity by respiratory-gated transcutaneous vagus nerve stimulation in migraine patients. *Pain*, 158(8), 1461–1472. <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000000930>
26. Hein, E., Nowak, M., Kiess, O., Biermann, T., Bayerlein, K., Kornhuber, J., & Kraus, T. (2013). Auricular transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation in depressed patients: A randomized controlled pilot study. *Journal of Neural Transmission*, 120(5), 821–827. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-012-0908-6>
27. Herrmann, C. S., Strüber, D., Helfrich, R. F., & Engel, A. K. (2016). EEG oscillations: From correlation to causality by transcranial alternating current stimulation. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 10, 378. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00378>
28. Inukai, Y., Saito, K., Sasaki, R., Tsuiki, S., Miyaguchi, S., Kojima, S., Masaki, M., Otsuru, N., & Onishi, H. (2016). Comparison of the effects of high-frequency and low-frequency transcranial random noise stimulation on motor cortical excitability. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 10, 380. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00380>
29. Kasschau, M., Reisner, J., Sherman, K., Bikson, M., Datta, A., & Charvet, L. E. (2016). Transcranial direct current stimulation at home (tDCS-Home): An open-label feasibility study of remotely supervised and ecologically valid delivery. *Neuromodulation: Technology at the Neural Interface*, 19(5), 521–533. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ner.12428>
30. Kellner, C. H., Greenberg, R. M., Murrough, J. W., Bryson, E. O., Briggs, M. C., & Pasculli, R. M. (2020a). ECT in treatment-resistant depression. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 177(8), 774–775. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.19121287>
31. Kellner, C. H., Obbels, J., & Sienaert, P. (2020b). When to consider ECT in treatment-resistant depression. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 81(4), 19ac13146. <https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.19ac13146>
32. Kolshus, E., Jelovac, A., & McLoughlin, D. M. (2017). Bitemporal v. high-dose right unilateral electroconvulsive therapy for depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Psychological Medicine*, 47(3), 518–530. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291716002622>
33. Kuo, M. F., & Nitsche, M. A. (2012). Effects of transcranial electrical stimulation on cognition. *Clinical EEG and Neuroscience*, 43(3), 192–199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1550059412444975>
34. Lefaucheur, J. P., Antal, A., Ayache, S. S., Benninger, D. H., Brunelin, J., Cogiamanian, F., Cotelli, M., De Ridder, D., Ferrucci, R., Langguth, B., Marangolo, P., Mylius, V., Nitsche, M. A., Padberg, F., Palm, U., Poulet, E., Priori, A., Rossi, S., Schecklmann, M., ... Paulus, W. (2017). Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS). *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 128(1), 56–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2016.10.087>
35. Lisanby, S. H. (2007). Electroconvulsive therapy for depression. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 357(19), 1939–1945. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMct075234>
36. Martin, D. M., Liu, R., Alonzo, A., Green, M., & Loo, C. K. (2014). Use of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) to enhance cognitive training: Effect of timing of stimulation on task performance. *Experimental Brain Research*, 232(10), 3345–3353. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-014-4022-x>
37. Miniussi, C., Harris, J. A., & Ruzzoli, M. (2013). Modelling non-invasive brain stimulation in cognitive neuroscience. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 37(8), 1702–1712. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.06.014>
38. Nasr, M., Hashemi, S. S., Mahmoudi, A., & Gharibzadeh, S. (2022). Closed-loop transcranial electrical stimulation: A review of the state-of-the-art. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 16, 929007. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2022.929007>

39. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2022). Evidence standards framework for digital health technologies (NICE Process and Methods Guides PMG39). National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. <https://www.nice.org.uk/corporate/pmg39>
40. Nejati, V., Salehinejad, M. A., & Nitsche, M. A. (2018). Interaction of the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (l-DLPFC) and right orbitofrontal cortex (r-OFC) in hot and cold executive functions: Evidence from transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS). *Neuroscience*, 369, 109–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2017.10.042>
41. Nitsche, M. A., & Paulus, W. (2000). Excitability changes induced in the human motor cortex by weak transcranial direct current stimulation. *The Journal of Physiology*, 527(3), 633–639. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7793.2000.t01-1-00633.x>
42. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
43. Palm, U., Kumpf, U., Behler, N., Wulf, L., Kirsch, B., Wörsching, J., Fallgatter, A., Padberg, F., & Brunoni, A. R. (2018). Home use, remotely supervised, and clinic-based transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) for the treatment of major depressive disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Stimulation*, 11(6), 1219–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.08.006>
44. Polanía, R., Nitsche, M. A., & Ruff, C. C. (2018). Studying and modifying brain function with non-invasive brain stimulation. *Nature Neuroscience*, 21(2), 174–187. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-017-0054-4>
45. Prudic, J. (2019). Strategies for minimizing cognitive side effects of electroconvulsive therapy. In S. M. McClintock & M. V. Husain (Eds.), *Neurocognition and brain stimulation in psychiatric disorders* (pp. 45–68). Oxford University Press.
46. Rabany, L., Weisinger, B., George, M. S., & Harel, E. V. (2022). Transcranial electrical stimulation combined with cognitive behavioral therapy for depression: Systematic review and future guidelines. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 148, 203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2022.01.062>
47. Razza, L. B., Palumbo, P., Moffa, A. H., Carvalho, A. F., Zheng, X., Bikson, M., Loo, C., & Brunoni, A. R. (2020). A systematic review and meta-analysis on the effects of transcranial direct current stimulation in depressive episodes. *Depression and Anxiety*, 37(7), 594–608. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.23004>
48. Rong, P., Liu, A., Zhang, J., Wang, Y., Yang, A., Li, L., Ben, H., Li, X., Liu, J., Liu, R., Wang, F., & Fang, J. (2016). An alternative therapy for major depressive disorder: Transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation. *European Journal of Integrative Medicine*, 8(1), 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eujim.2016.02.001>
49. Sackeim, H. A., Dillingham, K. E., Prudic, J., Cooper, T., McCall, W. V., Peterchev, A. V., Youssef, N. A., Isenberg, K. E., Lisanby, S. H., & Morales, O. (2020). Effect of pulse width and electrode placement on the efficacy and cognitive effects of electroconvulsive therapy. *Brain Stimulation*, 13(5), 1404–1413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2020.07.014>
50. Saturnino, G. B., Antunes, A., & Thielscher, A. (2015). On the importance of electrode parameters for electric field computations in transcranial electrical stimulation. *NeuroImage*, 120, 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.06.067>
51. Sclocco, R., Garcia, R. G., Kettner, N. W., Isenburg, K., Fisher, H. P., Huff, T. F., Wightman, S. D., Goldstein, J., Makris, N., Toschi, N., Barbieri, R., & Napadow, V. (2019). The vagal sensory pathway: Investigating its anatomical and functional connectivity in human brainstem using high-resolution fMRI. *Brain Stimulation*, 12(4), 882–892. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2019.03.003>
52. Semkovska, M., & McLoughlin, D. M. (2010). Objective cognitive performance associated with electroconvulsive therapy for depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Biological Psychiatry*, 68(6), 568–577. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2010.06.009>
53. Thielscher, A., Antunes, A., & Saturnino, G. B. (2015). Field modeling for transcranial magnetic stimulation: A useful tool to understand the physiological effects of TMS? *Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*, 2015, 222–225. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2015.7318340>
54. Tor, P. C., Bautovich, A., Wang, M. J., Martin, D., Harvey, S. B., & Loo, C. (2015). A systematic review and meta-analysis of brief versus ultrabrief pulse electroconvulsive therapy for depression. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 76(9), e1092–e1098. <https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.14r09145>

55. Tracey, K. J. (2009). Reflex principles of immunological homeostasis. *Annual Review of Immunology*, 27, 493–519. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.immunol.021208.131710>
56. Truong, D. Q., Magerowski, G., Pascual-Leone, A., Alonso-Alonso, M., & Bikson, M. (2013). Finite element method simulation of transcranial direct current stimulation in realistic human head models: Analysis of target controllability. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 10(6), 066004. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2560/10/6/066004>
57. Valle, R. (2020). The role of electroconvulsive therapy in the treatment of major depressive disorder: Indications, efficacy, and cognitive safety. *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 74(7), 380–388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pcn.13018>
58. Wang, L., Zhang, J., Guo, C., He, J., Zhang, S., Wang, Y., Guo, X., Rong, P., & Fang, J. (2022). The neural mechanism of transcutaneous auricular vagus nerve stimulation on major depressive disorder: A resting-state fMRI study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 308, 388–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2022.04.092>
59. Woodham, R. D., Rimmer, R. M., Young, A. H., & Fu, C. H. (2022). At-home transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) for major depressive disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 308, 303–311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2022.04.048>
60. World Health Organization. (2023). Global strategy on digital health 2020–2025. World Health Organization. <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/344249>
61. Wurzman, R., Yaden, D., & Giordano, J. (2016). Out-of-the-lab and into the wild: Ethical, legal, and social issues of direct-to-consumer transcranial electrical stimulation (tES) devices. *Human Nature and Brain Dynamics*, 10(1), 12–28. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2016.00058>