USAARL Report No. 2019-11

A Systematic Review of Cognitive Enhancement Interventions for Use in Military Operations

By Amanda Kelley¹, Kathryn Feltman¹, Emmanuel Nwala¹, Kyle Bernhardt^{1,2}, Amanda Hayes^{1,2}, Jared Basso^{1,2}, Colby Mathews^{1,2}

¹U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory ²Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education



United States Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory

Warfighter Performance Group

August 2019

Approved for public release; Distribution unlimited.

Notice

Qualified Requesters

Qualified requesters may obtain copies from the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC), Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060. Orders will be expedited if placed through the librarian or other person designated to request documents from DTIC.

Change of Address

Organizations receiving reports from the U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory on automatic mailing lists should confirm correct address when corresponding about laboratory reports.

Disposition

Destroy this document when it is no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

Disclaimer

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation. Citation of trade names in this report does not constitute an official Department of the Army endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial items.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.							
1. REPORT DA	TE (DD-MM-YY	YY) 2. REPO	ORT TYPE			3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
12-	-08-2019		Final			Nov 16 to Mar 18	
4. TITLE AND	SUBTITLE				5a. COI	NTRACT NUMBER	
A Systematic	Review of Cog	nitive Enhance	ement Interventions for	Use in			
Military Opera	ations				5b. GRA	ANT NUMBER	
					5c. PRC	DGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)	da. Ealtman V	other A Nir	ala Emmanyalı Damh	andt Viela			
Haves Amon	da, reiuliali, K	d: Mothews C	ala, Ellillalluel, Dellilla	alut, Kyle,	22900		
nayes, Amano	la, Dasso, Jare	u, mathews, C	biby		5e. TASK NUMBER		
					E4 WO		
					51. WO	RK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMIN	G ORGANIZATI	ON NAME(S) AI	ND ADDRESS(ES)		<u> </u>	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	
	romedical Des	earch Laborate				REPORT NUMBER	
$P \cap Box 620^4$	577		ny			USAARL 2019-11	
Fort Rucker, AL 36362							
9. SPONSORIN		GAGENCY NAM	IF(S) AND ADDRESS(FS)	1		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)					11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUT	ION/AVAILABILI	TY STATEMEN	Г				
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.							
13. SUPPLEME	NTARY NOTES						
14. ABSTRACT							
Future battlefi and to interact more efficient mission succes enhancement, more appropri interventions f the identified of duration of eff	eld environment with adaptive processing of ss and operation including the u ate for military from randomiz methods, further	nts will require autonomous s perceptual info nal effectivene use of stimulan v settings. The ed, placebo-co er evaluations of d prior to imple	Soldiers to process lar ystems. Enhancing cog yrmation, and quicker d ess. The literature sugget t agents, transcranial di purpose of this review introlled, experimental n of not only the effective ementation in military s	ge amounts of nitive abilities lecision-maki- ests numerous irect current s was to summ- research studi- eness and safe settings.	f mission s such as ng process interven timulatio arize find es. While ety of the	n critical information within short periods sustaining attention over longer periods, sses in these environments will promote ations for cognitive performance on, as well as others, some of which may be lings regarding the enhancement e evidence supports the efficacy of some of sse interventions but also the reliability and	
15. SUBJECT T	ERMS						
cognition, atte	ention, memory	, enhancement					
16. SECURITY	16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: 17. LIMITATION OF 18. NUMBER 19a, NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON						
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE	ABSTRACT	OF	Loraine	e St. Onge, PhD	
UNCLAS	UNCLAS	UNCLAS	SAR	51	19b. TEL	EPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 334-255-6906	
I		-	-	-	-	Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8/98)	

1

This page is intentionally blank.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Michelle Aguirre, the USAARL librarian, for her assistance in this project.

This page is intentionally blank.

Table	of	Contents
-------	----	----------

	Page
Introduction	1
Methods	2
Eligibility	2
Exclusion criteria	3
Procedure	4
Results	4
Pharmaceuticals/Drugs	4
Herbal and Vitamin Supplements	8
Training	12
Sleep	14
Transcranial Stimulation	16
Miscellaneous	22
Miscellaneous Interventions	22
Discussion	25
Pharmaceutical Interventions	25
Herbal and Vitamin Supplements	26
Training	27
Sleep	27
Transcranial Stimulation	27
Miscellaneous	28
Recommendations for Future Research	28
Conclusions	29
References	30

List of Tables

1. Keywords Included in Literature Search	2
2. Study Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria	3
3. Literature Search and Review Results	4
4. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Pharmaceuticals/Drugs	5
5. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Herbal and Vitamin Supplements	8
6. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Training	.12
7. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Sleep/Napping	.14
8. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Transcranial Stimulation	.17
9. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Miscellaneous Cognitive Enhancement Interventions	s22
· · ·	

This page is intentionally blank.

Introduction

Cognitive enhancement is broadly defined as the amplification of human cognitive functioning in the bid to improve information-processing system (Bostrom & Sandberg, 2009). In much research, the term "cognitive enhancement" is used in a therapeutic sense with diseased populations to describe interventions for remedying specific pathology or functional impairment. For our purposes, however, we are interested in an alternate definition of the term, specifically research describing interventions that augment cognitive abilities beyond normal, healthy function. Cognitive subsystems targeted for enhancement include but are not limited to: (1) information retention – memory; (2) information selection – attention; (3) information acquisition – perception; (4) information representation – understanding; and (5) information outputs – reasoning and decision-making (Bostrom & Sandberg, 2009).

Soldiers operating in future environments will face complex situations in which they must attend to increasingly larger volumes of information in a very short time, requiring speedy processing of mission relevant information, and the necessity to 'decide faster' – one of the four Army Science & Technology Priorities. In order to do so, and to achieve cognitive dominance, Soldiers will need to sustain attention and process information rapidly. Research is needed to determine the effectiveness and operational safety of stimulant agents as well as other cognitive enhancement interventions on military-specific task performance and in operational settings. Operational settings include, but are not limited to, training environments, field operations, and deployment to combat zones.

Cognitive enhancement, especially through pharmaceutical intervention, is not a new concept to the military. The history of military use of performance enhancement drugs dates back to the medieval period with the advent of some particularly fearless Scandinavian class of warriors known as "berserkers" who used amanita muscaria mushroom stimulant drugs known as "fly agaric" to improve their physical and mental abilities (Anonymous, 2004). As the use of enhancement drugs in the military evolved over the centuries, the first and second world wars saw significant growth in the use of unregulated performance enhancement drugs, especially amphetamine, cocaine, and opium, with the German, British, French and American militaries as prominent users (Kamienski, 2016). Notably, Hitler's famous use of methamphetamine to enhance Nazi soldiers' performance remains a historical precedence. Nazi pilots were reportedly consuming large amounts of methamphetamine to help sustain their fighting strengths against adversaries (Ohler, 2017). Pharmaceutical enhancement amongst American troops continued during the Vietnam War where psychoactive substances like Dexedrine (dextroamphetamine), codeine, and Darvon (opioid) helped heighten a sense of invulnerability, bravado and alertness among Soldiers (Kamienski, 2016).

However, many of the historical methods for enhancement were discontinued as new information surfaced regarding the safety of the pharmaceuticals being used, to include their potential for addiction. Therefore, the history of performance enhancement interventions in military operations informs current policy regarding their use with respect to ethical considerations and safety. Balancing enhancement with the health of the Soldier is a key priority in determining how best to implement these interventions. Many of the interventions under consideration for use in military operations (pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical) have been primarily studied in diseased populations or have not been fully evaluated with respect to safety. This has resulted in limited knowledge for how effective they are at enhancing above baseline

function as well as their appropriateness for military populations and settings. Thus, the purpose of this systematic review was to synthesize the existing literature on potential cognitive enhancement strategies for use by the military. The criteria for this review were structured such as to include studies using strong research designs (e.g., placebo-controlled, random assignment). The objectives were then to: 1) identify interventions that may be appropriate for use in operational settings, and 2) to identify gaps in the literature and areas for future research.

Methods

Literature searches were conducted in mainstream databases, including Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC), PubMed/Medline, clinicaltrials.gov, and PsychInfo. The literature search included "gray" (difficult to locate) literature, which required the assistance of a professional librarian on staff at the U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory. The keywords included in the search are displayed in Table 1.

Categories	Keywords
Interventions	Modafinil
	Caffeine
	Pharmaceuticals
	Dopamine agonists
	Methylphenidate
	Exercise
	Nutrition
	Supplements
	Vitamins
	Training
	Sleep
	Mental strategies
	Transcranial stimulation
Cognitive Functions	Memory
	Attention
	Decision Making
	Judgments
	Cognition
	Enhancement
	Spatial abilities
	Visual perception
Enhancement	Performance
	Enhancement

Table 1. Keywords Included in Literature Search

Eligibility

The inclusion criteria were set to be conservative in order to increase homogeneity and ensure a high level of study quality. To be included in the systematic review, a study must have the following characteristics: a) random assignment, b) control group (between-subjects designs) or placebo-controlled (within-subjects designs), c) healthy human subjects aged 18-50 years, d) assessments of cognition-enhancement using valid and reliable cognitive performance measures, e) published in the English language, and f) published between 2008 and 2018. Study exclusion and inclusion criteria are provided in Table 2.

Criteria	Included	Excluded
Date published	2008-2018	Any prior to 2008
Study Designs	Within-subjects placebo-controlled	Non-random drug order
	Between-subjects with control group	Non-random assignment
Test Populations	Age: 18 to 50 years	Age: under 18 years and
		over 50 years
	Race: Any	Race: None
	Males and females	Gender: None
	Healthy	Unhealthy or abnormal
	Nationality: Any	Nationality: None
Interventions	Modafinil	None
	Caffeine	
	Pharmaceuticals	
	Dopamine agonists	
	Methylphenidate	
	Exercise	
	Nutrition	
	Supplements	
	Vitamins	
	Training	
	Mental strategies	
	Transcranial stimulation	
Language	English language	Non-English language
Outcome Measures	Valid and reliable	Not validated
	Neuropsychological tests of	Not tested for reliability
	cognition	
	Measures of memory, attention,	Measures of mood,
	spatial reasoning, math reasoning,	personality constructs,
	decision making, and judgment	imaging studies

Table 2. Study Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Exclusion criteria

The term cognition enhancement is used rather liberally in research. This review is focused on enhancement in specific areas of cognitive functioning. Therefore, studies that used only measures of mood, imagining, or other non-performance measures were excluded from the analysis given that the focus of the review is enhancement of *cognitive performance*. Also, studies using only measures of group performance (as opposed to individual performance) were excluded. All foreign language articles were excluded due to the lack of translation resources available to the investigators. Studies of unhealthy or abnormal populations, of humans under the age of 18 years or over the age of 50 years, or of animals were excluded. The use of healthy populations included populations who were not arbitrarily placed into abnormal circumstances, such as sleep deprivation protocols, in order to assess enhancement properties beyond their baseline function. Studies using measures of cognition that have not been validated or tested for reliability were excluded.

Procedure

The analysis was carried out according to the guidelines for systematic reviews and metaanalyses provided by Littell, Corcoran, and Pillai (2008) and Lipsy and Wilson (2001).

The research team first located potentially relevant studies using the search criteria specified above. The team then reviewed the titles and abstracts of the search results and requested full text versions of potentially relevant articles. All full text reports were reviewed for study eligibility. All eligible studies were independently read and reviewed by no less than two members of the research team. Minor discrepancies regarding eligibility were settled through discussion. The review process and results are provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Literature Search and	Review	Resu	lts
--------------------------------	--------	------	-----

Search Results (January 2018)	3,807
Duplicated citations	550
Judged irrelevant or ineligible by title and abstract	2,937
Full text retrieved	320
Included studies	136

Results

Pharmaceuticals/Drugs

Sixty-two^{*} articles were identified and reviewed, 37 of which did not meet the study criteria for inclusion. Nineteen articles were excluded because they were a review article (or meta-analysis), seven used animal models, seven were not experimental studies of cognitive enhancement, two were duplicates, one used an abnormal population, and two preceded the year 2008. Of the 25 included articles, majority of them studied modafinil (7 studies) or amphetamines (7 studies). Other drugs and drug classes studied includes selective serontin reuptake inhibitors (2 studies), methylphenidate (2 studies), cholinesterase inhibitors (2 studies), caffeine (2 studies), serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (2 studies), nootropics (1 study), selective inhibitor of cyclic guanosine monophosphate (1 study), nicotine (1 study), and antibiotics (1 study).[†] Table 4 provides a summary of enhancement effects.

^{*} One article describes a combination of a drug and transcranial stimulation and thus appears in both sections of the results. This article is only counted once in Table 3.

[†] Note that the number of studies reported here exceeds the total number of articles included given that two articles studied more than one drug or drug class.

1 word 1: Summary of Emmandement Effects with I marmaceuteaus Drags	Table 4. Summa	ary of Enhancemer	nt Effects with	Pharmaceuticals/Drugs
---	----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------

Pharmaceuticals/Drugs					
1. Main findings:					
a. Baseline level of performance modera			ted enhancement such that enhancement		
(t in high performers				
b. Variability in tasks used					
c.]	Many effects	are dose or time depende	ent		
d. (Consistent fir	ndings:			
	i. Enhan	cement effects on attent	ion tasks		
	11. No eff	tects on working memory	y tasks		
2. Design,	individual di	interences, and sample size	zes:		
a. I b. I	Within subject	ender were not reported	range from 16-60 with significant effects		
c.	Retween subi	ects design – sample sizes	es range from 26-70 with significant effects		
Drug	Dose Dose	Construct Measured	Enhancement effect(s)		
Modafinil	100mg	Abstract reasoning	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in		
Wodamm	Toomg	Abstract reasoning	low baseline performers (Esposito et al.,		
			2013)		
		Attention	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Cope et al., 2017)		
	200mg	Response inhibition	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Mohamed et al., 2014)		
		Implicit learning	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Gilleen et al., 2014)		
		Working memory	No enhancement (Gilleen et al., 2014)		
		Attention	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Ikeda et al., 2017; Cope et al., 2017)		
		Learning	No enhancement (Cope et al., 2017)		
		Alertness	No enhancement (Bellebaum et al., 2016)		
		Impulsivity	No enhancement (Bellebaum et al., 2016)		
	400mg	Alertness	Higher levels of alertness than placebo (Finke et al., 2010)		
		Visual Perception	Enhancement (compared to placebo) seen		
		Processing Speed	in low baseline performers (Finke et al.,		
			2010)		
		Visual Short Term	Enhancement (compared to placebo) seen		
		wemory	2010)		
Methylphenida	te 20mg	Associative Learning	Enhancement (compared to placebo) seen		
			in high baseline performers (van der		
			Schaaf, 2013)		
			performers (van der Schaaf, 2013)		

	30mg	Error Awareness	Enhancement compared to placebo (reported effect size [Cohen's d' = 2.34]) (Hester, 2012)
	40mg	Alertness	Higher levels of alertness than placebo (Finke et al., 2013)
		Visual Perception Processing Speed	Enhancement (compared to placebo) seen in low baseline performers (Finke et al., 2013)
		Visual Short Term Memory	No enhancement (Finke et al., 2013)
Atomoxetine	60mg	Error Awareness	No enhancement (Hester, 2012)
Amoxetine and rTMS (combined)	60mg	Motor-sequence learning	Enhancement (compared to control) (Sczesny-Kaiser, 2014)
Citalopram	30mg	Error Awareness	No enhancement (Hester, 2012)
Amphetamine	10mg	Vigilance	No enhancement (MacQueen, 2018)
	20mg	Speed of Processing	Performance deficits in high baseline performers (Chou, 2013)
		Attention/Vigilance	Enhancement in low baseline performers (Chou, 2013)
		Working Memory	Performance deficits in high baseline performers (Chou. 2013)
		Verbal Learning	Performance deficits in high baseline performers (Chou, 2013) Enhancement in low baseline performers (Chou, 2013)
		Reason and Problem	Enhancement in low baseline performers
		Solving Social Cognition	(Chou, 2013) Performance deficits in high baseline performers (Chou, 2013)
		Visual Learning	Performance deficits in high baseline performers (Chou, 2013)
		Vigilance	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in 20mg dose group (MacQueen, 2018)
d-Amphetamine	10mg	Verbal Memory	Enhancement (compared to placebo) after a week daily, no immediate effects (Zeeuws 2010(a), Zeeuws, 2010(b)
Mixed amphetamine salts	10mg	Verbal Convergent Creative Thinking	No enhancement (Farah, 2009)
		Non-verbal Convergent Creative Thinking	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Farah, 2009)
		Verbal Divergent Thinking	No enhancement (Farah, 2009)

		Non-verbal Divergent Thinking	No enhancement (Farah, 2009)
	20mg	Episodic Memory	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in low baseline performers (Ilieva, 2015)
		Working Memory	No enhancement (Ilieva, 2015)
		Inhibitory Control	No enhancement (Ilieva, 2015)
		Non-verbal	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in
		Convergent	low baseline performers (Ilieva, 2015)
		Verbal convergent creativity	No enhancement (Ilieva, 2015)
		Non-verbal	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in
		Intelligence	low baseline performers (Ilieva, 2015)
		Verbal and	No enhancement (Ilieva, 2015)
0 1	0	Mathematical Ability	
(nutraceutical nootropic)	See note*	Abstract Reasoning	placebo group) (Stough, 2011)
Physostigmine	0.01 mg/kg per hour	Visual Attention	Enhancement (compared to placebo group) (Bauer, 2012)
Escitalopram	10mg	Executive Attention	Enhancement seen in acute (single dose and sub-chronic (daily for 7 days) dosage groups (compared to placebo) but effect moderated by familiarity with task (Drueke, 2009)
D-cycloserine	50mg	Visuospatial Construction and Nonverbal Memory	No enhancement (Otto et al., 2009)
		Logical Memory	No enhancement (Otto et al., 2009)
		Secondary Verbal Memory	No enhancement (Otto et al., 2009)
Donepezil	5mg	Visual Working Memory	No enhancement (Reches, 2014)
Caffeine	20mg	Attention	No enhancement
		Short term memory Long term memory	Enhancement (as compared to placebo) when collapsing across three tasks (Davidson, et al., 2011) Enhancement (as compared to placebo) when collapsing across three tasks (Davidson et al. 2011)
	200mg	Motor Memory	No enhancement (Hussain et al., 2015)
	-	-	,

*huperzine A 150ug, Vinpocetine 15mg, Acetyl-l-carnitine 1500mg, r-alpha lipoic acid 400mg, rhodiola rosea 300mg, biotin 500ug

Herbal and Vitamin Supplements

The herbal and vital supplements studied included glucose, fish oil, fat, proteins, palm oil, and *Ginkgo biloba*. Thirty-one articles were retrieved and reviewed, 15 of which met eligibility criteria. Of those excluded, six did not include an experimental study of cognitive enhancement, six were reviews (or meta-analyses), two used animal models, and two used older adults. Table 5 presents a summary of the enhancement effects.

Table 5. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Herbal and Vitamin Supplements Herbal and Vitamin Supplements

1. Main findings:

- a. Mixed effects for working memory tasks
- b. Many effects are does or time dependent
- c. Consistent effects seen with:
 - i. Word recall tasks
 - ii. Working memory tasks on general neuropsychological batteries
 - iii. Information processing speed/accuracy/efficiency on general neuropsychological batteries
- 2. Design, individual differences, and sample sizes:
 - a. Findings by gender are not reported
 - b. Within subjects design sample sizes range from 18-32 with significant effects
 - c. Between subjects design sample sizes range from 63-140 with significant effects

Supplement	Dose	Construct(s)	Enhancement effect(s)
		Measured	
Brain-directed	Multi-vitamin	Executive Function	No enhancement (Amen et al.,
nutrients mixture	(≈1,448mg), fish		2013)
	oil (2.8g), brain	Reasoning	Enhancement (compared to
	enhancement		placebo) (Amen et al., 2013)
	supplement	Memory	Enhancement (compared to
	(≈1,424mg)		placebo) (Amen et al., 2013)
		Information Processing	Enhancement (compared to
		Efficiency	placebo) (Amen et al., 2013)
Palm leaf extract	500mg	Working memory	Enhancement (compared to
oil*			placebo) (Mohamed et al.,
			2013)
		Spatial learning	Enhancement (compared to
			placebo) following 2 months
			(Mohamed et al., 2013)
		Processing speed	Enhancement (compared to
			placebo) following 2 months
			(Mohamed et al., 2013)
DHA-rich fish	1g (daily dose	Episodic Memory	No enhancement (Jackson et al.,
oil	for 12-week		2012)
	regiment)	Attention	Enhancement (compared to
			placebo) (Jackson et al., 2012)

		Working Memory	No enhancement (Jackson et al., 2012)
EPA-rich fish oil	1g (daily dose for 12-week	Episodic Memory	No enhancement (Jackson et al., 2012)
	regiment)	Attention	No enhancement (Jackson et al., 2012)
		Working Memory	No enhancement (Jackson et al., 2012)
Fat	16g vegetable	Attention	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Jones et al. 2012)
	on	Working Memory	No enhancement (Jones et al., 2012) 2012)
Protein	40g	Attention	No enhancement (Jones et al., 2012)
		Working Memory	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Jones et al., 2012)
Glucose	17g	Verbal Attention	Enhancement (compared to placeba) (An at al. 2015)
		Non-verbal Attention	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (An et al., 2015)
	25g	Episodic Memory	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Brown et al. 2013)
		Attention	No enhancement (Brown et al., 2013) 2013)
		Associative learning	No enhancement (Stollery et al., 2014)
		Implicit Memory	No enhancement (Owen et al., 2010)
		Delayed Memory	No enhancement (Owen et al., 2010; Scholey et al., 2009)
		Immediate Memory	No enhancement (Owen et al., 2010)
		Spatial working	Enhancement (compared to
		memory Working memory	placebo) (Owen et al., 2013) Enhancement (compared to
			placebo) (Owen et al., 2013)
	40g	Attention	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Jones et al., 2012)
		Working Memory	No enhancement (Jones et al., 2012)
	60g	Implicit Memory	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Owen et al. 2010)
		Delayed Memory	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Owen et al., 2010, 2012)
		Immediate Memory	No enhancement (Owen et al., 2010)

		Spatial working memory Working memory	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Owen et al., 2013) Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Owen et al., 2013) Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Owen et al., 2013)
	75g	Memory	No enhancement (MacPherson et al., 2015)
		Spatial ability	No enhancement (MacPherson et al., 2015)
Cytidine 5'- disphosphocoline	500mg	Verbal Learning	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in low baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015) Performance deficits in high baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015)
		Psychomotor Speed	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in low baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015)
		Working Memory	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in low baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015) Performance deficits in high baseline performers
		Executive Function	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in low baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015)
		Delayed Recall	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in low baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015) Performance deficits in high baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015)
		Attention	No enhancement (Knott et al., 2015)
	1000mg	Verbal Learning	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in low baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015) Performance deficits in high baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015)
		Psychomotor Speed	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in low baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015)
		Working Memory	Enhancement (compared to placebo) in low baseline performers (Knott et al., 2015)

			Performance deficits in high
			baseline performers
		Executive Function	Enhancement (compared to
			placebo) in low baseline
			performers (Knott et al., 2015)
		Delayed Recall	Enhancement (compared to
			placebo) in low baseline
			performers (Knott et al., 2015)
			Performance deficits in high
			baseline performers (Knott et
		Attention	al., 2013)
		Auention	2015)
Васора	450mg	Working Memory	No enhancement (Sathyan-
monniera			arayanan, et al., 2013)
(Brahmi)			
		Information Processing	
		Speed	No enhancement (Sathyan-
		A	arayanan, et al., 2013
		Attention	No onhangement (Sothyon
			arovenen et al. 2012
Amaniaan	100mm ~	Wantring Manager	Enhancement (command to
American	Toomg	working Memory	Placebol (Scholay et al. 2010)
ginseng		Attention	Enhancement (compared to
		Attention	Placebol (Scholay et al. 2010)
		Information Processing	No enhancement (Scholey et al., 2010)
		Spood	2010)
	200mg	Working Momory	Enhancement (compared to
	20011ig	working wiemory	placebo) (Scholey et al. 2010)
		Attention	Enhancement (compared to
		Attention	placebo) (Scholev et al. 2010)
		Information Processing	No enhancement (Scholev et al.
		Sneed	2010)
	400mg	Working Memory	Enhancement (compared to
	TOOME	working wontony	placebo) (Scholev et al 2010)
		Attention	Enhancement (compared to
			placebo) (Scholev et al. 2010)
		Information Processing	No enhancement (Scholev et al.
		Speed	2010)
Alpha Brain	≈2,545mg	Intelligence	No enhancement (Solomon et
1		C	al., 2016)
		Logical Memory	No enhancement (Solomon et
		- /	al., 2016)
		Visual Memory	No enhancement (Solomon et
		-	al., 2016)
		Verbal Memory	Enhancement (compared to
			placebo) after 45 days of

	consumption (Solomon et al.,
	2016)
Attention	Higher levels of alertness than
	placebo (Solomon et al., 2016)
Executive Function	Enhancement (compared to
	placebo) seen in low baseline
	performers (Solomon et al.,
	2016)
Visual Short Term	Enhancement (compared to
Memory	placebo) seen in low baseline
	performers (Solomon et al.,
	2016)

*Study design details were not reported

Training

Forty-one^{*} articles were reviewed and 16 met the eligibility criteria. Exclusions were due to lack of an experimental study (13 reviews, 1 statistical simulation), lack of cognitive performance measurements (7 studies), limited to a specialized or abnormal population (3 studies), and lack of enhancement strategy (1 study). Two types of training were evaluated primarily: neurofeedback training and task-specific training. Table 6 presents a summary of the enhancement effects.

Table 6. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Training

		Training	
1. Main fin	dings:		
a. N	leurofeedback traini	ng yielded mixed results	
b. T	ask training consist	ently produced enhanceme	nt effects
2. Design, i	ndividual difference	es, and sample sizes:	
a. F	indings by gender a	re not reported	
b. B	etween subjects des	sign – sample sizes range f	rom 13-82 per group with
significant effects			
с.			
Training	Characteristics	Construct(s)	Enhancement effect(s)
		Measured	
Neurofeedback	Single session	Executive function	No enhancement (Escolano et al.,
training	(25-30 minutes)		2014)
		Attention	No enhancement (Escolano et al.,
			2014)
			Enhancement (compared to
			sham) (Escolano et al., 2014)

^{*} One article describes a combination of training and exercise and thus appears in this section as well as the miscellaneous section of the results. This article is only counted once in Table 3.

		_	
		Working memory	Enhancement (compared to placebo) (Escolano et al., 2014)
		Verbal learning	No enhancement
	3 sessions/week for 4 weeks	Working memory	Enhancement (compared to baseline) (Hsueh et al., 2016)
	3 sessions, 10 minutes each	Motor learning	No enhancement (Rozengurt et al., 2016)
	1 session/week for 5 weeks	Attention	Enhancement (compared to control) (Sutarto, Wahab, & Zin, 2013)
	30 sessions (25 minutes/session, 5 sessions/week, 6 weeks)	Working memory	Enhancement (compared to control) (Sutarto, Wahab, & Zin, 2013)
	30 sessions (25 minutes/session, 5 sessions/week, 6 weeks)	Attention	No enhancement (Doppelmeyer, 2011)
	,	Spatial ability	Enhancement (compared to control) for sensorimotor rhythm neurofeedback training (Doppelmeyer, 2011)
Instrumental sensorimotor rhythm conditional training	10 sessions/ 1 hour per session	Declarative memory	Marginal enhancement (compared to control) (Hoedlmoser, 2008)
Haptic feedback	Force control task (maintain stable pressure on a wall with a stylus) during which stylus provided vibration cues	Focused attention	Enhancement (compared to controls) (Wang, 2014)
Task training	Exposure to familiar or novel images followed by a list of familiar words.	Working memory	Enhancement (compared to control) (Fenker, 2008; Moreau, 2015 [large effect sizes reported])
	Memory training using either verbal cues or imagery (90 minutes)	Working memory in spatial text processing	Enhancement in imagery group (compared to verbal cue group) (Gyselinck et al., 2009)
	Mental rotation training (45	Spatial cognition	Enhancement in mental rotation group (compared to control)

min/session for 6 sessions in 2 weeks)		(Meneghetti et al., 2011)
Semantic control training (45 min/session for 6 sessions)	Semantic processing	Enhancement (compared to control) (Metuki & Lavidor, 2013)
Mobile training application for distributed attention task (5 hours in 2 weeks)	Spatial attention	No enhancement (Rolle et al., 2017
Tracking task training (both experimental and control group completed task twice before test)	Attention	Enhancement (compared to control) (Strong & Alvarez, 2017)

Sleep

Forty-one articles were reviewed, nineteen articles of which met the eligibility criteria. Exclusions were due to lack of an experimental study (6 reviews, 2 commentaries, 4 correlational designs), lack of cognitive performance measurements (2 studies), lack of a control condition or group (7 studies), and abnormal conditions (sleep deprivation) (1 study). Majority of the included articles tested the utility of a nap (duration ranging from 20 to 90 minutes). Table 7 presents a summary of the enhancement effects.

Table 7. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Sleep/Napping

		Sleep/Napping	
1. Main f	indings:		
a.	Inconsistent findings	suggesting enhancement n	nay be dependent on:
	i. REM, SWS, c	or non-REM durations	
	ii. Individual dif	ferences in baseline ability	
b.	Enhancements seen w	when the period between le	arning and testing was a night of
	sleep for motor seque	ence learning	
2. Design	, individual difference	es, and sample sizes:	
a.	Findings by gender an	re not reported	
b.	Between-subject desi	gns were used in 16 of the	included studies with sample
	sizes ranging from 9	to 40 per group	
с.	Within-subject design	ns were used in 3 studies w	vith sample sizes ranging from 15
	to 32		
Intervention	Duration /	Construct(s)	Enhancement effect(s)
	Characteristics	Measured	
Single session	90-minute	Spatial learning/spatial	Enhancement (compared to
nap		memory	control group) (Albouy, 2015;

			Diekelmann, 2012)
		Motor-sequence learning Probabilistic learning	No enhancement (Albouy, 2015; Backhaus, 2016) Enhancement correlated with REM sleep amount; interference training following nap eliminated enhancement effects (Barsky, 2015)
		Working memory	Enhancement (compared to controls) (Lau et al., 2015)
	Delayed 90- minute nap (4 hours post learning)	Recognition memory	Enhancement (compared to controls and immediate nap groups) (Alger, 2010)
	Short (10-20 minutes)	Declarative memory	No enhancement (Backhaus, 2016)
		Visuomotor adaptation learning	No enhancement (Backhaus, 2016)
		Motor-sequence learning	No enhancement (Backhaus, 2016)
	40-minutes	Spatial learning/spatial memory	No enhancement (Diekelmann, 2012)
	Long (50-80 minutes)	Declarative memory	No enhancement (Backhaus, 2016)
		Visuomotor adaptation learning	No enhancement (Backhaus, 2016)
		Motor-sequence learning	No enhancement (Backhaus, 2016)
	2 hour (30 minutes of non- REM sleep)	Motor-sequence learning	No enhancement (Landry, 2016)
	REM sleep (60 or 90 minute nap)	Perceptual learning	Enhancement (compared to controls and non-REM sleep group) (Enhancement greatest for high performers; McDevitt, 2014)
	Non-REM sleep (60 or 90 minute nap)	Perceptual learning	No enhancement (compared to controls) (McDevitt, 2014)
	• /	Declarative memory	Enhancement (compared to controls) (Enhancement greatest for high performers, Tucker, 2007)
Targeted memory reactivation during slow-	Presented during normal night of rest (~8hrs)	Explicit knowledge	Enhancement (compared to control) (Cousins, 2014)

wave sleep			
	90-minute nap	Emotional memory	Selective enhancement dependent on emotional salience (memory enhancement for highly emotional cues; Cairney, 2014)
Overnight sleep ("wake' group trained in morning and tested in evening, "sleep" group	Testing delay of 12-hours	Motor-sequence learning	Enhancement (compared to control) (Debarnot, 2009; Brawn, 2010; Gregory, 2014; Malangre, 2016 [enhanced speed not accuracy]) No enhancement (Kemeny, 2016; Rickard, 2008)
trained in evening and tested in morning		Emotional learning	Enhancement for "negative" images compared to "neutral (compared to control group) (Cunningham, 2014)
		Probabilistic learning	Enhancement (compared to control), effect moderated by performance level achieved during training (enhancement limited to low performers; Djonlagic, 2009) No enhancement (Kemeny, 2016)
		Sequence learning (grammar learning task)	No enhancement (Kemeny, 2016)
Sleep fragmentation	EEG micro- arousals (rate of 30+/hour)	Spatial attention	No enhancement (Ferri, 2010)
		Mental rotation	Enhancement (inconsistent across performance outcomes; Ferri, 2010)
		Selective attention	No enhancement (Ferri, 2010)
		Inhibition of return (attentional orienting)	No enhancement (Ferri, 2010)

Transcranial Stimulation

Ninety-two articles were reviewed, 47articles of which met the eligibility criteria. Exclusions were due to lack of an experimental study (1 review, 2 commentaries, 1 workshop overview), lack of cognitive performance measurements (26 studies), conditions not randomized (4 studies), lacked a control group (3 studies), older adult participants (2 studies), and published before 2008 (6 study). Majority of the included articles tested the utility of a transcranial direct current stimulation however, specific parameters varied between studies. Table 8 presents a summary of the enhancement effects.

Table 8. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Transcranial Stimulation Transcranial Stimulation

- 1. Main findings:
 - a. Mixed effects for tasks requiring executive functioning
 - b. Mixed effects for creativity/object naming tasks
 - c. Mixed effects on attention, though some consistency in quicker response times
 - d. Mixed effects for decision making
 - e. Mixed effects for working memory
 - f. Consistent effects seen with:
 - i. Learning tasks, however, type of learning differed (e.g., motor vs. language) faster rate of learning found
 - ii. Perception based tasks, with increased accuracy and reduced thresholds found
 - iii. Visuospatial attention, increased accuracy
 - iv. Recall tasks
- 2. Sample size:
 - a. Findings by gender are not reported
 - b. Within subjects design sample sizes range from 9-120 with significant effects
 - c. Between subjects design sample sizes range from 24-48 with significant effects
- 3. Stimulation parameters are inconsistent across many studies

Intervention	Type, intensity, location, duration	Construct(s) Measured	Enhancement effect(s)
Transcranial Direct Current	1 mA applied for 10 minutes to the	Working Memory	Enhancement (compared to sham-control: Andrews 2011)
Stimulation	frontal region		Enhancement (compared to
(tDCS)			sham; Giglia, 2014)
	I mA applied for	Executive Function	Enhancement when applied to
	20 minutes to		each hemisphere (compared to
	frontal region		sham-control: Gbadevan, 2016 [*])
		Learning	No enhancement for learning
			new material, enhancement of
			automaticity of already learned
			material (compared to sham-
			control and application to
			Enhancement (compared to
			sham-control: deVries 2009)
		Perception / Attention	Enhancement (compared to 2
		1	mA application and sham-
			control; Hoy, 2013)
			No enhancement (compared to 2
			mA and sham-control; Teo,
			2011)
			No enhancement (compared to
			sham-control; deVries, 2009)

i ma applied	Working memory	Enhancement with cathodal
twice for 10		applied with a 10 minute interval
minutes (total of		between sessions and with
20 minutes of		continuous anodal application
stimulation) to		(compared to sham-control, each
frontal region		anodal and cathodal, and
		different timed intervals between
		stimulation applications;
		Carvahlo, 2014)
	Perception / Attention	Enhancement (compared to
1 7 1 1 1		sham-control; Hsu, 2015)
1.5 mA applied	Executive Function	Enhancement (compared to
for 15 minutes to		sham-control, accuracy
frontal region		improved as a function of
		predictability; Sela, 2012)
	Working Memory	No enhancement (compared to
		sham-control; Steenbergen,
1 7 1 1 1	<u>a</u>	2016)
1.5 mA applied	Creativity / Cognitive	Enhancement (compared to
for 20 min to	Flexibility	sham-control, increased
frontal region		creativity as a function of
		priming; Colombo, 2015)
	Perception / Attention	No Enhancement (compared to
		application to parietal region and
2 4 1: 1.0	<u>a</u>	sham-control; Roy, 2015)
2 mA applied for	Creativity / Cognitive	Enhancement when applied for
		In manual to a looman and to allow
8 & 10 minutes to	riexidinty	10 minutes (compared to snam-
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region		control; Fertonani, 2010)
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for	Learning	control; Fertonani, 2010) Enhancement (compared to
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to	Learning	control; Fertonani, 2010) Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham-
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning	Control; Fertonani, 2010) Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015 [*])
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory Working Memory	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory Working Memory	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory Working Memory	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory Working Memory	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)No enhancement (compared to
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory Working Memory	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy,
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory Working Memory	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy, 2015)
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory Working Memory	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy, 2015)
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory Working Memory	To finitutes (compared to shaft- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy, 2015)No enhancement (compared to 1 mA and sham-control; Hoy,
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region	Learning Memory Working Memory	 To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010) Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*) Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015) No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016) No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy, 2015) No enhancement (compared to 1 mA and sham-control; Hoy, 2013)
8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for	Learning Memory Working Memory Attention / Decision	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy, 2015)No enhancement (compared to 1 mA and sham-control; Hoy, 2013)No enhancement (compared to 1
 8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region 	Learning Memory Working Memory Attention / Decision Making	To finitutes (compared to shaft- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy, 2015)No enhancement (compared to 1 mA and sham-control; Hoy, 2013)No enhancement (compared to 1 sham-control; Smittenaar, 2014)
 8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region 	Learning Memory Working Memory Attention / Decision Making	 To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010) Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*) Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015) No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016) No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy, 2015) No enhancement (compared to 1 mA and sham-control; Hoy, 2013) No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Smittenaar, 2014)
 8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 2 mA applied for 25 minutes to the frontal region 2 mA applied for 	Learning Memory Working Memory Attention / Decision Making Perception / Attention	To minutes (compared to sham- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy, 2015)No enhancement (compared to 1 mA and sham-control; Hoy, 2013)No enhancement (compared to 1 mA and sham-control; Hoy, 2013)No enhancement (compared to 5 sham-control; Hoy, 2013)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Smittenaar, 2014)
 8 & 10 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 20 minutes to frontal region 2 mA applied for 25 minutes to the frontal region 2 mA applied for 30 minutes to 	Learning Memory Working Memory Attention / Decision Making Perception / Attention	To minutes (compared to snam- control; Fertonani, 2010)Enhancement (compared to temporal region and sham- control; Nikolin, 2015*)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Matzen, 2015)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Wang, 2016)No enhancement (compared to sham-control and tACS; Hoy, 2015)No enhancement (compared to 1 mA and sham-control; Hoy, 2013)No enhancement (compared to 1 mA and sham-control; Hoy, 2013)No enhancement (compared to sham-control; Smittenaar, 2014)Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Smittenaar, 2012)

frontal region	Working Memory	Enhancement (for alerting attention, compared to sham- control; Coffman, 2012) Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Trumbo, 2016) Enhancement when paired with training (compared to no- training sham-control and tDCS only; Martin, 2013)
1 mA applied for 20 minutes to parietal region	Learning	Enhancement (compared to frontal application and sham- control; Luculano, 2013) Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Meinzer, 2014)
1.5 mA applied for 20 minutes to parietal region	Perception / Attention	Enhancement when applied to right side (compared to sham- control, left side, and frontal region; Roy, 2015 [*])
1.5 mA applied for 15 minutes to parietal region	Perception / Attention	No enhancement (Weiss, 2012)
2 mA applied for 20 minutes to parietal region	Perception / Attention	Enhancement (compared to sham-control, occurred when placed on both hemispheres; Fujimoto, 2017)
2 mA applied for 30 minutes to parietal region	Perception / Attention	Enhancement when applied to right side (compared to sham- control and left side placement; Bolognini, 2010)
1 mA applied for 20 minutes to motor cortex	Learning	Enhancement with task-specific learning outcomes (Saucedo Marquez, 2013)
	Executive Function	No enhancement (when compared to frontal application and sham-control; Gbadeyan, 2016 [*])
2 mA applied for 20 minutes to the right cerebral hemisphere	Working Memory	No enhancement (Van Wessel, 2016)
2 mA applied for 13 minutes to temporal region	Memory	Enhancement with anodal placement on right hemisphere (compared to sham-control and left hemisphere placement; Chi, 2010)
2 mA applied for 20 minutes to	Learning	No enhancement (compared to sham-control and frontal region

	temporal region		placement; Nikolin, 2015*)
	2 mA applied for 20 minutes to cerebellum	Learning	Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Ferruci, 2013)
	1 mA applied for 20 minutes to primary somatosensory cortex	Perception / Attention	Enhanced when applied to both hemispheres (compared to single hemisphere application and sham-control; Fujimoto, 2014)
	1.5 mA applied for 20 minutes to occipital cortex	Memory	Enhanced when applied offline (compared to online and sham- control; Barbieri, 2016)
	0.7 mA applied for 570s intervals for 10 minutes to the frontal region	Attention / Decision Making	Enhancement when applied to left hemisphere (compared to right hemisphere application and sham-control; Filmer, 2017)
Oscillating tDCS	0 to 0.6 mA oscillating at 75 Hz for 25 minutes applied to frontal region during sleep	Memory	Enhancement for motor recall but not paired word associations (compared to sham-stimulation; Sahlem, 2015)
Intermittent theta-burst stimulation (iTBS)	3 pulses of stimulation at 50 Hz delivered during a 2s train repeated every 10s for total of 190s, this was repeated every 200ms for a total of 600 pulses; applied to frontal region	Working Memory	Enhancement (compared to sham-control; Hoy, 2016)
		Sustained attention	Enhancement only when applied to cortical dorsal attention network (compared to sham- control) greatest degree seen in low-baseline performers (Esterman, 2017)
		Transient attentional control	Enhancement (compared to sham-control) (Esterman, 2017)
Transcranial Alternating Current Stimulation (tACS)	1500 μA at frequencies of 40, 60 or 80 Hz for 45 minutes or 15 minutes to the	Perception / Attention	Enhancement with 60 Hz application (compared to 40 Hz, 80 Hz, and sham-control; Laczo, 2012)

	visual cortex		
	Between -750 µA and 750 µA at frequency of 40 Hz delivered for 20 minutes to frontal region	Working Memory	Enhancement as a function of load (compared to tDCS and sham-control; Hoy, 2015)
	Theta-tACS, 6Hz, temporo-parietal cortex, 20 min	Associative learning	Enhancement (compared to sham group) (Antonenko, 2016)
	Gamma-tACS, 40Hz, dorso- lateral pre-frontal cortex, 20 min	Working memory	Enhancement (compared to sham and tDCS groups) limited to higher workload version of task (Hoy, 2015)
	6 Hz, left and right frontal cortex, 11 min	Reversal learning	Enhancement (compared to sham group) in faster learning but deficit in rule-application behavior (Wischnewski, 2016)
Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS)	1 Hz, primary motor cortex, 10 min	Visuomotor skill	No enhancement (Borich, 2011)
	1 Hz, right and left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, 6 min	Contextual reasoning	Enhancement (compared to sham) (Tulviste, 2016)
		Visuospatial working memory	No enhancement (Tulviste, 2016)
	10 Hz, lateral occipital cortex, 1050 pulses	Visual selective attention	Enhancement (compared to sham) when applied in early stages of task execution (Estocinova, 2016)
	10 Hz, right and left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, 6 min	Contextual reasoning	Enhancement left-side only (compared to sham) (Tulviste, 2016)
		Visuospatial working memory	No enhancement (Tulviste, 2016)
	5 HZ, lateral occipital complex or premotor cortex, 7s prior to task onset or during task	Working memory	Enhancement (compared to sham) when applied to lateral occipital complex, deficit when applied to premotor cortex <i>during</i> task; Enhancement (compared to sham) when applied to premotor cortex <i>prior</i> to task (Luber 2017)

	20 Hz, targeted hippocampal cortical networks, 20 min/day, 5 consecutive days	Relational memory	Enhancement (compared to sham) that persisted an average of 15 days post-treatment (Wang, 2015)
rTMS and Amoxetine (60mg)	10 Hz, primary motor cortex, 10 minutes	Motor-sequence learning	Enhancement (compared to sham) (Sczesny-Kaiser, 2014) No enhancement (Backhaus, 2016)

Note. * studies compared stimulation at different brain regions and reported twice within the table.

Miscellaneous

Fifty articles were assessed and reviewed spanning 15 cognitive enhancement interventions including energy drinks, meditation, light therapy, psychosocial stress, oxygen, music, exercise, sensory deprivation, aroma therapy, haptic feedback, dreaming, suspense/anticipation, cuing, mental strategies, video games, and enhanced water. Fifteen of the articles met eligibility criteria. Reasons for exclusion included no cognitive measures (16 studies), review or commentary (6 articles), lack of control condition/group (5 studies), quasiexperimental or correlational design (4 studies), published before 2008 (2 studies), use of animal models (1 study), and use of a novel task (1 study). Summary of findings is presented in Table 9.

Miscellaneous Interventions

Table 9. Summary of Enhancement Effects with Miscellaneous Cognitive Enhancement Interventions

	111		, IIS	
1. Main f	indings:			
a.	Positive enhancement effects seen with exercise interventions for executive			
	function and spatial	ability		
b.	. Inconsistent findings for studies of meditation			
2. Design	2. Design, individual differences, and sample sizes:			
a.	Findings by gender a	are not reported		
b.	Between-subject des	igns were used in 7 of the	e included studies with sample sizes	
	ranging from 6 to 31	per group		
с.	Within-subject desig	ns were used in 7 studies	with sample sizes ranging from 15	
to 52				
	10 52			
Intervention	Duration/	Construct(s)	Enhancement effect(s)	
Intervention	Duration/ Characteristics	Construct(s) Measured	Enhancement effect(s)	
Intervention Video games	Duration/ Characteristics Ten 1-hour	Construct(s) Measured Visuomotor control	Enhancement effect(s) Enhancement (compared to	
Intervention Video games	Duration/ Characteristics Ten 1-hour sessions playing	Construct(s) Measured Visuomotor control	Enhancement effect(s) Enhancement (compared to control group) ($\eta^2 = 0.41$, Li,	
Intervention Video games	Duration/ Characteristics Ten 1-hour sessions playing action game	Construct(s) Measured Visuomotor control	Enhancement effect(s) Enhancement (compared to control group) ($\eta^2 = 0.41$, Li, 2016)	
Intervention Video games	Duration/ Characteristics Ten 1-hour sessions playing action game (driving or first-	Construct(s) Measured Visuomotor control	Enhancement effect(s) Enhancement (compared to control group) ($\eta^2 = 0.41$, Li, 2016)	
Intervention Video games	Duration/ Characteristics Ten 1-hour sessions playing action game (driving or first- person-shooter)	Construct(s) Measured Visuomotor control	Enhancement effect(s) Enhancement (compared to control group) ($\eta^2 = 0.41$, Li, 2016)	
Intervention Video games	Duration/ Characteristics Ten 1-hour sessions playing action game (driving or first- person-shooter)	Construct(s) Measured Visuomotor control	Enhancement effect(s) Enhancement (compared to control group) ($\eta^2 = 0.41$, Li, 2016)	
Intervention Video games Energy drinks	Duration/ Characteristics Ten 1-hour sessions playing action game (driving or first- person-shooter) Red Bull*	Construct(s) Measured Visuomotor control	Enhancement effect(s)Enhancement (compared to control group) ($\eta^2 = 0.41$, Li, 2016)No enhancement (Wesnes, 2017)	

		Working memory accuracy and speed	Enhancement (compared to controls and Sugar-free Red Bull, medium effect size) (Wesnes, 2017)
	Sugar-free Red Bull** (250ml)	Sustained attention accuracy and speed	No enhancement (Wesnes, 2017)
		Working memory accuracy and speed	No enhancement (Wesnes, 2017)
Enhanced water	A menthane carboxamide based cooling agent and citric acid added to water served at - 17 degrees C	Sustained attention	Enhancement (compared to controls) (Labbe, 2010)
Exercise	Aerobic (20- minutes)	Attention	No enhancement (Lowe, 2016; Popovich, 2015)
	Aerobic (40- minutes	Spatial ability	Enhancement (compared to controls, limited to subset of tasks) (Moreau, 2015 [large effect sizes reported])
		Working memory	No enhancement (Moreau, 2015)
		Executive function	Enhancement <i>during</i> low- intensity exercise (Wohlwend, 2017)
			Enhancement <i>after</i> high-intensity exercise (Wohlwend, 2017)
	Designed sport (freestyle wrestling, 40- minutes	Spatial ability	Enhancement (compared to controls) (Moreau, 2015 [large effect sizes reported])
		Working memory	Enhancement (compared to controls) (Moreau, 2015 [large effect sizes reported])
Meditation	Mindfulness- Based Stress Reduction (2.5- hour	Sustained and selective attention	No enhancement (MacCoon, 2014)

	session/week for 8 weeks)		
	Meditation training program (2 weeks, 20- minutes mediation daily)	Metacognitive ability - memory	Enhancement (compared to controls) (Baird, 2014)
		Metacognitive ability - perception	No enhancement (Baird, 2014)
		Working memory	Enhancement (compared to controls) (Mrazek, 2013)
	Progressive Muscle Relaxation (11- minute session)	Derived relations	Enhancement (compared to control, $\eta 2 = .33$) (Tyndall, 2016)
Music	Background music in synchrony with presentation of visual stimuli	Visual processing	Enhancement (compared to control, $\eta 2 = 0.198$) (Escoffier, 2010)
	Background music during learning	Verbal learning	No enhancement (Jancke, 2010)
Psychosocial stress	Trier Social Stress Task (includes	Priming non-declarative memory	Enhancement (compared to controls) (Hidalgo, 2012)
del spe	preparing and delivering a speech, math)	Priming declarative memory	No enhancement (Hidalgo, 2012)
Oxygen	100% pure oxygen in a	Spatial working memory	Enhancement (compared to controls) (Yu, 2015)
	2.0 absolute	Immediate memory	No enhancement (Yu, 2015)
	pressure (80- minutes/day for	Digital working memory	No enhancement (Yu, 2015)
	5 days)	Attention	No enhancement (Yu, 2015)
		Long term memory	No enhancement (Yu, 2015)

* Red Bull (250ml) contains caffeine (80 mg), taurine (1000 mg), B-group vitamins (B3, B5, B6, B12), glucose (27 g), alpine spring water

**Sugar-free Red Bull (250ml) contains caffeine (80 mg), taurine (1000 mg), B-group vitamins (B3, B5, B6, B12), aspartame and acesulfame k, and alpine spring water

Discussion

The goal of this systematic literature review was to identify and summarize evidence for and against cognitive enhancement interventions for potential use with Soldiers in operational settings. We reviewed literature on both pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical interventions in an effort to summarize the current state-of-the science (years 2008-2018) regarding utility and efficacy of these methods for enhancement purposes. Overall, working memory enhancement and selective attention (using the Stroop Test) were the most consistently studied cognitive functions among the included studies. Inconsistent findings across all studies may be a reflection of true differences in effects or may be driven by methodology such as different tasks used to measure the same constructs or individual differences. A key finding reported in many studies is the moderating effect of baseline performance on enhancement (enhancement was seen in low performers and deficits in high performers) which has important implications for use in military settings. Specifically, some interventions may not be appropriate or effective in highly skilled or highly trained operators such as aviators. Below, we discuss the results of each intervention category in the context of feasibility for use in military settings.

Pharmaceutical Interventions

A total of eleven drugs and drug classes were identified in this review for enhancement purposes. The most researched drug in this review was modafinil with studies of doses ranging from 100-400 mg. The most consistent finding is the moderating effect of baseline performance on enhancement such that enhancement properties were limited to low baseline performers. Considering the findings of this review alongside the findings of a 2015 systematic review specific to modafinil of studies published from 1990-2015, there appears to be consistent evidence in support of enhancement of low-level cognitive processes but not for higher-order processes or complex tasks (Battleday & Brem, 2015). There is some recent evidence in support of attention enhancement whereas past research findings have been mixed (Battleday & Brem, 2015; Repantis, Schlattmann, Laisney, & Heuser, 2010). The variability in tasks used to measure attention and its sub-component, alertness, may be a contributing factor to the mixed results that are also likely confounded by individual differences. The source of this inconsistency in findings is only speculated upon at this point and needs to be further examined prior to decisions regarding implementation in military settings. Importantly, the studies reviewed did not suggest any negative side effects or mood changes associated with modafinil, consistent with past findings (Battleday & Brem, 2015). Overall, modafinil may be useful for enhancement in military settings given that it is not habit-forming, does not appear to yield any negative secondary effects, and does have considerable support suggesting some enhancement properties, however, limited.

Similar findings to those for modafinil were seen for amphetamine and mixed amphetamine salts (e.g., Adderall). Specifically, enhancement was moderated by baseline performance with enhancement limited to low baseline performers. The cognitive constructs enhanced included non-verbal convergent creative thinking, reasoning, and episodic memory whereas mixed results were seen for vigilance and verbal learning. No enhancement was found for divergent thinking, verbal creative thinking, working memory, and inhibitory control. In fact, one study suggested decremented working memory, processing speed, visual learning, and verbal learning performance in high baseline performers. Again, similar to modafinil, other reviews have found that mixed amphetamine salts may be appropriate for enhancing simple tasks and sustained attention yet inappropriate for more complex tasks and selective attention given increases in impulsivity following administration (Advokat, 2010). With regard to side effects, mixed amphetamine salts are addictive and have potential for abuse making them less attractive for implementation.

Methylphenidate is another potential drug for cognitive enhancement with mixed results in the literature and concerning negative secondary effects (as well as addictive properties). The present review yielded evidence for enhancement of associative learning, error awareness, alertness, and visual perception processing speed with large effect sizes when reported. Doses ranged from 20-40 mg and some findings were moderated by baseline performance level with some enhancement limited to low performers and some limited to high performers. These findings are consistent with those from a published literature review of single-dose studies published between 1978 and 2013 showing evidence in support of working memory and processing speed enhancement (Linssen et al., 2014). Translation of any enhancement properties to complex tasks has not been established, however, and is needed prior to recommending consideration for military settings.

The enhancement results for the other drugs and drug classes included in this review (selective serontin reuptake inhibitors cholinesterase inhibitors, caffeine, serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors, nootropics, selective inhibitor of cyclic guanosine monophosphate, nicotine, and antibiotics) were mixed. Specifically, the enhancement evidence for caffeine was mixed with positive findings limited to short- and long-term memory recall tasks. Enhancement from escitalopram appears to be confounded by task familiarity in the study. Ceretrophin and physostigmine showed enhancement for abstract reasoning and visual attention, respectively. These drugs may be potentially useful in military settings, however, additional replication studies are needed.

Herbal and Vitamin Supplements

Eleven herbal and vitamin supplements were identified in this review for enhancement purposes. The most researched of which was glucose with studies of doses ranging from 17-75 mg. Working memory was most consistently enhanced across the studies despite differences in methodology. This is consistent with published literature reviews suggesting memory enhancement in healthy adults in normal conditions (Smith, Riby, van Eekelen, & Foster, 2011). Note that this review found episodic memory to be most consistently enhanced. There did not appear to be a clear pattern with respect to dosage (e.g., effects were not seen with one dose level and not others) and inconsistent results likely are reflections of differences in methodology or individual differences. Interestingly, the enhancement effects of palm leaf extract oil were studied in the long-term (following two months of use) whereas majority of the other studies were more short-term or single-dose in nature. Enhancement was found for palm leaf extract oil but only one study was identified (Mohamed et al., 2013). Nearly all studies including fish oil yielded null effects. Our review did not find support for Bacopa, which is inconsistent with past reviews. Specifically, Neale, Camfield, Reay, Stough, & Scholey, 2012 conducted a metaanalysis comparing effect sizes for enhancement by nutraceuticals (bacopa and ginseng) and modafinil and found that the nutraceuticals were nearly as effective as modafinil at enhancing cognition. Our review did find support, however, for ginseng enhancing working memory and attention but not information processing. Use of nutraceuticals and vitamins is very attractive given the lack of habit-forming properties but the literature is mixed and further replication studies are needed.

Training

A total of four forms of training were included within the review. These included neurofeedback training (5 studies), instrumental sensorimotor rhythm conditional training (1 study), haptic feedback (1 study), and task training (6 studies). Results from neurofeedback training studies suggest that repeated sessions over time may be more beneficial than single sessions given that single sessions produced mixed results and multiple sessions more consistently produced enhancement effects. Additionally, enhancement of working memory and attention were most commonly seen within the literature, suggesting these constructs may be more likely to benefit from neurofeedback training. The task training studies consistently showed positive effects in attention, working memory, and spatial cognition tasks. However, due to the variability of tasks trained on and methods used, it is difficult to evaluate whether task training would provide benefit to the military. Needed are studies examining the transferability of tasks.

Sleep

Methods of targeted sleep interventions for cognitive enhancement that were reviewed included single session naps (9 studies), memory reactivation during slow-wave sleep (2 studies), overnight sleep (8 studies), and fragmented sleep (1 study). Enhancement following naps appears to be moderated by the duration of REM sleep acquired as well as the type of cognitive ability tested. Specifically, results seem to be strongest for perceptual learning and declarative memory. Training prior to a wake-day or sleep-night also appears to affect subsequent performance such that those who are tested following sleep show greater gains in performance than those tested before a night of sleep. These enhancements were seen for emotional, probabilistic, and motor-sequence learning.

Transcranial Stimulation

Five forms of transcranial stimulation were identified for enhancement purposes within this review. These included transcranial direct current stimulation (33 studies), oscillating direct current stimulation (1 study), intermittent theta-burst stimulation (2 studies), transcranial alternating current stimulation (4 studies), and repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (6 studies including1 combined with amoxetine). Amongst these five forms, the stimulation parameters used within studies varied greatly. However, in terms of outcomes, several consistent findings were seen. These were primarily enhancement of learning tasks, perception-based tasks, visuospatial attention, and recall tasks. The consistencies were found across the five forms of stimulation identified. These results partially align with past reviews of the literature on this topic. For example, enhancement of learning has been found for motor learning. Specifically, one review that examined the effects of tDCS including only studies where the placement of the anode was over M1, determined the effects of stimulation on learning may depend on the stage of learning when stimulation is applied, as well as the tasks assessed and stimulation parameters used (Hashemirad et al., 2016). The variability of studies finding enhancement or none has been supported in other reviews. For example, a recent meta-analysis of tDCS effects on working memory concluded that the enhancement of working memory by application of tDCS still remained uncertain, but that application of anodal stimulation to the left DLPFC *during* working memory training appeared to have the greatest potential (Mancuso, Ilieva, Hamilton, & Farah, 2016). Similarly, application of rTMS over the DLPFC was concluded to improve working memory in one review article, whereas application of tDCS only improved reaction time for working memory tasks (Brunoni & Vanderhasselt, 2014).

Given the variety of stimulation parameters used in the studies, as well as differences in cognitive assessments used, it is not possible to recommend any form of transcranial stimulation for military use at this time. This issue was confirmed in a review of tDCS applied to the DLPFC in both healthy and neuropsychiatric samples, where an examination of stimulation parameters used across studies suggested that task accuracy were predicted by stimulation current, density, and density charge (Dedoncker, Brunoni, Baeken, & Vanderhasselt, 2016). These would need to be remedied prior to recommending use of any form of transcranial stimulation. However, in terms of plausibility, tDCS and its variants (e.g., alternating current) are the most suitable candidates for further examination due to established safety, low costs, and ease of application.

Miscellaneous

Of the additional interventions identified in the review, exercise appears to have some potential for use such that aerobic exercise enhanced executive function and spatial ability but not working memory. Energy drinks did not produce enhancement effects whereas meditation did tend to show enhancement in higher-order processes.

Limitations

While the methodology used here complimented the study purpose, it is not exhaustive by any means and the results are thus limited to some degree. First, the methodology was not designed to identify novel or underrepresented interventions. Thus, we find that the interventions with the most support are also those with the most attention (stimulants and transcranial direct stimulations). Also, some interventions with potential for enhancement were not picked up using this approach. For example, macular pigment is a promising intervention approach shown to enhance visual performance but was not identified in our literature searches. Similarly, not all articles on a particular intervention were captured which is particularly a problem for underrepresented approaches since the conclusions are unfairly based on one or two studies. Considering these limitations is important when drawing conclusions about the utility of a particular intervention, and more so important when interpreting our findings with respect to an underrepresented topic.

Recommendations for Future Research

Additional research is needed prior to implementation of cognitive enhancement interventions in military settings. Missing from the literature overall are studies examining the

post-enhancement effects of these interventions. Specifically, whether dosing a Soldier with a stimulant or transcranial stimulation has lasting effects beyond the enhancement period that could negatively affect subsequent function such as negative impacts on sleep. Impaired sleep quality or duration could potentially compromise the next day's performance which, depending on mission needs, could be a substantially limiting factor. Also, secondary effects during the enhancement period were not consistently reported in studies. Some of the interventions summarized may have considerable negative side effects (e.g., increased risk-taking, increased impulsivity) that would override any benefit from enhancement. Systematic evaluation of side effects associated with enhancement interventions that include assessment of those that would be particularly detrimental in an operational setting, such as increased impulsivity, are required. Ideally such studies would be done in conjunction with evaluation of performance on military tasks using a military population, as similar examination within the general population may result different risk-taking decisions based on past experiences.

Conclusions

The findings of this review support a number of cognitive enhancement interventions. However, the strength of that support varies and is affected by moderating variables as well as inconsistent results across the literature. The interventions with the strongest support are pharmaceuticals and transcranial stimulation, which may be a reflection of the amount of attention given to these interventions and not purely strength of the interventions' effects. Much is unknown with respect secondary effects and post-enhancement effects for these interventions and further research is needed to understand the most advantageous implementation strategies. This page is intentionally blank.

References

- Advokat, C. (2010). What are the cognitive effects of stimulant medications? Emphasis on adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *34*(8), 1256-1266.
- Albouy, G., Fogel, S., King, B., Laventure, S., Benali, H., Karni, A.,... Doyon, J. (2015). Maintaining vs. enhancing motor sequence memories: Respective roles of striatal hippocampal systems. *NeuroImage*, 108, 423-434.
- Alger, S., Lau, H., & Fishbein, W. (2010). Delayed onset of a daytime nap facilitates retention of declarative memory. *PlosOne*, *5*(8), e12131.
- Amen, D. G., Taylor, D.V., Ojala, K., Kaur, J., & Willeumier, K. (2013). Effects of the braindirected nutrients on cerebral blood flow and neuropsychological testing: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover trial. *Advances*, 27(2), 24-33.
- An, Y., Jung, K., Kim, S., Lee, C., & Kim, D. (2015). Effects of blood glucose levels on restingstate EEG and attention in healthy volunteers. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology*, 32, 51-56.
- Anonymous, 2004
- Antonenko, D., Faxel, M., Grittner, U., Lavidor, M., & Floel, A. (2016). Effects of transcranial alternating current stimulation on cognitive functions in healthy young and older adults. *Neural Plasticity, 2016*, 1-13.
- Backhaus, W., Braab, H., Renne, T., Kruger, C., Gerloff, C., & Hummel, F. (2016). Daytime sleep has no effect on the time course of motor sequence and visuomotor adaptation learning. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, *131*, 147-154.
- Baird, B., Mrazek, M., Phillips, D., & Schooler, J. (2014). Domain-specific enhancement of metacognitive ability following meditation training. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 413(5), 1972-1979.
- Barbieri, M., Negrini, M., Nitsche, M. A., & Rivolta, D. (2016). Anodal-tDCS over the human right occipital cortex enhances the perception and memory of both faces and objects. *Neuropsychologia*, *81*, 238-244. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.12.030
- Barsky, M., Tucker, M., & Stickgold, R. (2015). REM sleep enhancement of probabilistic classification learning is sensitive to subsequent interference. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, *122*, 63-68.
- Battleday, R., & Brem, A. (2015). Modafinil for cognitive neuroenhancement in healthy nonsleep deprived subjects: A systematic review. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, 25(11), 1865-1881.
- Bauer, M., Kluge, C., Bach, D., Bradbury, D., Heinze, H., Dolan, R., & Driver, J. (2012). Cholinergic enhancement of visual attention and neural oscillations in the human brain.

Current Biology, 22, 397-402.

- Bellebaum, C., Kuchinke, L., & Roser, P. (2016). Modafinil alters decision making based on feedback history- A randomized placebo-controlled double blind study in humans. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, 1-7.
- Bolognini, N., Fregni, F., Casati, C., Olgiati, E., & Vallar, G. (2010). Brain polarization of parietal cortex augments training-induced improvement of visual exploratory and attentional skills. *Brain Research*, 1349, 76-89. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2010.06.053
- Borich, M., Furlong, M., Holsman, D., & Kimberley, T. (2011). Goal-directed visuomotor skill learning: Off-line enhancement and the importance of the primary motor cortex. *Rehabilitation Medicine*, *29*(2), 105-113.
- Bostrom, N., & Sandberg, A. (2009). Cognitive enhancement: Methods, ethics, regulatory challenges. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 15, 311-341.
- Brawn, T., Fenn, K., Nusbaum, H., & Mragoliash, D. (2010). Consolidating the effects of waking and sleep on motor-sequence learning. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *30*(42), 13977-13982.
- Brown, L., & Riby, L. (2013). Glucose enhancement of event-related potentials associated with episodic memory and attention. *Food & Functioning*, *4*, 770.
- Brunoni, A. R., & Vanderhasselt, M. A. (2014). Working memory improvement with noninvasive brain stimulation of the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain and Cognition*, *86*, 1-9.
- Cairney, S., Durrant, S., Hulleman, J., & Lewis, P. (2014). Targeted memory reactivation during slow wave sleep facilitates emotional memory consolidation. *Sleep*, *34*(4), 701-707.
- Carvahlo, S., Boggio, P., Goncalves, O., Vigario, A., Faria, M., Silva, S., ... Leite, J. (2014). Transcranial direct current stimulation based metaplasticity protocols in working memory. *Brain Stimulation*, 1-6.
- Chi, R. P., Fregni, F., & Snyder, A. W. (2010). Visual memory improved by non-invasive brain stimulation. *Brain Research*, 1353, 168-175. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2010.07.062
- Chou, H., Talledo, J., Lamb, S., Thompson, W., Swerdlow, N. (2013). Amphetamine effects on MATRICS Concensus Cognitive Battery performance in healthy adults. *Psyhchopharmacology*, 227, 165-176.
- Coffman, B. A., Trumbo, M. C., & Clark, V. P. (2012). Enhancement of object detection with transcranial direct current stimulation is associated with increased attention. *BMC Neuroscience*, *13*(1), 108. doi:10.1186/1471-2202-13-108
- Colombo, B., Bartesaghi, N., Simonelli, L., & Antonietti, A. (2015). The combined effects of neurostimulation and priming on creative thinking. A preliminary tDCS study on dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 9.

doi:10.3389/fnhum.2015.00403

- Cope, Z., Minassian, A., Kreitner, D., MacQueen, D., Milienne-Petiot, M., Geyer, M., ... Young, J. (2017). Modafinil improves attentional performance in healthy, non-sleep deprived humans at doses not inducing hyperarousal across species. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 125, 254-262.
- Cousins, J., El-Deredy, W., Parkes, L., Hennies, N., Lewis, P. (2014). Cued memory reactivation during slow-wave sleep promotes explicit knowledge of a motor sequence. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *34*(8), 15870-15876.
- Cunningham, T., Crowell, C., Alger, S., Kessinger, E., Villano, M., Mattingly, S., & Payne, J. (2014). Psychophysiological arousal at encoding leads to reduced reactivity but enhanced emotional memory following sleep. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 114, 155-164.
- Debarnot, U., Creveaux, T., Collet, C., Doyon, J., & Guillot, A. (2009). Sleep contribution to motor memory consolidation: A motor imagery study. *Sleep*, *32*(12), 1559-1565.
- 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 in healthy and neuropsychiatric samples: Influence of stimulation parameters. *Brain Stimulation 9*, 501-517.
- De vries, M., Barth, A., Maiworm, S., Knecht, S., Switserlood, P., & Floel, A. (2009). Electrical stimulation of the Broca's Area enhances implicit learning of an artificial grammar. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 22(11), 2427-2436.
- Diekelmann, S., Biggel, S., Rasch, B., & Born, J. (2012). Offline consolidation of memory varies with time in slow wave sleep and can be accelerated by cuing memory reactivations. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, *98*, 103-111.
- Djonlagic, I., Rosenfield, A., Shohamy, D., Myers, C., Gluck, M., & Stickgold, R. (2009). Sleep enhances category learning. *Learning & Memory*, 16(12), 751-755.
- Dopplemeyer, M., & Weber, E. (2011). Effects of SMR and theta/beta neurofeedback on reaction times, spatial abilities, and creativity. *Journal of Neurotheraphy*, 15(2), 115-129.
- Drueke, B., Baetz, J., Boecker, M., Moeller, O., Heimke, C., Grunder, G., & Gauggel, S. (2009). Differential effects of escitalopram on attention: A placebo-controlled, double-blind cross-over study. *Psychopharmacology*, 207, 213-223.
- Escoffier, N., Sheng, D., & Schirmer, A. (2010). Unattended musical beats enhance visual processing. *Acta Psychologica*, 135, 12-16.
- Escolano, C., Navarro-Gil, M., Garcia-Campayo, J., & Minguez, J. (2014). The effects of a single session of upper alpha neurofeedback for cognitive enhancement: A Shamcontrolled study. *Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback*, 39(3-4), 227-236. doi:10.1007/s10484-014-9262-9

- Esposito, R et al. (2013). Acute effects of Modafinil on brain resting state networks in young healthy subjects. *PlosOne*, 8(7), e69224.
- Esterman, M, Thai, M., Okabe, H., DeGutis, J., Saad, E., Laganiere, S., & Halko, M. (2017). Network-targeted cerebellar transcranial magnetic stimulation improves attentional control. *NeuroImage*, 190-198.
- Estocinova, J., Gerfo, E., Libera, C., Chelazzi, L., & Santandrea, E. (2016). Augmenting distractor filtering via transcranial magnetic stimulation of the lateral occipital cortex. *Cortex, 84*, 63-79.
- Falcone, B., Coffman, B. A., Clark, V. P., & Parasuraman, R. (2012). Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Augments Perceptual Sensitivity and 24-Hour Retention in a Complex Threat Detection Task. *PLoS ONE*, 7(4). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0034993
- Farah, M., Haimm, C., Sankoorikal, G., & Chatterjee, A. (2009). When we enhance cognition with Adderall, do we sacrifice creativity? A preliminary study. *Psychopharmacology*, 202, 541-547.
- Fenker, D. B., Frey, J. U., Schuetze, H., Heipertz, D., Heinze, H., & Duzel, E. (2008). Novel scenes improve recollection and recall of words. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 20(7), 1250-1265. doi:10.1162/jocn.2008.20086
- Ferri, R., Drago, V., Arico, D., Bruni, O., Remington, R., Stamatakis, K., & Punjabi, M. (2010). The effects of experimental sleep fragmentation on cognitive processing. *Sleep Medicine*, 11, 378-385.
- Ferrucci, R., Brunoni, A. R., Parazzini, M., Vergari, M., Rossi, E., Fumagalli, M., ... Priori, A. (2013). Modulating Human Procedural Learning by Cerebellar Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation. *The Cerebellum*, *12*(4), 485-492. doi:10.1007/s12311-012-0436-9
- Fertonani, A., Rosini, S., Cotelli, M., Rossini, P. M., & Miniussi, C. (2010). Naming facilitation induced by transcranial direct current stimulation. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 208(2), 311-318. doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2009.10.030
- Filmer, H. L., Varghese, E., Hawkins, G. E., Mattingley, J. B., & Dux, P. E. (2017). Improvements in Attention and Decision-Making Following Combined Behavioral Training and Brain Stimulation. *Cerebral Cortex*, 27, 3675-3682. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhw189
- Finke, K., Dodds, M. C., Bublak, P., Regenthal, R., Baumann, F., Manly, T., Muller, U. (2010). Effects of modafinil and methylphenidate on visual attention capacity: a TVA-based study. *Psychopharmacology*, 210, 317-329.
- Fujimoto, S., Tanaka, S., Laakso, I., Yamaguchi, T., Kon, N., Nakayama, T., ... Kitada, R. (2017). The effect of dual-hemisphere transcranial direct current stimulation over the parietal operculum on tactile orientation discrimination. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 11(173).

- Fujimoto, S., Yamaguchi, T., Otaka, Y., Kondo, K., & Tanaka, S. (2014). Dual-hemisphere transcranial direct current stimulation improves performance in a tactile spatial discrimination task. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *125*(8), 1669-1674. doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2013.12.100Gbadeyan, O., Mcmahon, K., Steinhauser, M., & Meinzer, M. (2016). Stimulation of Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex Enhances Adaptive Cognitive Control: A High-Definition Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Study. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *36*(50), 12530-12536. doi:10.1523/jneurosci.2450-16.2016
- Giglia, G., Brighina, F., Rizzo, S., Puma, A. Indovino, S., Maccora, S., Baschi, R., Cosentino, G., & Fierro, B. (2014). Anodal transcranial direct current stimulation of the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex enhances memory-guided responses in a visuospatial working memory task. *Functional Neurology*, 29(3), 189-193.
- Gill, J., Shah-Basak, P., Hamilton, R. (2015). It's the thought that counts: Examining the taskdependent effects of transcranial direct current stimulation on executive function. *Brain Stimulation*, *8*, 253-259.
- Gilleen, J., Michalopoulou, P., Reichenberg, A., Drake, R., Wykes, T., Lewis, S., & Kapur, S. (2014). Modafinil combined with cognitive training is associated with improved learning in healthy volunteers- A randomized controlled trial. European *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 24, 529-539.
- Gregory, M., Agam, Y., Selvadurai, C., Nagy, A., Vangel, M., Tucker, ... Manoach, D. (2014). Resting state connectivity immediately following learning correlates with subsequent sleep-dependent enhancement of motor task performance. *NeuroImage*, *102*, 666-673.
- Gyselinck, V., Meneghetti, C., Beni, R. D., & Pazzaglia, F. (2009). The role of working memory in spatial text processing: What benefit of imagery strategy and visuospatial abilities? *Learning and Individual Differences, 19*(1), 12-20. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2008.08.002
- Hester, R. Nandam, L., O'Connell, R., Wagner, J., Strudwick, M., Nathan, P., ... Bellgrove, M. (2012). Neurochemical enhancement of conscious error awareness. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(8), 2619-2627.
- Hidalgo, V., Villada, C., Almela, M., Espin, L., Gomez-Amor, Jesus, & Salvador, A. (2012). Enhancing effects of acute psychosocial stress on priming of non-declarative memory in healthy young adults. *Stress*, 15(3), 329-338.
- Hoedlmoser, K., Pecherstorfer, T., Gruber, G., Anderer, P., Doppelmayr, M., Klimesch, W., & Schabus, M. (2008). Instrumental conditioning of human sensorimotor rhythm (12-15 Hz) and its impact on sleep as well as declarative learning. *Sleep*, *31*(10), 1401-1408.
- Hussain, S., & Cole, K. (2015). No enhancement of 24-hour visumotor skill retention by postpractice caffeine administration. *PlosOne*, *10*(6), e0129543.
- Hsueh, J., Chen, T., Chen, J., & Shaw, F. (2016). Neurofeedback training of EEG alpha rhythm enhances episodic and working memory. *Human Brain Mapping*, *37*(7), 2662-2675. doi:10.1002/hbm.23201

- Hoy, K. E., Emonson, M. R., Arnold, S. L., Thomson, R. H., Daskalakis, Z. J., & Fitzgerald, P. B. (2013). Testing the limits: Investigating the effect of tDCS dose on working memory enhancement in healthy controls. *Neuropsychologia*, 51(9), 1777-1784. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.05.018
- Hoy, K. E., Bailey, N., Arnold, S., Windsor, K., John, J., Daskalakis, Z. J., & Fitzgerald, P. B. (2015). The effect of γ-tACS on working memory performance in healthy controls. *Brain* and Cognition, 101, 51-56. doi:10.1016/j.bandc.2015.11.002
- Hoy, K., Bailey, N., Michael, M., Fitzgibbon, B., Rogasch, N., Saeki, T., & Fitzgerald, P. (2016). Enhancement of working memory and task-related oscillatory activity following intermittent theta burst stimulation in healthy controls. *Cerebral Cortex, 26*, 4563-4573.
- Hsu, W. Y., Zanto, T. P., Anguera, J. A., Lin, Y. Y., & Gazzaley, A. (2015). Delayed enhancement of multitasking performance: Effects of anodal transcranial direct current stimulation on the prefrontal cortex. *Cortex*, *69*, 175-185.
- Ikeda, Y., Funayama, T., Tateno, A., Fukayama, H., Okubo, Y., Suzuki, H. (2017). Modafinil enhances alerting-related brain activity in attention networks. *Psychoparmacology*, 234, 2077-2089
- Ilieva, I., Hook, C., & Farah, M. (2013). Prescription simulants' effects on healthy inhibitory control, working memory, and episodic memory: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 27(6), 1069-1089.
- Jackson, P. A., Deary, M. E., Reay, J. L., Scholey, A. B., & Kennedy, D. O. (2012). No effect of 12 weeks supplementation with 1 g DHA-rich or EPA-rich fish oil on cognitive function or mood in healthy young adults aged 18–35 years. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 107(08), 1232-1243. doi:10.1017/s000711451100403x
- Jancke, L., & Sandmann, P. (2010). Music listening while you learn: No influence of background music on verbal learning. *Behavioral and Brain Functions*, 6(3), 1-14.
- Jones, E. K., Sünram-Lea, S. I., & Wesnes, K. A. (2012). Acute ingestion of different macronutrients differentially enhances aspects of memory and attention in healthy young adults. *Biological Psychology*, *89*(2), 477-486. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2011.12.017
- Kamienski, L. (2016). *Shooting Up: A short history of drugs and war*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kemeny, F., & Lukacs, A. (2016). Sleep-independent off-line enhancement and time of day effects in three forms of skill learning. *Cognitive Processing*, 17, 163-174.
- Knott, V., Salle, S. D., Choueiry, J., Impey, D., Smith, D., Smith, M., ... Labelle, A. (2015). Neurocognitive effects of acute choline supplementation in low, medium and high performer healthy volunteers. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior*, 131, 119-129. doi:10.1016/j.pbb.2015.02.004
- Labbe, D., Martin, N., Le Coutre, J., & Hudry, J. (2011). Impact of refreshing perception on

mood, cognitive performance and brain oscillations: An exploratory study. *Food Quality* and Preference, 22, 92-100

- Laczo, B., Antal, A., Niebergall, R., Treue, S., & Paulus, W. (2012). Transcranial alternating stimulation in a high gamma frequency range applied over V1 improves contrast perception but does not modulate spatial attention. *Brain Stimulation*, *5*, 484-491.
- Landry, S., Anderson, C., & Conduit, R. (2016). The effects of sleep, wake activity and time-ontask on offline motor sequence learning. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 127, 56-63.
- Lau, E., Wong, M, Lau, K., Hui, F., & Tseng, C. (2015). Rapid-eye-movement-sleep (REM) associated enhancement of working memory performance after a daytime nap. *PlosOne*, 10(5), e0125752.
- Li, R., & Chen, J. (2016). Playing action video games improves visuomotor control. *Psychological Science*, *27*(8), 1092-1108.
- Linssen, A., Sambeth, A., Vuurman, E., & Riedel, W. (2014). Cognitive effects of methylphenidate in healthy volunteers: A review of single dose studies. *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology*, 17(6), 961-977.
- Lipsy, M. & Wilson, D. (2001). Practical Meta-Analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Littell, J. H., Corcoran, J., & Pillai, V. (2008). *Systematic reviews and meta-analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lowe, C., Kolev, D., Hall, P. (2016). An exploration of exercise-induced cognitive enhancement and transfer effects to dietary self-control. *Brain and Cognition*, *110*, 102-111.
- Luber, B., Davis, S., & Lisanby, S. (2017). Working memory enhancement in young and older adults using rTMS. *Clinical Neurphysiology*, *128*, e1-e163.
- Luculano, T., & Kadosh, R. (2013). The mental cost of cognitive enhancement. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *33*(10), 4482-4486.
- MacCoon, D., MacLean, K., Davidson, R., Saron, C., & Lutz, A. (2014). No sustained attention differences in a longitudinal randomized trial comparing mindfulness based stress reduction versus active control. *Plos One*, *9*(6), e97551.
- MacQueen, D., Minassian, A., Kenton, J., Geyer, M., Perry, W., Brigman, J., & Young, J. (2018). Amphetamine improves mouse and human attention in the 5-choice continuous performance test. *Neuropharmacology*, 138, 87-96.
- Macpherson, H., Robertson, B., Sunram-Lea, S., Stough, C., Kennedy, D., & Scholey, A. (2015). Glucose administration and cognitive function: Differential effects of age and effort during a dual task paradigm in younger and older adults. *Psychopharmacology*, 232, 1135-1142.

- Malangre, A., & Blischke, K. (2016). Sleep-related offline improvements in gross motor task performance occur under free recall requirements. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 10*, 134.
- Mancuso, L. E., Ilieva, I. P., Hamilton, R. H., & Farah, M. J. (2016). Does transcranial direct current stimulation improve healthy working memory? A meta-analytic review. *Journal* of Cognitive Neuroscience, 28(8), 1063-1089.
- Martin, D. M., Liu, R., Alonzo, A., Green, M., Player, M. J., Sachdev, P., & Loo, C. K. (2013). Can transcranial direct current stimulation enhance outcomes from cognitive training? A randomized controlled trial in healthy participants. *The International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology*, 16(09), 1927-1936. doi:10.1017/s1461145713000539
- Matzen, L. E., Trumbo, M. C., Leach, R. C., & Leshikar, E. D. (2015). Effects of non-invasive brain stimulation on associative memory. *Brain Research*, 1624, 286-296. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2015.07.036
- McDevitt, E., Rowe, K., Brady, M., Duggan, K., & Mednick. (2014). The benefit of offline sleep and wake for novel object recognition. *Experimental Brain Research*, 232, 1487-1496
- Meinzer, M., Jähnigen, S., Copland, D. A., Darkow, R., Grittner, U., Avirame, K., . . . Flöel, A. (2014). Transcranial direct current stimulation over multiple days improves learning and maintenance of a novel vocabulary. *Cortex, 50*, 137-147. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2013.07.013
- Meneghetti, C., Beni, R. D., Gyselinck, V., & Pazzaglia, F. (2016??). Working memory involvement in spatial text processing: What advantages are gained from extended learning and visuo-spatial strategies? *British Journal of Psychology*, 102(3), 499-518. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8295.2010.02007.x
- Metuki, N., & Lavidor, M. (2013). Applying advancements in neurolinguistic research to enhance semantic processing via cognitive training. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 26(6), 662-690. doi:10.1016/j.jneuroling.2013.05.003
- Mohamed, S., Ming, T., & Jaffri, J. (2013). Cognitive enhancement and neuroprotection by catechin-rich oil palm leaf extract supplement. *The Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 93(4), 819-827.
- Moreau, D., Morrison, A., Conway, A. (2015). An ecological approach to cognitive enhancement: Cognitive motor training. *Acta Psychologica*, 157, 44-55.
- Mrazek, M., Franklin, M., Phillips, D., Baird, B., & Schooler, J. (2013). Mindfulness training improves working memory capacity and GRE performance while reducing mind wandering. *Psychological Science*, 2(45), 776-781.
- Neale, C., Camfield, D., Reay, J., Stough, C., & Scholey, A. (2012). Cognitive effects of two nutraceuticals Ginseng and Bacopa benchmarked against modafinil: A review and comparison of effect sizes. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 75(3), 728-737.

- Nikolin, S., Loo, C. K., Bai, S., Dokos, S., & Martin, D. M. (2015). Focalised stimulation using high definition transcranial direct current stimulation (HD-tDCS) to investigate declarative verbal learning and memory functioning. *NeuroImage*, 117, 11-19. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.05.019
- Ohler, N. (2017). Blitzed: Drugs in the Third Reich. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Otto, M., Basden, S., McHugh, R., Kantak, K., Deckersbach, T., Cather, C., ... Smits, J. (2009). Effects of D-Cycloserine administration on weekly nonemotional memory tasks in healthy participants. *Psychotherapy and psychosomatics*, 78, 49-54.
- Owen, L., Finnegan, Y., Hu, H., Scholey, A., & Sunram-Lea, S. (2010). Glucose effects on longterm memory performance: Duration and domain specificity. *Psychopharmacology*, 211, 131-140.
- Owen, L., Scholey, A., Finnegan, Y., & Sunram-Lea, S. (2013). Response variability to glucose facilitation of cognitive enhancement. *British Journal of Nutrition, 110*, 1873-1884.
- Popovich, C., & Staines, W. (2015). Acute aerobic exercise enhances attentional modulation of somatosensory event-related potentials during a tactile discrimination task. *Behaviour Brain Research*, 281, 268-275.
- Reches, A., Laufer, I., Ziv, K., Cukierman, G., McEvoy, K., Ettinger, M., ... Geva, A. (2014). Network dynamics predict improvement in working memory performance following donepezil administration in healthy young adults. *NeuroImage*, 88, 228-241.
- Repantis D, Schlattmann P, Laisney O, Heuser I. (2010). Modafinil and methylphenidate for neuroenhancement in healthy individuals: a systematic review. *Pharmacological Research, 62*, 187-206.
- Rickard, A., Lauer, I., Ziv, K., Cukierman, G., McEvoy, K., Ettinger, M., ... Geva, A. (2008). Network dynamics predict improvement in working memory performance following donepezil administration in healthy young adults. *NeuroImage*, 88, 228-241.
- Rolle, C., Anguera, J., Skinner, S., Voytek, B., & Gazzaley, A. (2017). Enhancing spatial attention and working memory in younger and older adults. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 29(9), 1483-1497.
- Rozengurt, R., Barnea, A., Uchida, S., & Levy, D. A. (2016). Theta EEG neurofeedback benefits early consolidation of motor sequence learning. *Psychophysiology*, 53(7), 965-973. doi:10.1111/psyp.12656
- Roy, L. B., Sparing, R., Fink, G. R., & Hesse, M. D. (2015). Modulation of attention functions by anodal tDCS on right PPC. *Neuropsychologia*, 74, 96-107. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.02.028
- Sahlem, G. L., Badran, B. W., Halford, J. J., Williams, N. R., Korte, J. E., Leslie, K., . . . George, M. S. (2015). Oscillating Square Wave Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) Delivered during Slow Wave Sleep Does Not Improve Declarative Memory More Than

Sham: A Randomized Sham-Controlled Crossover Study. *Brain Stimulation*, *8*, 528-534. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2015.01.414

- Sathyan-arayanan, V., Thomas, T., Einöther, S. J., Dobriyal, R., Joshi, M. K., & Krishnamachari, S. (2013). Brahmi for the better? New findings challenging cognition and anti-anxiety effects of Brahmi (Bacopa monniera) in healthy adults. *Psychopharmacology*, 227(2), 299-306. doi:10.1007/s00213-013-2978-z
- Saucedo Marquez, C. M., Zhang, X., Swinnen, S. P., Meesen, R., & Wenderoth, N. (2013). Task-Specific Effect of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation on Motor Learning. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2013.00333
- Scholey, A., Sunram-Lea, S., Greer, J., Elliot, J., Kennedy, D. (2009). Glucose administration prior to a divided attention task improves tracking performance but not work recognition: Evidence against differential memory enhancement?. *Psychopharmacology*, 202, 549-558.
- Scholey, A., Ossoukhova, A., Owen, L., Ibarra, A., Pipingas, A., He, K., ... Stough, C. (2010).
 Effects of American ginseng (Panax quinquefolius) on neurocognitive function: An acute, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover study.
 Psychopharmacology, 212(3), 345-356. doi:10.1007/s00213-010-1964-y
- Sela, T., Ivry, R.B., & Lavidor, M. (2012). Prefrontal control during a semantic decision task that involves idiom comprehension: a transcranial direct current stimulation study. *Neuropsychologia*, 50, 2271–80.
- Smith, M. A., Riby, L. M., van Eekelen, J. A. M., & Foster, J. K. (2011). Glucose enhancement of human memory: a comprehensive research review of the glucose memory facilitation effect. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 35(3), 770-783.
- Smittenaar, P., Prichard, G., Fitzgerald, T. H., Diedrichsen, J., & Dolan, R. J. (2014).
 Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation of Right Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex Does Not Affect Model-Based or Model-Free Reinforcement Learning in Humans. *PLoS ONE*, 9(1). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0086850
- Solomon, T. M., Leech, J., Debros, G. B., Murphy, C. A., Budson, A. E., Vassey, E. A., & Solomon, P. R. (2016). A randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled, parallel group, efficacy study of alpha BRAIN® administered orally. *Human Psychopharmacology: Clinical and Experimental*, 31(2), 135-143. doi:10.1002/hup.2520
- Steenbergen, L., Sellaro, R., Hommel, B., Lindenberger, U., Kühn, S., & Colzato, L. S. (2016). "Unfocus" on foc.us: Commercial tDCS headset impairs working memory. *Experimental Brain Research*, 234(3), 637-643. doi:10.1007/s00221-015-4391-9
- Stollery, B., & Leonie, Christian. (2014). Glucose, relational memory, and the hippocampus. *Psychopharmacology*, 232(12), 2113-2125.
- Stough, C., Camfield, D., Kure, C., Tarasuik, J., Downey, L., Lloyd, J., ... Reynolds, J. (2011). Improving general intelligence with a nutrient-based pharmacological intervention.

Intelligence, 39, 100-107.

- Strong, R. W., & Alvarez, G. A. (2017). Training enhances attentional expertise, but not attentional capacity: Evidence from content-specific training benefits. *Journal of Vision*, 17(4), 4. doi:10.1167/17.4.4
- Sutarto, A. P., Wahab, M. N. A., & Zin, N. M. (2013). Effect of biofeedback training on operator's cognitive performance. *Work*, 44, 231-243.
- Szesny-Kaiser, M., Bauknecht, A., Hoffken, O., Tegenthoff, M., Dinse, H., Jancke, D., ... Schwenkreis, P. (2014). Synergistic effects of noradrenergic modulation with atomoxetine and 10 Hz repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on motor learning in healthy humans. *BMC Neuroscience*, 15, 46.
- Teo, F., Hoy, K. E., Daskalakis, Z. J., & Fitzgerald, P. B. (2011). Investigating the Role of Current Strength in tDCS Modulation of Working Memory Performance in Healthy Controls. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 2. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2011.00045
- Trumbo, M. C., Matzen, L. E., Coffman, B. A., Hunter, M. A., Jones, A. P., Robinson, C. S. H., & Clark, V. P. (2016). Enhanced working memory performance via transcranial direct current stimulation: The possibility of near and far transfer. *Neuropsychologia*, 93, 85-96. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.10.011
- Tucker, M., & Fishbein, W. (2007). Enhancement of declarative memory performance following a daytime nap is contingent on strength of initial task acquisition. *Sleep*, *31*(2), 197-203.
- Tulviste, J., Goldberg, E., Podell, K., & Bachmann, T. (2016). Effects of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation on non-veridical decision making. *Acta Neurobiologiae Experimentalis*, 76, 182-191.
- Van der Schaaf, M., Fallon, S., Huurne, N., Buitelaar, J., & Cools, R. (2013). Working memory capacity predicts effects of methylphenidate on reversal learning. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 38, 2011-2018.
- van Wessel, B. W., Verhage, M. C., Holland, P., Frens, M. A., & Geest, J. N. (2016). Cerebellar tDCS does not affect performance in the N-back task. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *38*(3), 319-326. doi:10.1080/13803395.2015.1109610
- Wang J, Wang Y, Hu Z, & Li X. (2014). Transcranial direct current stimulation of the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex increased pain empathy. *Neuroscience*, 281C, 202-207.
- Wang, J., & Voss, J. (2015). Long-lasting enhancements of memory and hippocampal-cortical functional connectivity following multiple-day targeted noninvasive stimulation. *Hippocampus*, 25(8), 877-883.
- Wang, Q., Cui, H., Han, S., Black-Schaffer, R., Vols, M., Lee, Y., ... Fregni, F. (2016). Combination of transcranial direct current stimulation and methylphenidate in subacute stroke. *Neuroscience Letters*, 569, 6-11.

- Weiss, M., & Lavidor, M. (2012). When Less Is More: Evidence for a Facilitative Cathodal tDCS Effect in Attentional Abilities. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 24(9), 1826-1833. doi:10.1162/jocn a 00248
- Wesnes, K., Brooker, H., Watson, A., Bal, W., & Okello, E. (2017). Effects of the Red Bull energy drink on cognitive function and mood in healthy young volunteers. *Journal of Psyhcopharmacology*, *31*(2), 211-221.
- Wischnewski, M., Zerr, P., & Schutter, D. (2016). Effects of theta transcranial alternating current stimulation over the frontal cortex on reversal learning. *Brain Stimulation*, *9*, 105-711.
- Wohlwend, M., Olsen, A., Haberg, A., & Palmer, H. (2017). Exercise intensity-dependent effects of cognitive control function during and after acute treadmill running in young healthy adults. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 406.
- Yu, R., Wang, B., Li, S., Wang, J., Zhou, F., Shufang, C., ... Huang, R. (2015). Cognitive enhancement of healthy young adults with hyperbaric oxygen: A preliminary resting-state fMRI study. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 126, 2058-2067.
- Zeeuws, I., Deroost, N., & Soetens, E. (2010a). Effect of an acute d-amphetamine administration on context information memory in healthy volunteers: Evidence from a source memory task. *Human Psychopharmacology*, *25*, 326-334.
- Zeeuws, I., Deroost, N., & Soetens, E. (2010b). Verbal memory improved by d-amphetamine: Influence of the testing effect. *Human Psychopharmacology*, 25, 377-387.





Department of the Army U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory Fort Rucker, Alabama 36362-0577 www.usaarl.army.mil



U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command