To cite this article:

Running head: tDCS OF THE INFERIOR FRONTAL CORTEX

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) of the Inferior Frontal Cortex affects the "social scaling" of extrapersonal space depending on perspective taking ability

Chiara Fini[1,4], Lara Bardi[2], Alessandra Epifanio[3], Giorgia Committeri[3], Agnes Moors[4,1], Marcel Brass[2]

[1] Department of Experimental-Clinical and Health Psychology, Ghent University, Belgium.

[2] Department of Experimental Psychology, Ghent University, Belgium

[3] Laboratory of Neuropsychology and Cognitive Neuroscience, Department of Neuroscience, Imaging and Clinical Sciences, University G. d'Annunzio, and ITAB, Foundation G. d'Annunzio, Chieti, Italy

[4] Research Unit for Quantitative psychology and Individual differences; Centre for Social and Cultural Psychology, University of Leuven, Belgium

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Chiara Fini, Department of Experimental-Clinical and Health Psychology, Ghent University, Henri-Dunantlaan 2, 9000, Ghent, Belgium. E-mail: Chiara.Fini@ugent.be

Abstract

When we have to judge the distance between another person and an object (social condition), we judge this distance as being smaller compared to judging the distance between two objects (nonsocial condition). It has been suggested that this compression is mediated by the attribution of a motor potential to the reference frame (Other person vs. Object).

In order to explore the neural basis of this effect, we investigated whether the modulation of activity in the Inferior Frontal Cortex (IFC) of the left hemisphere (recruited during visuo-spatial processes with a social component) changes the way we categorize space in a social compared with a nonsocial condition. We applied Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation (tDCS) to the left IFC, with different polarities (anodal, cathodal, and sham) while subjects performed an extrapersonal space categorization task. Interestingly, anodal stimulation of IFC induced an higher compression of space in the social compared to nonsocial condition. By contrast, cathodal stimulation induced the opposite effect. Furthermore, we found that this effect is modulated by inter-individual differences in cognitive perspective taking. Our data support the idea that IFC is recruited during the social categorization of space.

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) of the Inferior Frontal Cortex affects the social scaling of extrapersonal space in dependence of the perspective taking ability

Introduction

Recent research has provided evidence for the idea that we perceive the space around us by taking into account our bodily resources and action opportunities (Proffitt et al., 2003; 2006; Coello & Delevoye-Turrell, 2007; Sugovic & Witt, 2013; Schnall et al., 2010). In the peripersonal space (i.e., reaching space), we perceive the target object as closer when holding a tool to reach an object compared to when no tools are available (Witt, Proffitt & Epstein, 2005). Furthermore, when judging a distance in extrapersonal space (i.e., beyond the reaching space) we scale the distance according to the specific motor potential and intention we have (Proffitt et al., 2003; Witt, et al., 2004; Proffitt, 2006; Witt & Proffitt, 2008). The distance can be scaled by the walking effort necessary to cover it, or by the throwing effort if we plan to throw a ball (Witt et al., 2004). These findings support the idea that potential anticipated behavior directly affects space perception (see Proffitt, 2006). However, since we share the space with others, our space perception is also altered by the other's action opportunities and action intentions (Costantini et al, 2011; Cardellicchio et al., 2012; Fini et al., 2014). In reaching space, for example, observing someone else using a tool to reach a target, causes a compression of the perceived target distance (Bloesch et al., 2012; Costantini et al., 2011). Furthermore, we have recently shown that in extrapersonal space a target object is judged as closer when adopting a human as an external reference frame (Fini et al., 2014). We will refer to this effect as 'compression of extrapersonal space' or 'space compression'. Moreover, the compression of extrapersonal space is greater if the space

categorization is anticipated by the observation of a target-oriented walking/running movement (Fini et al., under review).

Such results suggest that our space perception is rooted in shared motor representations, coherent with the action afforded by the environment. The space would be judged as compressed in the social compared with the nonsocial condition, because filtered by an implied biological motion. Starting from this evidence, an intriguing question concerns what are the underlying mechanisms of this social scaling of extrapersonal space perception.

The Inferior Frontal Cortex is known to be involved in different processes, one of this is the matching of motor plans (Iacoboni et al., 1999; Rizzolatti, Fogassi, & Gallese, 2001) through the encoding and representation of goals and intentions from observed actions (e.g., the goal or intention to drink from the grasping of a cup) (Cattaneo, Caruana, Jezzini, & Rizzolatti, 2009; Gallese & Sinigaglia,2011; Rizzolatti &Sinigaglia, 2010). Moreover, a recent study showed that tDCS stimulation of the Inferior Frontal Gyrus (IFG) significantly modulates motor resonance as indexed by psychophysiological measures of motor activation (Enticott et al., 2012). IFC plays also a role in the semantic processing (Mazoyer et al.,1993; Thompson-Schill et al., 1997, 1998; Wagner et al., 1997, 2001).

In a study using chronically implanted depth electrodes in the lateral inferior prefrontal cortex (LIPC), it has been found greater activity in that region related to semantic decision relative to a perceptual decision (Abdullaev and Bechtereva, 1993). By considering all these evidences, we hypothesize that IFC could be involved in the categorization of a human as biological agent, and it might form the functional basis for the motor remapping of extrapersonal space when judging the distance between another person and an object (social condition). To investigate whether IFC plays a

role during the social scaling of extrapersonal space, we used a brain stimulation technique (tDCS) to this area during a distance judgment when adopting a person (social condition) versus an object (nonsocial condition) as reference frame. With tDCS, anodal stimulation enhances cerebral excitability, while cathodal stimulation diminishes it (Nitsche & Paulus, 2000; Jang et al., 2009; Stagg et al., 2009). Although excitation and inhibition induced by tDCS do not necessarily correspond to behavioral improvements and impairments, anodal stimulation has been shown to increase performance in different tasks (e.g., Hsu et al., 2011; Galea & Celnik, 2009).

Thus, by enhancing activity (anodal stimulation) in the IFC cortex, we expect increased compression of space in the social compared with nonsocial condition. Conversely, by inhibiting (cathodal stimulation) the IFC activity, we predict a reduced compression of space in social compared with nonsocial condition.

Moreover, when a person is in the scene and participants are asked to express a spatial judgment, an automatic visuo-spatial perspective taking towards the person in the scene is promoted, (e.g., Tversky & Hard, 2009) that correlates with cognitive perspective taking ability (Erle & Topolinski 2015). Here, we tested whether cognitive perspective taking ability modulates visual spatial perspective taking and consequently the impact of the stimulation on the social space compression effect.

Method

Participants

Twenty-seven healthy students recruited at Ghent University participated at this experiment (11 females, all but 3 right handed, mean age 22,25 ± 2,48, range 18-30), all with normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Participants received financial compensation for their participation. The study was in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the local ethics committee.

Materials

Stimuli included a 3D scene created by means of 3D modelling software (3D Studio Max 4.2, Autodesk, Discreet). The scene was a 3D environment, representing a square arena defined by the two short lateral wings and the long central wing of a palace (Figure 1). In the first set of stimuli (Figure 1a) a human body (other RF) was located 45° to the right (left) of the central camera representing the participant's perspective, and a target red beach umbrella was located along a central vector aligned with the avatar at 25 different distances (from 1m to 25m). The avatar and the umbrella were 177 cm and 192 cm tall, respectively, resembling their ecological relative proportion in a real scenario. The second set of stimuli (Figure 1b) was identical to the first one, except for the presence of a green beach umbrella instead of the avatar (object RF). Note that the avatar and the green umbrella had the same spatial extension in the anterior direction. We administered the stimuli using the method of limits. This is a method for measuring perceptive thresholds, in which the subject is presented with series of stimuli with progressively increasing or decreasing (in steps of a predetermined value) intensity (distance in our case), until he/she reports to feel a change.

Procedure

Before starting the experiment participants were asked to complete the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) (Davis, 1983). We focused on the subscale of cognitive Perspective Taking (PT) that measures the reported tendency to spontaneously adopt the psychological point of view of others in everyday life (i.e. the process of projecting oneself "into the shoes" of another person).

The experiment followed the same experimental procedure employed in previous works (Fini et al., 2014; 2015a,b) and consisted of ascending and descending

series of trials. Each series started with a white fixation cross on a black background (1.5 x 1.5 cm) for 2500 msec and consisted of a maximum of 25 trials, but was terminated when a perceptual switch occurred. Each trial lasted 2500 ms. Subjects were asked to judge whether the red beach umbrella was "Near" or "Far" from the two different RFs, by pressing two different buttons arranged horizontally on the computer keyboard and counterbalanced in the "Near"/ "Far" judgment. In ascending series, the red umbrella was progressively moved away from the RF until the participants provided three consecutive "Far" judgments. In descending series, the red umbrella was progressively moved closer to the RF until the participants provided three consecutive "Near" judgments. Then the following series started. A mean was calculated for each subject as the average distance at which the subject expressed a transition from "Far" to "Near" (descending series) and from "Near" to "Far" (ascending series). The single-subject Judgment Transition Thresholds (JTTs) were averaged together to obtain a final group mean referring to the different RFs. Higher JTT values show a categorization of space as "Near" at longer target distance compared to lower JTT values. In other words, the higher the JTT, the wider the space categorized as "Near". Thus, a wider "Near" space corresponds with a more compressed distance.

Each series was repeated 4 times for each RF. In total each participant was submitted to 16 series: 2 RFs (Other, Object) x 8 series (4 ascending, 4 descending). Stimuli were presented at full screen on a 17' computer display placed 57 cm from the subject. The presentation of the stimuli and the recording of the participant's responses were controlled by a customized script for Presentation version 14.9.08.11.

tDCS

A direct current of 1.5 mA intensity was delivered by a battery-driven, constant-current stimulator (Magstim, UK) through two electrodes placed in saline-soaked sponges. All

participants indicated that they felt the stimulation. Previous studies have shown that this intensity of stimulation is safe in healthy volunteers (Iyer et al., 2005). The active electrode (anodal or cathodal) was placed over the left IFC (equivalent to electrode position FC5 in a 10-10 EEG nomenclature; Holland et al., 2011; Enticott et al., 2012). The active electrode (IFC) measured 5x7 cm and was placed with a horizontal orientation. With this electrode placement, stimulation covers both the Inferior Frontal Gyrus (IFG) and the ventral Premotor Cortex (vPMC).

The reference electrode was placed over the supraorbital area of the right hemisphere. The reference electrodes measured 10 x 10 cm. A large electrode was used for the reference in order to minimize the risk of stimulation effect in this area (Nitsche et al., 2007). Finally, for the Sham condition, anodal or cathodal pseudo-stimulation was applied for 30 sec. The sham stimulation caused temporary itching sensation but delivered little actual current.

The tDCS stimulation lasted 20 minutes (with a 30 sec ramp up, ramp down), and was started five minutes before the beginning of the task for two reasons. This delay was implemented to make the participant familiar with the sensation of being stimulated, and to have the peak of stimulation during the task. All participants took part in three counterbalanced conditions: anodal, cathodal, sham. The extrapersonal space categorization task was also administered immediately after the period of stimulation (post-tDCS) in order to capture any long-lasting effect of the tDCS stimulation.

Results

In accordance with Fini et al. (2015), we first computed a score that captures the difference in JTT between the person and the object as RF. More specifically, we subtracted the Near space threshold for the object as RF from the Near space threshold

for the person as RF (JTT$_{(Other-object)}$). Positive values indicate a Near space extension (i.e. a stronger compression of space) with the human vs. the object as RF. Negative values indicate the opposite (see Fini et al., 2015). We hypothesized that this index should have decreased when cathodal stimulation was applied to the IFC. Conversely, this index should have increased when cortical excitability was enhanced via anodal tDCS.

A repeated-measures ANOVA with Stimulation (anodal, cathodal, sham) and Task Session (during tDCS, post-tDCS) as within-subjects factor was conducted. The Stimulation x Task Session interaction was significant (F(2,52)=3.5, *p*<.05, η=.12). Using Post Hoc Newman Keuls tests we found a significant difference between cathodal (-.39 JTT$_{(other-object)}$) and anodal stimulation (.25 JTT$_{(other-object)}$) in the tDCS session (*p*<.04), but not in the post-tDCS session (cathodal: .04 JTT$_{(other-object)}$; anodal: -.02 JTT$_{(other-object)}$; *p*=.94) (Figure 2). The positive JTT$_{(other-object)}$ index (.25) that we observed for anodal tDCS indicates that during the boosting of IFC activity, the "Near" space was wider when a human vs. an object was the reference (social condition). Conversely, the negative JTT$_{(other-object)}$ (-.39) index for cathodal tDCS indicates that during the inhibition of IFC activity, the "Near" space was wider when an object vs. a human was the reference (nonsocial condition). These results are in line with the hypothesis that the social scaling of extrapersonal space recruits IFC.   For a better understanding of the above described effects, we also looked at the Near space thresholds for the object and the other RF separately. With the Other RF, anodal and cathodal stimulation equally affected extrapersonal space categorization by reducing the space judged as "Near" (sham Other JTT=9,8 m; cathodal Other JTT= 9,53 m; anodal Other JTT=9,58 m), whereas with the Object RF only the anodal stimulation strongly reduced the threshold (sham Object JTT=9,81 m; anodal Object

JTT=9,32 m), and a slight enlargement was observed with cathodal stimulation (cathodal Object JTT=9,93 m). This resulted into opposite effects of anodal and cathodal tDCS on the JTT$_{(Other-object)}$, as presented above within the repeated-measures ANOVA.

In order to investigate whether the perspective taking measured with IRI modulates the impact of the stimulation, the score of the Perspective Taking (PT) subscale was entered as covariate in a Repeated Measures ANOVA with Stimulation (cathodal, anodal, sham) as within-subjects factor. The PT score significantly modulated the effect of the Stimulation (F(2, 24)=3.7, *p<.03,* η=.25). To additionally explore the relation between perspective taking and space compression expressed by the JTT$_{(Other-object)}$ index, the sample was split in two groups: the High PT group were those with a PT score above the median (PT>15); the Low PT group were those with a PT score below the median (PT<15). Crucially, the sham in the Low PT group (JTT $_{other-object}$ = -0,23) was significantly different from the sham in the High PT group (JTT $_{other-object}$ =0,23) (p<0.05). This result indicates that perspective taking, does not only affect the response to brain stimulation but determines the baseline effect.

A Repeated Measures ANOVA with Stimulation (anodal, cathodal, sham) as within-subjects factor and Group (High PT group, Low PT group) as between-subjects factor was performed. We obtained a main effect of the Stimulation (F(2,50)=5.75, p<.001, η=.18) and a significant interaction between Group and Stimulation (F(2,50)=7.16, p< .001, η=.22). The stimulation had an impact only in the Low PT group, in which anodal tDCS significantly increased JTT$_{(other-object)}$ (.66 JTT) as compared to sham (-.23 JTT$_{(other-object)}$) (*p<.01*) and cathodal tDCS (-.55 JTT$_{(other-object)}$) stimulation (*p<.01*). Conversely, in the High PT group the stimulation had not an impact. The anodal tDCS (-.18 JTT$_{(other-object)}$) was not different from the sham (.23

JTT$_{(other-object)}$) ($p=.12$) and the cathodal tDCS (-.24 JTT$_{(other-object)}$) ($p=.29$) (Figure 3).

Again, for descriptive purposes, we looked at the Near space thresholds for the object

and the other RF separately. In the Low PT group cathodal and anodal stimulation

impacted as in the general sample (sham Object JTT=10,78 m; anodal Object JTT=9,46

m; cathodal Object JTT= 11,25 m; sham Other JTT=10,55 m; anodal Other=10,13 m;

cathodal Other JTT= 10,7 m). The only difference was that the cathodal stimulation

did not reduce the Other JTT compared with the sham. In the High PT group, the

cathodal stimulation reduced both the Object JTT=8,76 m and the Other JTT=8,28 m

compared with the sham Object JTT=8,52 m and Other JTT=8,99 m; the anodal

stimulation increased the Object JTT=9,17 m but not the Other JTT=8,99 m.

In summary, our results suggest that cognitive perspective taking acts as a

modulator of the tDCS effect on the social scaling of extrapersonal space.

Discussion

In a series of previous studies (Fini et al., 2015a,b) we have shown that the

distance between another person and an object is judged as compressed compared to

the distance between two objects. Here, we aimed to investigate the neuronal correlate

of this perceptual effect. Starting from the assumption that our perceptual effect implies

to categorize a human as a biological agent and to filter the space by considering the

perceptual consequences of the afforded action (e.g. walking), we individuate the

Inferior Frontal Cortex (IFC) as a candidate area to be modulated.

Indeed, IFC is a brain area assumed to be involved both in the semantic categorization

(Mazoyer et al.,1993; Thompson- Schill et al., 1997, 1998; Wagner et al., 1997, 2001)

and also recruited during mechanisms of interpersonal motor resonance (IMR; Uithol,

et al., 2011). In presence of a human, we remap the space by considering the action

(e.g., walking) that the other person would perform to cover the distance. In the current

work we modulated (with tDCS) the activity of this area while participants performed the extrapersonal space categorization task with an object (nonsocial condition) or a person (social condition) as reference. Importantly, tDCS of the IFC has been previously shown to modulate motor resonance as indexed by psychophysiological measures of motor activation (Enticott et al., 2012). We are aware, however, of the methodological limitations of tDCS, primarily its relatively low spatial resolution. The IFC includes the Ventral Premotor Cortex (vPMC) and the Inferior Frontal Gyrus (IFG). Ventral PMC responds both to action observation and performance (Gazzola et al., 2007; Vogt et al., 2007; Gazzola, et al., 2006), and IFG is recruited during the matching of motor plans (Iacoboni et al., 1999; Rizzolatti, et al., 2001) through the encoding and representation of goals and intentions from observed actions (Cattaneo, et al., 2009; Gallese & Sinigaglia, 2011; Rizzolatti & Sinigaglia, 2010). Future investigations with other techniques, such as fMRI and TMS, are therefore needed to further specify the neural substrate of our effect. Our results, as in Fini et al. (2015b), are calculated on an index that corresponds to the subtraction of the Near space threshold for the object as RF from the Near space threshold for the person as RF ($JTT_{(Other-object)}$). We used this index as dependent variable, because it is more sensitive to capture the relation between the social and nonsocial conditions. We found that when IFC activity was increased by the anodal stimulation, there was a space compression (i.e. a greater portion of space judged as "Near", corresponding to a greater JTT threshold) for the social vs. nonsocial condition, compared to when IFC activity was inhibited through the cathodal stimulation. The described results was only found during the stimulation, which is in accordance with the observation that tDCS effects over motor areas are not very long lasting (Nitsche et al., 2008). Our results suggest that compression of space in a social context could be associated with the categorization of a human as a biological agent,

and the space would be judged by implicitly considering the other's inferred motor plan. Interestingly, the opposite effect of anodal and cathodal stimulation on the JTT$_{(other-object)}$ ratio was in part driven by a general perturbation of the Other RF perception (longer distance between the person and the object). The unspecific effect of transcranial direct stimulation on biological action representation is in line with Enticott et al., 2012 and also with several studies reporting a disruption of processes following both stimulation polarities (Ferrucci et al., 2008; Marshall, Molle, Siebner, & Born, 2005). Conversely, the effect of the stimulation on the Object RF perception was specific: while the cathodal stimulation increased the Object RF perception (shorter distance between the two objects), the anodal stimulation worked in the opposite direction, (longer distance between the two objects). Our speculation is that the perception of a biological appearance and the associated space representation are hard-wired mechanisms, not very flexible and easy to being manipulated. The object RF perception would be a neutral condition where the specific effects of the stimulation polarities are rather manifested. We also found that the impact of the stimulation over IFC was modulated by perspective taking ability: the lower the PT score at the IRI, the greater the impact of the brain stimulation. Specifically, only those participants with lower PT score were sensitive to the brain stimulation. There is evidence that people automatically take the other's spatial perspective to describe the physical world and that in order "to understand" the other, we often need to physically assume his/her position in the environment (see Tversky & Hard, 2009). In this regard, Erle and Topolinski (2015) have shown that cognitive perspective taking ability measured with IRI correlates with visuo-spatial perspective taking measured with the Tube figure Test (TFT; Stumpf & Fay, 1983). This suggests that "being in the other's body entails being in the other's mind" or vice-versa. In other words, assuming the other's perspective

can be not just a "metaphor" but an embodied process, framed in sensorimotor mechanisms (for a review see Creem- Regehr et al., 2013). When we judge the space by considering another body as reference frame, we probably promote three processes: 1) we categorize a human as a biological agent; 2) we assume the other's physical and cognitive perspective and 2) we process the space as a function of the other's bodily capabilities and goals. In those with a weak cognitive perspective taking there would be space for improving interpersonal motor resonance by brain stimulation over IFC. By contrast, participants who scored high on the perspective taking scale probably already showed interpersonal motor resonance, which could not be further improved by anodal stimulation. This interpretation is supported by the differences in the baseline effect between the high PT group and the low PT group: in the high PT group, the space compression was significantly greater for the social vs. nonsocial condition compared with the low PT group. Thus, the ability to take the other's perspective seems to be a prerequisite of the social scaling of extrapersonal space and to determine the effect of tDCS.

In conclusion, our results suggest that: (a) IFC is recruited during the extrapersonal space categorization task; (b) the underlying mechanisms behind the reduced perceived distance could be the semantic attribution of the biological nature to a human; an automatic visual spatial perspective taking and consequently the promotion of the interpersonal motor resonance; c) these processes are modulated by the individual level of cognitive perspective taking, with a weak level allowing responsivity to IFC activity boosting.

References

Abdullaev, Y. G., & Bechtereva, N. P. (1993). Neuronal correlate of the higher-order semantic code in human prefrontal cortex in language tasks. International Journal of Psychophysiology, 14(3), 167-177.

Bloesch, E. K., Davoli, C. C., Roth, N., Brockmole, J. R., & Abrams, R. A. (2012). Watch this! Observed tool use affects perceived distance. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *19*(2), 177-183.

Cardellicchio, P., Sinigaglia, C., & Costantini, M. (2011). The space of affordances: A TMS study. *Neuropsychologia*, *49*(5), 1369-1372.

Cattaneo, L., Caruana, F., Jezzini, A., & Rizzolatti, G. (2009). Representation of goal and movements without overt motor behavior in the human motor cortex: a transcranial magnetic stimulation study. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *29*(36), 11134-11138.

Coello, Y., & Delevoye-Turrell, Y. (2007). Embodiment, spatial categorisation and action. *Consciousness and cognition*, *16*(3), 667-683.

Costantini, M., Ambrosini, E., Sinigaglia, C., & Gallese, V. (2011). Tool-use observation makes far objects ready-to-hand. *Neuropsychologia*, *49*(9), 2658-2663.

Creem-Regehr, S. H., Gagnon, K. T., Geuss, M. N., & Stefanucci, J. K. (2015). Relating spatial perspective taking to the perception of other's affordances: providing a foundation for predicting the future behavior of others. *Perspective Taking: building a neurocognitive framework for integrating the "social" and the "spatial"*.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *44*(1), 113.

Enticott, P. G., Arnold, S. L., Fitzgibbon, B. M., Hoy, K. E., Susilo, D. A., & Fitzgerald, P. B. (2012). Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) of the inferior frontal gyrus disrupts interpersonal motor resonance. *Neuropsychologia*, *50*(7), 1628-1631.

Erle, T. M., & Topolinski, S. (2015). Spatial and empathic perspective-taking Correlate on a dispositional level. *Social Cognition*, *33*(3), 187.

Ferrucci, R., Marceglia, S., Vergari, M., Cogiamanian, F., Mrakic-Sposta, S., Mameli, F. E. E. A., ... & Priori, A. (2008). Cerebellar transcranial direct current stimulation impairs the practice-dependent proficiency increase in working memory. *Journal of cognitive neuroscience*, *20*(9), 1687-1697.

Fini, C., Brass, M., & Committeri, G. (2015a). Social scaling of extrapersonal space: Target objects are judged as closer when the reference frame is a human agent with available movement potentialities. *Cognition*, *134*, 50-56.

Fini, C., Committeri, G., Müller, B. C., Deschrijver, E., & Brass, M. (2015b). How Watching Pinocchio Movies Changes Our Subjective Experience of Extrapersonal Space. *PloS one*, *10*(3), e0120306.

Fini, C., Costantini, M., & Committeri, G. (2014). Sharing space: the presence of other bodies extends the space judged as near. *PloS one*, *9*(12), e114719.

Galea, J. M., & Celnik, P. (2009). Brain polarization enhances the formation and retention of motor memories. *Journal of neurophysiology*, *102*(1), 294-301.

Gallese, V., & Sinigaglia, C. (2011). What is so special about embodied simulation?. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, *15*(11), 512-519.

Gazzola, V., Aziz-Zadeh, L., & Keysers, C. (2006). Empathy and the somatotopic auditory mirror system in humans. *Current biology*, *16*(18), 1824-1829.

Gazzola, V., Rizzolatti, G., Wicker, B., & Keysers, C. (2007). The anthropomorphic brain: the mirror neuron system responds to human and robotic actions. *Neuroimage*, *35*(4), 1674-1684.

Holland R., Leff A. P., Josephs O., Galea J. M., Desikan M., Price C. J., Rothwell J. C., Crinion J. (2011). Speech facilitation by left inferior frontal cortex stimulation. Curr. Biol. 21, 1403–1407.

Hsu, T. Y., Tseng, L. Y., Yu, J. X., Kuo, W. J., Hung, D. L., Tzeng, O. J., ... & Juan, C. H. (2011). Modulating inhibitory control with direct current stimulation of the superior medial frontal cortex. *Neuroimage*, *56*(4), 2249-2257.

Iacoboni, M., Woods, R. P., Brass, M., Bekkering, H., Mazziotta, J. C., & Rizzolatti, G. (1999). Cortical mechanisms of human imitation. *Science*, *286*(5449), 2526-2528.

Iyer, M. B., Mattu, U., Grafman, J., Lomarev, M., Sato, S., & Wassermann, E. M. (2005). Safety and cognitive effect of frontal DC brain polarization in healthy individuals. *Neurology*, *64*(5), 872-875.

Jacobson, L., Koslowsky, M., & Lavidor, M. (2012). tDCS polarity effects in motor and cognitive domains: a meta-analytical review. *Experimental brain research*, *216*(1), 1-10.

Jang, S. H., Ahn, S. H., Byun, W. M., Kim, C. S., Lee, M. Y., & Kwon, Y. H. (2009). The effect of transcranial direct current stimulation on the cortical activation by motor task in the human brain: an fMRI study. *Neuroscience letters*, *460*(2), 117-120.

Kessler, K., & Thomson, L. A. (2010). The embodied nature of spatial perspective taking: embodied transformation versus sensorimotor interference. *Cognition*, *114*(1), 72-88.

Kourtzi, Z., & Kanwisher, N. (2000). Activation in human MT/MST by static images with implied motion. *Journal of cognitive neuroscience*, *12*(1), 48-55.

Marshall, L., Mölle, M., Siebner, H. R., & Born, J. (2005). Bifrontal transcranial direct current stimulation slows reaction time in a working memory task. *BMC neuroscience*, *6*(1), 1.

Matelli, M., & Luppino, G. (2001). Parietofrontal circuits for action and space perception in the macaque monkey. *Neuroimage*, *14*(1), S27-S32.

Mazoyer, B. M., Tzourio, N., Frak, V., Syrota, A., Murayama, N., Levrier, O., ... & Mehler, J. (1993). The cortical representation of speech. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 5(4), 467-479.

Michelon, P., Vettel, J. M., & Zacks, J. M. (2006). Lateral somatotopic organization during imagined and prepared movements. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *95*(2), 811-822.

Nitsche, M. A., & Paulus, W. (2000). Excitability changes induced in the human motor cortex by weak transcranial direct current stimulation. *The Journal of physiology*, *527*(3), 633-639.

Nitsche, M. A., Cohen, L. G., Wassermann, E. M., Priori, A., Lang, N., Antal, A., ... & Pascual-Leone, A. (2008). Transcranial direct current stimulation: state of the art 2008. *Brain stimulation*, *1*(3), 206-223.

Nitsche, M. A., Doemkes, S., Karakoese, T., Antal, A., Liebetanz, D., Lang, N., ... & Paulus, W. (2007). Shaping the effects of transcranial direct current stimulation of the human motor cortex. *Journal of neurophysiology*, *97*(4), 3109-3117.

Proffitt, D. R. (2006). Embodied perception and the economy of action. *Perspectives on psychological science*, *1*(2), 110-122.

Proffitt, D. R., Stefanucci, J., Banton, T., & Epstein, W. (2003). The role of effort in perceiving distance. *Psychological Science*, *14*(2), 106-112.

Rizzolatti, G., & Sinigaglia, C. (2010). The functional role of the parieto-frontal mirror circuit: interpretations and misinterpretations. *Nature reviews neuroscience*, *11*(4), 264-274.

Rizzolatti, G., Fogassi, L., & Gallese, V. (2001). Neurophysiological mechanisms underlying the understanding and imitation of action. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *2*(9), 661-670.

Schnall, S., Zadra, J. R., & Proffitt, D. R. (2010). Direct evidence for the economy of action: Glucose and the perception of geographical slant. *Perception*, *39*(4), 464-482.

Stagg, C. J., O'shea, J., Kincses, Z. T., Woolrich, M., Matthews, P. M., & Johansen-Berg, H. (2009). Modulation of movement‐associated cortical activation by transcranial direct current stimulation. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *30*(7), 1412-1423.

Stumpf, H., & Fay, E. (1983). *Schlauchfiguren: ein Test zur Beurteilung des räumlichen Vorstellungsvermögens*. Verlag für Psychologie, Hogrefe.

Sugovic, M., & Witt, J. K. (2013). An older view on distance perception: older adults perceive walkable extents as farther. *Experimental brain research*, *226*(3), 383-391.

Surtees, A., Apperly, I., & Samson, D. (2013). Similarities and differences in visual and spatial perspective-taking processes. *Cognition*, *129*(2), 426-438.

Thompson-Schill, S. L., D'Esposito, M., Aguirre, G. K., & Farah, M. J. (1997). Role of left inferior prefrontal cortex in retrieval of semantic knowledge: A reevaluation. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 94(26), 14792-14797.

Thompson-Schill, S. L., Kurtz, K. J., & Gabrieli, J. D. (1998). Effects of semantic and associative relatedness on automatic priming. Journal of Memory and Language, 38(4), 440-458.

Tversky, B., & Hard, B. M. (2009). Embodied and disembodied cognition: Spatial perspective-taking. *Cognition*, *110*(1), 124-129.

Uithol, S., van Rooij, I., Bekkering, H., & Haselager, P. (2011). Understanding motor resonance. *Social neuroscience*, *6*(4), 388-397.

Van Kemenade, B. M., Muggleton, N., Walsh, V., & Saygin, A. P. (2012). Effects of TMS over premotor and superior temporal cortices on biological motion perception. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *24*(4), 896-904.

Vogt, S., Buccino, G., Wohlschläger, A. M., Canessa, N., Shah, N. J., Zilles, K., ... & Fink, G. R. (2007). Prefrontal involvement in imitation learning of hand actions: effects of practice and expertise. *Neuroimage*, *37*(4), 1371-1383.

Witt, J. K., & Proffitt, D. R. (2008). Action-specific influences on distance perception: a role for motor simulation. *Journal of experimental psychology: Human perception and performance*, *34*(6), 1479.

Witt, J. K., Proffitt, D. R., & Epstein, W. (2004). Perceiving distance: A role of effort and intent. *Perception*, *33*(5), 577-590.

Witt, J. K., Proffitt, D. R., & Epstein, W. (2005). Tool use affects perceived distance, but only when you intend to use it. *Journal of experimental psychology: Human perception and performance*, *31*(5), 880.

Figure Legends

1) Stimuli in 3D scenario: a) the Other RF, b) the Object RF

2) Results: a) $JTT_{(other-object)}$ index during tDCS in the three tDCS sessions (sham, cathodal, anodal);. b) $JTT_{(other-object)}$ index post tDCS. * = significant difference ($p < 0.05$).

3) Results during tDCS in the High PT Group and the Low PT Group: a) $JTT_{(other-object)}$ index in the High PT Group during three sessions (sham, cathodal, anodal)

b) $JTT_{(other-object)}$ index in the Low PT Group; $JTT_{(other-object)}$ index was significantly wider during the anodal stimulation compared with the sham and the cathodal stimulation.