

NIH Public Access

Author Manuscript

Biol Psychiatry. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2009 July 9.

Published in final edited form as:

Biol Psychiatry. 2008 October 1; 64(7): 607–614. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2008.03.008.

Decomposing Intra-Subject Variability in Children with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder

Adriana Di Martino^{1,2}, Manely Ghaffari¹, Jocelyn Curchack¹, Philip Reiss³, Christopher Hyde⁴, Marina Vannucci⁵, Eva Petkova³, Donald F. Klein^{1,6,7}, and F. Xavier Castellanos^{1,6} ¹Phyllis Green and Randolph C wen Institute for Pediatric Neuroscience at the NYU Child Study Center, New York, NY

²Division of Child and Adolescent Neuropsychiatry, Department of Neuroscience, University of Cagliari, Italy

³NYU Child Study Center, New York NY

⁴BioAssessments, LLC., Elkton, DE

⁵Rice University Houston, TX

⁶Nathan Kline Institute for Psychiatric Research, Orangeburg, NY

⁷Department of Psychiatry, Columbia University College of Physicians & Surgeons, New York, NY.

Abstract

Background—Increased intra-subject response time standard deviations (RT-SD) discriminate children with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) from healthy controls. RT-SD is averaged over time, thus it does not provide information about the temporal structure of response time variability. We previously hypothesized that such increased variability may be related to slow spontaneous fluctuations in brain activity occurring with periods between 15s and 40s. Here, we investigated whether these slow response time fluctuations add unique differentiating information beyond the global increase in RT-SD.

Methods—We recorded RT at 3s intervals for 15 minutes during an Eriksen flanker task for 29 children with ADHD and 26 age-matched typically developing controls (TDC) (mean ages 12.5 ± 2.4 and 11.6 ± 2.5 ; 26 and 12 boys, respectively). The primary outcome was the magnitude of the spectral component in the frequency range between 0.027 and 0.073 Hz measured with continuous Morlet wavelet transform.

Results—The magnitude of the low frequency fluctuation was greater for children with ADHD compared to TDC (p=0.02, d=0.69). After modeling ADHD diagnosis as a function of RT-SD, adding this specific frequency range significantly improved the model fit (p=0.03; odds ratio= 2.58).

Conclusions—Fluctuations in low frequency response time variability predict the diagnosis of ADHD beyond the effect associated with global differences in variability. Future studies will examine whether such spectrally specific fluctuations in behavioral responses are linked to intrinsic regional cerebral hemodynamic oscillations which occur at similar frequencies.

Corresponding authors: F. Xavier Castellanos (E-mail: castef01@nyumc.org) Phyllis Green and Randolph Cōwen Institute for Pediatric Neuroscience NYU Child Study Center 215 Lexington Avenue New York NY 10016.

Financial disclosure: A. Di Martino, M. Ghaffari, J. Curchack, P. Reiss, M. Vannucci, E. Petkova, D. F. Klein, and F.X. Castellanos have no conflicts of interest to declare. Christopher Hyde is employed by BioAssessments, L.L.C., which conducted fast Fourier transform analyses under contract.

ADHD; inattention; response time standard deviation; variability; multisecond oscillations; children

Introduction

The diagnosis of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is based primarily on historical reports of symptoms, usually from parents and educators, which although reliable, are necessarily subjective (1). Neuropsychological tests designed to assess executive functions have been studied extensively in attempts to discover objective markers to substantiate the diagnosis and constrain models of pathophysiology. Metaanalyses confirm that most such measures differentiate ADHD from healthy comparison groups, but with only moderate effect sizes (2,3).

The observation that individuals with ADHD are *consistently inconsistent*, reflected experimentally as increased intra-subject variability in response time (RT-ISV), led to the suggestion that RT-ISV should be considered an objective index of ADHD (4,5). Klein et al. (6) examined four commonly used tasks and found that response time standard deviation (RT-SD) best discriminated children with ADHD from healthy controls, with substantially larger effect sizes than mean response time, directional errors, omission, or inhibitory control measures.

Increased RT-ISV has been repeatedly documented in ADHD (4,6), but trial-to-trial variations in performance, which are also found in aging, dementia, and traumatic brain injury (7), are generally assumed to reflect primarily stochastic factors. An open question is whether additional systematic processes underlie elevated RT-ISV. Our interest in the temporal characteristics of RT-ISV stemmed from two converging lines of evidence. First, basal ganglia neurons recorded in the awake locally anesthetized rat exhibit intrinsic rhythmic activity in the range of 0.028-0.05 Hz (8). These fluctuations are selectively modulated by dopaminergic medications which are the first drugs of choice in the treatment of ADHD (8). Second, intrinsic brain hemodynamic oscillations of the putative default-mode network (9,10,11,12), which has been posited to underlie attentional lapses characteristic of ADHD (13,14,15), occur at similarly low frequencies. These observations led us to hypothesize that fluctuations in RT should exhibit an oscillatory pattern in the low frequency range (i.e., one cycle occurring \sim every 15-40s) reflecting "a failure to fully and effectively transition from a baseline defaultmode to an active processing mode during performance of cognitive tasks" (p.2; 14). We reasoned that these fluctuations would be significantly more prominent in individuals with ADHD than in healthy comparison subjects (4). To investigate such a hypothesis, frequency analyses which break up a function into the frequencies that compose it are useful methods to examine fluctuations in RT-ISV. Applying such approaches in a secondary analysis of previously collected Eriksen-flanker task data (16,17,18), we found that the power of the frequency band (i.e., a range of frequencies with an upper and lower limit) centered at 0.05 Hz was significantly higher (p=0.01) in 24 boys with ADHD compared to 18 matched controls (4). However, those data had been collected discontinuously in six 180 s blocks, limiting the observable lower range of frequencies. In the present study, we prospectively administered the same task continuously for 900 s to quantify RT-ISV in a broader range of lower frequencies.

Examining the frequency characteristics of RT-ISV could provide a means for linking this cognitive measure to underlying neurophysiological processes (4,19). In order to select externally validated frequency bands, we made use of the observation that the frequency ranges of neuronal oscillations (i.e., frequency bands) and their center frequencies "form a linear progression on the natural logarithmic scale." (p. 1926; 19) Signals at frequency bands so

defined have been hypothesized to be generated by distinct, independent mechanisms (20). The frequency band targeted here (0.027–0.073 Hz), corresponds to the slowest of the 10 putative oscillation bands defined by Penttonen and Buzsaki (20). We selected it based on our prior data (4) and the modal frequency of brain resting state networks (21,22,23). This study was designed to determine whether such multisecond oscillations in RT-ISV differentiate groups of children with ADHD from typically developing control children, beyond the spectrally non-specific effects of RT-ISV which are easily quantified by RT-SD (6). To address the spectral specificity of our findings, we also examined the neighboring slow frequency bands (20).

Methods

Thirty-three children with ADHD (27 boys) and 26 typically developing comparison children (TDC; 12 boys) between the ages of 7.5 and 16.4 years participated in this study. Children with ADHD were recruited through referrals from the NYU Child Study Center Child & Family Associates, parent support groups, newsletters, flyers, and web/newspaper ads. We recruited TDC from the local community through flyers/ads, and word of mouth. Families received \$60 for participating in the study. Written informed consent was obtained from parents and assent from children, as approved by the institutional review board. Estimated full-scale IQ ≥ 80 and absence of known neurological or chronic medical diseases were required of all subjects. DSM-IV diagnosis of ADHD (1) was based upon parent interviews using the Schedule of Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for Children - Present and Lifetime Version (K-SADS-PL) (24). Diagnosis of psychotic disorders, major depressive disorder, conduct disorder, tic disorders, and pervasive developmental disorders were exclusionary. Children were excluded if they were being treated with psychoactive medications except for psychostimulants which were withheld for at least 24 hours prior to testing. Inclusion as a TDC required T-scores below 60 on all four Conners' Parent Rating Scale-Revised: Long Version ADHD-summary scales (25.26).

Symptom severities were obtained from the Conners' Parent Rating Scale-Revised: Long Version, the Child Behavior Checklist (27), and the Conners' Teacher Rating Scale-Revised: Long Version (25,26). Parents provided demographic information and socio-economic status was estimated using the Hollingshead Index of Social Position (28). The Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (29) provided estimates of IQ. The Wechsler Individual Achievement Test Second Edition (30) provided standardized measures of Word Reading, Numerical Operations, and Spelling.

Experimental Procedure

Participants completed the same arrow version of the Eriksen Flanker task used in Scheres et al. (16) except that stimuli were presented continuously for 930 s. Task stimuli consisted of a horizontal array composed of a target central arrow with four flanking arrows (two per side) pointing either to the same direction (*congruent trials*) or the opposite direction (*incongruent trials*) as the center arrow (e.g., >>>> and <<><<, respectively) or, on *neutral* trials, four rectangles (e.g., $\Box \Box \Box \Box \Box$). Within each trial, a warning fixation cross (500ms) was followed by a stimulus (1000ms), then a blank screen (1500ms). Inter-trial intervals were constant at 3000ms. Trial types occurred with equal frequency, as did the direction of the target arrow (right or left) in a block-randomized order within each of five 60-trial blocks. To minimize transition effects, the 15-minute task was preceded by 10 trials (30s) that were discarded from analysis. All participants received the same pseudo-randomized sequence. Children were instructed to press the right or left button corresponding to the direction of the target arrow as quickly and accurately as possible. Children completed at least one 90s-practice session which

could be repeated until criterion of 80% correct responses was attained (six children with ADHD and one TDC required a second practice session).

Data Analyses

Time Domain—Responses below the minimal physiological response time of 100ms (31) were discarded. For each subject, we then computed the mean RT and the RT-SD over all remaining responses. Number of omissions and directional errors (no button pressed and incorrect button pressed, respectively) were also computed. Subjects with omissions exceeding 15% of trials (45/300) were excluded from further analyses, as they were considered insufficiently engaged in the task. Four children with ADHD (ages 7.6 to 9.5 years, three girls) were excluded for omission rates of 21% to 41%. A 2-tailed Mann-Whitney test indicated that these children were significantly younger (8.2 ± 0.8 vs. 12.4 ± 2.5 years; p=.008) and more hyperactive (e.g., ADHD Index T-score 77 ± 5 vs. 69 ± 6; p=.03) than the remaining children with ADHD.

Data Preparation for Frequency Domain Analyses—First, a displaced logarithmic transformation, i.e., f(x)=ln(x-a) with displacement parameter a=100, was applied to each subject's observed RTs using the S-PLUS/R function (32) "logtrans," to obtain approximate normality of the distribution. Second, since trial type, a factor with six levels (three stimulus types and two directions), impacts mean RTs, we regressed it out and used the timeseries of residuals in our analyses. Third, to maintain the temporal structure of the timeseries, missing and impossible responses ≤ 100 ms were interpolated by averaging the two immediate neighboring trial responses.

Frequency Domain—We examined a frequency interval ranging from 0.0052 Hz to 0.17 Hz as appropriate with our 900 s task duration and 3000 ms inter-trial interval (see Supplementary Text). Within this frequency range we identified four bands based on the approach of Penttonen and Buzsaki (20). Following their formula, we extended the oscillation classes down to Slow-6. Accordingly, we selected Slow-6 (0.0052 Hz – 0.010 Hz, centered at 0.006 Hz [period 101-192s]), Slow-5 (0.010 – 0.027 Hz, centered at 0.016 Hz [37-101s]), Slow-4 (0.027 – 0.073 Hz, centered at 0.044 Hz [14-37s]), and Slow-3 (0.073 – 0.17 Hz, centered at 0.12 Hz [6-14s]); (see Supplementary Table 1).

Spectral Measures—We were interested in the contribution of each frequency component as a proportion of total variance. As such, for each frequency band we computed the normalized spectral density (see Supplementary Text). Normalized spectral density is usually estimated with the periodogram method via fast Fourier transform (FFT) (33). An alternative method for decomposing variability into oscillatory components, which avoids the stationarity assumption, is the time-frequency representation of timeseries using the continuous wavelet transform (CWT) (33, 34, 35) (see Supplementary Text). We applied the CWT (35) using Morlet wavelets (half-length 25), implemented in the Matlab (The MathWorks, Natick, MA) Time-Frequency Toolbox (http://tftb.nongnu.org), to each subject's normalized timeseries (RT timeseries divided by RT-SD). Following other authors (e.g., Humeau et al.(36)), we averaged the scalogram at a given frequency band over time to represent the average relative energy of the timeseries within this frequency band over the whole task interval. To examine the effect of time on task, we computed the average relative energy separately for the five 180s-blocks, each of which included equal proportions of all trial types. We also estimated the spectral density function with FFT using a 15-point Hamming window on the residual data after resampling to create timeseries of 1024 evenly spaced data points. The area under the curve of the normalized spectral density within each target frequency was the resulting outcome variable. In this paper, the term *relative spectrum* refers to both the relative energy measured by CWT and the normalized spectral density measured by FFT.

Statistical Analyses

Group Characteristics—We compared the two groups on demographic and clinical characteristics using chi-square tests for sex, ethnic group, and socioeconomic class and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) adjusting for sex for continuous clinical measures.

Task Group Comparisons—The comparison between ADHD and TDC groups with respect to the time and frequency domain measures averaged over the 900s task period was based on ANCOVA. Effect of time on task was examined based on time and frequency domain measures computed over the five 180 s blocks using repeated measures ANCOVA. Age was included as a covariate because it showed a significantly linear negative relation with RT-SD within our sample age-range as expected (37,38). Sex was included because of our group differences in sex distribution and a prior report of sex differences in RT-SD (39). We report F-tests, p-values and Cohen's d effect size.

Predicting ADHD Diagnosis—To test whether the relative spectrum of Slow-4 oscillations contributes to the diagnostic classification of ADHD, independent of and in addition to RT-SD, we carried out a series of logistic regressions. First, we modeled ADHD diagnosis (yes/no) as a function of RT-SD; we then added Slow-4 relative spectrum as a predictor and assessed its contribution to the deviance from the model using a likelihood ratio test. Second, to confirm that the findings are specific to Slow-4 variations, we repeated the same analysis separately with Slow-3, Slow-5 and Slow-6. All logistic regression models controlled for age and sex. The estimated effects are expressed as odds ratios, i.e., the proportional change in odds of ADHD associated with one-standard-deviation change in the measure of relative spectrum. All tests were performed at the 0.05 level of significance, two-sided.

Correlations—To explore the relation between Slow-4 measures and indices of task performance, Spearman correlation coefficients were computed between unadjusted Slow-4 spectrum and the number of omission and directional errors within each group. Additionally, we computed correlations between unadjusted Slow-4 spectrum and symptom severity ratings within each group.

Results

Group Characteristics

Twelve out of 29 children with ADHD included in the analysis met current criteria for Combined type (ADHD-C), 16 for Predominantly Inattentive type (ADHD-I), and one for Predominantly Hyperactive/Impulsive type (ADHD-H/I). Eleven children with ADHD (six ADHD-C, six ADHD-I, and one ADHD-H/I) presented with comorbid disorders: four with Oppositional Defiant Disorder, four with anxiety disorders (one with Generalized Anxiety Disorder and Social Phobia, one with Social Phobia, and two with Anxiety Disorder Not Otherwise Specified, one of whom also had dysthymia), two with nocturnal enuresis, and one with an Adjustment Disorder with Depressive Symptoms. Sixteen were drug naïve at the time of testing (nine ADHD-I, six ADHD-C, and one ADHD-H/I) and two (ADHD-I) had discontinued stimulant treatment within three months prior to this study. The eleven children undergoing stimulant treatment (five ADHD-I and six with ADHD-C) reported discontinuing medication 24 hours prior to testing.

As shown in Table 1, the two groups of children differed in sex distribution. They did not differ significantly on estimated IQ, academic achievement, age, socioeconomic status (85% of TDC and 87% of ADHD were from the two highest SES classes) or parent-identified ethnicity (Caucasian 54%, and 48%, African-American 8% and 17%, Hispanic/Latino 11% and 28%, "others," including Asian, Native American and mixed ethnic group, 27% and 7%, in TDC

and ADHD, respectively; $\chi^2_{(3)}$ =6.19; p=.10). Symptom ratings differed significantly, as expected.

Task Results

Group Comparisons—The groups did not differ in mean-RT. Children with ADHD had significantly more errors and greater RT-SD than controls, although both groups were accurate (96% overall for TDC, 95% for ADHD; see Table 2). As Figure 1 shows, children with ADHD had greater relative spectrum in the Slow-3, Slow-4, and Slow-5 frequency bands, but the difference reached statistical significance only in the Slow-4 band. Figure 2 illustrates the between-group differences in spectrum across the sampled frequency bands. Similar results were obtained for the Slow-4 relative spectrum measured with FFT ($F_{(1,51)}$ =4.03, p=0.05; see Supplementary Table 2).

The only difference between groups with respect to time-on-task effects was observed on number of directional errors (F_(2,3,117,3)=2.94, Greenhouse-Geisser corrected, p=0.049). The TDC children had the fewest directional errors in the first three-minute interval (0.38 ± 0.70), and a slightly higher but stable number of such errors in blocks 2-5 (0.69 ± 1.09 ; 0.54 ± 0.90 ; 0.58 ± 0.64 ; 0.61 ± 0.80 , respectively), while the children with ADHD showed a more robust increase over time $(0.48 \pm 1.06; 1.17 \pm 1.92; 1.80 \pm 3.19; 1.14 \pm 1.96; 1.65 \pm 2.74$ for blocks 1-5, respectively). There were no significant differences in the three-way interaction between group by frequency band by time-on-task (F_(12, 1007)=0.82, p=0.63) nor in the two-way interaction between group and time-on-task ($F_{(4,1019)}=0.66$, P=0.62). The two-way interaction between frequency band and time-on-task (F_(12, 468)=4.64, p<0.001) and the main effect of time-on-task (F_(4,216)=17.76, p<0.001) were significant, indicating non-stationarity of the RT timeseries and differences between frequency bands with respect to deviations from stationarity. Specifically, Slow-4, Slow-5 and Slow-6 showed quadratic time effects (e.g., Slow-4 relative spectrum: 3.41 ± 0.95 ; 4.04 ± 1.16 ; 3.76 ± 1.15 ; 3.90 ± 1.18 ; $3.30 \pm .89$ for blocks 1-5, respectively; post-hoc pairwise comparisons between blocks 1 and 2 and blocks 4 and 5 differed significantly; p<0.001 for both). By contrast, Slow-3 relative spectrum increased only slightly from block 1 to 4 with a slight decrease at block 5 (Slow-3: $2.53 \pm .62$, $2.66 \pm .$ 60, $2.77 \pm .66$, $2.85 \pm .65$, $2.57 \pm .66$ for blocks 1-5, respectively).

Prediction of ADHD Diagnosis—After adjusting for age and sex, RT-SD significantly predicted diagnosis (p=0.04; see Table 3). The deviance significantly decreased after adding Slow-4 relative spectrum to the model RT-SD + age + sex (p=0.03). Separately adding the relative spectrum measure of any of the other frequency bands to the initial model did not significantly improve the prediction of diagnosis. The same analyses repeated with relative spectrum of each low frequency band computed with FFT yielded similar but non-significant results (Slow-4 odds ratio =1.89, see Supplementary Table 3).

Correlations—As shown in Figure 3, unadjusted Slow-4 spectrum was significantly correlated with omission errors within the ADHD and TDC groups (r=0.81, and r=0.62, respectively; p<0.001), and with directional errors in ADHD (r=0.60, p<0.001) but not in TDC (r=-0.17, NS). None of the symptom severity ratings correlated significantly with unadjusted Slow-4 spectrum within groups. However, across the entire sample, unadjusted Slow-4 spectrum was significantly correlated with Child Behavior Checklist attention problems parent ratings (r=0.44, n=55, p=0.001).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether measuring response time variability in children with ADHD within the Slow-4 frequency band (i.e., 0.027-0.073 Hz) would provide

greater diagnostic information than RT-SD alone. Having confirmed prior reports (6,40,41, 42,43,44,45) that children with ADHD exhibit greater RT-SD than age-matched TDC, we also found that they showed significantly greater variability specifically in the Slow-4 frequency range. Furthermore, when variability in the Slow-4 frequency band was isolated by normalizing the spectral density functions, it was the only low frequency band tested which significantly contributed to RT-SD in differentiating the ADHD from the TDC group.

Our results are in broad agreement with recent findings by Johnson et al. (46,47). Using fixed and random order versions of the Sustained Attention Response Task, with instructions to respond to all digits from 1 to 9 except to the digit 3, presented every 1.4 s, they found that children with ADHD show greater spectrum in frequencies from 0.004 to 0.35 Hz. Their task allowed them to differentiate a "fast" variability component (0.0772-0.35 Hz), which they suggested reflects sustained attention mechanisms, and a slower variability component (below 0.0772 Hz), ascribed to arousal processes. While the increased magnitude in the lower frequency band is broadly in agreement with our findings, differences in task designs do not allow us to determine the extent of convergence or disagreement. For instance, we did not find group differences in frequencies higher than Slow-4. However, our fixed 3 s inter-trial interval limited the extent to which we could examine the entire range of Slow-3 and the even faster frequencies analyzed by Johnson et al. (46,47). On the other hand, because our task duration was nearly three times longer (15 min), we could explore the slower frequency bands. Slow-5 and Slow-6. The groups did not differ significantly in these two frequency bands.

The present work confirms our previous findings (4) despite several methodological refinements. First, we performed frequency analysis in residualized RT timeseries demonstrating that group differences in Slow-4 are not due to RT fluctuations driven by the trial types. Second, by normalizing the spectrum by total variance, we measured the proportional contribution of each frequency band separately from global spectrally non-specific variability. Thus, our findings highlight a more delimited low frequency band, Slow-4. Third, we decomposed variability into both time and frequency domains using the Morlet CWT, thus avoiding violations of the assumption of stationarity of the RT timeseries required by FFT. We found equivalent nonstationarity in both diagnostic groups; thus, analyzing relative spectrum over time did not lead to a loss of information comparing groups. By contrast, computing spectral density via FFT under the assumption that the RT timeseries are stationary, is strictly speaking, not appropriate in this case. Still, FFT measures provided for comparability with the literature showed rough agreement with our CWT results.

In contrast with the frequency domain and other time domain measures, children with ADHD worsened over time in number of directional errors, suggesting a possible additional impairment in sustained attention. RT Slow-4 was positively correlated with the number of omission and directional errors, except in TDC where directional errors were minimal. Better characterization of the relation between errors and RT spectral measures, as well as of the frequency pattern with which errors occur, would require designs that can elicit more frequent errors.

Our results should be interpreted in light of study limitations. The two groups, although matched for age, socio-economic status, ethnicity and IQ, were not matched for sex distribution. Accordingly, all our analyses were adjusted for sex. However, comparisons limited to the 26 boys with ADHD and 12 TDC boys showed identically significant results for Slow-4 ($F_{(36)}$ =5.98, p=0.02, Cohen's *d* = 0.80). We excluded children who omitted over 15% of responses. The four excluded children with ADHD were among the most severely affected, and conservatively removing them reduced our statistical power. Further our sample size was not adequate to test the possible effects of specific clinical characteristics such as ADHD group

subtype, comorbidity, history of medication treatment, current medication status, and whether effects may have been exacerbated by pharmacological rebound.

Increased ISV in ADHD has been a recent focus of active study (45,4,6). Leth-Steensen et al. suggested that exponentially prolonged RTs contributed to increased RT-ISV and are uniquely responsible for the group differences observed in such tasks (48). The contribution of such prolonged RTs can be measured by analyzing ex-Gaussian distributions (49), which decompose the RT distribution into a Gaussian normal component (indexed by *mu* and *sigma*, representing the mean and SD of the normal distribution) and an exponential component (indexed by *tau* representing both mean and SD of the exponential distribution). Hervey et al. (41) confirmed that children with ADHD differ markedly in having prolonged RTs, indexed by larger *tau* (48,41). Increased variability can also include a higher proportion of extremely rapid RTs (45,38).

From a theoretical perspective, increased RT-ISV in ADHD has been attributed to a deficient allocation of effort in accordance with the cognitive energetic state regulation deficit model (50,51). Independent confirmation that Slow-4 fluctuations in RT contribute independently to differentiating individuals with ADHD would support focusing on this easily collected measure as an objective index that could be linkable to underlying neurophysiological processes (19, 4). Independent neuronal oscillation bands have been defined from ultra fast (1-4 ms/cycle) to very slow (15-40 s/cycle) frequencies (19). Although their nature, relation, and specific physiological functions have yet to be fully clarified, in general high frequency oscillations are hypothesized to provide high spatial resolution, whereas slow oscillations involve larger neuronal areas and are better suited for regulating dynamic relationships between and within brain networks (19,20).

Episodic prolongations of RT were predicted by periodically decreased BOLD fMRI signal in any of three loci, including right dorsal anterior cingulate (52). In our present data, the association between the magnitude of Slow-4 fluctuations and errors supports the interpretation that these fluctuations in RT reflect episodic lapses of attention which may result from the interplay of intrinsic brain rhythms fluctuating at low frequencies and spanning large expanses of brain (9,23,53,15,13,12). In a recent resting state fMRI study, we found that the temporal coherence between the right dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (52) and precuneus/posterior cingulate cortex was significantly decreased in adults with ADHD (13). A planned study will test whether increased Slow-4 fluctuations in RT are linked to decreased functional connectivity of this circuit in ADHD. Additional study designs, electrophysiological approaches, and pharmacological probes are needed to examine whether increased Slow-4 variability may have a greater effect on incongruent trials requiring inhibitory control, or on presumably more boring neutral or congruent trials (14).

In summary, our findings indicate that fluctuations in Slow-4 RT variability predict the diagnosis of ADHD beyond the effects associated with differences in global variability. Future studies will examine whether such spectrally specific fluctuations in behavioral responses are linked to intrinsic regional cerebral hemodynamic oscillations (12) occurring in similar frequency bands.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge Dr. Judith Walters for helpful considerations on frequency analyses, Drs. Edmund Sonuga-Barke and Anouk Scheres for helpful discussions of earlier versions of this work; Drs. Glenn Hirsh, Steven

Kurtz and Amy Krain for assistance in subject recruitment; Daniel Margulies and Weijin Gan for assistance in data analyses and Snigdha Rathor for technical assistance in the initial design of the database. Most of all, sincere gratitude goes to the children and parents who dedicated their time for this study.

Support: This work was supported by the Stavros S. Niarchos Foundation and the National Alliance for Research on Schizophrenia and Depression.

References

- 1. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. Vol. Fourth Edition. American Psychiatric Association; Washington, D.C.: 2000. Text Revision
- Willcutt EG, Doyle AE, Nigg JT, Faraone SV, Pennington BF. Validity of the executive function theory of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a meta-analytic review. Biol Psychiatry 2005;57:1336– 1346. [PubMed: 15950006]
- Lijffijt M, Kenemans JL, Verbaten MN, van Engeland H. A meta-analytic review of stopping performance in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: deficient inhibitory motor control? J Abnorm Psychol 2005;114:216–222. [PubMed: 15869352]
- Castellanos FX, Sonuga-Barke EJS, Scheres A, Di Martino A, Hyde C, Walters JR. Varieties of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder-related intra-individual variability. Biol Psychiatry 2005;57:1416–1423. [PubMed: 15950016]
- Castellanos FX, Tannock R. Neuroscience of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: the search for endophenotypes. Nat Rev Neurosci 2002;3:617–628. [PubMed: 12154363]
- Klein C, Wendling K, Huettner P, Ruder H, Peper M. Intra-subject variability in attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder. Biol Psychiatry 2006;60:1088–1097. [PubMed: 16806097]
- MacDonald SW, Nyberg L, Backman L. Intra-individual variability in behavior: links to brain structure, neurotransmission and neuronal activity. Trends Neurosci 2006;29:474–480. [PubMed: 16820224]
- Ruskin DN, Bergstrom DA, Shenker A, Freeman LE, Baek D, Walters JR. Drugs used in the treatment of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder affect postsynaptic firing rate and oscillation without preferential dopamine autoreceptor action. Biol Psychiatry 2001;49:340–350. [PubMed: 11239905]
- Fox MD, Corbetta M, Snyder AZ, Vincent JL, Raichle ME. Spontaneous neuronal activity distinguishes human dorsal and ventral attention systems. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2006;103:10046–10051. [PubMed: 16788060]
- Raichle ME, MacLeod AM, Snyder AZ, Powers WJ, Gusnard DA, Shulman GL. A default mode of brain function. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2001;98:676–682. [PubMed: 11209064]
- Raichle ME, Gusnard DA. Intrinsic brain activity sets the stage for expression of motivated behavior. J Comp Neurol 2005;493:167–176. [PubMed: 16254998]
- Fox MD, Raichle ME. Spontaneous fluctuations in brain activity observed with functional magnetic resonance imaging. Nat Rev Neurosci 2007;8:700–711. [PubMed: 17704812]
- Castellanos FX, Margulies DS, Kelly C, Uddin LQ, Ghaffari M, Kirsch A, et al. Cingulate-precuneus interactions: a new locus of dysfunction in adult attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Biol Psychiatry 2008;63:332–337. [PubMed: 17888409]
- Sonuga-Barke EJ, Castellanos FX. Spontaneous attentional fluctuations in impaired states and pathological conditions: A neurobiological hypothesis. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2007
- Kelly AMC, Uddin LQ, Biswal BB, Castellanos FX, Milham MP. Competition between functional brain networks mediates behavioral variability. Neuroimage 2008;39:527–537. [PubMed: 17919929]
- Scheres A, Oosterlaan J, Sergeant JA. Response execution and inhibition in children with AD/HD and other disruptive disorders: the role of behavioural activation. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 2001;42:347–357. [PubMed: 11321204]
- Scheres A, Oosterlaan J, Swanson J, Morein-Zamir S, Meiran N, Schut H, et al. The effect of methylphenidate on three forms of response inhibition in boys with AD/HD. J Abnorm Child Psychol 2003;31:105–120. [PubMed: 12597703]
- Scheres A, Oosterlaan J, Geurts H, Morein-Zamir S, Meiran N, Schut H, et al. Executive functioning in boys with ADHD: primarily an inhibition deficit? Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology 2004;19:569–594. [PubMed: 15163457]

- Buzsaki G, Draguhn A. Neuronal oscillations in cortical networks. Science 2004;304:1926–1929. [PubMed: 15218136]
- Penttonen M, Buzsaki G. Natural logarithmic relationship between brain oscillators. Thalamus & Related Systems 2003;2:145–152.
- Horovitz SG, Fukunaga M, de Zwart JA, van GP, Fulton SC, Balkin TJ, et al. Low frequency BOLD fluctuations during resting wakefulness and light sleep: A simultaneous EEG-fMRI study. Hum Brain Mapp. 2007
- 22. Fukunaga M, Horovitz SG, van GP, de Zwart JA, Jansma JM, Ikonomidou VN, et al. Large-amplitude, spatially correlated fluctuations in BOLD fMRI signals during extended rest and early sleep stages. Magn Reson Imaging 2006;24:979–992. [PubMed: 16997067]
- Fransson P. Spontaneous low-frequency BOLD signal fluctuations: an fMRI investigation of the resting-state default mode of brain function hypothesis. Hum Brain Mapp 2005;26:15–29. [PubMed: 15852468]
- 24. Kaufman, J.; Birmaher, B.; Brent, D.; Rao, U.; Ryan, N. Diagnostic interview. 1996. Kiddie-Sads-Present and Lifetime Version (K-SADS-PL) - Screen interview
- 25. Conners, CK. Conners' Rating Scales-Revised Technical Manual. Multi-Health Systems, Inc.; North Tonawanda, NY: 1997.
- 26. Conners, CK. Conners' Rating Scales-Revised User's Manual. Multi-Health Systems, Inc.; North Tonawanda, NY: 1997.
- 27. Achenbach, T.; Rescorla, L. Manual for the ASEBA school-age forms and profile. University of Vermont, rsearch center for Children, Youth and Families; Burlington, VT: 2001.
- 28. Hollingshead, AB. Four factor index of social status. New Haven: 1975.
- 29. Wechsler, D. Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI). The Psychological Corporation; San Antonio, TX: 1999.
- Wechsler, D. Wechsler Individual Achievement Test. Vol. 2nd ed.. The Psychological Corporation; New York: 2001. (WIAT-II)
- Luce, RD. Response times: their role in inferring elementary mental organization. Oxford University Press; New York: 1986.
- 32. Venables, WN.; Ripley, BD. Modern Applied Statistic with S*. Vol. 4th ed. Springer; New York: 2002.
- Rioul O, Flandrin P. Time-Scale Energy-Distributions A General-Class Extending Wavelet Transforms. Ieee Transactions on Signal Processing 1992;40:1746–1757.
- 34. Percival, DB.; Walden, AT. Wavelet methods for time series analysis. Cambridge University Press; Cambridge: 2000.
- 35. Vidakovic, B. Statistical Modeling by Wavelets. Wiley; New York: 1999.
- 36. Humeau A, Koitka A, Abraham P, Saumet JL, L'Huillier JP. Time-frequency analysis of laser Doppler flowmetry signals recorded in response to a progressive pressure applied locally on anaesthetized healthy rats. Physics in Medicine and Biology 2004;49:843–857. [PubMed: 15070207]
- 37. Williams BR, Ponesse JS, Schachar RJ, Logan GD, Tannock R. Development of inhibitory control across the life span. Dev Psychol 1999;35:205–213. [PubMed: 9923475]
- Williams BR, Strauss EH, Hultsch DF, Hunter MA. Reaction time inconsistency in a spatial stroop task: age-related differences through childhood and adulthood. Neuropsychol Dev Cogn B Aging Neuropsychol Cogn 2007;14:417–439. [PubMed: 17612816]
- 39. Conners CK, Epstein JN, Angold A, Klaric J. Continuous performance test performance in a normative epidemiological sample. J Abnorm Child Psychol 2003;31:555–562. [PubMed: 14561062]
- 40. Bellgrove MA, Hawi Z, Kirley A, Gill M, Robertson IH. Dissecting the attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) phenotype: sustained attention, response variability and spatial attentional asymmetries in relation to dopamine transporter (DAT1) genotype. Neuropsychologia 2005;43:1847–1857. [PubMed: 16168728]
- Hervey AS, Epstein JN, Curry JF, Tonev S, Eugene AL, Keith CC, et al. Reaction time distribution analysis of neuropsychological performance in an ADHD sample. Child Neuropsychol 2006;12:125– 140. [PubMed: 16754533]

- 42. Mullins C, Bellgrove MA, Gill M, Robertson IH. Variability in time reproduction: difference in ADHD combined and inattentive subtypes. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 2005;44:169–176. [PubMed: 15689730]
- Rubia K, Smith A, Taylor E. Performance of children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) on a test battery of impulsiveness. Child Neuropsychol 2007;13:276–304. [PubMed: 17453834]
- 44. Teicher MH, Ito Y, Glod CA, Barber NI. Objective measurement of hyperactivity and attentional problems in ADHD. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 1996;35:334–342. [PubMed: 8714322]
- 45. Williams BR, Strauss EH, Hultsch DF, Hunter MA, Tannock R. Reaction time performance in adolescents with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder: evidence of inconsistency in the fast and slow portions of the RT distribution. J Clin Exp Neuropsychol 2007;29:277–289. [PubMed: 17454348]
- Johnson KA, Kelly SP, Bellgrove MA, Barry E, Cox M, Gill M, et al. Response variability in attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: evidence for neuropsychological heterogeneity. Neuropsychologia 2007;45:630–638. [PubMed: 17157885]
- 47. Johnson KA, Robertson IH, Kelly SP, Silk TJ, Barry E, Daibhis A, et al. Dissociation in performance of children with ADHD and high-functioning autism on a task of sustained attention. Neuropsychologia 2007;45:2234–2245. [PubMed: 17433378]
- Leth-Steensen C, Elbaz ZK, Douglas VI. Mean response times, variability, and skew in the responding of ADHD children: a response time distributional approach. Acta Psychol (Amst) 2000;104:167– 190. [PubMed: 10900704]
- 49. Heathcote A. Fitting wald and ex-Wald distributions to response time data: an example using functions for the S-PLUS package. Behav Res Methods Instrum Comput 2004;36:678–694. [PubMed: 15641415]
- Sergeant, J.; Oosterlaan, J.; Van der Meere, J. Information processing and energetic factors in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. In: Quay, HC.; Hogan, AE., editors. Handbook of disruptive behavior disorders. Plenum Press; New York: 1999. p. 75-104.
- Sergeant JA. Modeling attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a critical appraisal of the cognitiveenergetic model. Biol Psychiatry 2005;57:1248–1255. [PubMed: 15949995]
- 52. Weissman DH, Roberts KC, Visscher KM, Woldorff MG. The neural bases of momentary lapses in attention. Nat Neurosci 2006;9:971–978. [PubMed: 16767087]
- 53. Biswal B, Yetkin FZ, Haughton VM, Hyde JS. Functional connectivity in the motor cortex of resting human brain using echo-planar MRI. Magn Reson Med 1995;34:537–541. [PubMed: 8524021]
- 54. Brockwell, PJ.; Davis, RA. Time series: Theory and methods. Vol. 2nd ed. Springer; New York: 2006.
- 55. Muller T, Reinhard M, Oehm E, Hetzel A, Timmer J. Detection of very low-frequency oscillations of cerebral haemodynamics is influenced by data detrending. Med Biol Eng Comput 2003;41:69– 74. [PubMed: 12572750]

NIH-PA Author Manuscript



Figure 1. Group Differences in Slow-6, 5, 4, 3 Relative Spectra

Relative spectra in the Slow-6, 5, 4, and 3 averaged over time resulting from continuous Morlet wavelet transform of normalized residuals of response time (RT) timeseries. ADHD = Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder; TDC = typically developing children (dotted-line). Although the ADHD group showed increased relative spectrum in Slow-5, Slow-4, and Slow-3, group differences were statistically significant only for Slow-4 (*: p=0.02).

Di Martino et al.



Frequency Hz

Figure 2. Group Differences in Frequency Spectrum

ADHD = Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (continuous line); TDC = typically developing children (dotted-line). The X-axis represents the frequencies on the natural logarithmic scale included between 0.0052 and 0.17 Hz grouped in four ranges: Slow-6 centered at 0.006 Hz, Slow-5 at 0.016 Hz, and Slow-4 at 0.044 Hz and Slow-3 at 0.12 Hz. The Y-axis represents the magnitude of the frequency spectra measured with continuous Morlet wavelet transform.

Di Martino et al.



RT Slow-4 Spectrum

Figure 3. Correlations Between Errors and Unadjusted Slow-4 Spectrum

Errors of omission (left) and directional errors (right). The X-axis represents the magnitude of the frequency spectra measured with continuous Morlet wavelet transform. The significant correlation between Slow-4 spectrum and number of omission errors is nearly identical in the two groups (r=.81 and r=.62 for ADHD and TDC, respectively).

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Table 1

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

1			
		- 1	

Di Martino et al.

Image: matrix for the second state of the	Include Include <t< th=""><th>Include (n=2) (n=2) (n=2) Mile 1 (d) 1 (d) (n=2) (n</th><th>Interpret to the state of the sta</th><th>Males, Number (%) Mean</th><th>(n=26)</th><th>(=u)</th><th>29)</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>	Include (n=2) (n=2) (n=2) Mile 1 (d) 1 (d) (n=2) (n	Interpret to the state of the sta	Males, Number (%) Mean	(n=26)	(=u)	29)			
Mater, Number (%) I_2 (46) <th< th=""><th>Male, Number (%) I.1 (4) I.2 (4) <thi.2 (4)<="" th=""> I.2 (4) <thi.2 (4)<="" th=""></thi.2></thi.2></th><th>Addise Number (s) I.2 (d) <thi.2 (d)<="" th=""> I.2 (d) <thi.2 (d)<="" th=""></thi.2></thi.2></th><th>Motor, Number (%) 12 (40) 56 (90) $x_1^2 = 13.15 \text{ p-c001}$ Accord Name Name SD Name Name Name Accord Name SD Name SD F p Accord Name Name SD Name SD F p Accord Name Name SD Name SD F p Accord Name 116 2.5 12.5 2.4 0.68 0.36 Accord Name 119 12 2.5 2.4 0.89 0.35 0.35 Accord Name 113 12 12 12 12 12 13 Accord Name 113 12 12 12 2.33 0.08 0.09 P Name 13 13 13 2.33 0.03 0.03 P Name 13 13 13 13 13 13 P 13 13 13 13 13</th><th>Males, Number (%) Mean Age (vears) 11.6</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></th<>	Male, Number (%) I.1 (4) I.2 (4) <thi.2 (4)<="" th=""> I.2 (4) <thi.2 (4)<="" th=""></thi.2></thi.2>	Addise Number (s) I.2 (d) I.2 (d) <thi.2 (d)<="" th=""> I.2 (d) <thi.2 (d)<="" th=""></thi.2></thi.2>	Motor, Number (%) 12 (40) 56 (90) $x_1^2 = 13.15 \text{ p-c001}$ Accord Name Name SD Name Name Name Accord Name SD Name SD F p Accord Name Name SD Name SD F p Accord Name Name SD Name SD F p Accord Name 116 2.5 12.5 2.4 0.68 0.36 Accord Name 119 12 2.5 2.4 0.89 0.35 0.35 Accord Name 113 12 12 12 12 12 13 Accord Name 113 12 12 12 2.33 0.08 0.09 P Name 13 13 13 2.33 0.03 0.03 P Name 13 13 13 13 13 13 P 13 13 13 13 13	Males, Number (%) Mean Age (vears) 11.6						
MotionSDNotNotNotAgrown1165120 \mathbf{r} \mathbf{p} \mathbf{r} Agrown1161212120012Agrown1161212120012Agrown1161412120012Agrown1191212120012Agrown1191212120012Agrown1191212120012Agrown1191212120012Agrown119121212121212Alb Diate113121212121212Abb Diate13121212121212Abb Diate13131212121212Abb Diate14131212121212Abb Diate14131212121212Abb Diate14131212121212Abb Diate14131212121212Abb Diate14131212121212Abb Diate14131212121212Abb Diate14121212121212Abb	More BD More P More Age (rear) 116 23 More P </th <th>Motion SD Motion P MOMAna 4e (orm) 116 23 126 <td< th=""><th>More all of the standing of the standin</th><th>Mean Ase (vears) 11.6</th><th>12 (46)</th><th>26 (</th><th>00)</th><th></th><th>$\chi_1^2 = 12.15 \text{ p} < .001$</th><th></th></td<></th>	Motion SD Motion P MOMAna 4e (orm) 116 23 126 <td< th=""><th>More all of the standing of the standin</th><th>Mean Ase (vears) 11.6</th><th>12 (46)</th><th>26 (</th><th>00)</th><th></th><th>$\chi_1^2 = 12.15 \text{ p} < .001$</th><th></th></td<>	More all of the standing of the standin	Mean Ase (vears) 11.6	12 (46)	26 (00)		$\chi_1^2 = 12.15 \text{ p} < .001$	
Mathematical statematical s	Afer Constrain SD Mean SD FD p df Afer Constrain 16 25 125 24 068 35 35 35 Afer Constrain 16 25 125 125 325 068 129 129 Aff Constrain 119 12 126 129 036 129 129 APD Hales 113 11 12 239 039 039 129 APD Hales 13 12 12 239 039 129 129 APD Hales 43 13 16 12 239 039 129 APD Hales 43 14 631 631 129 129 129 APD Hales 43 44 641 133 4034 640 129 129 APD Hales 43 13 643 133 4034 640 129 129 APD Hales 43	Main SD Main SD F p df stycerul: 116 23 24 0.68 33 0.68 33 stycerul: 119 12 23 24 0.68 33 0.69 13 stycerul: 119 12 12 12 239 0.06 13 stycerul: 113 12 12 236 0.69 13 stycerul: 13 14 12 236 0.69 13 stycerul: 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 stycerul: 14 14 14 14 14 14 stycerul:	Matrix SD Matrix SD F P Age Geary 116 23 123 33 036 036 Age Geary 116 23 123 33 036 036 Pig 119 126 126 129 036 036 Pig 113 116 102 127 239 036 Pig 113 116 102 127 239 036 Pig 113 116 102 127 234 036 Distribution 43 41 102 123 034 036 Distribution 43 41 13 034 036 036 Distribution 43 43 63 63 63 63 63 Distribution 43 13 63 133 034 60 60 Distribution 43 13 133 133 136 60 <th>Mean Age (vears) 11.6</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>ANCOVA_{sex}</th> <th></th>	Mean Age (vears) 11.6					ANCOVA _{sex}	
Age (sees)11.62.51.2.52.40.680.361.52PQ11.41.41.41.061.33.7.50.061.52VQ11.91.91.91.61.33.7.50.061.50VQ1.11.01.11.01.23.3.40.081.50PQ1.11.11.021.23.3.40.091.50PQ1.11.11.021.23.3.40.091.50PQ1.11.11.021.23.3.40.081.50PQ1.131.61.131.72.390.091.52PMSNP Index4.54.16.11.34.34.31.52DSNNP Index4.54.16.11.34.34.34.31.52DSNNP Index4.54.16.51.34.34.01.52DSNNP Index4.16.51.34.034.01.52DSNNP Index4.15.36.41.183.066<0.01	Age (overs) 116 23 123 24 0.66 0.36 132 PLO 114 14 16 13 3.35 0.06 132 VLO 113 114 14 106 13 3.35 0.06 132 VLO 113 113 113 113 12 3.34 0.08 1.30 PLO 113 113 11 102 12 2.39 0.09 1.30 PLO 113 16 103 113 12 2.39 0.09 1.30 PLO 113 16 103 13 2.39 0.09 1.30 PLO 113 66 133 6.3 6.3 6.3 6.3 1.32 DSM-IV Instantion 45.1 7.3 6.83 5.7 2.38.90 0.09 1.32 DMHD dec 4.3 7.3 6.83 6.7 1.83 2.35 0.01 1.32	qc foron3) 116 23 123 24 0.68 0.36 0.36 123 PQ 114 14 0.06 13 3.33 0.06 123 PQ 119 18 106 13 3.34 0.08 123 PQ 113 113 113 123 3.34 0.08 123 PQ 113 12 12 2.39 0.09 0.09 123 PQ 113 12 12 2.33 0.08 0.09 123 PMPI materine 43 41 63 57 2.38 0.09 123 DSM-IV Trait 43 44 63 63 57 2.38 0.09 123 DSM-IV Trait 43 44 63 63 67 133 0.09 123 DSM-IV Trait 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43	Age (norm) 11.6 2.5 12.5 2.4 0.68 0.36 Pig 11.9 11.4 14 10.6 13 3.75 0.06 Vig 11.9 11.9 12 10.9 16 2.89 0.35 Pig 11.9 10.7 11.9 10.7 2.34 0.06 Pig 11.3 11.6 10.7 12.7 2.34 0.05 Pig 11.3 16 10.7 12.7 2.39 0.06 Pig 11.3 16 10.7 12.7 2.39 0.05 Pig 41.4 63.7 63.7 13.3 40.34 <01	A ge (vears)	SD	Mean	SD	Ĩ	d	đf
PQ 14 14 16 13 3.75 006 12 VQ 19 18 109 16 2.89 0.09 15 PQ 11 12 12 2.89 0.09 15 PQ 11 12 12 2.89 0.09 15 PQ 113 12 12 2.89 0.09 15 $PALTcomposite113122.990.190.915PMTcomposite1336302.930.920.9215DSM-VI hattention45341631632228.300.9215DSM-VI hattention453416316325372090.9115DSM-VI hattention453416311334034<00115DSM-VI hattention4131212228.30001129129DSM-VI hattention453123123320022002129DSM-VI hattention413123123312022002129DSM-VI hattention413121123120212021202DSM-VI hattention12312021202120212021202DSM-VI hattention123120212021202120212021202DSM-VI hattention12112021202<$	RQ 114 14 106 13 3.75 0.06 123 VQ 113 114 114 114 114 113 114 125 124	RQ 114 14 16 13 375 0.6 13 RQ 13 14 14 16 13 17 28 0.6 13 RQ 13 1 13 13 13 23 0.6 13 13 RMT 13 1 13	PQ 14 14 16 37 375 000 VQ 11 10 16 16 239 000 PQ 11 10 11 102 12 239 000 PQ 113 16 102 12 239 003 PQ 113 16 12 12 239 003 $CPRS.PL$ 12 12 12 12 239 000 $CPRS.PL$ 12 12 12 12 239 003 $CPRS.PL$ 12 12 12 12 239 003 $DNH Under Indication 43 4 63 63 12 120 001 DNH Under Indication 430 63 120 120 120 120 DNH Under Indication 43 63 62 120 120 120 $		2.5	12.5	2.4	0.68	0.36	1,52
VQ1013101310131015PQ10711121213131515PQ113113121213131515MAT composit113131613172.990.0915CBS-R4L1314131613172.990.0915CBS-R4L131413172.990.0115CBS-R4L13141313131515CBS-R4L14141414131315CBS-R4L14141414141316CBS-R4L14141414141316CBS-R4L14141414141316CBS-R4L14141414141616CBS-R4L14141414141416CBS-R4L141414141414CBS-R4L141414141414CBS-R4L141414141414CBS-R4L141414141414CBS-R4L141414141414CBS-R4L141414141414CBS-R4L1414141414CBS-R	VQ 119 18 109 16 2.89 0.09 150 PQ 107 11 102 12 2.34 0.09 150 PQ VIAT composite 113 16 103 17 2.39 0.09 150 PADE Data 450 41 102 12 2.39 0.09 150 CPRSACI 450 450 41 103 2.39 0.09 150 CPRSACI 450 450 41 651 137 2.394 0.09 152 CPRSACI 43 44 63 57 2.38.70 0.01 152 DM-U Hyper/Inputs 44 13 657 137 2.38.70 0.01 152 CPRSACI 41 63 641 118 3.06 0.01 153 CPRSACI 41 56 12 132 132 132 132 CPRSACI Intervitor 42 57<	QQ 19 18 109 16 2.89 0.09 150 PC 113 11 12 2.34 0.09 150 153 PC 113 16 103 113 12 2.34 0.09 150 PC 2.73 13 13 13 13 13 13 CPES-FL 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 CPES-FL 43 43 44 63 65 57 2.89 0.09 13 CPES-FL* 13 14 63 65 13 13 13 DSM-V Instension 41 63 65 13 13 13 13 DSM-V Instension 43 13 13 13 13 13 DSM-V Instension 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 DSM-V Instension 43 61 13	VQ 119 18 109 16 2.89 009 PQ 07 11 12 2.99 009 VLT composite 113 16 103 17 2.99 009 VLT composite 113 16 103 17 2.99 009 $CDSSSEL$ 2.00 4.1 69.1 62.3 2.39.4 009 $CDSSSEL$ 4.1 69.1 63.7 2.39.7 2.01 001 $SNH-VLPattenion 45.0 4.1 69.1 15.3 2.39.4 001 SNH-VLPattenion 45.1 61.1 62.7 2.39.7 001 SNH-VLPattenion 45.1 63.7 15.3 2.39.4 001 SNH-VLPattenion 45.1 63.7 15.3 15.3 0.01 SNH-VLPattenion 45.1 63.7 15.3 15.3 0.01 SNH-VLPattenion 46.1 5.3 15.3 15.3 0.01 0.01 $	FIQ 114	14	106	13	3.75	0.06	1,52
PQ0111102123.240.0815WitT composite131613172.990.1915WitT composite131613172.990.1915CPRS-RL4.16.16.12.990.1915CPRS-RL4.34.16.16.12.990.1915CPRS-RL4.16.16.16.22.8946.0115DRM-Unatention4.54.16.16.113.340.346.0115DSM-Unatention4.34.16.36.35.72.8946.0115DSM-Unatention4.34.16.36.36.72.896.0115DSM-Unatention4.16.113.340.346.011515DSM-Unatention4.15.113.340.346.0115DSM-Unatention4.15.313.340.346.0113DSM-Unatention4.15.111.830.666.0113DSM-Unatention4.17.46.111.830.666.0113DSM-Unatention4.17.411.812.71313DSM-Unatention4.17.411.812.71313DSM-Unatention4.17.411.812.71313DSM-Unatention4.17.411.812.71313DSM-Unate	PQ 1 10 11 102 12 324 0.08 15 NIX comport 113 16 103 17 2.99 0.19 1.52 CDES.E.L 2 41 691 62 228.39 0.09 1.52 CDES.L.L 43 41 663 5.7 228.79 6.00 1.52 DSM-VT materition 453 41 663 5.7 228.79 6.00 1.52 DSM-VT materition 423 43 663 133 40.34 6.00 1.52 DSM-VT materition 41 653 133 40.34 6.00 1.52 DSM-VT materition 41 13 663 1.18 2.00 1.52 DSM-VT materition 41 143 6.61 1.18 2.60 1.53 DSM-VT materition 41 1.18 1.18 2.60 1.53 1.53 DSM-VT materition 4.11 1.18 2.61	PQ 10 11 12 12 13 14 0.08 15 MAT composite 113 16 103 17 2.99 0.09 12 CRS-SEL 450 410 621 2.39 0.09 12 CRS-SEL 450 410 631 62 2.38,90 <019	PQ 10 11 10 12 3.24 00 W1AT composite 113 16 103 17 2.99 0.19 CRS-RL 450 41 62 238.49 0.06 DBM-IV Instruction 45.2 43 63 57 228.79 601 DSM-IV Instruction 45.3 41 65.7 13.3 40.34 601 DSM-IV Total 43.8 41 65.7 13.3 40.34 601 DSM-IV Total 43.8 73 66.5 13.3 40.34 601 DSM-IV Total 47.1 73 66.5 15.2 19.86 601 DSM-IV Instruction 46.1 74 66.6 14.2 20.66 601 DSM-IV Instruction 46.1 74 66.6 14.2 20.66 601 DSM-IV Instruction 46.1 74 66.6 14.2 20.66 601 DSM-IV Instruction 46.1 <td< td=""><td>VIQ 119</td><td>18</td><td>109</td><td>16</td><td>2.89</td><td>0.09</td><td>1,50</td></td<>	VIQ 119	18	109	16	2.89	0.09	1,50
WIAT composite[13][6][03][7]2.99[04][52]CPSS-RL </td <td>With composite 113 16 103 17 2.99 0.19 1.52 Cress-st. 41 61 62 238.94 601 1.52 Cress-st. 45.0 41 63 57 238.70 601 1.52 DSM-IV Instruction 45.2 43 68.5 57 238.70 601 1.52 DSM-IV Instruction 45.4 41 65.7 133 40.34 601 1.52 DSM-IV Instruction 45.1 65.7 133 40.34 601 1.52 DSM-IV Instruction 45.1 7.3 66.5 15.2 7.90 1.53 DSM-IV Instruction 46.1 58.8 66.7 1.62 1.52 6.01 1.53 DSM-IV Instruction 46.1 58.8 66.5 1.12 2.05 0.01 1.53 DSM-IV Instruction 47.1 7.4 1.13 2.06 1.53 1.53 DSM-IV Instruction 46.1 58 6.01 1.53 1.53 1.53 DSM-IV Instruction</td> <td>W/H composite 113 16 103 17 2.99 0.19 152 CMS-ReL A 41 61 62 28.34 0.19 153 153 CMS-Rel 43 41 631 633 57 28.349 (019) 153 ADHD Index 453 43 41 637 133 40.34 (010) 153 SM-V Instention 453 43 41 657 133 40.34 (010) 153 DMD Index 473 73 73 665 152 158 (010) 153 CMS-M V Instention 461 58 663 153 153 600 153 DMD Index 473 73 73 665 153 156 153 153 SM-V Vinstention 461 74 663 163 163 163 163 DSM-V Vinstention 471 74 113 153 153 153 153 DSM-V Vinstention 461 123 164 163</td> <td>HAT composite 113 16 133 17 2.99 0.19 CPRS-RL ADHD Index 45.0 4.1 69.1 6.2 28.3.4 <01</td> DNALY Instruction 45.2 4.3 68.5 5.7 2.38.70 <01	With composite 113 16 103 17 2.99 0.19 1.52 Cress-st. 41 61 62 238.94 601 1.52 Cress-st. 45.0 41 63 57 238.70 601 1.52 DSM-IV Instruction 45.2 43 68.5 57 238.70 601 1.52 DSM-IV Instruction 45.4 41 65.7 133 40.34 601 1.52 DSM-IV Instruction 45.1 65.7 133 40.34 601 1.52 DSM-IV Instruction 45.1 7.3 66.5 15.2 7.90 1.53 DSM-IV Instruction 46.1 58.8 66.7 1.62 1.52 6.01 1.53 DSM-IV Instruction 46.1 58.8 66.5 1.12 2.05 0.01 1.53 DSM-IV Instruction 47.1 7.4 1.13 2.06 1.53 1.53 DSM-IV Instruction 46.1 58 6.01 1.53 1.53 1.53 DSM-IV Instruction	W/H composite 113 16 103 17 2.99 0.19 152 CMS-ReL A 41 61 62 28.34 0.19 153 153 CMS-Rel 43 41 631 633 57 28.349 (019) 153 ADHD Index 453 43 41 637 133 40.34 (010) 153 SM-V Instention 453 43 41 657 133 40.34 (010) 153 DMD Index 473 73 73 665 152 158 (010) 153 CMS-M V Instention 461 58 663 153 153 600 153 DMD Index 473 73 73 665 153 156 153 153 SM-V Vinstention 461 74 663 163 163 163 163 DSM-V Vinstention 471 74 113 153 153 153 153 DSM-V Vinstention 461 123 164 163	HAT composite 113 16 133 17 2.99 0.19 CPRS-RL ADHD Index 45.0 4.1 69.1 6.2 28.3.4 <01	PIQ 107	11	102	12	3.24	0.08	1,50
CPRS-R.1ADHD Index450416916223894<01	CMS-RE.1 ADHD Index 45.0 4.1 69.1 6.2 28.94 6.01 1.52 DSM-IV Instention 45.2 4.3 68.5 5.7 228.70 6.01 1.52 DSM-IV Instention 45.4 4.1 68.5 5.7 228.70 6.01 1.52 DSM-IV Instention 45.4 4.1 67 13.3 40.34 6.01 1.52 DSM-IV Total 41.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 15.2 6.01 1.52 CMSE.1* 47.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 30.66 6.01 1.39 CMPL Instention 46.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 30.66 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 2.03 0.08 1.39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 1.39 1.39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 1.2 2.03 0.08 1.39 <td>CPRS.R.1 ADHD Index 450 41 691 62 238.94 <001</td> 152 SM-IV Instruction 452 43 685 57 238.70 <001	CPRS.R.1 ADHD Index 450 41 691 62 238.94 <001	CMS. ALI ADHD Index 450 41 69.1 6.2 228.94 601 DSM-IV Inattention 45.2 43 68.5 5.7 228.70 601 DSM-IV Inattention 45.2 43 68.5 5.7 228.70 601 DSM-IV Inattention 45.4 41 65.7 13.3 40.34 601 DSM-IV Total 47.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 185.22 601 DSM-IV Total 47.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 600 601 DSM-IV Inattention 46.1 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.8 601 DSM-IV Inattention 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 5.55 601 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 601 601 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 7.1 7.2 601 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 7.1 7.2 601 DSM-IV Total	WIAT composite 113	16	103	17	2.99	0.19	1,52
APHD Index 4.0 4.1 6.1 6.2 23.94 <00 1.52 DSM-IV Inatention 4.5 4.3 6.5 5.7 23.870 <00 1.52 DSM-IV Inatention 45.4 4.1 6.5 13.3 40.34 <00 1.52 DSM-IV Inatention 45.4 4.1 6.5 13.3 40.34 <00 1.52 DSM-IV Total 4.8 4.1 6.5 1.32 $2.28.70$ <00 1.52 DSM-IV Total 4.1 6.5 1.2 1.32 <0.04 1.52 DSM-IV Total 4.7 7.3 6.6 1.52 $1.85.2$ <00 1.52 DSM-IV Intertion 4.1 5.8 6.6 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 DSM-IV Intertion 4.1 5.8 6.1 1.18 30.66 <00 1.39 DSM-IV Intertion 4.1 7.4 6.6 1.42 5.55 0.08 1.39 DSM-IV Intertion 4.1 7.4 6.6 1.42 5.55 0.08 1.39 DSM-IV Intertion 4.7 7.4 6.6 1.42 5.55 0.08 1.39 DSM-IV Intertion 4.7 7.4 5.6 1.42 5.05 0.08 1.39 DSM-IV Intertion 1.2 7.1 7.2 7.1 7.2 1.39 1.39 DSM-IV Intertion 1.2 1.2 7.1 7.2 2.015 0.08 1.39 DSM-IV Intertion <td>APHD Index 450 4.1 691 6.2 228.94 <001 1.52 DSM-IV Inattention 452 43 685 5.7 228.70 <001</td> 1.52 DSM-IV Inattention 454 4.1 68.7 13.3 40.34 <001	APHD Index 450 4.1 691 6.2 228.94 <001 1.52 DSM-IV Inattention 452 43 685 5.7 228.70 <001	APHD Index 450 4.1 601 6.2 2.894 6.01 1.52 DSM-IV Interetion 452 4.3 685 5.7 228.70 6.01 1.52 DSM-IV Interetion 454 4.1 68.7 5.3 6.01 6.01 1.52 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 4.4 4.1 6.57 13.3 6.03 6.01 1.52 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 4.1 6.0 6.7 18.32 6.01 1.52 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 4.1 5.8 6.41 1.18 6.01 1.32 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 4.1 5.8 6.41 1.18 3.06 6.01 1.32 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 4.1 7.4 6.12 1.42 6.01 1.32 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 4.1 7.4 6.12 1.42 6.01 1.32 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 4.3 7.3 6.12 1.42 6.01 1.32 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 7.4 6.	APHD Index 45.0 4.1 6.1 6.2 28.04 (00) DSM-IV Inatention 45.2 4.3 68.5 5.7 228.70 (00) DSM-IV Inatention 45.4 4.1 65.7 13.3 228.70 (00) DSM-IV Index 45.4 4.1 65.7 13.3 40.34 (00) DSM-IV Toal 4.7 7.3 66.5 15.2 185.22 (00) DSM-IV Toal 4.7 7.3 66.5 15.2 185.2 (00) DSM-IV Inatention 46.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 5.6 (00) DSM-IV Inatention 46.1 7.4 65.6 11.8 5.55 (00) DSM-IV Toal 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 (00) DSM-IV Toal 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 (00) DSM-IV Toal 17.4 65.6 7.1 7.2 20.05 (00) DsM to blems	CPRS-R:L						
DSM-IV Institution 45.2 4.3 68.5 5.7 228.70 601 1.52 DSM-IV Hyper/Inputs. 45.4 4.1 65.7 13.3 40.34 601 1.52 DSM-IV Hyper/Inputs. 4.8 4.1 6.9 6.7 13.3 40.34 601 1.52 DSM-IV Total 4.1 7.3 6.9 6.7 185.22 601 1.52 DSM-IV Instention 4.1 5.8 6.4 11.8 30.66 601 1.39 DSM-IV Instention 4.1 5.8 6.4 11.8 30.66 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Hyper/Inputs. 4.7 7.3 $6.6.7$ 12.2 1.986 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Hyper/Inputs. 4.7 7.3 $6.6.7$ 1.18 30.66 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 4.7 7.3 $6.6.7$ 1.18 30.66 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 4.7 7.4 $6.6.7$ 1.18 30.66 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 4.7 7.4 $6.6.7$ 1.42 2.005 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 1.47 7.4 6.56 1.42 7.9 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 1.47 7.9 7.9 7.9 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 1.47 7.9 7.9 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 1.47 7.9 7.9 6.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 1.47 $7.$	DSM-IV Inattention45.24.368.55.7228.706011.52DSM-IV Ipater/Impuls.45.44.16.5713.340.346011.52DSM-IV Total4.4.84.46.96.7185.226.011.52CTRS-RL*1.31.526.011.52CTRS-RL*6.61.521.9.866.011.39CTRS-RL*1.321.30CTRS-RL*1.321.30CTRS-RL*1.321.30CTRS-RL*1.321.30CTRS-RL*1.321.30CTRS-RL*1.321.30CTRS-RL*1.321.30DRH-UP intension1.30DSM-UP intension1.30DSM-UP intension1.30DSM-UP intension1.30DSM-UP intension1.30DSM-UP intension1.30DSM-UP intension <td>DSM-IV Intattention 452 43 685 5.7 28.70 601 152 DSM-IV Hyper./Imputs. 454 4.1 657 13.3 40.34 601 152 DSM-IV Hyper./Imputs. 448 647 647 13.3 40.34 601 152 DSM-IV trait 413 7.3 665 152 601 1,35 CTSS.Ref.* 471 7.3 665 152 601 1,35 DSM-IV hattention 461 58 641 11.8 3066 601 1,39 DSM-IV hattention 471 7.4 656 161 5.55 008 1,39 DSM-IV traitention 471 7.4 656 161 5.55 008 1,39 DSM-IV traitention 471 7.4 656 7.0 0.66 1,39 DSM-IV traitention 471 7.4 14.2 7.0 1,30 1,39 DSM-IV traitention 47.1 7.4 <</td> <td></td> <td>ADHD Index 45.0</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>69.1</td> <td>6.2</td> <td>228.94</td> <td><.001</td> <td>1,52</td>	DSM-IV Intattention 452 43 685 5.7 28.70 601 152 DSM-IV Hyper./Imputs. 454 4.1 657 13.3 40.34 601 152 DSM-IV Hyper./Imputs. 448 647 647 13.3 40.34 601 152 DSM-IV trait 413 7.3 665 152 601 1,35 CTSS.Ref.* 471 7.3 665 152 601 1,35 DSM-IV hattention 461 58 641 11.8 3066 601 1,39 DSM-IV hattention 471 7.4 656 161 5.55 008 1,39 DSM-IV traitention 471 7.4 656 161 5.55 008 1,39 DSM-IV traitention 471 7.4 656 7.0 0.66 1,39 DSM-IV traitention 471 7.4 14.2 7.0 1,30 1,39 DSM-IV traitention 47.1 7.4 <		ADHD Index 45.0	4.1	69.1	6.2	228.94	<.001	1,52
DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 454 4.1 657 13.3 40.34 <01 $1,52$ DSM-IV Total 4.8 4.4 6.9 6.7 185.22 <01 $1,22$ $CTSS.FL^*$ 1.3 6.5 1.5 19.66 <01 $1,29$ $CTSS.FL^*$ 7.3 66.5 1.5 19.86 <01 $1,39$ $CTSS.FL^*$ 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 $DSM-IV Induction46.15.864.111.830.66<011.39DSM-IV Induction46.15.864.111.830.66<011.39DSM-IV Induction47.17.46.616.15.550.081.39DSM-IV Total47.17.46.616.15.550.081.39DSM-IV Total47.17.46.5614.220.05<011.39DSM-IV Total1.21.21.21.21.21.21.2DSM-IV Total1.21.21.21.21.21.21.2DSM-IV Total1.21.21.21.21.21.21.2DSM-IV Total1.21.21.21.21.21.21.2DSM-IV Total1.21.21.21.21.21.21.2DSM-IV Total1.21.21.21.21.$	DSM-IV Hyper/Imput. 45.4 4.1 65.7 13.3 40.34 <001 1.52 DSM-IV Total 4.8 4.4 69.9 6.7 185.22 <001 1.52 CTRS-RL* 4.1 69.9 6.7 185.22 <001 1.52 CTRS-RL* 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.86 <001 1.39 CTRS-RL* 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.86 <001 1.39 CTRS-RL* 8.1 6.0 6.1 1.1.8 30.66 <001 1.39 DSM-IV Intention 47.1 7.4 6.6.5 14.2 20.05 <001 1.39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 6.6.5 14.2 20.66 <001 1.39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 6.5.5 1.42 20.66 <01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 6.5.6 1.42 20.67 20.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 1.2 7.3 7.3 7.3 20.05 20.05 20.01	DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 45.4 4.1 6.57 13.3 40.34 <01 1.52 DSM-IV Total 4.8 4.4 6.99 6.7 185.22 <01 1.52 CTBS-str. ⁴ 4.3 7.3 6.99 6.7 185.22 <01 1.52 CTBS-str. ⁴ 7.3 6.63 15.2 19.86 <01 1.39 CTBS-str. ⁴ 4.1 7.3 6.63 16.1 1.83 0.046 1.39 CTBS-str. ⁴ 4.1 7.4 6.6 1.1 1.8 0.01 1.39 DSM-IV Intention 4.1 7.4 6.6 1.1 1.18 0.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 4.1 7.4 6.6 1.1 1.2 0.02 0.01 1.39 DSM-IV Total 4.1 7.4 6.6 1.1 1.2 0.02 0.01 1.30 DSM-IV Total 4.1 7.4 6.5 1.1 7.2 0.02 0.01 1.31 Data 1.2 1.1 1.2 <t< td=""><td></td><td>DSM-IV Inattention 45.2</td><td>4.3</td><td>68.5</td><td>5.7</td><td>228.70</td><td><:001</td><td>1,52</td></t<>		DSM-IV Inattention 45.2	4.3	68.5	5.7	228.70	<:001	1,52
DSM-IV Total 4.8 4.4 6.9 6.7 185.22 <001 1.52 CTRS-R.1 * CTRS-R.1 * CTRS-R.1 * CTRS-R.1 * CTRS-R.1 *	$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	DSM-IV Total 4.8 4.4 6.9 6.7 18.22 <001 1.52 CTBS-RL [*] $ < < <<<<01 <<<<<01 <<<<<>< <<<<<>< <<<<<><<<<>< <<<<<<><<<<><<<<>< <<<<<<<<><<<<><<<<<><<<<<><<<<<><<<<><<<<$	$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	DSM-IV Hyper./Impuls. 45.4	4.1	65.7	13.3	40.34	<:001	1,52
CTRS-R.L*CTRS-R.L*ADHD Index 47.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.86 <001 $1,39$ DSM-IV Inattention 46.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 30.66 <001 $1,39$ DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 48.4 8.1 60.6 16.1 5.55 $.008$ $1,39$ DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <001 $1,39$ DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <001 $1,39$ DSM-IV Total 7.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <01 $1,39$ DSM-IV Total 7.1 7.1 72.95 <01 $1,39$ DSM-IV Total 1.42 20.05 <01 $1,52$ DSM-IV Total 1.42 1.61 1.61 1.61 1.52 DSM-IV Total 1.61 7.1 72.95 <01 1.52 DSM-IV Total 1.61 1.71 72.95 <01 1.52 Dote 1.6 1.61 1.61 1.61 1.52 Dote 1.6 1.61 1.61 1.61 1.52 Dote 1.61 1.61 1.61 1.61 1.61 Dote 1.61 1.61 1.61 <td< td=""><td>CTRS. FL_{3}^{4} ADHD Index 47.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.86 <001</td> 1.39 DSM-IV Induction 46.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 30.66 <001</td<>	CTRS. FL_{3}^{4} ADHD Index 47.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.86 <001	CTBS-R.L [*] CTBS-R.L [*] ADHD Index 47.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.86 <001	CTRS-RL ² ADHD Index 47.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.86 <001	DSM-IV Total 44.8	4.4	6.69	6.7	185.22	<:001	1,52
ADHD Index 47.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.86 <001 1.39 DSM-IV Inatention 46.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 30.66 <001	ADHD Index 47.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.6 <001 1,39 DSM-IV Inattention 46.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 30.66 <001	ADHD Index 47.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.86 <001 1.39 DSM-IV Instention 46.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 30.66 <001	ADHD Index 4.3 7.3 66.5 15.2 19.86 <001 DSM-IV Inattention 46.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 30.66 <001 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 48.4 8.1 60.6 16.1 5.55 <002 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 16.1 5.55 <002 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 16.1 5.55 <002 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <001 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 7.1 72.95 <001 DSM-IV Problems 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001 Datal Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <01 Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <01 Internalizing Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <01 Internalizing Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <01 Internalizing Problems 42.6 8.6 56.7 11.4 14.27 <01 Internalizing Problems 10.0 18.65 <01 <01 Internalizing Problems 10.0 18.65 <01 <01 Internalizing Problems 10.6 10.0 18.65 <01 Internalizing Problems 10.6 10.0 18.65 <01 Internalizing Problems 10.6 </td <td>CTRS-R:L[*]</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	CTRS-R:L [*]						
DSM-IV lnatention 46.1 5.8 64.1 11.8 30.66 <01 1,39 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 48.4 8.1 60.6 16.1 5.55 .008 1,39 DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 47.1 7.4 60.6 16.1 5.55 .008 1,39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 5.55 .008 1,39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <001		DSM-IV Instantion46.15.864.11.1.830.66<0011.39DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 4.4 8.1 60.6 16.1 5.55 $.008$ 1.39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 2.005 <001 1.39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 2.005 <001 1.39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 2.005 <001 1.39 DSM-IV Total 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001 1.52 CBCL parent 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 CBCL parent 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <01 1.52 Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <01 1.52 Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <01 1.52 Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHDNumber and percentage of males in each group and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHDNumber and percentage of the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).		ADHD Index 47.3	7.3	66.5	15.2	19.86	<.001	1,39
DSM-IV Hyper./Impuls. 48.4 8.1 60.6 16.1 5.55 .008 1,39 DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <01		DSM-IV Hyper/Impuls. 48.4 8.1 60.6 16.1 5.55 008 $1,39$ DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <001 $1,39$ DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <001 $1,39$ CBCL parent 7.1 72.95 <001 $1,39$ Cotal Problems 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001 $1,52$ Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <01 $1,52$ Problems 42.6 8.6 56.7 11.4 14.27 <01 $1,52$ Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <01 $1,52$ Number and precentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typical I/ developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD Included in the task analyse (i.e., omissions < 15%). 10.0 18.65 <01 $1,52$	$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	DSM-IV Inattention 46.1	5.8	64.1	11.8	30.66	<:001	1,39
DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <01 1,39 CBCL parent CBCL parent CBCL parent Total Problems Total Problems Faternalizing Problems Internalizing Problems Internalizing Problems 	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <001 1.39 CBCL parent 1.100 1.200 1.100	DSM-IV Total 47.1 7.4 65.6 14.2 20.05 <01 CBCL parent R <	DSM-IV Hyper./Impuls. 48.4	8.1	60.6	16.1	5.55	.008	1,39
CBCL parent CBCL parent 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001 1.52 Total Problems 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001	CBCL parent Total Problems 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001	CBCL parent Total Problems 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001	CBCL parent Total Problems 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001 Externalizing 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <001 Problems 42.6 8.6 56.7 11.4 14.27 <001 Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <001 Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Lincluded in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).	DSM-IV Total 47.1	7.4	65.6	14.2	20.05	<.001	1,39
Total Problems 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001 1,52 Externalizing 1,52 Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 1,52 Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <01	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Total Problems 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001 $1,52$ Externalizing 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <001 $1,52$ Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <001 $1,52$ Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <01 $1,52$ Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD included in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).	Total Problems 39.8 8.3 61.2 7.1 72.95 <001 ExternalizingExternalizing 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <001 Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <001 Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity I included in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).	<u>CBCL parent</u>						
Externalizing Externalizing Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <001	Externalizing Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <001	Externalizing Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <01	Externalizing Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <001	Total Problems 39.8	8.3	61.2	7.1	72.95	<.001	1,52
Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <01 1,52 Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <01	Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <001 1.52 Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <01 1.52 Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD included in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).	Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <01 1.52 Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <01	Problems 42.6 8.6 56.8 10.0 18.65 <01 Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <001 Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity I included in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).	Externalizing						
Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <.001 1,52	Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <.001 1.52 Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD included in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).	Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <001 $1,52$ Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD included in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%). 7.4 56.7 11.4 11.4 14.27 <001 $1,52$	Internalizing Problems 43.5 7.4 56.7 11.4 14.27 <001 Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity L included in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).	Problems 42.6	8.6	56.8	10.0	18.65	<.001	1,52
	Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD included in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).	Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD included in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).	Number and percentage of males in each group and Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) in typically developing children (TDC), and children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity E included in the task analyses (i.e., omissions < 15%).	Internalizing Problems 43.5	7.4	56.7	11.4	14.27	<.001	1,52

	IL	C	(AD)	HD		Group Comparisons	
	=u)	:26)	= u)	29)		ANCOVA _{sex/age}	
	Mea n	SD	Mea n	SD	${ m F}_{(1,51)}$	4	p
ime Domain							
ean-RT (ms)	863.1	146.8	845.4	111.2	2.17	0.47	0.41
T-SD	155.5	34.8	170.0	32.3	4.74	0.03	09.0
Omission Errors	8.5	6.6	9.5	11.3	3.86	0.05	0.54
Directional Errors	2.8	3.1	6.2	9.3	5.62	0.02	0.66
equency Domain (MWT) ms/	/Hz ²						
ow-3 (0.12 Hz)	2.49	0.50	2.53	0.50	$\overline{\nabla}$	0.70	0.11
ow-4 (0.044 Hz)	3.21	0.55	3.64	0.70	6.27	0.02	0.69
ow-5 (0.016 Hz)	4.16	1.43	4.25	1.90	3.12	0.58	0.15
ow-6 (0.006 Hz)	4.23	2.28	4.04	2.14	$\overline{}$	0.97	0.01

sex/age). <u>Time Domain</u>: Mean RT: mean response time. <u>Frequency Domain</u>: for each frequency band, the group average am plitude resulting from the Morlet w avelet transform (MWT) of the norm alized residuals of ln(RT) is reported. Frequencies in parentheses are the central frequencies for thefour bands. *d*: Cohen's *d*.

Di Martino et al.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

_
_
_
т.
_
U
>
~
\mathbf{r}
~
-
<u> </u>
<u> </u>
5
~
0
-
~
<
_
<u>ш</u>
=
2
<u> </u>
_
S
č.
0
-
0

Table 3	elated Intra-Subject Variability
	6 to ADHD-r
	.,
	4
	Contributions of Slow-3, -

lodel	Added variable	Deviance	LR	đf	d	0R
tge + sex) *	RT-SD	58.64	4.39	-	0.04	1.97 (1.04, 4.05)
ge + sex + RT-SD +	Slow-3	58.56	0.12	1	0.78	1.11 (0.57, 2.49)
ge + sex + RT-SD +	Slow-4	54.10	4.65	1	0.03	2.58 (1.08, 7.50)
ge + sex + RT-SD +	Slow-5	58.49	0.13	1	0.72	1.14 (0.58, 2.39)
ge + sex + RT-SD +	Slow-6	58.43	0.21	1	0.65	0.86 (0.44, 1.65)

to the prediction of ADHD in the presence of RT-SD.

LR: Likelihood ratio; RT-SD: response time standard deviation; Likelihood ratio; RT-SD: response time standard deviation; Slow-3:0.073 - 0.170 Hz, center frequency 0.120 Hz; Slow-4: 0.027-0.073 Hz, center frequency 0.044; Slow-5: 0.010-0.027 Hz, center frequency 0.016; Slow-6: 0.0052-0.010, center frequency 0.006 Hz.

* Deviance with model limited to (age + sex) = 63.106; df =53.

** Odds ratio (OR) of ADHD diagnosis for increase in the added predictor by 1 SD unit and 95% CI based on profile likelihood.