

# 1 **Visual processing oscillates differently through time for** 2 **adults with ADHD**

3  
4 Pénélope Pelland-Goulet<sup>1,2,3,4¶\*</sup>, Martin Arguin<sup>1,2¶\*</sup>, Hélène Brisebois<sup>5,6&</sup>, Nathalie Gosselin<sup>1,2,3,4&</sup>

5  
6 <sup>1</sup> Psychology Department, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec, Canada

7 <sup>2</sup> Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Brain and Learning (CIRCA)

8 <sup>3</sup> International Laboratory for Brain, Music and Sound Research (BRAMS)

9 <sup>4</sup> Center for Research on Brain, Language and Music (CRBLM)

10 <sup>5</sup> Psychology Department, Collège Montmorency, Laval, Québec, Canada

11 <sup>6</sup> Centre Alpha-Neuro

12  
13 \* Corresponding authors

14 E-mails : [martin.arguin@umontreal.ca](mailto:martin.arguin@umontreal.ca) ; [penelope.pelland-goulet@umontreal.ca](mailto:penelope.pelland-goulet@umontreal.ca)

15  
16 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

17 & These authors also contributed equally to this work.

## 18 19 **Abstract**

20 ADHD is a neurodevelopmental disorder affecting 3-4% of Canadian adults and 2.6% of adults worldwide.  
21 Its symptoms include inattention, hyperactivity and impulsivity. Though ADHD is known to affect several  
22 brain functions and cognitive processes, little is known regarding its impact on perceptual oscillations. This  
23 study compared the temporal features of visual processing between ADHD and neurotypical individuals in  
24 a word recognition task. These features were sufficiently different across groups while at the same time  
25 sufficiently congruent across participants of the same group that a machine learning algorithm classified  
26 participants in their respective groups with a 91.8% accuracy using only a small portion of the available  
27 features. Secondary findings showed that individuals with ADHD could be classified with high accuracy

28 (91.3%) regarding their use of psychostimulant medication. These findings suggest the existence of strong  
29 behavioral markers of ADHD as well as of regular medication usage on visual performance which can be  
30 uncovered by random temporal sampling.

## 31 **Introduction**

32 The attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a neuropsychological condition  
33 characterised by symptoms of inattention, hyperactivity, and impulsivity (1) which affects 3-4% of  
34 Canadian adults (2,3) and 2.6% of adults worldwide (4). It has been demonstrated that people with ADHD  
35 show functional deficits affecting sustained attention (5,6), processing speed (7, 8), and executive functions  
36 (9) such as working memory (10,11), and inhibition (12). Persons with ADHD also exhibit several  
37 functional cerebral abnormalities which can be related to these cognitive and executive deficits (13).

38 Another line of investigation for ADHD pertains to cerebral oscillations, which originate from  
39 transient neural groups producing repeated synchronized action potentials at a particular frequency. Resting-  
40 state EEG studies have shown stronger oscillations in the theta (4-8 Hz) and alpha (8-12 Hz) ranges in  
41 ADHD than neurotypical participants (14; see 15 for a review). Relatedly, others report a stronger ratio of  
42 theta over beta (TBR; 13-30 Hz) oscillatory power in ADHD vs. neurotypical adults (16-19). However, other  
43 studies of EEG at rest have reported inconsistent findings (15), and objections have been addressed against  
44 the literature surrounding the TBR (20,21). Several investigations have shown that, while carrying out  
45 attentional tasks, adults with ADHD exhibit distinct oscillatory patterns that particularly pertain to alpha  
46 oscillations (22-25).

47 Neural oscillations have been argued to constitute the central basis for the functional output of brain  
48 activity (e.g. 26). If this is true, one crucial implication is that this output should be modulated through time.  
49 In the case of vision, this would imply temporal variability in processing capacity within a short time scale.  
50 A relatively substantial literature on this issue has more or less successfully attempted to demonstrate that  
51 visual function oscillates through time at a particular unique frequency or combination thereof, which would

52 be tied to the underlying brain activity (see 27-29 for reviews). Recently, our laboratory has developed a  
53 promising technique called random temporal sampling, which offers a strong demonstration of variations  
54 of visual processing effectiveness through time and can reveal differences in visual oscillatory mechanisms  
55 according to task demands (30), stimulation conditions (31) or the age of participants (32).

56         The random temporal sampling technique involves the brief (e.g. 200 ms) presentation of stimuli  
57 made of an additive combination of signal (the target to be processed) and noise (a patch of visual white  
58 noise superimposed on top of the signal), on which a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) that varies randomly  
59 through exposure duration (Fig 1) is added. By separating the temporal samples (i.e. temporal variations of  
60 SNR) associated with errors versus correct responses and by subtracting the former from the latter, one  
61 obtains a classification image (CI) that characterizes processing efficiency according to the temporal  
62 properties of stimulation. For instance, (30) were able to represent variations of visual processing efficiency  
63 according either to the temporal dimension alone or as a function of a time-frequency representation of the  
64 temporal samples (i.e. frequency spectrum of signal-to-noise ratio oscillations). Moreover, they showed that  
65 the power spectra of these CIs (extracted by Fourier transform) could be successfully used by a machine  
66 learning algorithm to map these patterns of temporal features onto the particular class of stimuli participants  
67 had to recognize. Specifically, the four-way mapping of individual patterns of temporal features to the task  
68 of recognizing words, familiar objects, unfamiliar objects, or faces was performed by the algorithm with an  
69 accuracy of 75%, which is far above the 25% chance level. In another study, (32) were able to predict  
70 whether participants were young adults or healthy elderly individuals with an accuracy above 90% based  
71 on individual data patterns extracted from classification images obtained in tasks of visual word or object  
72 recognition.

73         The highly likely origin of the temporal profiles of visual processing are the oscillatory mechanisms  
74 of the brain. Knowing that ADHD is associated with brain oscillations abnormalities at rest and during  
75 visuocognitive tasks, we should thus expect concomitant alterations in the temporal features of visual  
76 processing efficiency. The purpose of the present study is to compare the temporal features of visual word

77 processing efficiency in young adults with vs without ADHD using the temporal sampling technique. As  
78 shown by the results below, there are marked differences between the temporal features of processing  
79 efficiency between ADHD and matched neurotypical controls. Moreover, these temporal features appear to  
80 be largely shared among individuals of the same group.

## 81 **Materials and methods**

### 82 **Participants**

83 Fifty-eight francophone participants were initially recruited from two colleges (pre-university or  
84 professional formations) in Montreal and Laval, Canada, via e-mails sent to students through the colleges'  
85 online platforms. The age of participants ranged from 16 to 35 years old. All had normal or corrected to  
86 normal vision and were free of neurological or psychiatric disorders. Participants were separated into two  
87 groups, one for neurotypical controls and one for participants who reported having received an ADHD  
88 diagnosis from a qualified professional. The data of 49 of the 58 recruited participants was used for analysis.  
89 Of the 9 other participants, the data of one participant was rejected since they revealed, after data collection  
90 had started with them, that they had never actually received a formal diagnosis for ADHD. Another  
91 participant (neurotypical) was rejected because they had uncorrected vision problems, but only said so after  
92 data collection had started. Another seven participants (2 neurotypical controls and 5 ADHD) were removed  
93 from data analysis because they failed to complete the experiment or had missing data. The final sample  
94 was thus made of 26 neurotypical controls and 23 ADHD participants. Among the latter, 17 took stimulant  
95 medication on a regular basis for their condition and 6 did not. All participants provided written informed  
96 consent before enrolment. The study was approved by the Education and Psychology Research Ethics  
97 Committee of Université de Montréal and the Research Ethics Committee of Montmorency College.

## 98 **Materials and stimuli**

99           Before experimentation, participants completed the Conners Adult ADHD Rating Scale – Long  
100 Version (CAARS; 33) as well as a general information form collecting descriptive variables such as age,  
101 gender, diagnosis and medication use.

102           The experiment was conducted on a HPZ230 computer with an NVIDIA GeForce GTX970 graphics  
103 card. Stimuli were presented on an Asus VG248QR HD monitor with a 120 Hz refresh rate. Stimuli were  
104 all achromatic and the luminance manipulations were linear. The experiment was programmed in Matlab  
105 and used the Psychophysics Toolbox (34). Participants were seated in front of the screen, their head  
106 positioned on a chin rest 57 cm from the center of the screen.

107           Stimuli were 600 five-letter French words with an average frequency of 157 per 10 million (35).  
108 Words were presented on screen for 200ms in Tahoma font with an x-height of .76 degrees of visual angle.  
109 Letters were black and the background was grey, with a luminance in the middle of the available range for  
110 the screen.

111           Stimuli were made of two components: signal and noise (Fig 1. a). The signal part consisted in the  
112 target word over which a patch of visual white noise was applied. The white noise patch was changed on  
113 every trial and its contrast was adjusted according to the procedure described below in order to maintain  
114 performance at around 50% correct. The noise component of the stimuli was made of a second visual white  
115 noise patch with maximal contrast, independent from the one that is part of the signal. This second white  
116 noise field also changed on every trial. The signal/noise ratio (SNR) varied throughout exposure duration  
117 following a random function constructed by integrating sine waves with frequencies ranging from 5Hz to  
118 55Hz in steps of 5Hz, with random amplitudes and phases (Fig 1. b). The SNR range was normalised  
119 between 0 and 0.5 and the sum of sampling functions across their constituent 24 values (1 per screen frame,  
120 which totals an exposure duration of 200 ms at a refresh rate of 120 Hz), which represents the total stimulus

121 availability for a trial, was constant across trials. The overall luminance and contrast of the stimuli were also  
122 matched across image frames and across trials.

123

124 **Fig 1. Illustrations of the stimuli and the task.**

125 Section a) shows the signal and noise components which are additively combined in each stimulus. Section b) gives  
126 an example of the time course of the stimulation in a given trial. Each trial was made of 24 successive displays of the  
127 additive combination of signal and noise. The signal/noise ratio varied following a random function integrating sine  
128 waves during display.

129 **Procedure**

130 Each participant completed 1200 trials (8 blocks of 150 trials each) wherein each of the 600 words  
131 was presented twice. Participants were asked to identify the words on the screen, without time pressure. As  
132 they read the words out loud, the experimenter entered the response on a computer keyboard. The program  
133 determined if the answer was correct or incorrect and, if necessary, adjusted the contrast of the white noise  
134 that is part of the signal to control task difficulty (see below).

135 Each trial started with the presentation of a square white noise field (18 degrees of visual angle per  
136 side) at the center of the screen for 1250 ms. Then, a fixation cross was displayed for 250 ms at the center  
137 of the screen. Following a delay of 150 ms after the offset of the fixation cross, a pure tone of 900 Hz-60  
138 dB was presented for 14 ms, indicating the imminent target onset. One hundred ms later, the target stimulus  
139 was presented at the center of the screen. During this 200 ms display, the SNR varied following a random  
140 function, as described above. The target display was followed by the white noise field with which the trial  
141 began, and the participant's response was entered on the keyboard by the experimenter.

142 The contrast of the white noise patch that was part of the signal was adjusted on each trial following  
143 a staircase function with 128 levels in order to maintain performance at about 50%. At the beginning of the  
144 experiment, the contrast was set at 64 and remained so for at least the first 10 trials. Following the 10<sup>th</sup> trial,  
145 accuracy for the last 10 trials was assessed on every trial. If this accuracy was greater than 50%, white noise

146 contrast was increased by one step. The reverse was done if accuracy was under 50%. The size of the initial  
147 step was 16 and it was halved on each reversal of contrast adjustment down to a minimum of 1. The state  
148 of the algorithm was maintained across consecutive experimental blocks. The total duration of the  
149 experiment was of about 2 hours, and it was completed in two test sessions occurring on different days, with  
150 breaks in-between each 15 minutes blocks.

## 151 **Data Analysis**

### 152 **Classification images.**

153 Classification images (CIs) were calculated to depict how processing efficiency varied according to the  
154 features of the temporal sampling functions. Here, we focus on the classification images based on a time-  
155 frequency representation of the sampling functions, which revealed to be the most informative. To achieve  
156 this, a wavelet analysis was applied to the padded sampling functions on each trial using three-cycle complex  
157 Morlet wavelets. Padding was added to the beginning and end of the target SNR sampling function to be  
158 analyzed to avoid edge artifacts. This padding was made of 1.5 successive reversals of the sampling function  
159 connected end-to-end (36). This way, the function submitted to analysis was continuous and signal was  
160 present along the entire length of even the lowest frequency wavelet when positioned at either end of the  
161 target SNR function. The time-frequency data retained from the analysis exclusively pertained to the target  
162 SNR function. These wavelets varied in temporal frequency from 5 to 55 Hz in increments of 5 Hz. The  
163 choice of the number of cycles in the Morlet kernel favored high temporal precision, albeit at the expense  
164 of precision in the frequency domain. Consequently, the wavelet exhibited sensitivity not only to its specific  
165 temporal frequency, but also to a range of frequencies around it.

166 Classification images were calculated for each participant. The weighted sum of the time-frequency  
167 sampling functions associated with errors was subtracted from the weighted sum of those associated with  
168 correct responses. These initial raw classification images were transformed in Z scores by a bootstrapping  
169 operation where the sampling functions were randomly assigned to response accuracies while allowing for

170 repetition, and from which mock classification images were constructed. The mean and standard deviation  
171 of 1000 such mock classification images for an individual participant served as reference to transform the  
172 values from their raw classification image into  $Z$  scores.

173 The  $Z$ -scored individual classification images were averaged, smoothed, and then submitted to a two-  
174 way Pixel test (37) with  $\alpha = .05$  to determine the points in classification images which differed significantly  
175 from zero. The Pixel test is derived from random field theory and has been applied for about the last 30  
176 years for the analysis of brain imaging data. Its purpose is to establish the  $Z$  value that will serve as the  
177 significance criterion for a  $Z$ -scored image. The smoothing filter was Gaussian and had a full width at half  
178 maximum (FWHM) of 19.6 ms in the time domain and of 11.8 Hz frequency domain. The criterion  $Z$  score  
179 obtained was then used in its positive value to identify points that were significantly above 0 and in its  
180 negative value (i.e.,  $Z_{crit} * -1$ ) to identify points significantly below 0.

181 A between-group-contrast CI was also calculated to compare the CIs of the ADHD vs neurotypical  
182 participants. Thus, the mean CI for the ADHD group was subtracted from that of the neurotypical group  
183 and the three preceding steps were repeated on the difference CI (bootstrap, smoothing and Pixel test). The  
184 resulting CI thus showed the points of significant difference between the ADHD and neurotypical  
185 participants. A similar procedure was followed to contrast the CIs from the ADHD participants taking or  
186 not medication for their condition.

## 187 **Classification of individual data patterns.**

188 A further step of data processing was to submit features from CIs of individual participant to a  
189 machine learning algorithm for it to determine whether they came from a neurotypical or ADHD participant.  
190 The algorithm used for this purpose was a linear support vector machine (SVM; 38,39), along with a leave-  
191 one-out cross-validation procedure. Thus, a subset of features from all but one of the available CIs were  
192 presented to the SVM for it to learn the mapping from these features to group. Then, the CI features that



193 had been left out of the learning phase was presented to the SVM for it to decide the group (neurotypical vs  
194 ADHD) it came from. This procedure was repeated by leaving out the data from a different participant on  
195 each iteration until it had iterated through the complete set of participants. Classification accuracy was  
196 determined from the percentage of iterations on which the SVM determined correctly the group of  
197 participants the data came from. A binomial test was used to assess whether classification accuracy deviated  
198 significantly from chance.

199 The features used for data pattern classification were those produced by the Fourier transform of  
200 the individual time-frequency CIs. Specifically, for each stimulus oscillation frequency in these CIs, a fast  
201 Fourier transform was applied to the variations of processing efficiency through time for frequencies  
202 between 5 and 60 Hz, in 5 Hz steps. This analysis produced a 3D feature space made of 1584 cells  
203 representing oscillatory power, with dimensions of frequency in the CI (12 levels), phase of the extracted  
204 components (binned in 12 levels), and the frequency spectrum of stimulus oscillation frequencies (11  
205 levels). This particular data format was chosen because previous experience has shown that it offers the  
206 greatest discriminatory power to the classifier with a substantial increase of between-subject consistency  
207 and of the discrimination index of its features compared to the CIs themselves (31,32,40).

208 The classification of data patterns using an SVM satisfied several important aims. The most  
209 obvious is that an accuracy that is greater than chance implies that there exist significant relevant differences  
210 in the data patterns that are contrasted. Less obvious but crucially important is that it also provides an  
211 indication that these data patterns are replicable across individuals. Indeed, even if average data patterns are  
212 markedly different across the conditions compared, if they are not replicable across individuals, the  
213 performance of the classifier will be poor. In other words, to obtain a highly accurate classifier, the relevant  
214 features in the training sets must retain their value in the test pattern. Finally, another interesting aspect of  
215 using a classifier is that we can determine the features in the data patterns from which its discriminatory  
216 power is derived. This enables the characterization of the feature values that define each group.

217 In order to retain only the most relevant features that discriminate among conditions, we used a  
218 stepwise procedure for the introduction of features into the model one at a time, in a way similar to a stepwise  
219 multiple regression. This gradual introduction of features was pursued either until all of them were used or  
220 until 90% classification accuracy (to avoid overfitting) was reached. The order in which the features of  
221 classification images were introduced to the SVM model was based on the capacity of each possible feature  
222 to discriminate the ADHD and neurotypical groups. This discrimination capacity was analogous to an F  
223 ratio; i.e. it was measured by the ratio of the variance of the means across conditions over the error variance.  
224 Thus, the feature with the greatest discrimination index was entered first, followed by the second greatest,  
225 and so on, until the stopping criterion was reached.

226 For the illustration of the characteristic features of each level of a factor, the only data retained  
227 was that pertaining to the features used at the point where the stopping criterion was reached. The  
228 representation of a feature for each group was based on the squared difference between its mean and the  
229 overall mean across groups, which was divided by the error variance (see above). These values were then  
230 linearly normalized in the range -1 to 1 based upon the maximum absolute value among the features to  
231 illustrate. To facilitate focussing on the strongest levers for classification, i.e., the features with the most  
232 extreme values, the contrast of the color code used to illustrate feature values was linearly diminished  
233 according to their distance from the extremes of the scale (i.e. -1 or 1), down to a minimum of 30% (to  
234 maintain visibility of even the weakest features illustrated). However, when the value of a feature for a  
235 particular condition was exactly 0, it was omitted from the figures.

236 A complementary data classification procedure was conducted using methods as described above  
237 to examine whether there are differences between the temporal features of visual processing in ADHD  
238 participants taking or not medication for their condition.

## 239 **Results**

### 240 **Sample description**

241 Groups were matched in terms of gender (22 (85%) women in the neurotypical control group and  
242 16 (70%) women in the ADHD group, ( $\chi^2(48) = 1.59; p = .208$ ) and age (overall mean = 19.0, s.d. = 2.8;  
243  $F(1, 48) = .001; p = .98$ ). Participants with ADHD reported significantly more symptoms of inattention  
244 (average inattention score for the ADHD group: 63.91, s.d. = 12.11; average inattention for the neurotypical  
245 group : 55.24; s.d. = 9.7;  $F(1, 47) = 7.59; p = .008$ ) and hyperactivity (average hyperactivity score for the  
246 ADHD group : 55.5, s.d. = 9.44; average hyperactivity for the neurotypical group : 49.92, s.d. = 9.11;  $F(1,$   
247  $47) = 4.32; p = .043$ ) on the CAARS.

248 The average correct response rate on the task was of 49.4% for the neurotypical group and 50.0%  
249 for the ADHD group ( $t(47) = -.92; p = .181$ ). The mean contrast of the white noise field applied over the  
250 target images, which served to control task difficulty was of 55.2% for neurotypical participants and 55%  
251 for ADHD participants ( $t(47) = .09; p = .463$ )

### 252 **ADHD vs neurotypical controls analyses**

253 Group CIs are shown in Fig 2 for the neurotypical and ADHD groups, respectively. These CIs  
254 represent the capacity of participants to use the stimulus information available at each time point and for  
255 each SNR frequency (5 to 55 Hz) in order to reach a correct response; i.e. their processing efficiency. Cells  
256 colored in yellow and red indicate combinations of time and SNR frequencies where processing efficiency  
257 was significantly above 0, and blue cells indicate processing efficiency significantly below 0.

#### 258 **Fig 2. ADHD and neurotypical participants' classification images.**

259 Average classification image representing processing efficiency as a function of time and SNR oscillation  
260 frequencies for the neurotypical (a) and ADHD participants (b). Reference for the color code is on the right of the  
261 graph. Only the points that differ significantly from 0 are colored, the others are white.

262 While the group CIs seem roughly similar, the CI for the contrast between groups (Fig 3) shows  
263 several statistically significant differences. The cells colored orange and red in Fig 3 indicate significantly  
264 greater efficiency for the neurotypical group whereas the blue cells indicate an advantage for the ADHD  
265 participants.

266

267 **Fig 3. Between groups contrast classification image.**

268 The CI was obtained by subtracting the ADHD average CI from that of the neurotypical average CI. Conventions for  
269 the main axes of the graph are as in Fig 2. The color code represents the magnitude of between-group differences  
270 when significant. Cells that do not differ significantly between groups are white.

271 When exposed to the Fourier transforms of the individual time-frequency CIs, the SVM classifier  
272 reached an accuracy of 91.8% (binomial test;  $p < 0.001$ ) in classifying data patterns according to group  
273 while using only 51 (3.2%) of the 1584 features available. The features used by the classifier for this  
274 performance are shown in Fig 4. The classifier managed to reach perfect (i.e. 100% correct) classification  
275 performance while using 421 features (not illustrated here).

276

277 **Fig 4. Features used for diagnosis classification.**

278 Characteristic features for the ADHD group which served for the SVM classifier to reach 91.8% accuracy in  
279 determining the group from which individual data patterns came from. The color of cells indicates the normalized  
280 feature discrimination index (see color bar legend). The horizontal axis indicates the temporal frequencies extracted  
281 from the CIs by Fourier analysis. The vertical axis indicates the phase of these extracted components. The digit  
282 within each colored cell indicates the stimulus oscillation frequency from which the feature was extracted. All cells  
283 left white did not contribute to classification. The characteristic features for the neurotypical control group can be  
284 obtained by simply multiplying the feature values shown here by -1.

285           The features which were most useful to distinguish between neurotypical and ADHD individual  
286 were the oscillations of processing efficiency (i.e. oscillations in the CIs) at 5, 10 and 15 Hz, which  
287 comprised the highest number of useful features, which were strongest for the 30, 35 and 40Hz SNR  
288 oscillation frequencies. Across the 11 possible SNR oscillation frequencies, the 5 and 15 Hz stimulus  
289 frequencies were not or almost not used by the SVM, and the 10, 30, 35, 40 and 55 Hz frequencies were  
290 slightly more frequently used than the others. Of all features, though, three of them are stronger in their  
291 discriminatory index: the processing efficiency oscillations at 10 for SNR oscillatory frequencies of 30 and  
292 35 Hz, and the processing efficiency oscillations at 50 Hz for SNR oscillations at 20 Hz. Altogether, a higher  
293 concentration of informative features used by the SVM are found in the lower ranges of the frequencies in  
294 CIs (5, 10 and 15 Hz), but there is no clear pattern in which SNR oscillating frequencies are more used.

## 295 **Medicated vs non-medicated ADHD participants analyses**

296           The ADHD group was separated in two subgroups; one for participants who have prescription  
297 medication for their condition and who take it on a regular basis, and those who do not take medication.  
298 Neurotypical participants were not included in the remaining of the analyses. Of the 23 participants with  
299 ADHD, 17 were using medication and 6 were not.

300           Subgroups were matched in terms of gender (4 (67%) women in the non-medicated group and 12  
301 (71%) women in the medicated group ( $\chi^2(23) = .03; p = .858$ ), and age (overall mean = 19.09, s.d. = 3.68;  
302  $F(1, 22) = .004; p = .948$ ). Participants also reported equivalent severity of inattentive symptoms on the  
303 CAARS inattention/memory symptoms subscale (overall mean = 63.91, s.d. = 12.11;  $F(1, 21) = .19; p =$   
304  $.662$ ), and hyperactive symptoms subscale (overall mean = 55.5, s.d. = 9.44;  $F(1, 21) = .09; p = .769$ ). The  
305 average correct response rate was of 50.3% for the non-medicated group and 49.9% for the medicated group  
306 ( $t(21) = .56; p = .289$ ). The mean contrast of the white noise field applied over the target images (to control  
307 difficulty) was of 55.1% for non medicated participants and 54.9 for medicated participants ( $t(21) = .04; p$   
308  $= .49$ ).

309 Classification images for the subgroups of ADHD participants taking medication for their condition  
310 on a regular basis or not were also calculated (Fig 5). The contrast CI for the comparison between these  
311 subgroups showed no significant difference and thus, is not illustrated here.

312

313 **Fig 5. Medicated and non-medicated ADHD participants' classification images.**

314 Average classification image representing processing efficiency as a function of time and SNR oscillation  
315 frequencies for the ADHD participants who take stimulant medication (a) and who do not take stimulant medication  
316 (b). Conventions are the same as in Fig 2.

317 As in the case of the classification of ADHD vs neurotypical participants, an SVM was used to  
318 predict whether participants with ADHD take medication or not based on features from the Fourier  
319 transforms of individual time-frequency ICs. The SVM achieved a 91.3% decoding accuracy (binomial test;  
320  $p < 0.001$ ) using only 8 (0.5%) of the 1584 available features (11 SNR oscillation frequencies x 12 phases  
321 x 12 CI dimensions = 1584). Fig 6. Illustrates the features used to reach this accuracy. Perfect decoding,  
322 with 100% correct classification, was reached based on 32 features (not illustrated here).

323

324 **Fig 6. Features used for medication status classification.**

325 Characteristic features for the subgroup of ADHD participants who take medication on a regular basis for their  
326 condition. Conventions are the same as those for Fig 4.

327 A very limited number of features were used to discriminate between participants who take medication  
328 vs those who do not, and these features all had strong discrimination indexes. Although they are distributed  
329 across the possible SNR oscillating frequencies and CI frequencies, the strongest ones were oscillations in  
330 processing efficiency at 30 Hz for 20 Hz SNR oscillations, and processing efficiency oscillations at 20 Hz  
331 for 25 and 30 Hz SNR oscillations. Contrary to the ADHD vs control participants discrimination, in this

332 case, low frequencies in processing efficiency variations were not very useful to distinguish between  
333 participants with ADHD who take medication vs those who do not.

## 334 **Discussion**

335 The present study investigated the temporal fluctuations of visual processing efficiency in young  
336 adults with vs without ADHD using random temporal sampling. The average time-frequency CIs for both  
337 groups appeared rather similar and showed significant variations in processing efficiency both as a function  
338 of the time elapsed since target onset and as a function of the frequency spectrum of SNR oscillations in the  
339 stimulus. Rapid changes of processing capacity in the course of a 200 ms stimulus exposure such as those  
340 illustrated in Figs. 2 are most likely attributable to the neural oscillatory mechanisms underlying task  
341 performance. Specifically, such fluctuations imply that the system mediating the relation between stimuli  
342 and responses presents a form of temporal inhomogeneity in the timescale of 200 ms. Given current  
343 knowledge, we believe the best candidate to account for this is that of neural oscillations.

344 Significant differences were found between the average CIs of ADHD and neurotypical groups (Fig  
345 3). These were confirmed through the use of an SVM classifier which had the task of categorizing features  
346 from the Fourier transforms of the CIs of individual participants according to their group of origin. Thus,  
347 the classifier surpassed the performance criterion of over 90% correct while using only 51 (3.2%) features  
348 out of the 3-D feature space of frequency within the classification image (12 levels; 5-60 Hz in 5 Hz steps)  
349 x phase (binned according to 12 levels) x stimulus oscillation frequency (11 levels; 5-55 Hz in 5 Hz steps).  
350 Furthermore, the classifier obtained a perfect performance of 100% classification accuracy while using 421  
351 (26.6%) features to do so. The most salient features that served to discriminate between groups (Fig 4)  
352 largely pertain to low (5, 10 and 15 Hz) frequencies within the classification images, with a particular  
353 emphasis on 10 Hz, which comprised two of the three most discriminant features.

354 Considering that the temporal features of processing efficiency revealed by the classification images  
355 are a reflection of the neural oscillatory mechanisms underlying task performance, the group differences

356 demonstrated here must be interpreted in terms of a significant alteration of these brain oscillations in the  
357 ADHD group. This conclusion is congruent with that of several EEG studies which compared the brain  
358 oscillatory activity of individuals with ADHD to that of neurotypical participants. The fact that 5, 10 and  
359 15 (to some extent) Hz processing efficiency oscillations were the best indicators of the presence or absence  
360 of ADHD among the possible frequencies is also consistent with the specific patterns of EEG oscillations  
361 alterations in ADHD reported across literature (15,41). One significant constraint in interpreting the present  
362 observations, however, is that the way in which the temporal features of processing efficiency maps to  
363 specific neural mechanisms is presently unknown. Determining the way in which these domains map to  
364 each other should be an important goal of future studies. While the issue must remain on standby at present,  
365 we underline that this limitation is well compensated by the remarkable capacity of the random temporal  
366 sampling technique of discriminating between cases of ADHD and neurotypical participants on the basis of  
367 a small number of features extracted from the data.

368         This high discrimination power is also showcased in the classification of ADHD participants who  
369 take stimulant medication for their condition on a regular basis versus those that do not. Thus, this  
370 classification task was achieved with a very high degree of accuracy (91.3%) while using very few ( $n = 8$ ;  
371 0.5%) of the potential 1584 features available in the Fourier transforms of that time-frequency classification  
372 images. A number of different factors may be involved in this difference between the medicated and non-  
373 medicated groups. One is that the classification images picked up the functional impact of the structural  
374 effects on the brain caused by the long-term daily psychostimulant medication intake (42-44). Another  
375 possibility is that medicated vs non-medicated ADHD participants actually suffer different degrees of  
376 symptom severity (45) and that this is the cause of the differences between their classification images.  
377 Specifically, it seems possible that severe ADHD is more likely to lead to the prescription/usage of  
378 medication than milder cases. A weak link in the latter hypothesis, however, is that self-reported symptoms  
379 were equivalent between medicated and non-medicated ADHD participants. This observation suggests that  
380 symptoms intensity may not constitute the main difference between these groups. Regardless of the cause



381 however, the present results clearly show that brain function differs in some way between medicated and  
382 unmedicated individuals with ADHD. The existence of this difference means that future research focussing  
383 on cognitive and neural processes in ADHD should take the medication factor into account.

384 Another issue that needs to be addressed is that while an obvious difference in the brain's oscillatory  
385 activity was demonstrated between medicated and non-medicated participants through the classification of  
386 the Fourier transforms of time-frequency CIs, these CIs themselves failed to differ significantly when  
387 contrasted with one another. This very large difference between the outcomes of the two techniques to  
388 contrast the data patterns from groups of participants is consistent with our past experience in the processing  
389 of data from random temporal sampling experiments. Specifically, we have found previously that both the  
390 discriminatory power of features as well as the between-subject consistency in those feature values are  
391 increased by using the features produced by the Fourier transform of time-frequency CIs rather than the CIs  
392 themselves (40,46).

393 This is partially verified here based on the discrimination index which determined the entry order  
394 of features in the SVM classifier and the intra-group correlation coefficient (ICC; 47) to measure the  
395 consistency of data patterns across participants of the same group. As regards the ICC, it was lower with  
396 the Fourier transforms of CIs when compared to the CIs themselves in all cases except for the ADHD group  
397 in the contrast of their classification images with that of the control group (Table 1). However, large gains  
398 in the discrimination value of the features used by the SVM were evident with the Fourier transformed CIs  
399 (Table 1). Thus, this index was 1.9 times greater than after the Fourier transform of ICs for the ADHD vs  
400 neurotypicals classification problem, whereas the ratio was of 3.1 for the medication vs none problem. We  
401 attribute this difference to an improved alignment (or correlation) of the data with the brain activity it reflects  
402 when the time dimension of the time-frequency CIs is recoded into a frequency spectrum. This position is  
403 consistent with the notion that the functional output of the brain is based on oscillatory neural activity.  
404 Specifically, a phase x amplitude frequency spectrum offers greater validity to characterize an oscillator  
405 than the time dimension.

406 **Table 1. Discrimination values of Classification Images features and Intra-class Correlations.**

Controls vs ADHD	Feature discrimination index	Neurotypical control group			ADHD group		
		ICC	F(df)	<i>p</i>	ICC	F(df)	<i>p</i>
Time-Frequency CIs	.186	.085	5.74 (9, 107)	< 0.001	.041	2.78 (9, 145)	< 0.001
Fourier transforms of T-F CIs	.357	.043	2.17 (50, 1272)	< 0.001	.067	2.65 (50, 1121)	< 0.001
Medicated vs non-medicated	Feature discrimination index	Medicated ADHD subgroup			Non-medicated ADHD subgroup		
		ICC	F(df)	<i>p</i>	ICC	F(df)	<i>p</i>
Time-Frequency CIs	.476	.169	5.4 (12, 159)	< 0.001	.364	6.09 (12, 36)	< 0.001
Fourier transforms of T-F CIs	1.476	-.039	.4 (7, 81)	.900	-.197	.1 (7, 10)	1.00

407 Discrimination indexes of CI features and intra-group correlation coefficients for the time-frequency classification  
 408 images and for the Fourier transforms thereof for the control vs ADHD group, and for the medicated vs non-  
 409 medicated ADHD participants.

410 ADHD is known to be a very heterogeneous disorder (48,49). However, the high accuracy of the  
 411 SVM's classification points to high intra-group coherence in the data patterns. Indeed, the SVM  
 412 classifications performed here used a leave-one-out cross validation method. This method implies that on  
 413 every cycle, the data from one participant did not contribute to the learning of the mappings between data  
 414 patterns and group while it is precisely the data that was left out from the learning phase that served for the  
 415 test phase. To have an SVM classifier that offers a high accuracy, as in the present study, it is necessary that  
 416 the mappings learned from the data of all participants but one retain their validity when the data of the left-  
 417 out participant is presented to the classifier in the test phase. From this, we may thus conclude that there is  
 418 an essence in the individual data patterns that is largely shared among other members of the same group  
 419 These findings point to temporal sampling as a promising method which, combined with machine learning,

420 could help identify more homogeneous characteristics of ADHD and potentially be used as a powerful tool  
421 to assist in the diagnosis of ADHD.

## 422 **Conclusion**

423 The study compared the temporal features of visual processing between ADHD and neurotypical  
424 individuals in a word recognition task. These features were sufficiently different across groups while at the  
425 same time sufficiently congruent across participants of the same group that a machine learning algorithm  
426 classified participants in their respective groups with a 91.8% accuracy using only a small portion of the  
427 available features. This clearly shows that while ADHD is a very heterogeneous disorder (49,50), it remains  
428 possible to capture a highly powerful set of temporal features of visual processing that uniquely  
429 characterizes ADHD. Secondary findings showed that individuals with ADHD could be classified with high  
430 accuracy (91.3%) regarding their use of psychostimulant medication. This thus suggests the existence of  
431 strong behavioral markers of regular medication usage on visual performance which can be uncovered by  
432 random temporal sampling.

433

## 434 **References**

- 435 1. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5™, 5th ed. Arlington, VA, US:  
436 American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc.; 2013. xlv, 947 p.
- 437 2. Hesson J, Fowler K. Prevalence and correlates of self-reported ADD/ADHD in a large national  
438 sample of Canadian adults. *J Atten Disord*. 2018;1;22(2):191–200. PMID: 25749874.
- 439 3. Polanczyk G, de Lima MS, Horta BL, Biederman J, Rohde LA. The worldwide prevalence of  
440 ADHD: A systematic review and metaregression analysis. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2007 Jun;164(6):942–  
441 8. PMID: 17541055.
- 442 4. Song P, Zha M, Yang Q, Zhang Y, Li X, Rudan I. The prevalence of adult attention-deficit  
443 hyperactivity disorder: A global systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Glob Health*.  
444 2021;11:04009. PMID: 33692893; PMCID: PMC7916320.
- 445 5. Avisar A, Shalev L. Sustained Attention and Behavioral Characteristics Associated with ADHD in  
446 Adults. *Appl Neuropsychol*. 2011 Apr;18(2):107–16. PMID: 21660762.
- 447 6. Tucha L, Fuermaier ABM, Koerts J, Buggenthin R, Aschenbrenner S, Weisbrod M, et al. Sustained  
448 attention in adult ADHD: time-on-task effects of various measures of attention. *J Neural Transm*.  
449 2017 Feb 1;124(1):39–53. PMID: 26206605; PMCID: PMC5281679.
- 450 7. Butzbach M, Fuermaier ABM, Aschenbrenner S, Weisbrod M, Tucha L, Tucha O. Basic processes  
451 as foundations of cognitive impairment in adult ADHD. *J Neural Transm*. 2019 Oct  
452 1;126(10):1347–62. PMID: 31321549; PMCID: PMC6764934.
- 453 8. McAvinue LP, Vangkilde S, Johnson KA, Habekost T, Kyllingsbæk S, Bundesen C, et al. A  
454 componential analysis of visual attention in children with ADHD. *J Atten Disord*. 2015  
455 Oct;19(10):882–94. PMID: 23190613.
- 456 9. Doyle AE, Faraone SV, Seidman LJ, Willcutt EG, Nigg JT, Waldman ID, et al. Are endophenotypes  
457 based on measures of executive functions useful for molecular genetic studies of ADHD? *J Child*  
458 *Psychol Psychiatry*. 2005;46(7):774–803. PMID: 15972070.
- 459 10. Gropper RJ, Gotlieb H, Kronitz R, Tannock R. Working memory training in college students with  
460 ADHD or LD. *J Atten Disord*. 2014 May;18(4):331–45. PMID: 24420765.
- 461 11. Kim S, Liu Z, Glizer D, Tannock R, Woltering S. Adult ADHD and working memory: Neural  
462 evidence of impaired encoding. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2014;8(125):1596–603. PMID: 24411642.
- 463 12. Mostert JC, Onnink AMH, Klein M, Dammers JT, Harneit A, Schulten T, et al. Cognitive  
464 heterogeneity in adult attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder: A systematic analysis of  
465 neuropsychological measurements. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2015;25:2062–74. PMID:  
466 26336867; PMCID: PMC4788989.
- 467 13. Rubia K. Cognitive neuroscience of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and its  
468 clinical translation. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2018;12:100. PMID: 29651240; PMCID: PMC5884954.
- 469 14. Koehler S, Lauer P, Schreppe T, Jacob C, Heine M, Boreatti-Hümmer A, et al. Increased EEG  
470 power density in alpha and theta bands in adult ADHD patients. *J Neural Transm*. 2009 Jan  
471 1;116(1):97–104. PMID: 19030776.
- 472 15. Adamou M, Fullen T, Jones SL. EEG for diagnosis of adult ADHD: A systematic review with  
473 narrative analysis. *Front Psychiatry*. 2020 Aug 25;11:871. PMID: 33192633; PMCID:  
474 PMC7477352.

- 475 16. Bresnahan SM, Barry RJ, Clarke AR, Johnstone SJ. Quantitative EEG analysis in dexamphetamine-  
476 responsive adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Psychiatry Res.* 2006 Feb  
477 28;141(2):151–9. PMID: 16343642.
- 478 17. Bresnahan SM, Barry RJ. Specificity of quantitative EEG analysis in adults with attention deficit  
479 hyperactivity disorder. *Psychiatry Res.* 2002 Oct 10;112(2):133–44. PMID: 12429359.
- 480 18. Snyder SM, Quintana H, Sexson SB, Knott P, Haque AFM, Reynolds DA. Blinded, multi-center  
481 validation of EEG and rating scales in identifying ADHD within a clinical sample. *Psychiatry Res.*  
482 2008 Jun 30;159(3):346–58. PMID: 18423617.
- 483 19. Snyder SM, Rugino TA, Hornig M, Stein MA. Integration of an EEG biomarker with a clinician’s  
484 ADHD evaluation. *Brain Behav.* 2015;5(4):e00330. PMID: 25798338; PMCID: PMC4356845.
- 485 20. Boxum M, Voetterl H, van Dijk H, Gordon E, DeBeus R, Arnold LE, Arns M. Challenging the  
486 diagnostic value of theta/beta ratio: Insights from an EEG subtyping meta-analytical approach in  
487 ADHD. *Appl Psychophysiol Biofeedback.* 2024 Jun 10. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 38858282.
- 488 21. Clarke AR, Barry RJ, Johnstone S. Resting state EEG power research in Attention-  
489 Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: A review update. *Clin Neurophysiol Off J Int Fed Clin*  
490 *Neurophysiol.* 2020 Jul;131(7):1463–79. PMID: 32387965.
- 491 22. Mazaheri A, Fassbender C, Coffey-Corina S, Hartanto TA, Schweitzer JB, Mangun GR.  
492 Differential oscillatory electroencephalogram between Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder  
493 subtypes and typically developing adolescents. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2014 Sep 1;76(5):422–9. PMID:  
494 24120092; PMCID: PMC3972379.
- 495 23. Sohn H, Kim I, Lee W, Peterson BS, Hong H, Chae JH, et al. Linear and non-linear EEG analysis  
496 of adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder during a cognitive task. *Clin*  
497 *Neurophysiol.* 2010 Nov 1;121(11):1863–70. PMID: 20659814.
- 498 24. ter Huurne N, Onnink M, Kan C, Franke B, Buitelaar J, Jensen O. Behavioral consequences of  
499 aberrant alpha lateralization in Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2013  
500 Aug 1;74(3):227–33. PMID: 23507001.
- 501 25. van Dongen-Boomsma M, Lansbergen MM, Bekker EM, Sandra Kooij JJ, van der Molen M,  
502 Kenemans JL, et al. Relation between resting EEG to cognitive performance and clinical symptoms  
503 in adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Neurosci Lett.* 2010 Jan 18;469(1):102–6.  
504 PMID: 19945506.
- 505 26. Buzsáki G. *Rhythms of the brain.* New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press; 2006. xv, 448 p.
- 506 27. Gaillard C, Ben Hamed S. The neural bases of spatial attention and perceptual rhythms. *Eur J*  
507 *Neurosci.* 2022;55(11–12):3209–23. PMID: 33185294.
- 508 28. Keitel C, Ruzzoli M, Dugué L, Busch NA, Benwell CSY. Rhythms in cognition: The evidence  
509 revisited. *Eur J Neurosci.* 2022 Jun;55(11–12):2991–3009. PMID: 35696729; PMCID:  
510 PMC9544967.
- 511 29. VanRullen R. Attention Cycles. *Neuron.* 2018 Aug 22;99(4):632–4. PMID : 30138586.
- 512 30. Arguin M, Ferrandez R, Massé J. Oscillatory visual mechanisms revealed by random temporal  
513 sampling. *Sci Rep.* 2021 Oct 29;11(1):21309. PMID: 34716376.
- 514 31. Bertrand Pilon C, Arguin M. The processing of spatial frequencies through time in visual word  
515 recognition. *Sci Rep.* 2024 Mar 19;14(1):6628.
- 516 32. Lévesque M, Arguin M. The oscillatory features of visual processing are altered in healthy aging.  
517 *Front Psychol.* 2024;15:1323493. PMID : 38503810.

- 518 33. Conners CK, Pitkanen J, Rzepa SR. Conners 3rd Edition (Conners 3; Conners 2008). In: Kreutzer  
519 JS, DeLuca J, Caplan B, editors. *Encycl Clin Neuropsychol*. New York, NY: Springer; 2011. p.  
520 675–678.
- 521 34. Kleiner M, Brainard D, Pelli D, Ingling A, Murray R, Broussard C. What’s new in psychtoolbox-  
522 3. *Perception*. 2007;36(14):1–16.
- 523 35. Content A, Mousty P, Radeau M. BRULEX. Une base de données lexicales informatisée pour le  
524 français écrit et parlé. [BRULEX: A computerized lexical data base for the French language].  
525 *Année Psychol*. 1990;90(4):551–66.
- 526 36. Cohen MX. *Analyzing neural time series data: Theory and practice*. MIT Press; 2014. 615 p.
- 527 37. Chauvin A, Worsley KJ, Schyns PG, Arguin M, Gosselin F. Accurate statistical tests for smooth  
528 classification images. *J Vis*. 2005 Oct 5;5(9):1. PMID: 16356076.
- 529 38. Hearst MA, Dumais ST, Osuna E, Platt J, Scholkopf B. Support vector machines. *IEEE Intell Syst  
530 Their Appl*. 1998 Jul;13(4):18–28.
- 531 39. Suthaharan S. Support Vector Machine. In: Suthaharan S, editor. *Machine learning models and  
532 algorithms for big data classification: Thinking with examples for effective learning*. Boston, MA:  
533 Springer US; 2016. 359 p.
- 534 40. Arguin M, Fortier-St-Pierre S. Spatiotemporal letter processing in visual word recognition  
535 uncovered by perceptual oscillations. Rochester, NY; 2023. Available from:  
536 <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=4635714>
- 537 41. Haigh A, Buckby B. Rhythmic attention and ADHD: A narrative and systematic review. *Appl  
538 Psychophysiol Biofeedback*. 2024 Jun 1;49(2):185–204. PMID: 38198019.
- 539 42. Konrad K, Neufang S, Fink GR, Herpertz-dahlmann B. Long-term effects of methylphenidate on  
540 neural networks associated with executive attention in children with ADHD: Results from a  
541 longitudinal functional MRI study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2007 Dec 1;46(12):1633–  
542 41. PMID: 18030085.
- 543 43. Pretus C, Ramos-Quiroga JA, Richarte V, Corrales M, Picado M, Carmona S, et al. Time and  
544 psychostimulants: Opposing long-term structural effects in the adult ADHD brain. A longitudinal  
545 MR study. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2017 Dec 1;27(12):1238–47. PMID: 29129558.
- 546 44. Wang GJ, Volkow ND, Wigal T, Kollins SH, Newcorn JH, Telang F, et al. Long-term stimulant  
547 treatment affects brain dopamine transporter level in patients with Attention Deficit Hyperactive  
548 Disorder. *PLOS ONE*. 2013 May 15;8(5):e63023. PMID: 23696790; PMCID: PMC3655054.
- 549 45. Khan MU, Aslani P. Exploring factors influencing initiation, implementation and discontinuation  
550 of medications in adults with ADHD. *Health Expect*. 2021;24(S1):82–94. PMID: 32032467;  
551 PMCID: PMC8137499.
- 552 46. Milanova G, Singh A, Arguin M. The processing of spatial frequencies through time in object and  
553 scene recognition. [In preparation]. Université de Montréal.
- 554 47. Shrout PE, Fleiss JL. Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychol Bull*.  
555 1979;86(2):420–8. PMID: 18839484.
- 556 48. Faraone SV, Asherson P, Banaschewski T, Biederman J, Buitelaar JK, Ramos-Quiroga JA, et al.  
557 Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Nat Rev Dis Primer*. 2015 Aug 6;1:15020. PMID:  
558 27189265.

559 49. Luo Y, Weibman D, Halperin JM, Li X. A review of heterogeneity in Attention  
560 Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2019 Feb 11;13:42.PMID:  
561 30804772; PMCID: PMC6378275.





a) Signal



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.05.24313116>; this version posted September 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

+

Noise




b)

Figure1



a)

### Neurotypical controls average classification image



b)

### ADHD average classification image




Figure2

# Neurotypical controls average classification image




Figure3

# Features used for medication status classification





Figure4

Medicated ADHD subgroup average classification image



b) Non-medicated ADHD subgroup average classification image




Figure5

# Features used for medication status classification




Figure6