

Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) combined with cognitive training in adolescent boys with ADHD: a double-blind, randomised, sham-controlled trial

Samuel J. Westwood*^a, Marion Criaud^a, Sheut-Ling Lam^a, Steve Lukito^a, Sophie Wallace-Hanlon^b, Olivia S. Kowalczyk^{a,c}, Afroditi Kostara^a, Joseph Mathew^a, Deborah Agbedjro^d, Bruce E. Wexler^e, Roi Cohen Kadosh^f, Philip Asherson^g, Katya Rubia^a

^aDepartment of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, King's College London, UK

^bSchool of Psychology, University of Surrey, UK

^cDepartment of Neuroimaging, King's College London, UK

^dDepartment of Biostatistics, King's College London, UK

^eDepartment of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine, USA

^fDepartment of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, UK

^gSocial Genetic & Developmental Psychiatry, King's College London, UK

*Corresponding author:

Dr Samuel J. Westwood
Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry PO46,
Social, Genetic and Developmental Psychiatry (SGDP) Centre,
Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience,
King's College London,
16 De Crespigny Park,
London, SE5 8AF
UK
Email: samuel.westwood@kcl.ac.uk

Abstract word count: 245

Main text word count: 3891

Highlights

- tDCS has been suggested as an alternative treatment for ADHD
- We combined 15-session anodal tDCS over the rIFC with cognitive training in ADHD children
- Real versus sham tDCS showed no cognitive or symptom improvements
- Conversely, real tDCS showed lower ADHD symptoms and higher adverse effects
- Multi-session tDCS of rIFC shows no clinical or cognitive benefits in ADHD

ABSTRACT

Background: Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) could be a side-effect free alternative to psychostimulants in Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). Although there is limited evidence for clinical and cognitive effects, most studies were small, single-session, and stimulated left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC). No sham-controlled study has stimulated right inferior frontal cortex (rIFC), which is the most consistently under-functioning region in ADHD, with multiple sessions of anodal tDCS combined with cognitive training (CT) to enhance effects.

Objective/Hypothesis: To investigate clinical and cognitive effects of multi-session anodal tDCS over rIFC combined with CT in a double-blind, randomised, sham-controlled trial (RCT).

Methods: 50 boys with ADHD (10-18 years) received 15 weekday sessions of anodal or sham tDCS over rIFC combined with CT (20mins, 1mA). ANCOVA, adjusting for baseline measures, age, and medication status, tested group differences in clinical and ADHD-relevant executive functions at posttreatment and after 6-months.

Results: ADHD-Rating Scale, Conners ADHD Index, and adverse effects were significantly lower at post-treatment after sham relative to real tDCS. No other effects were significant.

Conclusions: This rigorous multi-session RCT of tDCS over the rIFC in ADHD combined with CT, showed no evidence of improvement of ADHD symptoms or cognitive performance. Findings extend limited meta-analytic evidence of cognitive and clinical effects in ADHD after 1-5 tDCS sessions over mainly left dlPFC. Given that tDCS is commercially and clinically available, the findings are important as they suggest that rIFC stimulation may not be indicated as a neurotherapy for cognitive or clinical remediation for ADHD

Keywords

tDCS; ADHD; treatment; randomised controlled trial

Abbreviations

Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder = ADHD

Cognitive Training = CT

Executive Functions = EF

Maudsley Attention and Response Suppression = MARS

Wisconsin Card Sorting Task = WCST

INTRODUCTION

Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is characterised by persisting, age-inappropriate, and impairing symptoms of inattention and/or impulsivity-hyperactivity [1]. ADHD is also associated with deficits in executive functions (EF), most prominently in motor and interference inhibition, sustained attention and vigilance, switching, working memory, and timing [2,3]. Neuroimaging studies indicate delayed structural and functional brain maturation [4,5], and consistent underactivation in predominantly right inferior frontal (rIFC), dorsolateral prefrontal (dlPFC), and anterior cingulate cortices, as well as striatal, parietal and cerebellar regions during cognitive control, timing, and attention tasks [3,6–9].

Psychostimulants are the gold-standard treatment for improving ADHD symptoms, but have associated side-effects [10], poor adherence in adolescence [11,12], and are not indicated for all individuals with ADHD [10]. Evidence of longer-term efficacy is also limited [12,13], possibly due to brain adaptation [14]. Meta-analyses indicate small to moderate efficacy of behavioural therapies, cognitive training (CT), neurofeedback, or dietary interventions on ADHD symptoms [15]. Non-invasive brain stimulation techniques, however, are promising given their potential to stimulate key dysfunctional brain regions associated with ADHD, with potentially longer-term neuroplastic effects that drugs cannot offer [3,16–19]. Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) is particularly well-suited for paediatric populations as it is user-friendly, well tolerated with minimal side effects [20], and is cheaper relative to other techniques, such as transcranial magnetic stimulation [21].

In tDCS, a weak direct electrical current is delivered through two electrodes placed on the scalp (one anode, one cathode), generating subthreshold, polarity-dependent shifts in resting membrane potentials in underlying brain regions. The resulting net increase (predominantly under the anode) or decrease (predominantly under the cathode) in neuronal excitability leads to modulation of the neuronal network [22], with neurophysiological effects

persisting after stimulation, presumably by potentiating mediators of practice-dependent synaptic plasticity, including GABA, glutamate [23,24], dopamine, and noradrenaline [25–27].

Evidence of cognitive performance and clinical improvement following tDCS is, however, limited. Two meta-analyses of tDCS studies stimulating mainly the left dlPFC in 1-5 sessions in children and adolescents with ADHD indicate a modest improvement in inhibitory control measures [28,29] with the later one showing non-significant improvement on processing speed and inhibitory measures with no effects on attention measures [19]. Only two sham-controlled studies tested ADHD symptoms, reporting improvement in inattentive symptoms, but not impulsivity/hyperactivity, immediately, one [30,31], and two weeks [31] after anodal tDCS over left or right dlPFC.

There is evidence that tDCS effects can be enhanced when combined with CT by functionally priming the brain regions that mediate the cognitive function being trained [32–35]. Multi-session anodal tDCS combined with CT has also been shown to elicit longer-term cognitive improvements in healthy controls for up to one [36,37], nine [38], or 12 months [34], and clinical improvements in psychiatric disorders for at least one month [39–41], suggesting longer-term neuroplastic effects.

Most studies in ADHD have targeted the left dlPFC. However, one of the most consistent findings of meta-analyses of functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies is the underactivation of rIFC during tasks of cognitive control [3,7–9,42]. The rIFC is a cognitive control “hub” region, playing a key role in cognitive control [43,44], sustained attention [45–47], and timing networks [48], mediating key functions of impairment in ADHD [2,49]. The rIFC dysfunction has also been shown to be disorder-specific to ADHD compared to several neurodevelopmental disorders in comparative fMRI meta-analyses of

cognitive control [3,8,9]. Further, its upregulation is the most consistent effect of single-dose and longer-term psychostimulant medication [9,50].

Only three published studies applied tDCS over rIFC in ADHD, in 1 or 5 sessions. One found improvements after anodal relative to sham tDCS in Flanker task errors and intrasubject response variability in 21 adolescents with ADHD [51], but no effect in 14 children with ADHD on a combined n-back and Stop task with high definition (HD) or conventional anodal tDCS [52]. In 20 undiagnosed high-school students with ADHD symptoms, anodal compared to sham tDCS improved Go accuracy in a Go/No-Go (GNG) task but no other inhibitory or Stroop task measures [53]. To our knowledge, no sham-controlled study so far has measured clinical and cognitive effects of multi-session anodal tDCS over rIFC in combination with CT in patients with ADHD

In this double-blind, sham-controlled, randomised controlled trial (RCT), 50 children and adolescents with ADHD were administered 15 consecutive weekday sessions of anodal or sham tDCS over rIFC combined with CT of EF typically impaired in ADHD. The primary outcome measures were parent-rated clinical symptoms and cognitive performance in an inhibition and a sustained-attention task. Secondary outcome measures were other clinical, safety, and EF measures.

Given some evidence of clinical and cognitive improvements with anodal tDCS over the dlPFC [30,31] or rIFC [51,53] and prolonged effects when tDCS is paired with CT, we hypothesised that, compared to sham, at posttreatment, multi-session anodal tDCS of rIFC with multi-EF training would show greater improvement in ADHD symptoms and/or performance on EF tasks mediated by rIFC and targeted by the CT. We also hypothesised that clinical and EF task improvement would persist 6-months after posttreatment. Finally, we hypothesised no side or adverse effects.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Trial Design

This pre-registered (ISRCTN: 48265228), double-blind, sham-controlled, parallel RCT compared multi-session anodal versus sham tDCS over the rIFC combined with multi-EF training. Randomisation to stimulation group was stratified by age (10 to 14.5 and 14.5 to 18 years) and medication status (naïve and non-naïve) using Smith randomisation [54,55] conducted by Innosphere Ltd (Haifa, Israel). Experimenters, participants, and parents/caregivers were blind to stimulation group. This trial received local research ethics committee approval (REC ID: 17/LO/0983) and was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) guidelines [56].

Participants

Fifty male participants (10 to 18 years) were recruited from South London clinics, social media, and parent support groups from February 2018 to 2020. All participants had a clinical DSM-5 diagnosis of ADHD established by a clinician, and validated by the Schedule of Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Age Children-Present and Lifetime version (K-SADS-PL) [57] and the Conners 3rd Edition-Parent (Conners 3-P, cut-off t-score > 60) [58]. Autism spectrum disorders (ASD) was excluded using a combination (both required) of both the parent-rated Social Communication Questionnaire (SCQ, cut-off > 17) [59] and the pro-social scale of the Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ, cut-off < 5) [60]; for participants falling outside these criteria, the absence of ASD was confirmed by their clinician. Further exclusion criteria were IQ \leq below 80 (Wechsler abbreviated scale of intelligence, WASI-II) [61], history of alcohol or substance abuse, neurological illness, comorbid major psychiatric disorders as established by the K-SADS-PL or clinical diagnoses (except for Conduct Disorder [CD]/Oppositional Defiant Disorder [ODD]), contraindications

to tDCS (e.g., metallic implants [except dental braces], previous neurosurgical procedures, history of migraine, diseased/damaged skin on the scalp), treated with drugs that lower seizure thresholds (e.g., antipsychotics, tricyclic antidepressants), and an inability to provide consent from the legal caregiver for children under 16-years or from participants over 16-years (Figure 1). Participants received £540 plus travel expenses for participating.

Baseline assessment was scheduled at least two weeks after medication titration. Thirty-two participants received stable ADHD medication (non-psychostimulants: 2; psychostimulants: 30; between 21 weeks and 10 years). To help avoid medication effects from masking tDCS effects, 14 of the 32 participants followed our optional request to abstain from psychostimulants at least 24 hours before each assessment time point. A further seven participants abstained for trial duration (i.e., baseline to posttreatment). One participant stopped taking medication 3 months before follow-up.

Intervention

Over 15 consecutive weekdays, participants played four 5-minute CT games during 20-minutes of anodal or sham tDCS. CT was composed of four ACTIVATE™ [62] games (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday) or a Stop task followed by three ACTIVATE™ games (Tuesday and Thursday). ACTIVATE™ games were played on an iPad Air 2 10.2”, the Stop task on a Dell XPS 15.6 Inch QHD Touch Laptop (Figure 2).

CT games. The ACTIVATE™ programme trains multiple EF with engaging video games that increase in complexity as the player improves. Five of the six tasks were selected for this study to target ADHD-relevant EF, including selective and multiple simultaneous attention, inhibition and cognitive flexibility (i.e., *Magic Lens*, *Peter’s Printer Panic*, *Treasure Trunk*) and visual-spatial working memory (i.e., *Grub Ahoy*, *Monkey Trouble*). Before commencing each game, participants chose a game to play from three options; the

ACTIVATE™ programme tracked choices and constrained future options so that multiple EF were twice as likely to be trained as working memory [62].

The training tracking Stop task trained motor response inhibition by requiring participants to cancel a prepotent motor response to a go signal that is followed shortly by an unexpected and rare (30% of trials) stop signal [63]. The delay between go and stop signals is dynamically adjusted to the participant performance, with better inhibition resulting in longer stop signal delays thus increasing the difficulty to withhold a response. Participants were encouraged to wait for the stop signal before responding to the go signal, thereby training inhibition and waiting behaviour/response delay (see Supplement).

tDCS. Direct current was delivered by NovoStim (InnoSphere, Haifa, Israel) via a pair of 25 cm² brush electrodes¹ dipped in saline solution (0.45 mol). The anode was placed over rIFC (F8, according to the international EEG 10-20 system) [64–67], the cathode over the contralateral supraorbital area (Fp1), and both were held in place with a 10-20 EEG cap. For anodal tDCS, 1mA was administered for 20 minutes (current density: 0.04cm²; total charge: 0.8C/cm²) with a 30-second fade-in/fade-out. For sham stimulation, only the 30-second fade-in/fade-out was administered [68]. After each week, participants, parents, and tDCS administrators were asked to guess if participants had received anodal or sham tDCS.

Primary Outcomes

Cognitive. The adult version of the Maudsley Attention and Response Suppression (MARS) task battery [63,69] measured motor response inhibition (GNG; dependent variable [DV]: probability of inhibition [PI]) and sustained attention (Continuous Performance Task [CPT]; DV: omission and commission errors) (see Supplement).

¹The saline solution was held in *tufts* by capillary forces between strands, which prevented it from spreading/dripping.

ADHD Symptoms. Parent-rated ADHD Rating Scale–IV (ADHD-RS) Home Version (DV: Total Scores) [70], a standard measure of treatment effects in DSM-IV ADHD symptoms.

Secondary Outcomes

Cognitive Measures. MARS tasks [63,69] measured interference inhibition (Simon Task; DV: Simon reaction time effect) or time discrimination (Time Discrimination task; DV: percentage correct). The Mackworth Clock task [71–73] measured vigilance (DV: percentage omissions and commission errors), the Wisconsin Card Sorting Task [74] (WCST; DV: total and preservative errors) measured cognitive flexibility, and the C8 Sciences version of the NIH List Sorting Working Memory (WM) task (DV: total score) [76] measured visuo-spatial working memory. Phonetic and semantic fluency (DV: percentage of correct responses) [77] were measured to account for potential downregulation of IIFC mediated language production functions via interhemispheric inhibition.

Generic EF. Three intercorrelated generic, task-independent EF were measured, which included: 1) general speed of information processing (i.e. mean reaction times (MRT) for Go [GNG], Congruent [Simon], and Target [CPT] trials, weighted by number of trials) 2); intrasubject response variability (i.e., Coefficient of Variance [CV; SD of MRT divided by MRT] for Go [GNG], Congruent [Simon], and Target [CPT] trials); and 3) prematurity (i.e., premature responses to all trials in GNG, Simon and CPT) (see Supplement Table 1-5 and Figures 1-3).

ADHD symptoms and related impairments. Caregiver-rated Conners 3-P ADHD index [58] measured ADHD symptoms, Weekly Parent Ratings of Evening and Morning Behaviour-Revised scale (WREMB-R) [78] and the Columbia Impairment Scale-Parent version (CIS) [79] measured ADHD related difficulties and functional impairments, the

child- and caregiver-rated Affective Reactivity Index (ARI) measured irritability [80], and the child-rated Mind Excessively Wandering Scale (MEWS) measured mind-wandering [81].

Safety, feasibility, and tolerability measures. Safety was measured with parent-rated questionnaires on side effects [82] and adverse events [83]. Participants rated their mood, wakefulness [84], and the tolerability of tDCS [85]. Parents and participants rated the overall impression of tDCS and CT using a rating scale from 0 (not at all/never) to 4 (definitely/always) designed specifically for this study.

EEG. EEG was measured at rest and during the GNG task at each assessment timepoint but will be reported in a separate publication.

Training outcome measures. The ACTIVATE™ DV was the highest game level reached each week averaged across three games that loaded on multiple EF (i.e., *Treasure Trunk*, *Magic Lens*, *Printer Panic*). The Stop task DV was PI on average for each week.

Assessment Time Points

Primary and secondary outcome measures were collected at baseline, posttreatment, and six-month follow-up. Adverse events and overall impression of tDCS and CT were measured at posttreatment. Ratings of mood, wakefulness, and the tolerability of tDCS were measured in each stimulation session. Baseline and posttreatment sessions were scheduled up to three weeks before the first and after the last stimulation session, respectively.

Statistical Methods

Confirmatory analysis. Repeated measures analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) tested group differences across posttreatment and follow-up, covarying for age in months, medication status (naïve, on-, or off-medication), and baseline value of outcomes where applicable. Sensitivity analyses were also conducted to remove statistical outliers on

cognitive tasks, participants who changed medication between posttreatment and follow-up, or participants whose treatment spanned over four instead of three weeks (see Supplement Table 6-8). The alpha level was set to 0.05, and False Discovery Rate (FDR) correction with Benjamini-Hochberg p -value adjustment [86] was applied to control for multiple testing. Only results based on adjusted p -values are reported, see Tables 3-4 for unadjusted p -values. Analyses were conducted with IBM SPSS Statistics 26 (IBM Corp., Armonk, N.Y., USA).

Medication status. Medication status was coded as a categorical covariate with three groups: medication-naïve, on-medication, and off-medication. Participants who abstained for the treatment trial period were coded as off-medication, participants who abstained at assessment time points only were coded as off-medication for cognitive outcomes and on-medication for clinical outcomes (which can cover three weeks).

Missing data & statistical outliers. In primary and secondary outcomes, only posttreatment WM task data for one participant were missing. Missing stop signal task data (1.33%) were random and replaced by group averages.

RESULTS

Baseline demographics

Compared to sham tDCS, the anodal tDCS group was significantly younger, had fewer years in education, higher ADHD-RS Total scores and ODD symptoms, and worse performance on the Macworth Clock, Time Discrimination, and list sort working memory tasks and during CT spent significantly more time playing the *Peter's Printer Panic* game (Tables 1 and 2).

Primary outcome measures

Cognitive. There were no significant effects on primary cognitive outcome measures after adjusting for multiple testing (see Table 3 and Figure 3).

ADHD symptoms. There was only a significant time by group interaction ($F_{1,44}=10.58$, $p=.002$, $\eta^2=.19$); simple effects analysis showed that the anodal versus sham tDCS group had higher scores at posttreatment but not at follow-up (posttreatment: $p=.011$ [95% CI: 1.65, 12.21]; follow-up: $p=.20$ [95% CI: -9.30, 1.97]). To determine what drove this effect, exploratory simple effects analysis of subscales showed that the anodal versus sham tDCS group had higher scores at posttreatment on the Inattention ($p=0.03$) and Hyperactivity-Impulsivity subscales ($p=.06$), with the latter being lower for active vs. sham tDCS at follow-up ($p=0.07$) (Table 3 and Figure 4).

Secondary outcomes measures

Cognitive. There were no significant effects on secondary cognitive outcome measures after adjusting for multiple testing (See Table 4).

ADHD symptoms and related impairments. There was only a significant time by group interaction for Conners 3-P ADHD Index ($F_{1,44}=13.726$, $p=.004$, $\eta^2=.238$). Simple effects analysis showed significantly higher scores in the anodal versus sham tDCS group at posttreatment only ($p=.001$ [95% CI: 1.92, -7.11]; follow-up: $p=.73$ [95% CI: -3.39, 2.41]) (Table 4).

Exploratory analyses

Separate repeated measures ANOVAs showed an effect of time (baseline versus posttreatment or follow-up) across groups. In cognitive measures, both groups improved in GNG task, Simon task, Letter Fluency (baseline versus posttreatment or follow-up); Speed of Processing (baseline versus posttreatment only); and CPT % Omissions and

Commissions, Mackworth Clock % Omissions, WM, Response Variability, and Prematurity (baseline versus follow-up only) (see Table 9 in Supplement). In clinical measures, both groups improved in ADHD-RS and Conners 3-P Index (baseline versus posttreatment or follow-up); and in ARI Parent and Child, WREMB-R, and CIS (baseline versus posttreatment only).

Group differences in CT performance across the three weeks were explored with repeated-measures ANCOVAs covarying for baseline, age in years, medication status (naïve, on-, or off-medication) and total time spent playing each game. There were significant effects in ACTIVATE™ or Stop task after adjusting for multiple testing (see Table 10 in Supplement).

We also explored if outcome changes that showed a significant time effect across both groups from baseline to posttreatment or follow-up were correlated with changes in CT performance scores (week 3 minus week 1). No correlations were significant (Table 11 in Supplement).

Given that age was not matched between groups, we conducted an post-hoc moderation analysis [87], predicting a change in ADHD-RS (baseline minus posttreatment) in a regression analysis by stimulation group, age, and a stimulation by age interaction. While the stimulation by age interaction was not significant ($\beta=0.2$, $SE=.12$, $t(46)=1.7$, $p=.096$), the simple effects showed a significant reduced improvement for anodal tDCS versus sham in older participants (1SD above mean age; $\beta=9.53$, $SE=4.26$, $t(46)=2.24$, $p=.03$), and an opposite but not significant pattern in younger children (1SD below mean age; $\beta=-.6$, $SE=4.11$, $t(46)=-.15$, $p=.88$), indicating that older participants benefitted clinically less from anodal versus sham tDCS.

Safety, feasibility, tolerability, and blinding integrity.

There were no significant group differences in ratings of mood, wakefulness, overall impression of tDCS and CT (Tables 12 and 13 in Supplement), and side effects (Table 4). Adverse effects were significantly higher in the anodal versus sham tDCS group at posttreatment ($F_{1,44}=4.09$, $p=.05$, $\eta^2=.08$), driven mainly by higher parent-ratings for the items “he seems more grumpy and irritable”, “has little appetite”, and “has more problems falling asleep” (Table 4). Tolerability ratings showed that stimulation was well tolerated, with only significantly higher reports of burning sensation during anodal than sham tDCS (see Table 14 in Supplement). Group assignment guesses did not exceed chance level for experimenters ($\chi^2[1]=3.9$, $p=.28$) and participants ($\chi^2[1]=1.85$, $p=.17$), with only parent guesses for anodal tDCS reaching borderline significance ($\chi^2(1)=3.57$, $p=.06$), thus blinding was overall successful.

DISCUSSION

This double-blind, sham-controlled RCT showed that 15 sessions of anodal compared to sham tDCS over rIFC combined with CT in 50 boys with ADHD showed no improvement in ADHD symptoms or cognitive performance. Although both groups improved in clinical and cognitive measures over time, anodal relative to sham tDCS was associated with higher primary (ADHD-RS) and secondary (Conners 3-P ADHD Index) clinical outcome measures. Side effects did not differ, but at posttreatment, higher adverse effects relating to mood, sleep and appetite were reported following anodal compared to sham tDCS.

The lack of an observable clinical or cognitive effect extend previous meta-analytic evidence of no significant cognitive effects and limited evidence of clinical effects in ADHD with 1-5 sessions of predominantly left dlPFC anodal tDCS [19]. These findings are unexpected given that rIFC underactivation is consistently associated with poor cognitive control, attention and clinical symptoms in ADHD [3,7–9]. While the findings of no clinical effect of tDCS of rIFC are novel, the negative effects on cognition extend evidence from

prior 1 or 5 session sham-controlled tDCS studies stimulating rIFC in ADHD which showed no or moderate effects (see introduction) [51–53].

Findings are furthermore unexpected given evidence of a synergistic effect of combined CT and tDCS on improving cognition [32,34,88]. Although we covaried for age, one possible explanation for the negative findings on clinical symptoms and cognition is that the anodal tDCS group were significantly younger with larger baseline clinical and cognitive impairments compared to sham, both of which could have impaired learning [89]. This would be supported by evidence that ADHD children with worse neurocognitive skills at baseline show less CT gains [90] and neurofeedback learning [91–93], while in healthy controls poorer cognitive performance at baseline can lead to null and even detrimental effects of tDCS [94,95].

Alternatively, given the stronger electric field strengths in children than in adults [96,97], multiple sessions of tDCS may have triggered a homeostatic plasticity response – i.e., the amount and direction of plasticity was attenuated in response to excessive increases in neuronal excitability [98–100] – thereby temporarily disrupting the excitability of rIFC [99–101]. This is in line with our post-hoc moderation analysis that revealed older but not younger participants improved less in the ADHD-RS Total Scores in the anodal versus sham tDCS group at posttreatment. Future studies should verify if tDCS has differential effects depending on current strength and age of participants with ADHD.

Another possibility is that rIFC stimulation downregulated neighbouring dorsal prefrontal or parietal regions part of the dorsal attention network [7,102], or left hemispheric prefrontal regions that mediate positive emotions [103,104].

Interestingly, however, impulsiveness/hyperactivity symptoms, which are most closely associated with rIFC activation [3,105], were lower at follow-up in the anodal relative to the sham tDCS group. The finding – that needs replication – could suggest longer-term

neuroplastic consolidation effects as have been shown in other neurotherapies, such as neurofeedback [106,107].

Both groups improved in symptoms and cognitive performance from baseline to posttreatment or follow-up, which could suggest gains due to CT [62]; however, given the lack of correlation with CT performance, placebo effects cannot be ruled out.

The negative findings from this trial are crucial given that tDCS is being increasingly incorporated into clinical practice, is considered an acceptable alternative to medication by parents, and is already commercially available [17,108]. Particularly alarming is that parent-rated ADHD symptoms and adverse effects were higher at posttreatment after anodal tDCS relative to sham.

Findings are not encouraging for the efficacy of multi-session tDCS of rIFC combined with CT in ADHD. However, there are limitations to the study. Although our sample of 50 participants is the largest sample of any tDCS study in children and adolescents with ADHD, larger studies may be more adequately powered to detect effects. We cannot rule out that positive results are achievable with other study designs and stimulation parameters. Computational current flow models suggest that higher stimulation intensities might be required to modulate clinical symptoms and cognitive functions mediated by rIFC given that this it is a deeper region compared to the commonly stimulated dlPFC [97]. Further, this study stimulated “F8” in line with other studies [51–53,109–111]; however, improved performance on inhibitory control tasks in healthy adults has been reported when stimulating T4-Fz and F8-Cz intersection [112–116] or F6 [117–120], which cover the rIFC along with areas closer to the surface implicated in motor inhibition (e.g., superior and middle frontal cortex, and the supplementary motor area) [7,42,121] and attention (e.g., right dlPFC, part of the dorsal attention network and typically underactivated in ADHD) [7,102]. Another limitation is that we could not test for weekly dose effects as ADHD symptoms were

only measured at baseline, posttreatment and follow-up; yet weekly changes in ACTIVATE™ game performance and stop task PI did not show dose effects.

Larger, double-blind, randomised-controlled trials should systematically investigate optimal and ideally individualised stimulation protocols (e.g., different stimulation sites, intensity, duration, number of sessions, etc.) measuring clinical, cognitive, and possible non-targeted cognitive outcomes. Stimulating T4-Fz and F8-Cz intersection and F6 could potentially be more effective for improving inhibitory control and attention functions in ADHD.

Conclusion

This rigorously conducted double-blind, randomised, sham-controlled trial of 15-weekday sessions of anodal tDCS over rIFC combined with CT in 50 boys with ADHD showed no clinical or cognitive improvement. Findings suggest that rIFC stimulation may not be indicated as a neurotherapy for cognitive or clinical remediation for ADHD.

FUNDING

This work was supported by grants from Action Medical Research (GN2426), the Garfield Weston Foundation, and National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre at South London and the Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, and King's College London to KR. KR has received additional research support for other projects from the Medical Research Council (MR/P012647/1), and the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre at South London and the Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, and King's College London. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. The funders were not involved in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the article for publication.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Bruce E. Wexler is Chief Scientist and an equity holder in the Yale Start Up company C8 Sciences that sells the cognitive training program evaluated in this study. RCK serves on the scientific advisory boards for Neuroelectrics and Innosphere. PA reports honoraria for consultancy to Shire/Takeda, Eli Lilly, and Novartis; educational and research awards from Shire, Lilly, Novartis, Vifor Pharma, GW Pharma, and QbTech; and speaking at sponsored events for Shire, Lilly, Flynn Pharma, and Novartis. KR has received funding from Takeda pharmaceuticals for another project.

CREDIT ROLES

Conceptualization: Samuel J. Westwood, Marion Criaud, Sheut-Ling Lam, Steve Lukito, Bruce Wexler, Roi Cohen-Kadosh, Philip Asherson and Katya Rubia. **Data Curation:** Samuel J. Westwood, Sophie Wallace-Hanlon and Afroditi Kostara. **Formal Analysis:** Samuel J. Westwood, Marion Criaud, Sheut-Ling Lam, Steve Lukito, Deborah Agbedjro, Roi Cohen-Kadosh and Katya Rubia. **Funding Acquisition:** Bruce Wexler, Roi Cohen-Kadosh, Philip Asherson and Katya Rubia. **Investigation:** Samuel J. Westwood, Marion Criaud, Sheut-Ling Lam, Steve Lukito, Sophie Wallace-Hanlon, Olivia S. Kowalczyk, Afroditi Kostara and Joseph Mathew. **Methodology:** Samuel J. Westwood, Marion Criaud, Sheut-Ling Lam, Steve Lukito, Olivia S. Kowalczyk, Bruce Wexler, Roi Cohen-Kadosh, Philip Asherson and Katya Rubia. **Project Administration:** Samuel J. Westwood and Katya Rubia. **Resources:** Bruce Wexler, Roi Cohen-Kadosh, Philip Asherson and Katya Rubia. **Software:** Marion Criaud, Bruce Wexler and Katya Rubia. **Supervision:** Samuel J. Westwood and Katya Rubia. **Validation:** Samuel J. Westwood and Katya Rubia. **Visualization:** Samuel J. Westwood and Katya Rubia. **Writing - Original Draft Preparation:** Samuel J. Westwood

and Katya Rubia. **Writing - Review & Editing:** Samuel J. Westwood, Marion Criaud, Sheut-Ling Lam, Steve Lukito, Sophie Wallace-Hanlon, Olivia S. Kowalczyk, Deborah Agbedjro, Bruce Wexler, Roi Cohen-Kadosh and Katya Rubia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the families and children who took part in this study, and the South London and Maudsley NHS Trust and local parent groups for their support and participation in this study. We would like to thank Yuanyuan Yang for her help in recruiting participants and data collection.

REFERENCES

- [1] American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5®). American Psychiatric Pub; 2013.
- [2] Coghill D, Toplak M, Rhodes S, Adamo N. Cognitive functioning in ADHD: Inhibition, memory, temporal discounting, decision-making, timing and reaction time variability. In: Banaschewski T, Coghill D, Zuddas A editors. Oxford Textbook of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2018
- [3] Rubia K. Cognitive Neuroscience of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and Its Clinical Translation. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2018;12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00100>.
- [4] Shaw P, Eckstrand K, Sharp W, Blumenthal J, Lerch JP, Greenstein D, et al. Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder is characterized by a delay in cortical maturation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2007;104:19649. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0707741104>.
- [5] Sripada CS, Kessler D, Angstadt M. Lag in maturation of the brain's intrinsic functional architecture in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2014;111:14259. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1407787111>.
- [6] Hart H, Radua J, Mataix-Cols D, Rubia K. Meta-analysis of fMRI studies of timing in attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2012;36:2248–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2012.08.003>.
- [7] Hart H, Radua J, Nakao T, Mataix-Cols D, Rubia K. Meta-analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging studies of inhibition and attention in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: exploring task-specific, stimulant medication, and age effects. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2013;70:185–98. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.277>.
- [8] Lukito S, Norman L, Carlisi C, Radua J, Hart H, Simonoff E, et al. Comparative meta-analyses of brain structural and functional abnormalities during cognitive control in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and autism spectrum disorder. *Psychol Med* 2020;50:894–919. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291720000574>.

- [9] Norman LJ, Carlisi C, Lukito S, Hart H, Mataix-Cols D, Radua J, et al. Structural and Functional Brain Abnormalities in Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder and Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder: A Comparative Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2016;73:815–25. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2016.0700>.
- [10] Faraone SV, Asherson P, Banaschewski T, Biederman J, Buitelaar JK, Ramos-Quiroga JA, et al. Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Nat Rev Dis Primer* 2015;1:1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrdp.2015.20>.
- [11] Cunill R, Castells X, Tobias A, Capellà D. Efficacy, safety and variability in pharmacotherapy for adults with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: a meta-analysis and meta-regression in over 9000 patients. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2016;233:187–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-015-4099-3>.
- [12] Cortese S, Adamo N, Del Giovane C, Mohr-Jensen C, Hayes AJ, Carucci S, et al. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of medications for attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder in children, adolescents, and adults: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2018;5:727–38. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(18\)30269-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30269-4).
- [13] Swanson JM, Arnold LE, Jensen PS, Hinshaw SP, Hechtman LT, Pelham WE, et al. Long-term outcomes in the Multimodal Treatment study of Children with ADHD (the MTA): From beginning to end. In: Banaschewski T, Coghill D, Zuddas A editors. *Oxford Textbook of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2018.
- [14] Fusar-Poli P, Rubia K, Rossi G, Sartori G, Balottin U. Striatal dopamine transporter alterations in ADHD: pathophysiology or adaptation to psychostimulants? A meta-analysis. *Am J Psychiatry* 2012;169:264–72. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2011.11060940>.
- [15] Catalá-López F, Hutton B, Núñez-Beltrán A, Page MJ, Ridao M, Macías Saint-Gerons D, et al. The pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in children and adolescents: A systematic review with network meta-analyses of randomised trials. *PloS One* 2017;12:e0180355. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0180355>.
- [16] Cinel C, Valeriani D, Poli R. Neurotechnologies for Human Cognitive Augmentation: Current State of the Art and Future Prospects. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2019;13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2019.00013>.
- [17] Sierawska A, Prehn-Kristensen A, Moliadze V, Krauel K, Nowak R, Freitag CM, et al. Unmet Needs in Children With Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder-Can Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Fill the Gap? Promises and Ethical Challenges. *Front Psychiatry* 2019;10:334. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00334>.
- [18] STIPED Press Release. New Ther ADHD Autism EU Funds Int Proj Brain Stimul 2017. https://www.stiped.eu/fileadmin/websites/stiped/Documents/STIPED_press_release_EN.pdf.
- [19] Westwood SJ, Radua J, Rubia K. Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation in Children and Adults with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Psychiatry Neurosci* 2020.
- [20] Bikson M, Grossman P, Thomas C, Zannou AL, Jiang J, Adnan T, et al. Safety of transcranial Direct Current Stimulation: Evidence Based Update 2016. *Brain Stimulat* 2016;9:641–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2016.06.004>.
- [21] Gilbert DL. Chapter 6 - Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation in Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. In: Oberman LM, Enticott PG, editors. *Neurotechnology and Brain Stimulation in Pediatric Psychiatric and Neurodevelopmental Disorders*,

- Academic Press; 2019, p. 115–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812777-3.00006-4>.
- [22] Liu A, Vöröslakos M, Kronberg G, Henin S, Krause MR, Huang Y, et al. Immediate neurophysiological effects of transcranial electrical stimulation. *Nat Commun* 2018;9:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-07233-7>.
- [23] Filmer HL, Ehrhardt SE, Bollmann S, Mattingley JB, Dux PE. Accounting for individual differences in the response to tDCS with baseline levels of neurochemical excitability. *Cortex* 2019;115:324–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2019.02.012>.
- [24] Stagg CJ, Nitsche MA. Physiological Basis of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation. *The Neuroscientist* 2011;17:37–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858410386614>.
- [25] Fonteneau C, Redoute J, Haesebaert F, Le Bars D, Costes N, Saud-Chagny M-F, et al. Frontal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Induces Dopamine Release in the Ventral Striatum in Human. *Cereb Cortex* 2018;28:2636–46. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhy093>.
- [26] Kuo M-F, Paulus W, Nitsche MA. Boosting Focally-Induced Brain Plasticity by Dopamine. *Cereb Cortex* 2008;18:648–51. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhm098>.
- [27] Monte-Silva K, Liebetanz D, Grundey J, Paulus W, Nitsche MA. Dosage-dependent non-linear effect of l-dopa on human motor cortex plasticity. *J Physiol* 2010;588:3415–24. <https://doi.org/10.1113/jphysiol.2010.190181>.
- [28] Salehinejad MA, Wischniewski M, Nejati V, Vicario CM, Nitsche MA. Correction: Transcranial direct current stimulation in attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: A meta-analysis of neuropsychological deficits. *PLOS ONE* 2019;14:e0221613. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0221613>.
- [29] Salehinejad MA, Wischniewski M, Nejati V, Vicario CM, Nitsche MA. Transcranial direct current stimulation in attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: A meta-analysis of neuropsychological deficits. *PLOS ONE* 2019;14:e0215095. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0215095>.
- [30] Soff C, Sotnikova A, Christiansen H, Becker K, Siniatchkin M. Transcranial direct current stimulation improves clinical symptoms in adolescents with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *J Neural Transm* 2017;124:133–44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-016-1646-y>.
- [31] Cachoeira CT, Leffa DT, Mittelstadt SD, Mendes LST, Brunoni AR, Pinto JV, et al. Positive effects of transcranial direct current stimulation in adult patients with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder A pilot randomized controlled study. *Psychiatry Res* 2017;247:28–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2016.11.009>.
- [32] Au J, Katz B, Buschkuehl M, Bunarjo K, Senger T, Zabel C, et al. Enhancing Working Memory Training with Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation. *J Cogn Neurosci* 2016;28:1419–32. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00979.
- [33] Au J, Karsten C, Buschkuehl M, Jaeggi SM. Optimizing Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Protocols to Promote Long-Term Learning. *J Cogn Enhanc* 2017;1:65–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41465-017-0007-6>.
- [34] Katz B, Au J, Buschkuehl M, Abagis T, Zabel C, Jaeggi SM, et al. Individual Differences and Long-term Consequences of tDCS-augmented Cognitive Training. *J Cogn Neurosci* 2017;29:1498–508. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01115.
- [35] Kronberg G, Rahman A, Sharma M, Bikson M, Parra LC. Direct current stimulation boosts hebbian plasticity in vitro. *Brain Stimulat* 2020;13:287–301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2019.10.014>.
- [36] Jones KT, Stephens JA, Alam M, Bikson M, Berryhill ME. Longitudinal Neurostimulation in Older Adults Improves Working Memory. *PLOS ONE* 2015;10:e0121904. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121904>.

- [37] Stephens JA, Berryhill ME. Older Adults Improve on Everyday Tasks after Working Memory Training and Neurostimulation. *Brain Stimulat* 2016;9:553–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2016.04.001>.
- [38] Ruf SP, Fallgatter AJ, Plewnia C. Augmentation of working memory training by transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS). *Sci Rep* 2017;7:876. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-01055-1>.
- [39] Kekic M, Boysen E, Campbell IC, Schmidt U. A systematic review of the clinical efficacy of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) in psychiatric disorders. *J Psychiatr Res* 2016;74:70–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2015.12.018>.
- [40] Moffa AH, Brunoni AR, Nikolin S, Loo CK. Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation in Psychiatric Disorders: A Comprehensive Review. *Psychiatr Clin North Am* 2018;41:447–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psc.2018.05.002>.
- [41] Tortella G, Casati R, Aparicio LVM, Mantovani A, Senço N, D’Urso G, et al. Transcranial direct current stimulation in psychiatric disorders. *World J Psychiatry* 2015;5:88–102. <https://doi.org/10.5498/wjp.v5.i1.88>.
- [42] McCarthy H, Skokauskas N, Frodl T. Identifying a consistent pattern of neural function in attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: a meta-analysis. *Psychol Med* 2014;44:869–80. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291713001037>.
- [43] Langner R, Leiber S, Hoffstaedter F, Eickhoff SB. Towards a human self-regulation system: Common and distinct neural signatures of emotional and behavioural control. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2018;90:400–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.04.022>.
- [44] Aron AR, Robbins TW, Poldrack RA. Inhibition and the right inferior frontal cortex: one decade on. *Trends Cogn Sci* 2014;18:177–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.12.003>.
- [45] Kim H. Involvement of the dorsal and ventral attention networks in oddball stimulus processing: A meta-analysis. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2014;35:2265–84. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22326>.
- [46] Langner R, Eickhoff SB. Sustaining Attention to Simple Tasks: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Neural Mechanisms of Vigilant Attention. *Psychol Bull* 2013;139:870–900. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030694>.
- [47] Petersen SE, Posner MI. The Attention System of the Human Brain: 20 Years After. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 2012;35:73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-062111-150525>.
- [48] Radua J, Pozo NO del, Gómez J, Guillen-Grima F, Ortuño F. Meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies indicates that an increase of cognitive difficulty during executive tasks engages brain regions associated with time perception. *Neuropsychologia* 2014;58:14–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.03.016>.
- [49] Noreika V, Falter CM, Rubia K. Timing deficits in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD): Evidence from neurocognitive and neuroimaging studies. *Neuropsychologia* 2013;51:235–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.09.036>.
- [50] Rubia K, Alegria AA, Cubillo AI, Smith AB, Brammer MJ, Radua J. Effects of stimulants on brain function in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Biol Psychiatry* 2014;76:616–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.10.016>.
- [51] Breitling C, Zaehle T, Dannhauer M, Bonath B, Tegelbeckers J, Flechtner H-H, et al. Improving Interference Control in ADHD Patients with Transcranial Direct Current

- Stimulation (tDCS). *Front Cell Neurosci* 2016;10.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fncel.2016.00072>.
- [52] Breitling C, Zaehle T, Dannhauer M, Tegelbeckers J, Flechtner H-H, Krauel K. Comparison between conventional and HD-tDCS of the right inferior frontal gyrus in children and adolescents with ADHD. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2020.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2019.12.412>.
- [53] Soltaninejad Z, Nejati V, Ekhtiari H. Effect of transcranial Direct Current Stimulation on Remediation of Inhibitory Control on right Inferio Frontal Gyrus in Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Symptoms. *Rehabil Med* 2015;3.
<https://doi.org/10.22037/r.m.v3i4.7837>.
- [54] Kaiser LD. Dynamic randomization and a randomization model for clinical trials data. *Stat Med* 2012;31:3858–73. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.5448>.
- [55] Smith RL. Sequential Treatment Allocation Using Biased Coin Designs. *J R Stat Soc Ser B Methodol* 1984;46:519–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1984.tb01323.x>.
- [56] Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gotzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, et al. CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMJ* 2010;340:c869–c869.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.c869>.
- [57] Kaufman J, Birmaher B, Brent D, Rao U, Flynn C, Moreci P, et al. Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Age Children-Present and Lifetime Version (K-SADS-PL): Initial Reliability and Validity Data. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 1997;36:980–8. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-199707000-00021>.
- [58] Conners CK, Pitkanen J, Rzepa SR. Conners 3rd Edition (Conners 3; Conners 2008). In: Kreutzer JS, DeLuca J, Caplan B, editors. *Encycl. Clin. Neuropsychol.*, New York, NY: Springer New York; 2011, p. 675–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-79948-3_1534.
- [59] Eaves LC, Wingert HD, Ho HH, Mickelson ECR. Screening for autism spectrum disorders with the social communication questionnaire. *J Dev Behav Pediatr JDBP* 2006;27:S95–103.
- [60] Goodman R. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A Research Note. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 1997;38:581–6. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1997.tb01545.x>.
- [61] Wechsler D. WASI-II: Wechsler abbreviated scale of intelligence. PsychCorp; 2011.
- [62] Wexler BE, Iseli M, Leon S, Zaggie W, Rush C, Goodman A, et al. Cognitive Priming and Cognitive Training: Immediate and Far Transfer to Academic Skills in Children. *Sci Rep* 2016;6:32859. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep32859>.
- [63] 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09297040600770761>.
- [64] Homan RW, Herman J, Purdy P. Cerebral location of international 10–20 system electrode placement. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol* 1987;66:376–82.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(87\)90206-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(87)90206-9).
- [65] Okamoto M, Dan H, Sakamoto K, Takeo K, Shimizu K, Kohno S, et al. Three-dimensional probabilistic anatomical cranio-cerebral correlation via the international 10–20 system oriented for transcranial functional brain mapping. *NeuroImage* 2004;21:99–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2003.08.026>.
- [66] Okamoto M, Dan I. Automated cortical projection of head-surface locations for transcranial functional brain mapping. *NeuroImage* 2005;26:18–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.01.018>.

- [67] Towle VL, Bolaños J, Suarez D, Tan K, Grzeszczuk R, Levin DN, et al. The spatial location of EEG electrodes: locating the best-fitting sphere relative to cortical anatomy. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol* 1993;86:1–6. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694\(93\)90061-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(93)90061-Y).
- [68] Palm U, Reisinger E, Keeser D, Kuo M-F, Pogarell O, Leicht G, et al. Evaluation of sham transcranial direct current stimulation for randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trials. *Brain Stimulat* 2013;6:690–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2013.01.005>.
- [69] Penadés R, Catalán R, Rubia K, Andrés S, Salamero M, Gastó C. Impaired response inhibition in obsessive compulsive disorder. *Eur Psychiatry* 2007;22:404–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2006.05.001>.
- [70] DuPaul GJ, Power TJ, Anastopoulos AD, Reid R. *ADHD Rating Scale—IV: Checklists, norms, and clinical interpretation*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press; 1998.
- [71] Mackworth NH. The breakdown of vigilance during prolonged visual search. *Q J Exp Psychol* 1948;1:6–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470214808416738>.
- [72] Lichstein KL, Riedel BW, Richman SL. The Mackworth Clock Test: a computerized version. *J Psychol* 2000;134:153–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980009600858>.
- [73] PsyToolkit. Mackworth Clock Task 2017. <https://www.psychtoolkit.org/experiment-library/mackworth.html>.
- [74] PsyToolkit. Wisconsin Card Sorting Task (WCST) 2018. <https://www.psychtoolkit.org/experiment-library/wcst.html> (accessed October 13, 2019).
- [75] C8 Sciences. NIH Toolbox Assessments - Cognitive Growth Measured 2018. <https://www.c8sciences.com/about/nih-toolbox-assessments/> (accessed October 13, 2019).
- [76] Tulskey DS, Carlozzi N, Chiaravalloti ND, Beaumont JL, Kisala PA, Mungas D, et al. NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery (NIHTB-CB): List Sorting Test to Measure Working Memory. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc* 2014;20:599–610.
- [77] Troyer AK. Normative Data for Clustering and Switching on Verbal Fluency Tasks. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol* 2000;22:370–8. [https://doi.org/10.1076/1380-3395\(200006\)22:3;1-V;FT370](https://doi.org/10.1076/1380-3395(200006)22:3;1-V;FT370).
- [78] Wehmeier PM, Dittmann RW, Schacht A, Helsenberg K, Lehmkuhl G. Morning and evening behavior in children and adolescents treated with atomoxetine once daily for Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD): Findings from two 24-week, open-label studies. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Ment Health* 2009;3:5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1753-2000-3-5>.
- [79] Bird HR, Shaffer D, Fisher P, Gould MS, et al. The Columbia Impairment Scale (CIS): Pilot findings on a measure of global impairment for children and adolescents. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res* 1993;3:167–76.
- [80] Stringaris A, Goodman R, Ferdinando S, Razdan V, Muhrer E, Leibenluft E, et al. The Affective Reactivity Index: a concise irritability scale for clinical and research settings. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2012;53:1109–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2012.02561.x>.
- [81] Mowlem FD, Skirrow C, Reid P, Maltezos S, Nijjar SK, Merwood A, et al. Validation of the Mind Excessively Wandering Scale and the Relationship of Mind Wandering to Impairment in Adult ADHD. *J Atten Disord* 2019;23:624–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054716651927>.
- [82] Hill P, Taylor E. An auditable protocol for treating attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Arch Dis Child* 2001;84:404–9. <https://doi.org/10.1136/adc.84.5.404>.

- [83] Döpfner M, Lehmkuhl G, Steinhausen H. *Kinder-Diagnostik-System (KIDS), Band 1: Aufmerksamkeitsdefizit und Hyperaktivitätsstörungen (ADHS)*. Göttingen: Hogrefe; 2006.
- [84] Maurizio S, Liechti MD, Heinrich H, Jaencke L, Steinhausen H-C, Walitza S, et al. Comparing tomographic EEG neurofeedback and EMG biofeedback in children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Biol Psychol* 2014;95:31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2013.10.008>.
- [85] Antal A, Alekseichuk I, Bikson M, Brockmüller J, Brunoni AR, Chen R, et al. Low intensity transcranial electric stimulation: Safety, ethical, legal regulatory and application guidelines. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2017;128:1774–809. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2017.06.001>.
- [86] Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *J R Stat Soc Ser B Methodol* 1995;57:289–300.
- [87] Hayes A. *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional analysis*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press; 2013.
- [88] Allenby C, Falcone M, Bernardo L, Wileyto EP, Rostain A, Ramsay JR, et al. Transcranial direct current brain stimulation decreases impulsivity in ADHD. *Brain Stimulat* 2018;11:974–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.04.016>.
- [89] Loe IM, Feldman HM. Academic and Educational Outcomes of Children With ADHD. *J Pediatr Psychol* 2007;32:643–54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpepsy/jsl054>.
- [90] Minder F, Zuberer A, Brandeis D, Drechsler R. Specific Effects of Individualized Cognitive Training in Children with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD): The Role of Pre-Training Cognitive Impairment and Individual Training Performance. *Dev Neurorehabilitation* 2019;0:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17518423.2019.1600064>.
- [91] Lam S-L, Criaud M, Alegria A, Barker GJ, Giampietro V, Rubia K. Neurofunctional and behavioural measures associated with fMRI-neurofeedback learning in adolescents with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *NeuroImage Clin* 2020;27:102291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2020.102291>.
- [92] Zilverstand A, Sorger B, Slaats-Willemse D, Kan CC, Goebel R, Buitelaar JK. fMRI Neurofeedback Training for Increasing Anterior Cingulate Cortex Activation in Adult Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. An Exploratory Randomized, Single-Blinded Study. *PloS One* 2017;12:e0170795. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0170795>.
- [93] Hammer EM, Halder S, Blankertz B, Sannelli C, Dickhaus T, Kleih S, et al. Psychological predictors of SMR-BCI performance. *Biol Psychol* 2012;89:80–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2011.09.006>.
- [94] Hsu T-Y, Juan C-H, Tseng P. Individual Differences and State-Dependent Responses in Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2016;10:643. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00643>.
- [95] Jones KT, Berryhill M. Parietal Contributions to Visual Working Memory Depend on Task Difficulty. *Front Psychiatry* 2012;3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2012.00081>.
- [96] Minhas P, Bikson M, Woods AJ, Rosen AR, Kessler SK. Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation in Pediatric Brain: A computational modeling study. *Conf Proc Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc Conf* 2012;2012:859–62. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2012.6346067>.
- [97] Salehinejad MA, Nejati V, Mosayebi-Samani M, Mohammadi A, Wischniewski M, Kuo M-F, et al. Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation in ADHD: A Systematic Review of Efficacy, Safety, and Protocol-induced Electrical Field Modeling Results. *Neurosci Bull* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12264-020-00501-x>.

- [98] Hoy KE, Fitzgerald PB. From bench to clinic to community: The far reaching implications of basic research. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2015;112:E5658. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1516590112>.
- [99] Karabanov A, Ziemann U, Hamada M, George MS, Quartarone A, Classen J, et al. Consensus Paper: Probing Homeostatic Plasticity of Human Cortex With Non-invasive Transcranial Brain Stimulation. *Brain Stimulat* 2015;8:442–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2015.01.404>.
- [100] Wefelmeyer W, Burrone J. Reply to Hoy and Fitzgerald: Considering homeostatic mechanisms in long-term treatments. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2015;112:E5659–E5659. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1516941112>.
- [101] Fricke K, Seeber AA, Thirugnanasambandam N, Paulus W, Nitsche MA, Rothwell JC. Time course of the induction of homeostatic plasticity generated by repeated transcranial direct current stimulation of the human motor cortex. *J Neurophysiol* 2011;105:1141–9. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00608.2009>.
- [102] Cubillo A, Halari R, Smith A, Taylor E, Rubia K. A review of fronto-striatal and fronto-cortical brain abnormalities in children and adults with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and new evidence for dysfunction in adults with ADHD during motivation and attention. *Cortex J Devoted Study Nerv Syst Behav* 2012;48:194–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2011.04.007>.
- [103] Groenewold NA, Opmeer EM, de Jonge P, Aleman A, Costafreda SG. Emotional valence modulates brain functional abnormalities in depression: evidence from a meta-analysis of fMRI studies. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2013;37:152–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2012.11.015>.
- [104] Gainotti G. Emotions and the Right Hemisphere: Can New Data Clarify Old Models? *Neurosci Rev J Bringing Neurobiol Neurol Psychiatry* 2019;25:258–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858418785342>.
- [105] Rubia K, Smith AB, Brammer MJ, Toone B, Taylor E. Abnormal Brain Activation During Inhibition and Error Detection in Medication-Naive Adolescents With ADHD. *Am J Psychiatry* 2005;9.
- [106] Alegria AA, Wulff M, Brinson H, Barker GJ, Norman LJ, Brandeis D, et al. Real-time fMRI neurofeedback in adolescents with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2017;38:3190–209. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.23584>.
- [107] Enriquez-Geppert S, Smit D, Pimenta MG, Arns M. Neurofeedback as a Treatment Intervention in ADHD: Current Evidence and Practice. *Curr PSYCHIATRY Rep* 2019;21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-019-1021-4>.
- [108] Buchanan DM, D’Angiulli A, Samson A, Maisonneuve AR, Robaey P. Acceptability of transcranial direct current stimulation in children and adolescents with ADHD: The point of view of parents. *J Health Psychol* 2020:1359105320937059. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105320937059>.
- [109] Campanella S, Schroder E, Monnart A, Vanderhasselt M-A, Duprat R, Rabijns M, et al. Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Over the Right Frontal Inferior Cortex Decreases Neural Activity Needed to Achieve Inhibition: A Double-Blind ERP Study in a Male Population: *Clin EEG Neurosci* 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1550059416645977>.
- [110] Campanella S, Schroder E, Vanderhasselt M-A, Baeken C, Kornreich C, Verbanck P, et al. Short-Term Impact of tDCS Over the Right Inferior Frontal Cortex on Impulsive Responses in a Go/No-go Task. *Clin EEG Neurosci* 2018;49:398–406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1550059418777404>.

- [111] Dambacher F, Schuhmann T, Lobbestael J, Arntz A, Brugman S, Sack AT. No Effects of Bilateral tDCS over Inferior Frontal Gyrus on Response Inhibition and Aggression. *PLOS ONE* 2015;10:e0132170. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0132170>.
- [112] Cunillera T, Fuentemilla L, Brignani D, Cucurell D, Miniussi C. A Simultaneous Modulation of Reactive and Proactive Inhibition Processes by Anodal tDCS on the Right Inferior Frontal Cortex. *PLoS ONE* 2014;9:e113537. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0113537>.
- [113] Cunillera T, Brignani D, Cucurell D, Fuentemilla L, Miniussi C. The right inferior frontal cortex in response inhibition: A tDCS–ERP co-registration study. *NeuroImage* 2016;140:66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.11.044>.
- [114] Jacobson L, Javitt DC, Lavidor M. Activation of inhibition: diminishing impulsive behavior by direct current stimulation over the inferior frontal gyrus. *J Cogn Neurosci* 2011;23:3380–7. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00020.
- [115] Jacobson L, Ezra A, Berger U, Lavidor M. Modulating oscillatory brain activity correlates of behavioral inhibition using transcranial direct current stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol Off J Int Fed Clin Neurophysiol* 2012;123:979–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2011.09.016>.
- [116] Stramaccia DF, Penolazzi B, Sartori G, Braga M, Mondini S, Galfano G. Assessing the effects of tDCS over a delayed response inhibition task by targeting the right inferior frontal gyrus and right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. *Exp Brain Res* 2015;233:2283–90. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-015-4297-6>.
- [117] Cai Y, Li S, Liu J, Li D, Feng Z, Wang Q, et al. The Role of the Frontal and Parietal Cortex in Proactive and Reactive Inhibitory Control: A Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Study. *J Cogn Neurosci* 2016;28:177–86. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00888.
- [118] Gómez-Ariza CJ, Martín MC, Morales J. Tempering Proactive Cognitive Control by Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation of the Right (but Not the Left) Lateral Prefrontal Cortex. *Front Neurosci* 2017;11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2017.00282>.
- [119] Hogeveen J, Grafman J, Aboseria M, David A, Bikson M, Hauner KK. Effects of High-Definition and Conventional tDCS on Response Inhibition. *Brain Stimulat* 2016;9:720–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2016.04.015>.
- [120] Sallard E, Mouthon M, De Pretto M, Spierer L. Modulation of inhibitory control by prefrontal anodal tDCS: A crossover double-blind sham-controlled fMRI study. *PLOS ONE* 2018;13:e0194936. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0194936>.
- [121] Zhang R, Geng X, Lee TMC. Large-scale functional neural network correlates of response inhibition: an fMRI meta-analysis. *Brain Struct Funct* 2017;222:3973–90. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-017-1443-x>.

Table 1: Baseline demographic, clinical, and cognitive measures; the number of tDCS and CT sessions; and the time spent playing each CT game in the sham and anodal tDCS groups

	Mean (SD)		Independent Samples t-test	
	Sham tDCS	Anodal tDCS	t(1, 48)	p
Demographics				
<i>N</i>	26	24		
<i>Mean age in years</i>	14.23 (2.06)	13.05 (1.98)	-2.06	0.04
<i>IQ (WASI-II)</i>	105.15 (13.83)	100.08 (13.17)	-1.33	0.19
<i>Years of education</i>	9.81 (2.08)	8.63 (2)	-2.05	0.05
<i>Age of onset of ADHD (years)</i>	4.85 (3.21)	4.42 (2.92)	-0.49	0.62
<i>SCQ</i>	8.31 (7.71)	10.04 (6.23)	0.87	0.39
<i>SDQ (Prosocial)</i>	7.31 (2.15)	6.5 (2.67)	-1.18	0.24
<i>Kiddie-SADS-Present and Lifetime Version (ADHD module)</i>				
<i>Total number of ADHD symptoms</i>	12.04 (2.49)	12.83 (3.24)	0.98	0.33
<i>Inattention symptoms</i>	7.58 (0.86)	7.58 (1.10)	0.02	0.98
<i>Hyperactivity/impulsivity symptoms</i>	4.39 (2.40)	5.25 (2.52)	1.24	0.22
<i>Oppositional defiant disorder symptoms</i>	7 (27%)	13 (54%)	2.40	0.02
Clinical Measures				
ADHD-RS				
<i>ADHD-RS Total Score</i>	37.08 (7.14)	41.71 (8.13)	2.14	0.04
<i>ADHD-RS Inattention</i>	21.39 (4.61)	23.21 (3.68)	1.54	0.13
<i>ADHD-RS Hyperactivity/Impulsivity</i>	15.69 (4.77)	18.50 (5.97)	1.84	0.07
Conners 3-P (T-Score)				
<i>ADHD Index</i>	14.35 (3.89)	16.25 (3.99)	1.71	0.09
<i>Global index</i>	83.42 (7.75)	84.71 (7.43)	0.60	0.55
<i>DSM-5 inattention</i>	82.46 (8.32)	85.00 (7.16)	1.52	0.26
<i>DSM-5 hyperactivity/ impulsivity</i>	83.50 (9.84)	85.88 (7.95)	0.93	0.36
ARI – raw scores				
<i>Parent-rated</i>	0.83 (0.51)	0.92 (0.58)	0.63	0.53
<i>Child-rated</i>	0.64 (0.48)	0.81 (0.51)	1.26	0.21
MEWS	16.27 (8.30)	18.71 (7.52)	1.09	0.28

WREMB-R Total Score	20.81 (5.53)	23.58 (5.59)	1.76	0.08
CIS	21.81 (7.85)	24.67 (9.31)	1.18	0.25
Side effects	13.69 (5.90)	18.96 (12.19)	1.96	0.06
Cognitive Measures				
Primary outcomes				
Go/No-Go task	49.80 (19.46)	46.20 (23.72)	-.59	.59
<i>Probability of Inhibition (%)</i>				
Continuous Performance task				
<i>Omissions (%)</i>	13.59 (14.70)	15.69 (13.75)	.52	.60
<i>Commissions (%)</i>	1.90 (3.2)	2.67 (2.78)	.92	.37
Secondary outcomes				
Simon task	63.39 (30.38)	80.17 (45.30)	1.55	.13
<i>Simon RT Effect</i>				
Time Discrimination task				
<i>Total Correct (%)</i>	76.80 (15.78)	68.54 (12.85)	-2.02	.05
Macworth Clock task				
<i>Omissions (%)</i>	34.42 (18.47)	49.27 (18.03)	2.87	.006
<i>Commissions (%)</i>	3.94 (6.4)	8.61 (9.04)	2.12	.04
Wisconsin Card Sorting Task				
<i>Perseverative Errors</i>	14.89 (4.60)	14.08 (4.84)	-.60	.551
<i>Non-Preservative Errors</i>	9.31 (4.2)	7.67 (3.74)	-.57	.57
List sort working memory task				
<i>Total Score</i>	31.08 (11.60)	19.92 (13.45)	-3.15	.003
Verbal fluency task				
<i>Letter (% Correct)</i>	93.42 (7.26)	91.31 (8.47)	-.95	.35
<i>Semantic (% Correct)</i>	94.91 (6.98)	95.25 (4.99)	.19	.85
Speed of Processing				
<i>Mean Reaction Times</i>	368.64 (34.95)	381.79 (48.12)	1.11	.27
Response Variability				
<i>Intrasubject Coefficient of Variation</i>	.27 (07)	.31 (.07)	1.95	.06
Prematurity				

<i>Premature Responses</i>	24.244 (46.64)	24.36 (25.37)	.01	.99
Cognitive Training				
<i>No. of completed tDCS & CT sessions*</i>	14.85 (0.78)	15.00 (0.00)	0.96	0.34
<i>Total game play (mins)</i>	265.96 (15.55)	269.17 (5.84)	1.18	0.24
<i>Grub Ahoy</i>	24.62 (10.76)	24.79 (11.74)	.06	.96
<i>Magic Lens</i>	58.46 (13.17)	55.63 (15.90)	.69	.49
<i>Monkey Trouble</i>	26.04 (11.22)	27.5 (14.78)	.39	.70
<i>Peter's Printer Panic</i>	92.69 (101.88)	101.88 (12.14)	2.29	.03
<i>Treasure Trunk</i>	62.69 (19.25)	60.83 (18.92)	.34	.73

ADHD-RS, Caregiver-rated ADHD Rating Scale; ARI, Affective Reactivity Index; CIS, Columbia Impairment Scale-Parent; MEWS, Mind Excessively Wandering Scale; SD, Standard Deviation; SCQ, Social Communication Questionnaire; SDQ, Social Difficulties Questionnaire; WASI-II, Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence; WREMB-R, Weekly Parent Ratings of Evening and Morning Behaviour-Revised

*One participant could not attend three stimulation sessions due to extreme weather conditions

Table 2. Medication status in the sham and anodal tDCS groups

ADHD Medication Status	N (%)		Pearson Chi Square	
	Sham tDCS (n = 26)	Anodal tDCS (n = 24)	χ^2 (3)	p
<i>Medication-naïve</i>	8 (31%)	10 (42%)	6.28	0.10
<i>On medication</i>	3 (27%)	8 (33%)		
<i>On-medication except for assessments</i>	10 (39%)	4 (17%)		
<i>Off medication</i>	5 (19%)	2 (8%)		
ADHD Medication Type			χ^2 (5)	p
<i>Atomoxetine</i>	0	1 (4%)	7.54	.18
<i>Dexamfetamine</i>	0	1 (4%)		
<i>Guanfacine</i>	0	2 (8%)		
<i>Lisdexamfetamine</i>	2 (8%)	0		
<i>Methylphenidate</i>	16 (62%)	10 (42%)		
<i>Medication-naïve</i>	8 (31%)	10 (42%)		

Table 3. Summary of adjusted average performance on primary cognitive and clinical outcome measures after sham and anodal tDCS combined with CT. Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted p-values given parentheses.

Primary Outcomes	Posttreatment		Follow-up		ANCOVA					
	Sham tDCS	Anodal tDCS	Sham tDCS	Anodal tDCS	Time		Group		Time by Group	
	<i>Adjusted Mean (SD)*</i>				<i>F (1,44)</i>	<i>p†</i>	<i>F (1,44)</i>	<i>p†</i>	<i>F (1,44)</i>	<i>p†</i>
Cognitive	<i>N=26</i>	<i>N=24</i>	<i>N=26</i>	<i>N=24</i>						
Go/No-Go task										
<i>PI (%)</i>	54.18 (14.18)	55.48 (14.23)	56.95 (16.96)	58.41 (17.02)	.01	.93 (.93)	.12	.73 (.73)	.001	.97 (.97)
Continuous Performance task										
<i>Omission (%)</i>	9.88 (8.44)	14.36 (8.48)	8.31 (8.22)	11.70 (8.25)	.32	.58 (1.00)	3.87	.06 (.09)	□.15	.71 (1.00)
<i>Commission (%)</i>	1.04 (1.65)	2.16 (1.66)	0.97 (1.14)	1.26 (1.14)	.08	.79 (1.00)	4.96	.03 (.09)	2.67	.14 (.42)
Clinical										
ADHD-RS‡										
<i>Total Score</i>	25.55 (8.91)	32.48 (8.96)	31.58 (9.51)	27.91 (9.54)	1.28	.26	.57	.46	10.58	.002
<i>Inattention</i>	14.61 (5.04)	18.01 (5.05)	16.87 (5.35)	16.10 (5.34)	.04	.84	1.41	.24	4.02	.051
<i>Hyperactivity/Impulsivity</i>	11.30 (4.95)	14.10 (4.95)	14.62 (5.00)	11.91 (5.00)	.01	.91	.001	.97	13.08	.001

ADHD-RS, ADHD Rating Scale; PI, Probability of Inhibition; SD, Standard Deviation

*Adjusted values as predicted by the repeated-measures ANCOVA testing group differences at posttreatment and follow-up, adjusting for baseline, age at entry and medication status (naïve, off-medication, on-medication).

†Benjamini-Hochberg adjustment was applied to p-values for time, group, and time by group interaction effect separately and was applied separately to primary cognitive, secondary cognitive, and secondary clinical outcome measures separately.

‡Benjamini-Hochberg adjustment was not applied to these measures

Table 4. Summary of adjusted average performance on secondary cognitive and clinical outcome measures after sham and anodal tDCS combined with CT. Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted p-values given parentheses.

Secondary Outcomes	Posttreatment		Follow-up		ANCOVA					
	Sham tDCS	Anodal tDCS	Sham tDCS	Anodal tDCS	Time		Group		Time by Group	
	<i>Adjusted Mean (SD)*</i>				<i>F (1,44)</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F (1,44)</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F (1,44)</i>	<i>p</i>
Cognitive	<i>N=26</i>	<i>N=24</i>	<i>N=26</i>	<i>N=24</i>						
Simon task										
Simon RT Effect	45.78 (32.03)	59.91 (32.15)	49.92 (25.54)	58.86 (25.64)	.11	.74 (.89)	2.52	.12 (.36)	.32	.58 (1.00)
Time Discrimination task										
Total Correct (%)	73.05 (12.31)	65.38 (16.17)	78.34 (11.78)	70.93 (15.47)	2.21	.14 (.84)	2.48	.11 (.45)	.003	.96 (1.00)
Macworth Clock task										
Commissions (%)	4.50 (4.57)	4.91 (4.60)	5.09 (8.09)	4.80 (8.12)	2.42	.13 (1.00)	.001	.93 (.93)	.25	.62 (.93)
Omissions (%)	34.26 (15.17)	38.82 (15.25)	27.24 (11.78)	34.14 (11.85)	1.79	.19 (.46)	2.89	.10 (.60)	.26	.61 (1.00)
Wisconsin Card Sorting Task (errors)										
Non Perseverative	7.11 (4.89)	8.9 (4.89)	7.11 (3.57)	7.59 (3.72)	1.83	.18 (.54)	1.21	.28 (.48)	.88	.35 (1.00)
Preservative	12.20 (4.64)	13.53 (4.65)	13.39 (5.87)	13.32 (5.89)	.503	.48 (.82)	.27	.61 (.73)	.51	.48 (1.00)
List sort working memory task										
Total Score	27.57 (14.20)	28.35 (14.65)	31.27 (16.65)	31.79 (17.18)	.14	.71 (.95)	.03	.86 (.94)	.002	.97 (.97)
Verbal Fluency task										
Letter % Corr	96.92 (3.97)	94.28 (3.98)	97.13 (4.08)	96.93 (4.09)	.27	.60 (.90)	2.47	.12 (.29)	2.52	.12 (.72)
Semantic % Corr	96.24 (3.69)	97.08 (3.70)	98.08 (5.32)	94.89 (5.33)	.12	.74 (.81)	1.22	.28 (.56)	5.89	.02 (.24)
Speed of Processing										
MRT	382.86 (31.02)	393.21 (31.12)	361.39 (31.32)	367.46 (31.42)	1.97	.17 (.68)	1.16	.29 (.43)	.17	.68 (.91)
Response Variability										
ICV	.27 (.00)	.28 (.00)	.25 (.00)	.26 (.00)	1.09	.30 (.60)	.78	.38 (.51)	.06	.81 (.97)
Prematurity										
Premature Resp.	13.55 (4.10)	24.99 (4.28)	7.78 (1.85)	8.39 (1.93)	.10	.75 (.75)	3.32	.08 (.96)	2.46	.12 (.48)
Clinical										
Conners 3-P	8.01 (4.41)	12.53 (4.42)	11.72(4.94)	11.22 (4.95)	.001	.97 (.97)	2.88	.10 (.30)	13.73	.001 (.004)

ADHD Index**ARI**

<i>Parent</i>	0.72 (.47)	0.79 (.44)	0.67 (.45)	0.49 (.42)	.27	.61 (.81)	2.77	.10 (.20)	2.89	.20 (.10)
<i>Child</i>	0.56 (.29)	0.55 (.5)	0.61 (.40)	0.60 (.4)	.702	.41 (.82)	.02	.89 (.89)	.001	.99 (.99)
MEWS	16.16 (6.22)	16.04 (6.23)	18.08 (6.92)	14.87 (6.94)	5.01	.03 (.12)	1.08	.31 (.37)	2.18	.20 (.15)
WREMB-R	15.21 (6.09)	18.28 (6.10)	n/t	n/t	n/a	n/a	2.96	.09 (.54)	n/a	n/a
CIS	16.75 (8.55)	19.82 (8.56)	n/t	n/t	n/a	n/a	1.52	.22 (.33)	n/a	n/a

Safety‡

<i>Side Effects</i>	11.92 (7.02)	14.59 (7.03)	n/t	n/t	n/a	n/a	1.68	.20	n/a	n/a
<i>Adverse Effects</i>	15.04 (2.20)	16.33 (2.20)	n/t	n/t	n/a	n/a	4.09	.05	n/a	n/a

ARI, Affective Reactivity Index; CIS, Columbia Impairment Scale-Parent; Corr, Correct; ICV, intrasubject coefficient of variance; MEWS, Mind Excessively Wandering Scale; MRT, Mean Reaction Times; Resp, responses; SD, Standard Deviation; WREMB-R, Weekly Parent Ratings of Evening and Morning Behaviour-Revised

*Adjusted values as predicted by the repeated-measures ANCOVA testing group differences at posttreatment and follow-up, adjusting for baseline, age at entry and medication status (naïve, off-medication, on-medication).

†Benjamini-Hochberg adjustment was applied to p-values for time, group, and time by group interaction effects separately and was applied separately to primary cognitive, secondary cognitive, and secondary clinical outcome measures separately.

‡Benjamini-Hochberg adjustment was not applied to these measures




Figure 1. CONSORT flow diagram [56] of this RCT from enrolment, intervention allocation, follow-up, and analysis




Figure 2: Schematic overview of the study design. ADHD-RS, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder-Rating Scale; ARI, Affective Reactivity Index; CIS, Columbia Impairment Scale; Conners 3-P, Conners' 3rd Edition Parent Rating; Cognitive battery, Maudsley Attention and Response Suppression task battery, vigilance, Wisconsin card sorting task, visual-spatial working memory, verbal fluency; K-SADS-PL, Kiddie-SADS-Present and Lifetime Version; MEWS, Mind Excessively Wandering Scale; SCQ, Social Communication Questionnaire (Lifetime), SDQ, Social Difficulties Questionnaire (prosocial scale only); WASI-II, Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence, 2nd Edition; WREMB-R, Weekly Rating of Evening and Morning Behavior-Revised.




Figure 3. Raw averages for a) GNG Probability of Inhibition (%) and b) CPT Omissions at baseline, posttreatment, and follow-up for sham and anodal tDCS groups (error bars: standard error).




Figure 4. Raw average ADHD-RS Total Scores at baseline, posttreatment, and follow-up for sham tDCS and anodal tDCS groups (error bars: standard error).