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**I. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE**

**Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD)**

Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a neurobiological disorder associated with high levels of impairment in adulthood [1-4], and is estimated to affect up to 5% of adults worldwide [5-7].

While stimulants remain the mainstay of treatment for the treatment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), 40% of patients do not respond or cannot tolerate these treatments, they are abuseable, and many more do not wish to be treated with controlled substances [8]. Although non-stimulant medicines have been developed, their efficacy is modest and they also have a wide range of tolerability problems [9]. There is thus significant clinical interest in the search for a novel alternative, safe and effective treatments for ADHD

One of the well-documented sources of morbidity and disability in subjects with ADHD is deficits in a group of high order executive functions [10-12]. Executive functions refer to key cognitive domains allowing planned, controlled, and successful behavior, such as planning, initiating, monitoring, changing, and inhibiting thoughts, feelings, and physical activity. These executive functions are essential for successful adaptation in occupational and social realms. Neuropsychological conceptualizations of ADHD view it as a signature disorder of executive function, and implicate the prefrontal-subcortical circuitry that underlies these functions. Studies of ADHD identify deficits both in high order cognition (directed attention and other executive functions allowing planned behavior) as well as in response to rewards (such as ability to delay gratification) [13-14].

While current treatments for ADHD are effective for attention, hyperactivity and impulsivity, they have limited utility for support of other important dysregulated aspects of executive function, such as poor planning and other organizational behaviors that are common in ADHD. Behavioral measures demonstrate a high burden of executive function deficits (EFD) in individuals with ADHD affecting organizational function planning, prioritization, working memory, and decision-making. In a study of 200 adults with ADHD by the MGH Adult ADHD Research Program, for example, 50% met a behavioral definition of executive function impairment developed from Barkley’s Current Behavior Scale (CBS) [15]. The Program also examined the effects of OROS-methylphenidate (OROS-MPH, Concerta®) on EFDs in a large six-week double blind study identifying EFDs. Participants continued to have an abnormal burden of EFDs s measured by the BRIEF-A in working memory, planning and organization, and task monitoring, despite improvement in ADHD symptoms [16].

A neurocognitive intervention specifically designed to enhance executive function and inhibitory control over impulsive risk-taking in ADHD individuals will facilitate more conservative behavior involving less risk-taking.

**Neuromodulation: an overview of transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS)**

Noninvasive brain stimulation encompasses a group of clinical and research tools which enable physicians and researchers to modulate brain and behavior safely and reversibly with minimal risks. The two most common methods employed are transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) and transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS).

In tDCS, electrodes are applied on the scalp to transmit direct current at low current amplitudes [10]. At the synaptic level, the current causes changes in the transmembrane potential thus affecting the probability of synaptic firing [11]. At a neurotransmitter level, the current affects the balance between excitation and inhibition through GABA and glutamate concentrations. tDCS has already been applied to healthy subjects, and patients with parkinson’s disease, chronic pain, stroke, major depressive disorder and psychosis in an attempt to modulate brain activity. A review of a total of 567 patients and controls undergoing tDCS according to the recommended parameters revealed that mild tingling at the site of stimulation was the most common side effect, with less likely occurrences of headache (11.8%) and nausea (2.9%) post-stimulation [12]. The effects of a single session of tDCS are transient and reversible, with cognitive or behavioral changes lasting between 30 and 90 minutes.

**Neuromodulation of executive dysfunction and impulsivity in health and disease:**

Executive functioning is an umbrella term encompassing the tasks of working memory, planning, execution, and inhibitory control. The use of tDCS in trying to enhance memory, learning, and executive functions in both healthy individuals and patients has dramatically increased. Studies have already shown improvement in explicit and implicit memory as well as attention with tDCS [13].

Jeon et al. [12] performed tDCS for 20 minutes at 1 mA on 32 healthy controls, and tested them before and after the intervention. The groups were divided into right prefrontal, left prefrontal, and a sham group. With left-sided stimulation, improvements were noted in the stroop test, backward digit span, and Boston naming. While with right-sided stimulation, stroop and visuospatial memory improvements were seen. Similar experiments performed by Fregni et al. [13], and Dockery et al. [14] showed improvement in performance on the 3 letter back test (a test of working memory), and the Tower of London test respectively with left dorsolateral prefrontal stimulation while studies focusing on improving inhibitory control have shown the efficacy of the right inferior frontal gyrus during stimulation when healthy subjects are engaged in the stop signal task [19,20].

In addition to encouraging results in healthy subjects, a number of studies have attempted to enhance cognition in different clinical populations. TMS has already been applied to patients with Alzheimer’s disease, Parkinson’s disease and dementia, fronto-temporal dementia, stroke, autism, schizophrenia, and depression [21]. There is also emerging data on tDCS: working memory using the n-back test was shown to improve in depressed individuals after the use of tDCS [22]. There is evidence of improvement in word recognition in dementia, visual recognition memory in Alzheimer’s disease [23,24] and working memory in Parkinson’s disease (25). However, A single tDCS trial in 10 patients with advanced FTD did not show any benefit in verbal fluency [26].

Studies suggest that tDCS targeting the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) modulates domains of executive neuropsychological function that are implicated in ADHD. These include aspects of attention, working memory, and inhibitory control [11]. Participants demonstrated greater vigilance during a simulated air-traffic control task during tDCS than under a sham condition [27]. Two studies of anodal stimulation of left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex suggest utility of tDCS for modulation of executive control of attention [28]. found greater response accuracy during a go / no-go task in patients with post-stroke cognitive decline, but not healthy control subjects [29]. found that healthy control subjects had greater reaction time on a Sternberg task when the incorrect choice presented was a distractor stimulus – allowing them to conclude that an effect on selective attention was responsible for working memory effects of tDCS.

Many cognitive neuroscience studies also demonstrate a causal link between the DLPFC and decision-making behaviors and reveal the capability of noninvasive brain stimulation techniques to influence decision-making processes. For example, anodal stimulation over the right DLPFC coupled with cathodal over the left DLPFC was associated with safer choices as measured by the Risk Task [30]. Conversely, participants receiving anodal stimulation over the left DLPFC coupled with cathodal over the right DLPFC did not differ in their choice related to risk-taking behaviors from those receiving sham stimulation. Butusing a more complex experimental paradigm involving calculation of level of risk and balance of reward during the Risk Task, [31] found increased risk taking in subjects who received 1 Hz rTMS over the right DLPFC.

**II. SPECIFIC AIMS**

We propose a crossover placebo-controlled study using two 30 min sessions of real (one session to left DLPFC and one session to right DLPFC) vs. one 30m min session of sham transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) with the goal of transiently modulating executive function and inhibitory control in participants with ADHD. Deficits in these cognitive functions are core to ADHD, and cause significant impairment and morbidity. The study will also include a cohort of healthy controls for comparison. We will create 2 groups of tasks which probe the 2 primary aspects of executive function: attention/working memory and inhibition/decision-making. We will test half of the recruited ADHD participants with the attention/working memory tasks and the other half with the inhibition/decision-making tasks. Likewise, these 2 cognitive domains will be tested independently in healthy controls as above.

Participants will be randomized to start with either sham or active stimulation. Cognitive testing will occur before and after a 30 min session of tDCS. During their second and third visits, participants will undergo the same protocol and receive the remaining tDCS conditions (anodal right DLPFC, anodal left DLPFC or sham) that were not done during the first visit in randomized order.

Hypothesis 1: At baseline, participants with ADHD will exhibit impaired performance on executive function task relative to healthy controls.

Hypothesis 2: Participants will show improvement in performance on neuropsychological tests of executive function following the active but not sham tDCS stimulation.

Hypothesis 3: Participants will show improvement in performance on neuropsychological tests of inhibitory control and impulsivity following the active but not sham tDCS stimulation.

**III. SUBJECT SELECTION**

The subjects will consist of healthy individuals or individuals diagnosed with ADHD. Healthy subjects will be recruited using: 1) flyers distributed to the college campuses in the greater Boston area and MGH nonpatient areas; 2) an announcement of the study distributed through the Partners Public Affairs distribution list; and 3) an announcement placed in the Martinos Center Website. ADHD participants will be recruited from the Adult ADHD Research Program, the Neuropsychiatry clinic and the Division of Behavioral Neurology at Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH). We will also accept referrals from other Boston area hospitals and clinics. A total of 120 male and female subjects will be recruited for the study, 60 ADHD individuals and 60 healthy controls. Some ADHD participants will be referred to the study after participating in the Screening Protocol in place at the Adult ADHD Research Program at MGH. This Screening Protocol includes assessment of a neuropsychological battery and structured diagnostic interview of the subject.

Inclusion Criteria

1. Male and female subjects 18-66 years of age
2. Healthy volunteers or volunteers with a diagnosis of ADHD in adulthood, meeting the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5) [American Psychiatric Association, 2013] criteria, including at least 5 moderate inattentive or impulsive-hyperactive symptoms, and onset of two symptoms of inattentive or of impulsive/hyperactive traits by the age of 12.
3. Patient will be either off stimulant medications or, if undergoing treatment with stimulants, will be asked to discontinue two days prior to the experiment, under physician-guided protocol, and allowed to resume afterwards. Subjects may resume stimulant use between the two study visits so long as they discontinue use two days prior to the second study visit. If fatigue is problematic in subjects discontinuing medication, they will be allowed to continue with the study if they are able to follow the suggested taper plan (50% of the dose day one, 25% dose day 2, stop day of visit (day 3)).
4. English-speaking

Exclusion Criteria

1. Current or past history of clinically unstable psychiatric conditions such as suicidal or homicidal behavior or psychotic disorders.
2. Pregnant or nursing females.
3. Inability to participate in testing procedures
4. Contraindication to tDCS: history or epilepsy, metallic implants in the head and neck, brain stimulators, vagus nerve stimulators, VP shunt, pacemakers, pregnancy.
5. Additional exclusion criteria for healthy controls:

a. Diagnosis of psychiatric of neurological disorder

b. Ongoing treatment with any psychotropic medications.

**IV. SUBJECT ENROLLMENT**

Study participants will be recruited from the Adult ADHD Research Program, the Neuropsychiatry clinic and the Division of Behavioral Neurology at Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH). We will also accept referrals from other Boston area hospitals and clinics. Flyers will also be posted in Boston area hospitals. A phone screening may be performed to efficiently confirm likelihood that subjects will meet inclusion and exclusion criteria prior to committing time for further evaluation of eligibility. A patient seen for an initial visit who meets entry criteria for the study will be asked by the evaluating clinic staff whether (s)he would be interested in participating in the study. If the subject cannot rule out the possibility of pregnancy, they will be given a pregnancy test prior to enrollment in the study. It will be made clear to all participants in this study has no bearing on their treatment. Discussions will take place in the clinic, in the investigators’ office or over the telephone, after the patient’s clinic visit, or during a research testing visit (for another study). Some subjects will be referred following participation in the MGH ADHD Research Program general screening protocol entitled “A Screening Protocol for Adults with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder” (Protocol 2002-P-002856). After participating in this screening protocol, subjects are assigned to specific studies based on eligibility requirements (i.e. age, prior medication efficacy or tolerability).

Healthy subjects will be recruited using: 1) flyers distributed to the college campuses in the greater Boston area and MGH nonpatient areas; 2) an announcement of the study distributed through the Partners Public Affairs distribution list; and 3) an announcement placed in the Martinos Center Website. The purposes, procedures, and risks of the study, and the subject's right to withdraw from a test at any time will be explained verbally and in a consent form to be read by the patient.

Informed consent will be obtained prior to the performance of any protocol procedures by the PI, co-investigators or specifically trained study staff. The informed consent document will be used to explain in simple terms the risks and benefits of study participation to the subject. The nature of the study will be fully explained to the subject by co-investigators or specially trained research coordinators. The subject will be encouraged to ask questions pertaining to their participation in the study and the subject may take as much time as they feel necessary to consider his/her participation in the study as well as consult with family members or their physicians. Participation in this study is voluntary and the subjects may withdraw from the study at any time. The IRB-approved informed consent documents will be signed and dated by the subject and the person obtaining consent.

**V. STUDY PROCEDURES**

To accomplish our specified aims, we propose to recruit 60participants with ADHD. Within each group of 60 subjects, 30 will be presented with the attention/working memory tasks and the other 30 with the impulsivity/decision-making tasks. Each subject will undergo 3 experimental sessions (corresponding to 3 tDCS conditions) but will always be tested on the same group of tasks for each experimental session. That said, taking part in the attention/working memory tasks does not exclude participants from also taking part in the inhibition/decision-making tasks (and vice-versa), but will require signing a new consent form to participate in the study again by completing the other group of tasks.

After providing study information and obtaining IRB approved informed consent, participants will undergo a psychiatric assessment sufficient to determine eligibility for inclusion and exclusion criteria. The following scales will be utilized during the initial evaluation:

Clinician rated scales

* DSM-IV based Adult ADHD Investigator Symptom Rating Scale (AISRS). Each of the individual symptoms of ADHD is rated 0 to 3 on a scale of severity.

Subject rated scales

* The Adult Self-Report Form (ASR) to measure a wide range of psychiatric syndromes (i.e., depressive problems, anxiety problems, antisocial personality problems) in adults. The ASR provides dimensional scale scores for each syndrome that are age- and gender-normed.
* The 18-item ADHD Rating Scale to evaluate frequency of ADHD symptoms on a scale of 0 to 4.
* The 86-item Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function – Adult Form (BRIEF-A) to assess levels of executive function deficits.
* Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (Version 11; “BIS-11”) to assess cognitive and motor impulsivity.
* Quick Inventory of Depressive Symptoms - Self-Rated (QIDS-SR) to assess mood.
* Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) to assess mood.

Computer based cognitive tasks

The following computer-based cognitive tasks will be used as outcomes to measure executive function. Subjects will be presented with either the attention/working memory tasks or the inhibition/decision making tasks:

Attention/Working Memory Tasks

1. *N-back task*: The n-back task engages working memory, a cognitive construct that falls under executive function. Deficits in working memory are observed across psychiatric diagnoses. In the n-back task, subjects are presented with a series of stimuli, such as words or numbers. The subjects are prompted to indicate whether the currently presented stimuli is the same as the stimuli presented n-stimuli previously. For instance, a 2-back task would ask the subjects to indicate whether the current stimuli was identical to that presented two previously. Outcome measures of interest include reaction time and accuracy.
2. *Flanker task:* The flanker task is a measure of attention and inhibitory control. In the task, subjects must attend and respond to a certain stimulus that is surrounded (“flanked”) by distracting stimuli. The stimuli are most commonly arrows. The flanking arrows can either have the same or opposing orientation as the central stimulus. Outcome measures of interest include accuracy and reaction time.
3. *Multi-Source Interference with International Affective Picture System:* The MSIT-IAPS task is a measure of cognitive control during emotion regulation. Subjects must identify the number in a three digit number that is different. These three digit numbers are overlaid on IAPS pictures which are neutral, negative, and positive in valence. Outcome measures of interest include reaction time and accuracy.

Inhibition/Decision Making Tasks

1. *Delayed Discounting:* Delay discounting, one element that underlies decision-making, can be defined as the depreciation of the value of a reward related to the time that it takes to be released. High rates of delay discounting are found in subjects who are willing to forgo greater rewards available only after some length of time and who show a preference for smaller rewards that are available immediately. Widely used as a measure of impulsiveness — a facet of executive control — delay discounting can be evaluated using experimental tasks. Measures of interest include percentage of immediate choices and reaction time.
2. *Stop Signal Task:* This task measures the ability to inhibit a response. The participant has to identify the direction in which an arrow points. If an audio tone is heard, the participant has to withhold a response. Outcome measures of interest include accuracy and number of successfully inhibited responses.
3. *Cambridge Gambling Task (CBT)*: In the computerized task, subjects are presented with ten boxes that are either red or blue. The ratio of each color changes across trials. The subjects are told that they must guess which color of boxes is hiding a coin. Subjects gain points if they select the color hiding the coin, while they will lose a certain number of points if they select the incorrect color. For each gamble, subjects risk a certain number of points from an initial endowment. The amount they can gamble is presented sequentially in either an ascending or descending fashion. Measures of interest include impulsive decision-making (originating from differences in bets in the ascending and descending conditions), quality of decision-making (how frequently highest probability color selected), overall risk taking, and response time.

**Randomization and tDCS**

A total of 120 subjects will be randomized to either sham or active stimulation (to either the left DLPFC or right DLPFC) for session 1 and have the remaining interventions in randomized order for sessions 2 and 3. Subjects will be presented with either the attention/working memory tasks or the inhibition/decision making tasks before and after sham/active stimulation. The average testing time is expected to be 20-40 minutes both pre and post tDCS. Testing will take place at the MGH Laboratory for Neuropsychiatry and Neuromodulation in the Charlestown Navy Yard Campus, or the Adult ADHD Research Program in the main MGH campus.

For tDCS stimulation, anodal stimulation of the left and right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex will each be performed for thirty minutes at 2mA**.** The cathode will be placed in the contralateral supraorbital region. The current will be applied by a battery-driven tDCS stimulator connected to specifically designed tDCS electrodes, which are applied to pre-determined targets on the head surface using electrophysiological conductive gel or saline solution for improved contact and impedance. The anodal electrode will be placed on the scalp at the F4 (for right DLPFC) or F3 (for left DLPFC) position according to the international 10-20 EEG coordinate system. For the sham condition, the electrodes will be placed at the same positions but the current will be applied only for a 15 second ramp up phase at the beginning and end of the 30 minute sham-stimulation period, to simulate the potential experience of local tingling sensation that real stimulation produces but without sustained effect on cortical activity. This sham protocol is standard, validated and programmed in our system. Stimulation willalso be administered with simultaneous electroencephalography (EEG) in order to record neurophysiological correlates of the executive function modulation.

tDCS will be administered by trained technicians, under the supervision of Dr. Camprodon. These selected technicians have followed an internal training and certification process under the supervision of the chief of the MGH TMS clinical service, Dr. Camprodon, who is the PI of this study. These procedures have been approved by the department’s quality and safety committee. The training involves not only theoretical principles and practical hands on use of these forms of noninvasive neuromodulation, but a thorough understanding of possible risks, how to identify them and how to activate the laboratory and/or clinic’s safety plan in case they occur. After this training, technicians and clinicians alike need to take an exam and have a period of observation until they can demonstrate proficiency in the use of TMS and tDCS. Experiments in the Laboratory for Neuropsychiatry and Neuromodulation follow the same high standards and criteria used in the MGH TMS clinical service, which is part of the same clinical and research program directed by Dr. Camprodon. These noninvasive neuromodulation modalities are considered low risk and it is standard in clinics and laboratories nation-wide that well-trained non-MDs apply the stimulation, just like MRI technicians run the MRI scans and radiologists are not present during the procedure.

We will test participants in the absence of stimulant medication (amphetamines or methylphenidate derivatives) for ADHD. In order to accomplish this, we will enroll participants who are not taking stimulants, or ask participants in treatment with stimulants to stop 2 days prior to the scheduled exam. We will inform participants regarding the potential risks of stopping their ADHD medication, if this would be necessary for study participation. Risks include increased fatigue or somnolence and transient worsening of ADHD symptoms. We will minimize the duration of their cessation of treatment, which would typically be 2-5 days (depending on the need for taper) to allow participation. We will inform them that their ADHD symptoms are likely to return, and that they can minimize any fatigue associated with stopping the medicine by tapering the dose.  Because it is common for many individuals with ADHD to take time off of medication for a variety of reasons, we believe the requirement of brief cessation will not add significant burden. For example, many participants routinely do not take this medication on weekends, or take physician-supervised “medication vacations” periodically, during which medications are stopped to assess the continued need for treatment. Furthermore, we will not include participants that we can predict would incur a significant burden from participation.

Participants will be informed they can discontinue the procedure at any time for any reason.

**VI. BIOSTATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

For the flanker task, n-back task, and MSIT-IAPS task, we will analyze both accuracy and response time. For the CGT, we will analyze impulsive decision-making, risk taking, quality of decision-making, and deliberation time. For the delay-discounting task, we will analyze percentage of more immediate choices, as well as reaction time. For the stop-signal task, we will analyze the accuracy and the number of successfully inhibited responses. Questionnaires administered at the beginning of the first study visit will be clinical measures that are included as regressors in our models.

A paired t-test comparison will be performed on these outcomes, comparing the change before/after real vs. sham tDCS. We will also use a paired t-test to compare the post-stimulation outcomes for real vs sham tDCS. A significance level of p<.05 will be used.

Due to the lack of prior data on tDCS in ADHD, an accurate sample size calculation cannot be performed. Based on similar studies in other patient populations or healthy controls, we estimate we may need 25 subjects. Based on prior studies, we anticipate that up to 20% of subjects might start but not complete the study. Therefore, we expect we may need to recruit 30 participants per group for each block of tasks resulting in 60 participants total, plus the 30 healthy controls.

**VII. RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS**

**Risks Associated with Transcranial Direct Current Stimlation (tDCS):**

tDCS is an investigational device that does not pose a significant risk to participants. The safety of this technique has been studied and summarized by different research groups around the world, especially in recent years [13, 35-39]. At the present time, there are more than 200 published studies using tDCS that involved several thousands of subjects, both controls and patients [13].

In a comprehensive review of studies published from 1998 to 2008, it was concluded: “Extensive animal and human evidence and theoretical knowledge indicate that the currently used tDCS protocols are safe” [35]. Accordingly, we will strictly follow standard methodology for tDCS application and stimulation parameters that have been used in previous research studies. We will also exclude participants with unstable medical conditions, or any illness that may increase the risk of stimulation, for example epilepsy. Furthermore, subjects should have no metallic implants. All these elements will be considered in this study and are included in the informed consent. tDCS appears to be less hazardous than other forms of brain stimulation, even other noninvasive modalities such as transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS). The protocol to be used will apply stimulation levels that fall within safety standards established by studies investigating neural tissue damage, as well as numerous studies applying tDCS to human participants. Human studies that reported safety outcomes have included patient populations and stimulation schemes of up to 6 weeks of daily stimulation [34]. No major adverse effects were reported using these parameters. Most importantly, the subjects will only be receiving two short-lived stimulation sessions during the study, which will lead to transient after-effects lasting 30-90 minutes.

**Side Effects**

The most common side effects associated with tDCS according to the most recent data available [12, 13, 35, 40] are:

1. Sensations reported by subjects under the electrode (these sensations can sometimes, though rarely, continue throughout the stimulation time and for a brief period following completion of the tDCS but usually resolve shortly after the initiation of tDCS): mild tingling, light itching, slight burning, discomfort or mild pain.
2. Effects reported that occur only during tDCS: visual sensation during switching on and off the stimulation. Other effects that can occur both during and after tDCS include: moderate fatigue, skin redness, headache and difficulties in concentration.

Rare side effects:

* Nausea
* Nervousness
* Shock-like sensation at the initiation of tDCS

Changes in the activity of the prefrontal region have the potential to induce acute changes in mood. Hypomania has been reported in a few patients receiving tDCS for bipolar disorder [41, 42] and depression [43] but not, to our knowledge, in patients not suffering from mood disorders. To minimize risk of exacerbating a comorbid mental health condition individuals with moderate to severe symptoms of a poorly controlled comorbid condition will be excluded.

It is important to note that many of the side effects listed above have been also reported in association with sham tDCS, even with similar rates [12, 40].

Although there are no reports suggesting increased risk for tDCS during pregnancy, pregnant women are excluded from this study due to insufficient knowledge of the effects of brain stimulationon the fetus.

**Risk from Cognitive testing**

Performing a test such as this, as with any cognitive testing, can result in frustration related to difficulty with performance, or boredom during longer sittings. Participants may refuse to answer questions that make them uncomfortable.

**Risk from brief medication discontinuation**

We will inform participants regarding the potential risks of stopping their ADHD medication, if this would be necessary for study participation. We will minimize the duration of their cessation of treatment, which would typically be less than one week to allow participation. We will inform them that their ADHD symptoms are likely to return, and that they can minimize any fatigue associated with stopping the medicine by tapering the dose.  Because it is common for many individuals with ADHD to take time off of medication for a variety of reasons, we believe the requirement of brief cessation will not add significant burden.  Furthermore, we will not include participants that we can predict would incur a significant burden from participation.

**VIII. Confidentiality**

All research-related records initiated as a result of a subject’s participation in this study that reveal the subject’s identity will remain confidential except as may be required by law. Data obtained from this study will not identify the subjects individually. Subjects will be assigned code-names and ID numbers. Data obtained from our studies may be published. Original research-related records may be reviewed by the Partners Human Research Committee, and regulatory authorities, for the purpose of verifying clinical trial procedures and/or data. Information may be held and processed on a computer. Access to these computerized records will be password protected and restricted to study staff. Subjects will only be contacted regarding future studies if they indicate that they are interested in being contacted by initialing in the specific section of the consent form.

**VIII. POTENTIAL BENEFITS**

Participants will not receive any direct benefit from this study. It is possible that after real tDCS executive function may improve, but this would only be transient and last for 30-90 minutes at most. This is not a therapeutic clinical trial, but a translational cognitive neuroscience study. Information derived from this research could reveal benefits from tDCS in this patient population, that could lead to future treatment-oriented clinical trials.

**IX. MONITORING AND QUALITY ASSURANCE**

The principal investigators will oversee the collection, maintenance, and analysis of all data. He will also be responsible for ensuring that all adverse events are reported according to the Partners Human Research Committee Adverse Event Reporting Guidelines (http://healthcare.partners.org/phsirb/adverse.htm).

Any adverse events experienced by a subject will be communicated to a principal investigator and conveyed to the Partner’s IRB. The principal investigators will review the completeness and accuracy of informed consent after each patient. The performance data will be automatically recorded on the computer workstation to ensure accuracy. Access to this digital data will require a password.

Every effort will be made to maintain patient confidentiality. We will use a coded ID numbers consisting of sequential numbers and a combination of letters on all results acquired and stored. The only name identification can be found on the consent form and other forms the subject has filled out. Partners consent forms will be stored in a designated locked cabinet. No identifying information will be used in any publications or presentations that emerge from this data.

Any experimental data will be passed on only to the principal investigators, co-investigators, and to study staff. Information derived from this study will be made available to the MGH IRB. The information collected in our study will be used only for research purposes. Computer-based data and hardcopies will be made available only to the research team, e.g. stored on password-protected computers or in locked file cabinets. We will use only the minimum amount of information necessary for our study. Data will not be part of a patient's chart, as this information is investigational only, and not diagnostic. All researchers and study staff are trained in methods to protect confidentiality

All adverse events and unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others will be reported to the HRC in accordance with HRC adverse event and unanticipated problems reporting guidelines.

If participants respond positively to questions regarding suicidality, the study clinician will be notified, and a safety evaluation will be performed. If clinically indicated, the participant will be referred to the MGH Acute Psychiatry Service.
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