

Supplementary Materials

Computational Modeling of Attentional Impairments in Disruptive Mood Dysregulation Disorder and Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder

Simone P. Haller, DPhil*^{†1}, Joel Stoddard, MD, MAS*², David Pagliaccio, PhD³, Hong Bui, BA¹, Caroline MacGillivray, BA¹, Matt Joes, PhD⁴, & Melissa A. Brotman, PhD¹

*The authors contributed equally

¹ *Emotion and Development Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, MD, 20892*

² *Pediatric Mental Health Institute, Children's Hospital Colorado, Department of Psychiatry & Neuroscience Program, University of Colorado, Anschutz Medical Campus, 13123 East 16th Avenue, Aurora, CO, 80045*

³ *Division of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, New York State Psychiatric Institute, Department of Psychiatry, Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, 1051 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10032*

⁴ *Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, 80309*

1. ISVRT

We expected youth with ADHD only and the DMDD + ADHD group to show increased ISVRT and decreased processing efficiency. ISVRT was measured as the coefficient of variation (CoV), the standard deviation/mean RT for correct responses. Comparisons of ISVRT were conducted using multivariate model testing for effects of ADHD (present/absent), DMDD (present/absent), task condition (congruent, incongruent, neutral) and their interaction, and Age and IQ as covariates. In a smaller sample ($n=87$), we also examined associations of CoV with ARI and Conners' scores (hyperactivity and inattentiveness tested in separate models), task condition with Age, and IQ as covariates.

Results

For the CoV omnibus model, the DMDD-by-ADHD-by-task condition interaction was marginally significant ($b=0.03$, $p=0.05$, $90\%CI=[0.00, 0.06]$, see Table S1).

Table S1. Mixed model outcomes, ISVRT

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Estimates</i>	CoV	
		<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.37	0.29 – 0.45	<0.001
ADHD [1]	0.02	0.00 – 0.05	0.020
DMDD [1]	0.03	-0.00 – 0.05	0.061
Condition [Congruent]	0.00	-0.01 – 0.02	0.536
Condition [Incongruent]	0.00	-0.01 – 0.01	0.968
Age	-0.01	-0.01 – -0.00	<0.001
FSIQ	-0.00	-0.00 – -0.00	0.001
ADHD [1] * DMDD [1]	-0.04	-0.07 – -0.00	0.029
ADHD [1] * Condition [Congruent]	-0.01	-0.03 – 0.01	0.197
ADHD [1] * Condition [Incongruent]	-0.02	-0.03 – 0.00	0.081
DMDD [1] * Condition [Congruent]	-0.01	-0.04 – 0.01	0.282
DMDD [1] * Condition [Incongruent]	-0.02	-0.04 – 0.00	0.117
(ADHD [1] * DMDD [1]) * Condition [Congruent]	0.02	-0.01 – 0.05	0.129
(ADHD [1] * DMDD [1]) * Condition [Incongruent]	0.03	-0.00 – 0.06	0.053
Random Effects			
σ^2	0.00		
τ_{00} Subject	0.00		
ICC	0.64		
N _{Subject}	187		
Observations	561		

Marginal R^2 / Conditional R^2 0.141 / 0.688

a. Reference levels for factor contrasts are ADHD is absent, DMDD is absent, and Flanker condition is “Neutral.”

2. Associations between CoV and Drift Diffusion parameters

Correlations between drift rate and CoV were high across conditions (neutral: $r=-.74$, $p<.001$; congruent: $r=-.74$, $p<.001$, incongruent: $r=-.62$, $p<.001$).

Table S2. Correlations between CoV (ISVRT) and DDM parameter v

DDM parameters	Condition	CoV
v	neutral	-.74***
	congruent	-.74***
	incongruent	-.62***

Note. * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$

3. Hyperactivity Model

Table 3. Mixed model outcomes, Hyperactivity

Predictors	Estimates	v		p
		CI		
(Intercept)	-4.12	-8.81 – 0.57		0.089
pARI_Factor [High]	-0.60	-2.26 – 1.05		0.476
Hyperactivity	-0.09	-0.18 – -0.01		0.038
Condition [Congruent]	-0.07	-0.62 – 0.48		0.802
Condition [Incongruent]	-2.75	-3.30 – -2.21		<0.001
Age	0.41	0.24 – 0.58		<0.001
FSIQ	0.04	0.02 – 0.07		0.004
pARI_Factor [High] * Hyperactivity	0.06	-0.07 – 0.19		0.391
pARI_Factor [High] * Condition [Congruent]	-0.44	-1.57 – 0.70		0.451
pARI_Factor [High] * Condition [Incongruent]	0.20	-0.93 – 1.33		0.729

Hyperactivity * Condition [Congruent]	-0.00	-0.06 – 0.06	0.990
Hyperactivity * Condition [Incongruent]	0.06	-0.00 – 0.11	0.057
(pARI_Factor [High] * Hyperactivity) * Condition [Congruent]	0.02	-0.07 – 0.10	0.738
(pARI_Factor [High] * Hyperactivity) * Condition [Incongruent]	-0.02	-0.11 – 0.07	0.704

Random Effects

σ^2	0.84
τ_{00} Subject	2.76
ICC	0.77
N_{Subject}	87
<hr/>	
Observations	261
Marginal R^2 / Conditional R^2	0.422 / 0.865

a. References levels for factor contrasts low ARI score (median split), and Flanker condition is “Neutral.”