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**Setting the foundations of developmental precision psychiatry for ADHD**
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**Scenario 1- August 2021**

John, 9-year-old, has just been diagnosed with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). After initial psychoeducation, he is started on methylphenidate, titrated up to the maximum FDA recommended dose (60 mg/day). Even though well tolerated, methylphenidate is not effective in decreasing the severity of the core symptoms of ADHD (inattention, hyperactivity, and impulsivity). A second trial with a properly titrated amphetamine-based agent is not successful either, due to poor tolerability. Therefore, John is started on a non-stimulant agent (atomoxetine), which proves to be effective and well tolerated. John and his parents are overall pleased, but John’s parents comment: “We wish we would have found the right medication for John earlier”.

**Scenario 2- Somewhere in the future (hypothetical)**

John, 9-year-old, has just been diagnosed with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). After initial psychoeducation, a resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging scan is performed. Based on the finding of atypical increased cingulo-opercular connectivity, a treatment with a non-stimulant agent (atomoxetine) is recommended. Atomoxetine is effective and well tolerated. John and his parents are very pleased.

ff

Pharmacotherapy is an important component of the multimodal treatment of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). FDA-approved medications for ADHD include stimulants (methylphenidate and amphetamines) and non-stimulants (atomoxetine, guanfacine extended-release, clonidine extended-release, and viloxazine) (1). In clinical guidelines (1), stimulants are generally recommended as first-line pharmacologic option, with some guidelines (e.g., those from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, NICE (2)) further recommending methylphenidate over amphetamines as first-line stimulant in children, given its more favourable efficacy/tolerability profile. These recommendations are in line with meta-analytic evidence from randomized controlled trials (RCTs) showing that, at the *group* level, effect sizes of stimulants are generally higher than those of non-stimulants in terms of reduction of severity of ADHD core symptoms (3). However, there is variability in response at the *individual patient* level. In cross-over RCTs, around 41% of participants responded to both amphetamines and methylphenidate, 28% responded better to amphetamines, 16% responded better to methylphenidate, and 15% did not respond to either of the two stimulants (4). Unfortunately, to date there are no reliable predictors of response, so the choice of medication in clinical practice is based on a trial-and-error process. Some in the field hope that this gap will be filled by the emerging approach of *precision psychiatry*, which, influenced by the broader concept of *precision medicine*, aims to develop and implement models able to accurately predict the diagnosis of mental health conditions, their prognosis, or the response to treatments at the *individual* subject level (5).

In this issue of the *Journal*, Luke et al. (6) report the results of a longitudinal study assessing the association between resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging (R-fMRI) connectivity and response to stimulants. The study included a sample of 110 children with ADHD treated with stimulants, who, alongside a typically developing control group (n = 141) were scanned up to five times during development (6-17 years). Worse response to stimulants was significantly associated with an atypical increase in the cingulo-opercular resting-state connectivity with increasing age. By contrast, better response to treatment was significantly associated with stability of the cingulo-opercular connectivity over the developmental period, which was similar to the connectivity observed in the control group. In a sensitivity analysis, findings were not significantly different according to the type of stimulant (methylphenidate-based or amphetamines-based agents). The study results are plausible, considering that, in RCTs in patients with ADHD, acute doses of stimulants during cognitive tasks have been shown to normalize the functional activity of brain areas overlapping with the cingulo-opercular network (7). Furthermore, functional abnormalities in the cingulo-opercular network have been reported, albeit inconsistently, also at rest in individuals with ADHD (8). The authors hypothesized that stimulants may normalize activity in cingulo-opercualr regions during cognitive tasks only when the resting state connectivity is close to typical levels. Alternatively, stimulants might lead to “better than typical” cingulo-opercualr connectivity, which would contribute to compensation of ADHD symptoms.

Do the findings of this elegant study mean that we now have a predictor of response to stimulants? Are we ready to move from Scenario 1 to Scenario 2 (see Box)? Unfortunately, the answer is: no. Why? The study by Luke at al. is highly valuable as it advances our knowledge on the patho-physiological mechanisms underlying response to stimulants, pointing to the cingulo-opercular network as a possible target of novel treatments. However, it was not designed to provide the level of evidence required to support the use of cingulo-opercular connectivity as a predictor of response in clinical practice. Indeed, the science of prediction, which informs precision medicine, has established a series of rigorous procedures that need to be addressed before prediction models can be implemented in clinical practice (5). First, it is recommended to select predictors based on the highest level of evidence. Although plausible from a neurobiological standpoint, the role of atypical cingulo-opercular connectivity will need to be replicated in independent studies and preferably confirmed by meta-analyses. Second, the massive multivariate and multimodal nature of mental health conditions points to the need of including multiple predictors, rather than relying on one predictor only. Of note, a study testing a set of possible predictors of response to methylphenidate in ADHD (including demographic, clinical, genetic and R-fMRI measures) provided an accuracy of 84.6%, with age, weight, MspI and DraI polymorphisms in the alpha-2A-adrenergic receptor gene, lead level, Stroop color word test performance, and oppositional symptoms as the most differentiating predictors (9). However, a systematic review of prediction models in psychiatry found that most available models (69.5%) were based on clinical predictors and concluded that there is no strong evidence that complex models including biomarker outperform prediction moles based on clinical variables. Therefore, the added value of including cingulo-opercualr connectivity to other putative clinical predictors of response would need to be rigorously tested. Machine learning approaches have been suggested to be suitable, as they can deal with large numbers of predictors, as well as complex, interactive and non-linear effects (10). Third, after the model is developed, it should be internally validated, by fitting the model in a training data set and then assessing performance in a test data set of unseen cases from the same population. Fourth, the model should be externally validated, to test to which extent it performs well in a population different from the one where it has been developed. Fifth, the impact of the model on clinical decision making in real life should be tested in pragmatic randomized trials comparing the effects of using the prediction model *vs.* care as usual. In this regard, it should be noted that complex models are generally difficult to be implemented in standard clinical practice and the cost-benefit ratio is an important factor to consider. As Luke and colleagues point out, one may argue that the cost of R-fMRI to predict response to stimulants in individuals with ADHD is not justifiable because stimulants, when effective, act quickly, and their side effects tend remit once the medication is stopped. However, one may reply pointing to the potential decrease in cost of technology in the future and the need of avoiding possible adverse events such as psychotic events (11) during stimulant treatment, that, even if rare and transitory, are certainly problematic for patients and their families. Last but not least, there are important ethical challenges. Concerns have been expressed in relation to ethical responsibility when prediction models are implemented in the clinical practice, dehumanization of clinical decision making, and loss of clinical judgment (10). It has also been highlighted that when the model is based on a non-representative population (e.g., only White participants) it may provide misleading information when applied to other populations (e.g., Black individuals) (10).

Have prediction models been rigorously tested and implemented in psychiatry? The aforementioned systematic review of prediction models found that, out of the 584 identified studies, only 61 (10.4%) performed an internal validation, 27 (4.6%) presented a rigorous external validation, and 1 (0.2%) described the protocol for the implementation of the model. Of these 89 studies, 68.2% were focused on the prediction of prognosis, 8.2% reported on diagnostic prediction, and only 13.6% on models predicting the response to treatment, none of which addressing response to ADHD medications. A few studies (12-14) testing prediction models of response/tolerability to ADHD medications using machine learning have been published after the last search date of this systematic review, but the inclusion of external validation or implementation were beyond their scope.

Therefore, it appears that there is a long way to go before implementing precision psychiatry approaches able to inform the choice of ADHD medication in clinical practice. In this regard, the value of the study by Luke et al. is twofold. First, it suggests a possible predictor of response that needs to be rigorously tested. Second, with its longitudinal design, it points to the need of adopting a developmental framework when assessing prediction models in child and adolescent psychiatry. It is possible that factors that are not significant predictors at a certain time point become significant later on during the development. Testing the validity of prediction models will need to take these developmental aspects into account. Considering, more broadly, diagnostic and prognostic models, *equifinality* (diversity of pathways may lead to the same outcome) and *multifinality* (one factor may lead to different outcomes depending on the organization of the system in which it operates) will be important when designing and testing prediction models focused on the developmental period (15). When applied specifically to ADHD treatment, prediction science will need to address important issues, including: 1) the lack of consensus in the field on how *response* to medication should be defined; 2) the need to accurately predict the specific response to methylphenidate and amphetamines, as the majority of patients respond to one or both of these agents, rather than predict response to stimulants as a class; 3) the need of accurate predictors not only of response, but also of side effects.

Without a rigorous developmental precision psychiatry approach, any claim on the clinical relevance of predictors of the effects of ADHD medications at the individual level will be potentially misleading.

**DISCLOSURE OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

SCo declares honoraria and reimbursement for travel and accommodation expenses for lectures from the following non-profit associations: Association for Child and Adolescent Central Health (ACAMH), Canadian ADHD Alliance Resource (CADDRA), British Association of Pharmacology (BAP), and from Healthcare Convention for educational activity on ADHD

**References**

1. Cortese S. Pharmacologic Treatment of Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder. N Engl J Med. 2020;383:1050-6.

2. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: diagnosis and management 2018 [Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng87>; Last access: 30 May 2021].

3. 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.

4. Arnold LE. Methylphenidate vs. amphetamine: comparative review. J Atten Disord. 2000;3:200-11.

5. Fusar-Poli P, Hijazi Z, Stahl D, Steyerberg EW. The Science of Prognosis in Psychiatry: A Review. JAMA Psychiatry. 2018;75:1289-97.

6. Luke NS, G; Bouyssi-Kobar, M; Sharp, W; Shaw, P. A longitudinal study of resting-state connectivity and response to psychostimulant treatment in attention/deficit hyperactivity disorder. American Journal of Psychiatry. 2021, in press

7. 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.

8. Cortese S, Aoki YY, Itahashi T, Castellanos FX, Eickhoff SB. Systematic Review and Meta-analysis: Resting-State Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Studies of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2021;60:61-75.

9. Kim JW, Sharma V, Ryan ND. Predicting Methylphenidate Response in ADHD Using Machine Learning Approaches. Int J Neuropsychopharmacol. 2015;18:pyv052.

10. Chekroud AM, Bondar J, Delgadillo J, Doherty G, Wasil A, Fokkema M, et al. The promise of machine learning in predicting treatment outcomes in psychiatry. World Psychiatry. 2021;20:154-70

11. Cortese S. Psychosis during Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder Treatment with Stimulants. N Engl J Med. 2019;380:1178-80.

12. Chang JC, Lin HY, Lv J, Tseng WI, Gau SS. Regional brain volume predicts response to methylphenidate treatment in individuals with ADHD. BMC Psychiatry. 2021;21:26.

13. Yoo JH, Sharma V, Kim JW, McMakin DL, Hong SB, Zalesky A, et al. Prediction of sleep side effects following methylphenidate treatment in ADHD youth. Neuroimage Clin. 2020;26:102030.

14. Faraone SV, Gomeni R, Hull JT, Busse GD, Melyan Z, O'Neal W, et al. Early response to SPN-812 (viloxazine extended-release) can predict efficacy outcome in pediatric subjects with ADHD: a machine learning post-hoc analysis of four randomized clinical trials. Psychiatry Res. 2021;296:113664.

15. Cicchetti DR, FA. Equifinality and multifinality in developmental psychopathology. Development and Psychopathology. 1996;8:597-600.