
IDENTIFYING ATTENTION-DEFICIT/HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER THROUGH THE ELECTROENCEPHALOGRAM COMPLEXITY

Dimitri Marques Abramov^a, Henrique Santos Lima^b, Vladimir Lazarev^a,
Paulo Ricardo Galhanone,^a and Constantino Tsallis^c

March 25, 2024

ABSTRACT

There are reasons to suggest that a number of mental disorders may be related to alteration in the neural complexity (NC). Thus, quantitative analysis of NC could be helpful in classifying mental conditions and clarifying our understanding about them. Here, we have worked with youths, typical and with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), whose neural complexity was assessed using q -statistics applied to the electroencephalogram (EEG). The EEG was recorded while subjects performed the visual Attention Network Test (ANT) based on the OddBall paradigm and during a shortpretask period of resting state. Time intervals of the EEG amplitudes that passed a threshold (signal regularity indicator) were collected from task and pretask signals from each subject. The data were satisfactorily fitted with a stretched q -exponential including a power-law prefactor (characterized by the exponent c), thus determining the best (c, q) for each subject, indicative of their individual complexity. We found larger values of q and c in ADHD subjects as compared with the typical subjects both at task and pretask periods, the task values for both groups being larger than at rest. The c parameter was highly specific in relation to DSM diagnosis for inattention, where well-defined clusters were observed. The parameter values were organized in four well-defined clusters in (c, q) -space. As expected, the tasks apparently induced greater complexity in neural functional states with likely greater amount of internal information processing. The results suggest that complexity is higher in ADHD subjects than in typical pairs. The distribution of values in the (c, q) -space derived from q -statistics seems to be a promising biomarker for ADHD diagnosis.

Introduction

Complexity is a property of many systems in the Universe related to integration among system's components by long-range correlations in a multiscale organization. As a result, these systems are non-reducible in their constituents, capable of transitioning between different states or configurations [1, 2].

The lifeforms are dissipative systems that manifest endothermic long-term stability due to their capacity for self-organization since they are complex, controlling the entropy through allostatic mechanisms, which keep and regulate homeostasis in the face of environmental stressors [3, 4]. Therefore, pathological states, typically non-adaptive, would likely result in a decrease in the organism's complexity [5, 6, 7]. In recent decades, several studies have systematically identified alterations in the brain complexity of individuals with mental disorders. [8, 9, 10]. However, the meaning

^a Instituto Nacional da Saúde da Criança, da Mulher e do Adolescente Fernandes Figueira. Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Avenida Rui Barbosa 716, Flamengo, Rio de Janeiro 22250-020, Brazil.
E-mail: dimitri.abramov@iff.fiocruz.br

^b Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rua Xavier Sigaud 150, Rio de Janeiro-RJ 22290-180, Brazil.
E-mail: hslima94@cbpf.br

^c Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas and National Institute of Science and Technology of Complex Systems, Rua Xavier Sigaud 150, Rio de Janeiro-RJ 22290-180, Brazil
Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501, USA
Complexity Science Hub Vienna, Josefstädter Strasse 39, 1080 Vienna, Austria
E-mail: tsallis@cbpf.br

of those changes in complexity remains elusive. Indeed, some of those studies have indicated higher complexity in patients as compared to typical subjects.

Many procedures based on different theoretical paradigms have been developed to quantify complexity in the human brain activity, mainly based on classical methods such as approximate entropy or Lempel–Ziv complexity, using indices of predictability and regularity of time series from the electroencephalogram (EEG) [10]. In 1988, a generalization of the standard Boltzmann–Gibbs statistical mechanics (BGSM) — non-extensive statistical mechanics (NESM), known as q -statistics — was introduced [11]. The NESM functions satisfactorily describe the behavior of wide classes of natural, social, and artificial systems [1]. Recently, we have demonstrated the applicability of q -statistics to describe brain complexity by analyzing the temporal regularity of the EEG signal [12], fitting a q -exponential function upon the empirical distribution of the probabilities y related to the occurrence of the events x (in this case, events are time distances between EEG amplitudes that passes down a threshold), as follows:

$$y_q = a_q x^{c_q} / [1 + (q - 1)b_q x^{h_q}]^{\frac{1}{q-1}} \quad (1)$$

where a_q is the normalization constant, and (b_q, c_q, h_q) are positive parameters. The parameter c_q denotes the slope of the left tail, while the index q and the parameter h_q have a straightforward relation with the slope of the right tail in the q -stretched exponential function. Thus, q departs further from unity as the range of the spatial-temporal correlations increases; in the limit of short-range correlations, we return to the original BG exponential ($q = 1$), which corresponds to strong chaos. In turn, the index c_q characterizes the number of degrees of freedom. Physically, this parameter is related to the degeneracies of the physical states [16]. Some other complex systems are modeled by similar q -exponential functions with a power-law function, (x_q^c) , such as the financial market [13], air traffic [14], or COVID-19 spreading [15].

To study brain complexity and its relation to mind disorders, we believe that q -statistics can be an effective and consistent approach due to its wide applicability in describing the complexity of a wide range of systems and its simplicity in implementation.

Here, we have evaluated the neural complexity in the EEG of typical boys and those with diagnostics of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) by q -statistics. Although ADHD is a condition with relatively recognized biological bases, accurate biomarkers for precise diagnosis and understanding of its mechanisms remain undefined [17]. Some previous studies about NC were discordant as to whether the EEG complexity of ADHD was greater or lesser than that of typical peers [10]. However, some findings have shown that in ADHD children, NC is higher than their peers and ADHD adults [18]. Here, we have described neural complexity from the EEG of the same ADHD and typical subjects that we had previously studied using other psychophysiological methods. We observed marked differences of event-related potentials [19] and EEG topography [20] between the groups, as well as high accuracy with respect to DSM diagnostics criteria by multivariate analysis [21].

By analyzing EEG complexity through q -statistics, we aim to show relevant differences between the typical and ADHD boys. Let us anticipate that q -statistics will effectively cluster the subjects based on the q and c parameters, which are uncorrelated quantities.

Methods

Subjects and procedures

We examined 19 typical and ADHD boys, aged from 11 to 13 years, performing the Posner’s Attention Network Test (ANT). The EEG’s of the subjects were recorded using a Nihon Kohden NK 1200 EEG System at 20 scalp points according to the International 10/20 System, with linked biauricular reference (A1+A2) at a sampling rate of 1000 Hz. The visual task required high cognitive effort during testing Posner’s alertness, spatial orientation, and executive dimensions of sustained attention. The test lasted 20 minutes. For details, see Kratz et al. [22] and Abramov et al. [19]. Before the ANT task begins, a short segment of EEG lasting about 5 minutes was collected (pretask), with open and closed eyes.

Two physicians evaluated the subjects independently of each other in order to reduce the bias associated with interpretation subjectivity. The classification of subjects regarding ADHD was based on the DSM-IV-TR criteria (at least six symptoms of inattention or hyperactivity/impulsivity are to be satisfied). The children must also present mental/behavioral dysfunctionality in at least two environments (e.g., school and home). The criteria for inattention and hyperactivity/impulsivity symptoms were assessed through direct questioning of the parents regarding their child’s characteristics, with responses recorded as "yes" or "no" for each criterion. A score between 0 and 18 was computed based on these responses. Boys with neurological or psychiatric comorbidities were excluded from the study. IQ was

assessed using a reduced version of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) test, with the Vocabulary and Block Design subtests [23].

All subjects and their parents gave us written informed consent to participate in this study, which was performed following all international and local ethical rules after being approved by our independent ethical board (CEP-IFF), registered under CAAE 08340212.5.0000.5269 (2013).

Data Analysis

The EEG signal was filtered using a convolution approach with a vector of size t (1 bin = 1 millisecond) defined by:

$$V = \exp(-x^2)/2 \quad (2)$$

where x is ranging from $-\sqrt{2}$ to $+\sqrt{2}$ with size t . For low-pass filtering, $t = 10$ ms (100Hz). And for high pass filtering, the output from convolution of V with $t = 2000$ ms (0.5Hz) was subtracted from the original signal. Baseline slow oscillations as well the muscle artifacts were suitably minimized. For 60Hz suppression (a very deterministic artifact from power net), we adopted band-pass filtering using a Fast Fourier Transform approach. No other signal handling was done.

The negative part of the signal was used to perform the regularity analysis, where blink artifacts had little effect on the signal after filtering. We truncated the amplitudes smaller than -200 μ V (higher absolute value) because no brain sources physiologically generate larger ones in the EEG. From the remaining negative part of the signal, we calculate the standard deviation and every amplitude that passes down the threshold of -1.0 std. dev. was considered as a time event. The histogram of these intervals was computed within 1000 classes from each of the 20 EEG channels (the time bins were nearly 1 to 2 ms long). The parameters of function (1), that model the distributions were empirically determined by fitting strategies (see below). However, we bind the distributions of all channels of each subject for best convergence.

After fitting, individual values of c and q in each condition and group (as well averaged ones) were plotted on a $(q \times c)$ space to observe sample dispersion and possibly clustering. The Mann-Whitney U-Test inferred differences between groups and conditions. Correlations between parameters and other variables (DSM scores, I.Q. etc) were explored using the Pearson or Spearman Tests.

The analysis of the normalized frequencies of the inter-occurrence times leads to a fitting by a function currently emerging in nonextensive statistical mechanics, given by (1). The probability distribution must obey the normalization condition, i.e., the integral $\int_0^\infty x^{c-h/(q-1)} dx$ can not diverge. This implies $(c+1)(q-1)/h < 1$. Our results satisfy this condition as shown in Fig. 3.

Results

Since we had previously ascertained that typical human EEG distributions satisfy $c > 1$ in function (1) (at least for mid-parietal channel) [12], we adopted $c \leq 1$ at least in one channel of any condition as an exclusion criterion for the subject. So, the distributions that we regarded were those exhibiting left and right tails, representing observations from both typical and ADHD subjects. The dataset with such distributions corresponded to 15 typical and 15 ADHD boys.

The distributions of frequencies reveal a q -stretched exponential profile, observing all subjects for each group and condition taken together in the same distribution (global distributions, with $n(\text{ADHD}) = 15$, $n(\text{typical}) = 15$, Fig. 1). The refined aspect of the distributions of task condition is due to the larger number of inter-event intervals computed in longer EEG vectors.

Each global distribution was fitted with the function (1). The empirical values found for the task and pretask parameters, were $q(\text{ADHD}) = 2.19$, $q(\text{typical}) = 2.34(2.35)$, $c(\text{ADHD}) = 1.89$, and $c(\text{typical}) = 1.71$. The correlations among the four parameters can be seen in Fig. 2: c shows no significant correlation with the other ones. In parallel, b and h show strong correlation with q ($r > 0.80$, Pearson Test). The respective linear functions were extracted to analytically set b and h for each group and condition (see methods). Subsequently, q and c were individually estimated by fitting the empirical distribution of each subject with the function (1).

There were no statistical differences between groups concerning confounding variables (age, time using videogame or internet, education, familiar incomes, and hours of sleep at night before the test), indicating no artifact of this kind influencing the results, and consequently that the two groups were paired (see Table 1). The I.Q.(estimated by WISC test) was slightly higher in typical boys than in ADHD ones, which was already pointed out before [24, 25, 26]. However, all subjects of both groups fell within the range of statistically normal I.Q.




Figure 1: Probabilities versus inter-occurrence time events for all datasets and their corresponding fittings. (Top left) Typical\pretask, (top right) ADHD\pretask (bottom left) Typical\task, and (bottom right) ADHD\task. The Greek letters in Typical\pretask represent the following frequencies γ (frequencies greater than 32 Hz), β (between 16 and 31 Hz), α (between 8 and 15 Hz), θ (between 4 and 7 Hz), and δ (smaller than 4Hz), respectively. Notice that the data dispersion corresponding to pretask EEGs is larger than that corresponding to the task EEGs, possibly due to the time duration of the EEGs.




Figure 2: (Top left) $\ln b \times q$, (top right) $\ln b \times c$, (middle left) $\ln b \times h$, (middle right) $h \times c$, (bottom left) $h \times q$, and (bottom right) $q \times c$. The $r(\text{Pearson})$ of the dashed straight lines in the same order are -0.87, 0.12, -0.87, 0.43, 0.82, and -0.15. The blue, green, red, and purple points represent typical\pretask, ADHD\pretask, typical\task, and ADHD\task, respectively.

Table 1: Relevant and confounding variables
 (*) SD = standard deviation; (**) Income per month are in Brazil minimum wages

Variable	Typical(mean)	Typical(SD*)	ADHD(mean)	ADHD(SD)
AGE	11.33	0.90	11.80	0.94
HOURS OF SLEEP	7.33	2.26	7.67	1.80
VIDEOGAME	3.47	1.25	3.20	1.61
INTERNET	3.40	1.30	3.33	1.68
YEARS OF STUDY	6.07	1.22	6.33	1.29
CURRENT SCHOOL GRADE	5.93	1.28	5.53	1.77
FAMILIAR INCOME**	8.43	6.84	5.90	8,83
DSM-IN	2.40	1.50	7.20	1.37
DSM-IMP+HIP	2.87	1.51	4.20	2.62
DSM-TOTAL	5.27	2.40	11.40	2.75
IQ	111.13	12.73	99.40	12.39
c (task)	1.80	0.01	2.00	0.00
q (task)	1.96	0.00	2.10	0.02
c (pretask)	1.68	0.01	1.90	0.01
q (pretask)	1.94	0.08	2.00	0.02




Figure 3: (Left) Linear plot of q versus c . The empty circles refer to the mean values of q and c for all cases. (Right) The plot of the condition of normalization of the probability distribution, where $h(q)$ is given by an independent analysis of the four types of electroencephalograms (Typical and ADHD in pretask and task, respectively).

Unlike the DSM-IV scores for inattention, those for hyperactivity/impulsivity were not different between groups, prevailing the inattentive subtype in the ADHD group (see Table 1).

The averaged parameters c and q from samples were statistically lower for typical subjects compared to ADHD pairs (all $p < 0.01$, see Table 1), with very low standard deviations. Comparing conditions, only q in ADHD differed between Task and pretask ($p = 0.0004$, Mann-Whitney U test, see means and std. deviations, Table 1). Fig. 3 shows the space ($c \times q$), where all individual values form well-defined clusters relative to each group and condition. We observed 100 % accuracy in differentiating typical ADHD in the “task” condition since there was no overlapping regarding the values of ($c \times q$) from these different groups. From all distributions taken together, the global values for q and c differed from averaged ones from individual fittings.

There is no monotonic correlation between c and q and DSM scores for Inattention (Fig. 4), nor for total scores (result not shown). However, well-defined clusters are observed in scatter plots for both c and $q(\text{task})$, which appears to roughly coincide with the DSM cutoff for inattention (i.e., six criteria satisfied).




Figure 4: q (pretask), q (task), c (pretask), and c (task) versus DSM score (top left, top right, bottom left, and bottom right, resp.). Notice that q (pretask) can be roughly fitted with an increasing straight line (dashed red) with $r(\text{Pearson})=0.55$.

Discussion

The traditional analytical-reductionist approach for studying the relationship between the human brain and mind usually comes down to correlating mental processes with the dynamics of neural networks. However, this approach cannot be considered fully adequate, since it does not take into account the complexity of the phenomena that are being compared.

The science of complexity is gaining space every day for studying the cerebral basis of the mind and its disorders [18]. The informativeness in complex systems is non-addictive and non-extensive [1] due to the system's inviolable completeness: the whole is larger than the sum of its parts. Studying the molecular receptor or neuronal cell activity mechanisms, outside their intricate network of correlations, might not be the most appropriate way to understand brain dynamics related to mental processes.

Here, we have shown that the q parameter, a complexity measure from NESM, seems to accurately discriminate ADHD young boys from their typical pairs. Corroborating other studies [10, 18], which used alternative procedures to infer brain complexity, here the NESM has shown that NC from EEG of ADHD subjects is higher than that of the typical

ones. Let us emphasize that the present approach, based on NESM [11, 1], enables us to describe the system in terms of complexity using a very simple function involving basic parameters, such as q and c . A hard problem in studying different mental disorders is the reliability of available diagnostic classifications and tools: The DSM (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders) is a qualitative/quantitative classifier of mind properties (phenomena, symptoms, and features) to a taxonomy of clusters (diagnostics), designed by expert’s perceptions about human diversity [32, 33]. And at least for ADHD, the experts’ taxonomy seems to correspond to biological reality. Previously, we had shown high accuracy (nearly 80 percent) among DSM-IV criteria for ADHD and multivariate analysis of the same subjects [21]. Now we have accessed complexity by q -statistics, and we observed satisfactory accuracy of q and c parameters to classify the subjects as ADHD or typical. We are concomitantly showing that (1) the DSM seems to adequately identify and describe ADHD and (2) possibly we can objectively identify ADHD by measuring objective and relevant properties of the brain, such as NC. However, the design of definitive and universal models for putative brain mechanisms appears to be elusive due to their extremely complex nature. We did not find other studies within which such a high accuracy of agreement between complexity measures and ADHD diagnostics would be achieved [34, 35, 36, 37].

Although we have shown that q -statistic can describe NC, it would still be premature to interpret the clinical meaning of the difference in q values found between ADHD and typical subjects. To explain the observed high complexity in ADHD, we need further studies that we are currently running. In physics, this parameter is related to complexity through long-range correlations, which modify the probability distribution of events as far from the Boltzmann-Gibbs model as the system is complex. EEG studies have found lower beta/alpha or beta/teta rates in ADHD subjects [38, 39, 40, 41], which could justify our findings. Whereas gamma oscillations are related to local and bottom-up processing, theta and Alpha bands are related to long-range functional connectivity in the brain in top-down (or inner) processing [42, 43, 44, 45]. In Fig. 1, a probability peak on the alpha band shows that this rhythm (between 8-12Hz, which diffusely spreads across the EEG channels) is present in the probability distributions.

As we have shown in a previous study [12], $c > 1$ seems to be a marker feature of the frequency distributions from human EEG time regularity. Here, some distributions did not satisfy this condition, which was probably an artifact of shorter EEG signals from the pretask condition or noisy ones. As a rule for our methodology, we advocate in favor of exclusion of these cases. As we see above, c parameter is crucial for the subject’s classification.

The parameter c was more sensitive to ADHD than q , as shown in Fig. 4. The larger the value of the parameter c , the more vertical the left slope of the stretched q -exponential function due to power law $a x^c$ (if $c=0$, the function recovers a pure q -stretched exponential curve). The left slope of the probability distribution is set by the expression of high-frequency EEG bands (beta and perhaps gamma). EEG gamma frequencies are not easily accessed in clinical examinations. However, there are some studies of the EEG gamma band in relation to psychiatric disorders [46]. Gamma and beta bands are highly correlated to bottom-up cognitive processes [43, 44], and are more expressed in typical than in ADHD subjects [38, 39, 40, 41]. Indeed, larger c values correspond to lower probability of detecting higher frequencies in the EEG signal since their amplitude is usually below the threshold that has been used (in preliminary essays, we have observed $c = 0$ to larger thresholds by statistical formalism in light of the central limit theorem, we advocate in favor of a suitable threshold of one standard deviation). We are currently conducting another study focusing on the effect of different cognitive states in typical adult subjects upon c and q parameters.

As seen in Table 1 and Fig. 1, by including the data corresponding to all the subjects in the same distribution we found q values above the average of the individual ones. Slight fitting errors are naturally possible by varying four instead of two parameters, and also because the straight lines for b and h may have an error close to 20 %.

Although we currently do not have enough information to establish a more enhanced discussion about the meaning of these complexities and the biological correlates with the q and c parameters, we provide robust evidence for the applicability of q -statistics to measure brain complexity and accurately clusterize mental states and conditions.

Data Archival

The raw EEG data are disposable upon request.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank The Child’s Neurology program of the National Institute of Women, Children, and Adolescents’ Health Fernandes Figueira. This work was supported by Programa de Incentivo a Pesquisa (Research Incentive Program—PIP) of the National Institute Fernandes Figueira (project IFF-008-Fio-13-3-2) as well as by the Brazilian agencies CNPq and Faperj.

References

References

- [1] C. Tsallis, *Introduction to Nonextensive Statistical Mechanics—Approaching a Complex World* (Springer, New York, 2009); Second Edition (Springer, 2023).
- [2] D.S. Bassett and M.S. Gazzaniga, *Understanding complexity in the human brain*, Trends Cogn. Sci. **15**(5), 200-9. (2011).
- [3] Kelso, J.A.S. *Dynamic Patterns: The Self-Organization of Brain and Behavior*. Massachusetts: MIT Press. 1995. 334pp.
- [4] Baffy G, Loscalzo J. Complexity and network dynamics in physiological adaptation: an integrated view. *Physiol Behav.* 2014 May 28;131:49-56.
- [5] Peng C-K, Mietus J, Hausdorff JM, Havlin S, Stanley HE, Goldberger AL. Long-range anticorrelations and non-Gaussian behavior of the heartbeat. *Phys Rev Lett.* 1993 Mar 1;70(9):1343-6. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.70.1343.
- [6] A.L. Goldberger, *Fractal variability versus pathologic periodicity: complexity loss and stereotypy in disease*, Perspect. Biol. Med. **40**(4), 543-61 (1997).
- [7] Keller SM, Gschwandtner U, Meyer A, Chaturvedi M, Roth V, Fuhr P. Cognitive decline in Parkinson's disease is associated with reduced complexity of EEG at baseline. *Brain Commun.* 2020 Nov 27;2(2):fcaa207. doi: 10.1093/braincomms/fcaa207.
- [8] A.C. Yang and S.J. Tsai. *Is mental illness complex? From behavior to brain*. Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry, 2013 **45** : 4253-7.
- [9] Keshmiri S. *Entropy and the Brain: An Overview*. Entropy (Basel), 2020;22(9):917.
- [10] Z.J. Lau, T. Pham, S.H.A. Chen and D. Makowski, *Brain entropy, fractal dimensions and predictability: A review of complexity measures for EEG in healthy and neuropsychiatric populations*. Eur J Neurosci. **56** (7):5047-5069. (2022) doi : 10. 1111/ejn. 15800
- [11] C. Tsallis, *Possible generalization of Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics*, J. Stat. Phys. **52**, 479-487 (1988).
- [12] Abramov DM, Tsallis C, Lima HS. *Neural complexity through a nonextensive statistical-mechanical approach of human electroencephalograms*. Sci Rep. 2023 Jun 26;13(1):10318.
- [13] C. Tsallis, C. Anteneodo, L. Borland and R. Osorio, *Nonextensive statistical mechanics and economics*, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, **324**(1–2): 89-100 (2003).
- [14] E. Mitsokapas, B. Schäfer, R.J. Harris and C. Beck, *Statistical characterization of airplane delays*, Sci. Rep. **11**, 7855 (2021).
- [15] C. Tsallis and U. Tirnakli, *Predicting COVID-19 Peaks Around the World*, Frontiers in Physics **8**, 2020.00217 (2020).
- [16] L. E. Reichl, *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics* (New York: Physics Books Co., 2005), 197-231.
- [17] Buitelaar J, Bölte S, Brandeis D, Caye A, Christmann N, Cortese S, Coghill D, Faraone SV, Franke B, Gleitz M, Greven CU, Kooij S, Leffa DT, Rommelse N, Newcorn JH, Polanczyk GV, Rohde LA, Simonoff E, Stein M, Vitiello B, Yazgan Y, Roesler M, Doepfner M, Banaschewski T. *Toward Precision Medicine in ADHD*. Front Behav Neurosci. 2022 Jul 6;16:900981. doi : 10. 3389/fnbeh. 2022. 900981
- [18] Hernández RM, Ponce-Meza JC, Saavedra-López MÁ, Campos Ugaz WA, Chanduvi RM, Monteza WC. *Brain Complexity and Psychiatric Disorders*. Iran J Psychiatry. 2023;18(4):493-502. doi : 10. 18502/ijps. v18i4. 13637
- [19] Abramov DM, Cunha CQ, Galhanone PR, Alvim RJ, de Oliveira AM, Lazarev VV. *Neurophysiological and behavioral correlates of alertness impairment and compensatory processes in ADHD evidenced by the Attention Network Test*. PLoS One. 2019 Jul; 14(7):e0219472.
- [20] Lazarev VV, Pontes M, Pontes AT, Vieira J, Quero-Cunha C, Tamborino T, Galhanone PR, DeAzevedo LC, Abramov DM. *EEG and ERP characteristics of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder in children and adolescents*. Int J Psychophysiol 2016; 108:75. doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2016.07.243
- [21] Abramov DM, Lazarev VV, Gomes Junior SC, Mourao-Junior CA, Castro-Pontes M, Cunha CQ, deAzevedo LC, Vigneau E. *Estimating biological accuracy of DSM for attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder based on multivariate analysis for small samples*. PeerJ. 2019;7:e7074. doi : 10. 7717/peerj. 7074.

- [22] Kratz O, Studer P, Malcherek S, Erbe K, Moll GH, Heinrich H. *Attentional processes in children with ADHD: An event-related potential study using the attention network test*. Int J Psychophysiol 2011; 81: 82–90. doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2011.05.008
- [23] Mello CB, Argollo N, Shayer PBM, Abreu N, Godinho K, Duran P et al. *Abbreviated version of the WISC-III: correlation between estimated IQ and global IQ of Brazilian children*. Psic Teor e Pesq 2011; 27: 149–155.
- [24] Frazier TW, Demaree HA, Youngstrom EA. Meta-analysis of intellectual and neuropsychological test performance in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Neuropsychology. 2004 Jul;18(3):543-55. doi: 10.1037/0894-4105.18.3.543.
- [25] Thaler NS, Bello DT, Etcoff LM. WISC-IV profiles are associated with differences in symptomatology and outcome in children with ADHD. J Atten Disord. 2013 May;17(4):291-301. doi: 10.1177/1087054711428806.
- [26] Mackenzie GB, Wonders E. Rethinking Intelligence Quotient Exclusion Criteria Practices in the Study of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. Front Psychol. 2016 May 31;7:794. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00794.
- [27] Hubel DH, Wiesel TH. *Receptive fields of single neurones in the cat's striate cortex*. Journal of Physiology. 1959; 148:574-91.
- [28] Spillmann L, Dresch-Langley B, Tseng CH. *Beyond the classical receptive field: The effect of contextual stimuli*. J Vis. 2015;15(9):7.
- [29] Dyballa L, Hoseini MS, Dadarlat MC, Zucker SW, Stryker MP. *Flow stimuli reveal ecologically appropriate responses in mouse visual cortex*. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2018; 115(44):11304-11309.
- [30] Quentin, R., Awosika, O., Cohen, L. G. *Plasticity and recovery of function*. Handbook of Clinical Neurology, 473–483.
- [31] Hopfield JJ. *Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities*. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1982;79(8):2554-8.
- [32] American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th ed., text rev.)*, 2000.
- [33] American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th ed.)*, 2013.
- [34] Fernández A, Quintero J, Hornero R, Zuluaga P, Navas M, Gómez C, Escudero J, García-Campos N, Biederman J, Ortiz T. Complexity analysis of spontaneous brain activity in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: diagnostic implications. Biol Psychiatry. 2009 Apr 1;65(7):571-7. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2008
- [35] Mohammadi, M. R., Khaleghi, A., Nasrabadi, A. M., Rafieivand, S., Begol, M., Zarafshan, H. EEG classification of ADHD and normal children using non-linear features and neural network. Biomedical Engineering Letters, 6(2), 66–73. doi:10.1007/s13534-016-0218-2
- [36] Zarafshan H, Khaleghi A, Mohammadi MR, Moeini M, Malmir N. Electroencephalogram complexity analysis in children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder during a visual cognitive task. J Clin Exp Neuropsychol. 2016;38(3):361-9. doi: 10.1080/13803395.2015.1119252.
- [37] Chen H, Chen W, Song Y, Sun L, Li X. EEG characteristics of children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Neuroscience. 2019 May 15;406:444-456. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2019.03.048.
- [38] Barry RJ, Clarke AR, Johnstone SJ. A review of electrophysiology in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: I. Qualitative and quantitative electroencephalography. Clin Neurophysiol. 2003 Feb;114(2):171-83. doi: 10.1016/s1388-2457(02)00362-0
- [39] Loo SK, Makeig S. Clinical utility of EEG in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a research update. Neurotherapeutics. 2012 Jul;9(3):569-87. doi: 10.1007/s13311-012-0131-z.
- [40] Barry RJ, Clarke AR. Resting state brain oscillations and symptom profiles in attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Suppl Clin Neurophysiol. 2013;62:275-87. doi: 10.1016/b978-0-7020-5307-8.00017-x
- [41] Markovska-Simoska S, Pop-Jordanova N. Quantitative EEG in Children and Adults With Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: Comparison of Absolute and Relative Power Spectra and Theta/Beta Ratio. Clin EEG Neurosci. 2017 Jan;48(1):20-32. doi: 10.1177/1550059416643824.
- [42] von Stein A, Sarnthein J. Different frequencies for different scales of cortical integration: from local gamma to long range alpha/theta synchronization. Int J Psychophysiol. 2000 Dec 1;38(3):301-13. doi: 10.1016/s0167-8760(00)00172-0.
- [43] Lisman JE, Jensen O. The $\theta - \gamma$ neural code. Neuron. 2013 Mar 20;77(6):1002-16. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2013.03.007.

- [44] Palva JM, Palva S. Functional integration across oscillation frequencies by cross-frequency phase synchronization. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2018 Oct;48(7):2399-2406. doi: 10.1111/ejn.13767.
- [45] Kam JWY, Rahnuma T, Park YE, Hart CM. Electrophysiological markers of mind wandering: A systematic review. *Neuroimage*. 2022 Sep;258:119372. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2022.119372.
- [46] Newson JJ, Thiagarajan TC. EEG Frequency Bands in Psychiatric Disorders: A Review of Resting State Studies. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2019 Jan 9;12:521.