

Trade Study of Population Age Groups for a Clinical Trial in Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

Dalton B. Lovins⁰⁰⁰⁰⁻⁰⁰⁰²⁻⁵⁸⁷⁵⁻⁴⁸⁷¹ and Robert A. Lodder⁰⁰⁰⁰⁻⁰⁰⁰¹⁻⁶¹³³⁻⁷⁵⁶¹

College of Pharmacy, Todd Building, 789 S. Limestone,, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40536

ABSTRACT

ADHD is a neurodevelopmental disorder characterized by difficulty paying attention, impulsivity, and hyperactivity that is treated by an array of different modalities in order to decrease functional impairment. Despite the variety of available pharmacologic treatment options and their widespread use, there still remains a strong need to create innovative therapies. Game Based Therapy (GBT) is a type of cognitive behavioral therapy that seeks to increase the efficacy of currently available pharmacological treatments through improving cognitive deficits and reducing the current dose of such treatments. At the University of Kentucky, a clinical trial was implemented to assess the effects of combining stimulant pharmacotherapy with the popular video game Minecraft as Game Based Therapy on ADHD symptoms in children ages 10-15. However, the low subject recruitment played a large role in the trial failing to produce conclusive data from that site.

This trade study serves to address the difficulties of subject recruitment and determine an optimal population and location for future adoption of the clinical trial. Through statistical analysis of state, national, and survey data it was found that in Lexington, Kentucky, 18-21 year olds are the optimal population for future GBT with pharmacotherapy clinical trials.

INTRODUCTION

Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a neurodevelopmental disorder characterized by difficulty paying attention, impulsivity, and hyperactivity¹ and is the most commonly diagnosed behavioral disorder in children.² ADHD was originally defined in children but is now recognized to persist into adulthood for some patients. Despite this recognition, adult ADHD remains underdiagnosed.³ A study using a nationally representative sample of adults in the United States estimated that the prevalence of ADHD in adults was 4.4%.⁴

Importantly, symptom presentation changes over a lifetime in individuals with ADHD and can be associated with different profiles of functional impairment. Symptoms of hyperactivity, impulsivity, and inattention during childhood often result in disruptive behavior at home and in academic impairment at school. In adulthood, symptoms further evolve such that hyperactivity decreases or morphs into more purposeful activity or inner restlessness, whereas

inattention, disorganization, and impulsivity remain, which can lead to functional difficulties in home, social, and work settings.^{5,6}

Appropriate management of adult patients with ADHD is multimodal. Psychoeducation, counseling, supportive problem-directed therapy, behavioral intervention, coaching, cognitive remediation, and couples and family therapy are useful adjuncts to medication management. Concurrent supportive psychosocial treatment or polypharmacy may be useful in treating the adult with comorbid ADHD.³

An array of nonpharmacologic and pharmacologic treatments are available for the treatment of ADHD in adults. Nonpharmacologic therapies, such as cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT), dialectical behavioral therapy (DBT), physical exercise, and mindfulness awareness practice, have all been shown to confer benefits in adults with ADHD.³ CBT is a model that combines higher-level organization and planning, behavioral skills training, and cognitive restructuring. CBT has been used extensively as a stand-alone therapy and in combination with pharmacotherapy in the treatment of ADHD in adults.⁷ Pharmacologic options include psychostimulants, which have demonstrated the greatest levels of efficacy for treating the core symptoms of ADHD in adults, and nonstimulants, which can be considered when there are concerns related to response, tolerability, or safety with psychostimulants. Despite the variety of available pharmacologic treatment options and their widespread use, there still remains a strong need to create innovative therapies.⁸

Unfortunately, the benefits that do result from stimulant use do not persist after discontinuation and patients with ADHD still suffer from adverse long-term outcomes such as poor academic performance, drug addiction, and criminal behavior to a much greater degree than non-ADHD subjects despite optimal therapy.⁹

The advantages of combining pharmaceutical therapy with behavioral therapy include lower cost, as personnel time with patients is reduced, and reduced doses of pharmaceuticals (50-75%). Additionally, the benefits of behavior therapy are more likely to carry forward once treatment has stopped.¹⁰

The possibility of a synergistic effect from combining pharmacological therapy with Game Based Therapy (GBT) for use in ADHD treatment stems from being able to increase the efficacy of currently available pharmacological treatments through improving cognitive deficits and having the ability to reduce the current dose of such treatments. The suggested mechanism for GBT improving ADHD symptoms is that improves the cognitive processes that underlie them. Executive function, a potential intervention target, is a set of top-down mental processes

that regulate distracting influences and automatic, unproductive behaviors.¹¹ As a result, targeting executive function may allow patients to have better self-control.

Another advantage of utilizing video games for combination therapy is the fact that there is a high volume of scenarios upon which to strengthen patients skills . Different scenarios each day throughout treatment periods reduce the training effect and allow the patient to broaden complex thinking skills instead of focusing on memorizing how to complete a specific task.

One study produced by Akili Interactive Labs, Inc. compared the cognitive functions' of neuro-typical children/those that lacked a diagnosis of ADHD with children that were diagnosed with ADHD. Akili uses a technology entitled EVO to evaluate cognitive interference and the potential maintenance of clinical benefit produced from game based therapy in children ages 8-12 with ADHD. EVO is used to assess reaction time, multitasking ability, and sustained effects of game-based therapy after the end of treatment periods. The study found that there was a significant improvement in the reaction time for the children with ADHD, and lacked a statistically significant result for the neurotypical children.

Minecraft is an online video game containing a virtual land where users can create their own worlds and experiences, using building blocks, resources discovered on the site and their own creativity. Minecraft requires its users to apply problem solving, planning, and organizational skills for creative building and exploration.¹² It offers many levels of difficulty, which allows for adaptation to users with a wide range of cognitive abilities as well as potential for incremental progressions in difficulty as the user's performance improves.

Our previous clinical study utilized the popular online video game, Minecraft, to evaluate its potential for improving executive function in children, ages 10 to 15, with ADHD. The personalized medicine approach included an individualized treatment regimen consisting of an initial stimulant dose recommendation and schedule of Minecraft activities which were determined by the initial ADHD assessment results of new patients.¹³ The study was designed to create novel training activities that would address both the underlying core executive functions (working memory, inhibition, and cognitive flexibility), as well as executive function skills utilized in school and work settings (planning, time management, self-regulation, sustained attention, organization, goal-directed persistence, and metacognition). One of the overall goals of the trial was to develop a better understanding of the relationship between NICHQ Vanderbilt Assessment scores (an assessment that measures ADHD symptoms as well as the patient's function in everyday life), game aspects of Minecraft, and executive function.

This paper will serve as a trade study¹⁴ to collect and compare relevant information regarding two different age groups. A trade study (also known as a trade-off study) serves to

analyze the differentiating factors between two or more systems and identify the most balanced technical solution. Trade studies utilize both quantitative and qualitative measures when determining which solution will produce the optimal outcome. They examine critical factors such as system cost, reliability, maintainability, logistic support, growth potential, and more to improve systematic decisions. For example, if the challenge for an automotive company is to design a vehicle that will bring in the most profit for the company, a trade study can be performed. This allows automotive teams to look into different manufacturing materials, locations for production, fuel-efficiency systems, etc. so that they can create different vehicles, then identify the one with the best profit margin. For a clinical trial, there are many outcome-influencing factors as well. For example, a disease may be location specific, like Ebola, so if an organization were to do a clinical trial in a low-prevalence area, the results of the study may not reflect the entire population.

The initial study¹³ sought to observe the effects of playing Minecraft on executive function in pediatric patients, ages 10-15, with ADHD. The exploratory study used specially designed technological activities to train executive function, working memory, and restraint within the environment of the popular computer game Minecraft. The study attempted to determine whether there is a functional relationship between NICHQ scores, game aspects of Minecraft, and executive function. The primary measures of this study were the changes in NICHQ scores, as measured by a NICHQ questionnaire before and after 4 weeks of therapeutic gaming while simultaneously taking a stimulant type ADHD medication. All study participants were recruited within UK Healthcare in Lexington, Kentucky from October of 2016 to June of 2018 .

The trial studying the 10-15 year old adolescent population in Lexington, Kentucky was launched to determine the possibility of synergistic effects from GBT and pharmaceutical therapy for ADHD.¹³ However, the trial failed to recruit a population large enough to be able to make an accurate scientific conclusion. One major obstacle the study encountered was that you cannot recruit in public schools unless you invest in getting permission. However, university students are readily available, thus it may be easier to conduct a study in the 18-21 year old college student population.

This trade study will address specific risks, benefits, challenges, and future clinical research directions associated with combining pharmacological and GBT for these two different populations. The paper will also reveal the value of reproducing the initial study with the 18-21 year old population as well as address the reasons for low recruitment in the past. In order for the future study to be executed we must meet requirements that include a minimum 16 subject population that is recruitable within two months and an IRB approved population.

For the two different study groups we will assess 13 different categories that we believe have a significant effect on subject recruitability and/or IRB approval. These categories and the values associated with them will serve as evidence for determining statistical differences between the two age groups. The 13 categories are as follows: transportation, the IRB parent/guardian approval requirement for those under the age of 18, financial need, ADHD rate, population density, population proximity, video game experience, life experience, student/teacher relationship strength as determined by class size, medication therapeutic range, obesity rate, sleeping disorder rate, and anxiety disorder rate. The descriptions of each category are included in our [scoresheet here](#).

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS VALUES ARE IN [BRACKETS]

Category	Adolescents (10-15y)	College Students (18-21y)
Transportation[#]	[10] ^{1,2} 10% availability Biking/walking distance, local buses, taxi services, dependent upon parents transportation or parent approval of transportation form.	[100] ^{2,3} Independent on others for transportation. Walking/biking distance, bus routes, self-owned vehicle.
Parent/Guardian Approval Requirement[#]	[0] ⁴ Required	[100] ⁴ Not required
Financial Need Rate	[17.8] ⁵ 17.8% are below the poverty level	[70.0] ⁶ 70% of students have debt after graduation. On average, \$29,800 owed after graduation.
Population Density (Lexington, KY)	[21.9] ⁷ n=16,175 Male: 8,283 Female: 7,892 Per square km (16,175/739km ²) = 21.9	[23.9] ⁷ n=17,671 (18-21) Male: 8,780 Female: 8,891 Per square km = 17671/739 = [23.9]

Proximity to UK Healthcare*	[4.0] ⁸ 3.97 miles Average distances from 5 middle and 5 high schools in Lexington, KY to UKHC	[0.7] ⁹ 0.7 miles between the UK Main Building and UKHC
ADHD Rates	[6.1] ¹⁰ Of studied 4-17 year olds, 6.1% take medication for ADHD in US	[5.0] ¹¹ 2-8% of college students across the US
Video Game Experience[#]	[.5] On average this sample will have less experience due to age and video game comprehension difference.	[1.0] On average this sample will have approximately double the amount of time based on the amount of years of video game playing capability.
Life Experience	[12.5] Age (10-15) mean	[19.5] Age (18-21) mean
Student/Teacher Relationship Strength as Determined by Class Size*	[19.2] ¹² average of 5 major high schools in Lexington	[17.0] ^{13,14} 17:1 Student:faculty ratio at the University of Kentucky
Obesity Risk*	[15.8] ¹⁵ 15.8% of students aged 10-17 had obesity	[10.2] ¹⁶ “While obesity rates for college-age students remains relatively low (males 10.8%, females 9.6%)”
Therapeutic dosing range^{*#}	[25] ¹⁷ Most common stimulant for UKHC - Dextroamphetamine For patients ages 6 and over, the starting dosage is typically 5 mg once or twice a day. Mayo Clinic states the daily dose is typically not over 30. (5mg-30mg) (30-5=25)	[35] ¹⁸ Dextroamphetamine - Usual dose ranges from 5 to 40 mg per day in 1 to 3 divided doses. Subsequent doses may be given at 4 to 6 hours intervals (5-40) (40-5=35)

Sleeping disorder rate*	[3.7] ¹⁹ Across all ages, 3.7% of youths had an ICD-9 diagnosis for a sleep disorder. 100,000+ sample size	[27] ²⁰ Twenty-seven percent of students were at risk for at least one sleep disorder. 1800+ sample size in southeastern college.
Anxiety Disorder Rate*	[25.1] ²¹ Anxiety disorders affect 25.1% of children between 13 and 18 years old	[21.9] ²² 21.9 percent of students said that within the last 12 months, anxiety had affected their academic performance.

Population Density (For NYC, CHC, ATL)	NYC - 749,424/784km ² = [955.9] ²³ CHC - 100,579/591km² = [170.2]²⁴ ATL - 11,886/343km ² = [34.7] ²⁵	NYC - 485,646/784km ² = [619.4] ²³ CHC - 69,268/591km² = [116.9]²⁴ ATL - 9,241/343km ² = [26.9] ²⁵
Location Proximity* (For NYC, CHC, ATL)	Distance from local NYC High Schools to NYU Global Center: [.833] ²⁶ Local HS/Middle schools to UChicago Medical Center: [1.13]²⁸ Local ATL High schools to Emory University Hospital: [3.97] ³⁰	Distance from NYU to NYU Medical Center: [0.2] ²⁷ From UChicago to UChicago Medical Center: [0.2]²⁹ From Emory University to Emory University Hospital: [0.4] ³¹
Student/Teacher Relationship as Determined by Class Size* (For NYC, CHC, ATL)	NYC - [26.4] citywide ³² CHC - [29.1] local HS/MS³⁴ ATL - [13] local HS/MS ³⁶	NYU - [30] ³³ UChicago - [15]³⁵ Emory University - [25] ³⁷

* = values between age groups were switched for statistical analysis

= heuristic values as described in the text

A summary of the resulting comparison

To reiterate, in order to compare the 10-15 year old age group to the 18-21 year old age group, thirteen different characteristics that may have an influence on an ADHD GBT clinical trial were identified. These characteristics were then given values for each age group based upon an in-depth literature search that served to reflect approximate demographics for Lexington, Kentucky when obtainable. If Lexington demographics were unavailable, national demographics were used. If national demographics or outside references were unavailable, a heuristic value was given. Heuristic values are like “rules of thumb”, values which are not guaranteed to be the true, real-world value, but are sufficient for immediate goals.¹⁵ Values that are heuristic are indicated as such within the table above.

Throughout all tables within this study, higher values are designated more valuable to recruitability and IRB approval versus lower values. However, certain category values were switched between age groups due to the higher number being less desirable (e.g. being 10 miles away from the clinical site is less desirable than 5 miles away- so the ‘10 miles away’ group received a value of 5, and vice-versa. The categorical values that were switched between age groups included: location proximity, student/teacher relationship as determined by class size, obesity risk, therapeutic dosing range, sleeping disorder rate, and anxiety disorder rate.

Four experts were recruited to rank the age group characteristics in order of magnitude of effect on subject recruitment and IRB approval influence, with 1 being the least magnitude and 13 being the most. Two of the subjects lacked prior knowledge of the study and were recruited to reduce subjective bias. The results of the survey are shown below in Table 1.

Table 1 - Survey Responses

Ranked from 1-13, with 13 being of highest importance.				
Respondent #1 DL	Respondent #2 RL	Respondent #3 PF	Respondent #4 CB	Avg
11	12	12	11	11.5
10	11	13	13	11.75
8	5	10	1	6
13	13	7	10	10.75
12	10	9	9	10
9	9	8	8	8.5
6	7	6	7	6.5
4	6	5	3	4.5
7	8	11	12	9.5
1	1	2	5	2.25
5	4	4	2	3.75
2	3	3	4	3
3	2	1	6	3

In the first statistical analysis shown below in Table 2, each value for both age groups was converted into a z-score, using the mean and standard deviation of the respective age group, allowing the values to be more comparable to each other. Z-scoring allows us to compare two

values that are taken from different distributions, reducing leverage effects. The 26 respective z-scores were averaged between the two age groups, resulting in 13 z-score values. The values were then weighted by multiplying the average subjective score for that specific characteristic. These 13 ‘overall score’ values give us a subjective reference on the magnitude of effect on subject recruitment and IRB approval influence for the corresponding characteristics. The higher overall score correlates to a stronger influence that the characteristic will have on the clinical trial.

Table 2 - Individual Age Group Values and Z-scores

Column 10-15 age group Mean	Column 10-15 age group SD	Column 18-21 age group Mean	Column 18-21 age group SD	Overall Column Mean	Overall Column SD
13.89	10.83	31.71	35.01	22.80	26.97
Characteristic	10-15 age group value	z-score 10-15 age group	18-21 age group value	z-score 18-21 age group	Overall Score
Transportation	10	-0.36	100	1.95	9.15
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed	0	-1.28	100	1.95	3.93
Financial Need	17.8	0.36	70	1.09	4.36
Population Density	21.9	0.74	23.9	-0.22	2.77
Proximity to UKHC	0.7	-1.22	4	-0.79	10.05
ADHD Rates	6.1	-0.72	5	-0.76	6.30
Video Game Experience	0.5	-1.24	1	-0.88	6.87
Life Experience	12.5	-0.13	19.5	-0.35	1.07
Student/Teacher Relationship	17	0.29	19.2	-0.36	0.33
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	10.2	-0.34	15.8	-0.45	0.89
Therapeutic Dosing Range	35	1.95	25	-0.19	3.29
Sleeping Disorder Rate	27	1.21	3.7	-0.80	0.62
Anxiety Disorder Rate	21.9	0.74	25.1	-0.19	0.83

In the second statistical analysis shown below in Table 3, the characteristic values were once again z-scored by age, however this time they were z-scored using the combined means and standard deviations of both age groups. The new 26 z-scores were then multiplied by the average of the subjective scores to produce new subjective magnitudes. Once again, the higher the score, the better the impact on the clinical trial.

Table 3 - Individual Age Group Values and Z-scores - Combined Mean & Std. Deviation

Characteristic	z-score 10-15 year olds	z score 18-21 year olds	10-15 average score	18-21 average score
Transportation	-0.47	2.86	5.46	32.92
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed	-0.85	2.86	9.93	33.64
Financial Need	-0.19	1.75	1.11	10.50
Population Density	-0.03	0.04	0.36	0.44
Proximity to UKHC	-0.82	0.70	8.19	6.97
ADHD Rates	-0.62	-0.66	5.26	5.61
Video Game Experience	-0.83	-0.81	5.37	5.25
Life Experience	-0.38	0.12	1.72	0.55
Student/Teacher Relationship	0.22	0.13	2.04	1.27
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	-0.47	-0.26	1.05	0.58
Therapeutic Dosing Range	0.45	0.08	1.70	0.31
Sleeping Disorder Rate	0.16	0.71	0.47	2.12
Anxiety Disorder Rate	-0.03	0.09	0.10	0.26
			42.77	100.42

In the third statistical analysis shown below in Table 4, the higher characteristic values that were deemed optimal for subject recruitability and IRB approval were given a ‘2’ for the age group value, whereas the characteristic values that produced less optimal results for subject

recruitability and IRB approval were given a ‘1’ for the respective age group value. Using ‘1’ and ‘2’ for values allows for a simpler version of statistical analysis that focuses less on exact numerical values and more on which age group is preferred for the respective category. The age group values are then multiplied by their respective average subjective score. The resulting individual scores are then totaled by age group. The higher overall score is expected to have the optimal impact on subject recruitability and IRB approval. This categorical analysis shows that regardless of using either exact values from a continuous distribution or categorical preference, the result of the 18-21 year old age group being the optimal population remains the same.

Table 4 - Simplified Optimal Age Group Values for Subject Recruitment & IRB Approval

Characteristic	10-15 age group value	10-15 score	18-21 age group value	18-21 score
Transportation	1	11.5	2	23
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed	1	11.75	2	23.5
Financial Need	1	6	2	12
Population Density	1	10.75	2	21.5
Proximity to UKHC	1	10	2	20
ADHD Rates	2	17	1	8.5
Video Game Experience	1	6.5	2	13
Life Experience	1	4.5	2	9
Student/Teacher Relationship	2	19	1	9.5
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	1	2.25	2	4.5
Therapeutic Dosing Range	2	7.5	1	3.75
Sleeping Disorder Rate	2	6	1	3
Anxiety Disorder Rate	1	3	2	6
		115.75		157.25

In the fourth statistical analysis shown below in Table 5, both of the age group values were divided by the 18-21 year old values to get two respective comparable factors. The new factor values were then multiplied by the corresponding average subjective score to produce concluding values that were totaled for each age group. The higher overall score is expected to have a more optimal expectation for subject recruitability and IRB approval.

Table 5 - Age Group Factorization Combined with Survey Respondent Scores

Characteristic	10-15 age group value	10-15 age group factor	10-15 Factor x Respondent Average (Score)	18-21 age group value	18-21 age group Factor	18-21 Factor x Respondent Average (Score)
Transportation	10	0.1	1.15	100	1	11.5
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed	0	0.00	0.00	100	1	11.75
Financial Need	17.8	0.25	1.53	70	1	6
Population Density	21.9	0.92	9.85	23.9	1	10.75
Proximity to UKHC	0.7	0.18	1.75	4	1	10
ADHD Rates	6.1	1.22	10.37	5	1	8.5
Video Game Experience	0.5	0.5	3.25	1	1	6.5
Life Experience	12.5	0.64	2.88	19.5	1	4.5
Student/Teacher Relationship	17	0.89	8.41	19.2	1	9.5
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	10.2	0.65	1.45	15.8	1	2.25
Therapeutic Dosing Range	35	1.40	5.25	25	1	3.75
Sleeping Disorder Rate	27	1.30	21.89	3.7	1	3
Anxiety Disorder Rate	21.9	0.87	2.62	25.1	1	3
			70.40			91

The third and fourth statistical analyses were compared below in Table 6.

Table 6 - Comparison of Data From Tables 4 and 5

	Scores for Using 1&2 as factors	Scores using values as factors
10-15 group	115.75	70.40
18-21 group	157.25	91
18-21 / 10-15	1.36	1.29

#6 - Sensitivity Analysis and Results

In order to test the **subjective** sensitivity of the trade model, the statistical analysis model from Table 3 was used because of its mathematical simplicity. This time however, the average respondent scores were not used, instead results were calculated using individual respondent scores, creating 4 unique respondent results. The respondents included: PharmD/MSPS candidate Dalton Lovins, PharmD/MBA candidate Conner Ball, UK College of Pharmacy pharmaceutical outcomes and policy professor Dr. Patricia Freeman, and UK College of Pharmacy professor and principal investigator for this study, Dr. Robert Lodder. Therefore, the sensitivity test will show how even though different users ranked categories in different positions, the 18-21 year old age group will still succeed in having the highest overall total, making them the optimal group for clinical trial subject recruitability and IRB approval.

Respondent Results Combined with Simplified Optimal Age Group Values

Respondent 1 Result - Dalton Lovins - PharmD/MSPS Candidate				
z-score category	10-15 age group value	10-15 score	18-21 age group value	18-21 score
Transportation	1	11	2	22
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed	1	10	2	20
Financial Need	1	8	2	16
Population Density	1	13	2	26
Proximity to UKHC	1	12	2	24
ADHD Rates	2	18	1	9
Video Game Experience	1	6	2	12
Life Experience	1	4	2	8
Student/Teacher Relationship	2	14	1	7
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	1	1	2	2
Therapeutic Dosing Range	2	10	1	5
Sleeping Disorder Rate	2	4	1	2
Anxiety Disorder Rate	1	3	2	6
		114		159

Respondent 2 Result - Dr. Robert Lodder - UK College of Pharmacy Professor, PI of Clinical Study				
z-score category	10-15 age group value	10-15 score	18-21 age group value	18-21 score
Transportation	1	12	2	24
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed	1	11	2	22
Financial Need	1	5	2	10
Population Density	1	13	2	26
Proximity to UKHC	1	10	2	20
ADHD Rates	2	18	1	9
Video Game Experience	1	7	2	14
Life Experience	1	6	2	12
Student/Teacher Relationship	2	16	1	8
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	1	1	2	2
Therapeutic Dosing Range	2	8	1	4
Sleeping Disorder Rate	2	6	1	3
Anxiety Disorder Rate	1	2	2	4
		115		158

Respondent 3 Result - Dr. Patricia Freeman - Pharmaceutical Outcomes and Policy Expert				
z-score category	10-15 age group value	10-15 score	18-21 age group value	18-21 score
Transportation	1	12	2	24
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed	1	13	2	26
Financial Need	1	10	2	20
Population Density	1	7	2	14
Proximity to UKHC	1	9	2	18
ADHD Rates	2	16	1	8
Video Game Experience	1	6	2	12
Life Experience	1	5	2	10
Student/Teacher Relationship	2	22	1	11
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	1	2	2	4
Therapeutic Dosing Range	2	8	1	4
Sleeping Disorder Rate	2	6	1	3
Anxiety Disorder Rate	1	1	2	2
		117		156

Respondent 4 Result - Conner Ball - PharmD/MBA Candidate				
z-score category	10-15 age group value	10-15 score	18-21 age group value	18-21 score
Transportation	1	11	2	22
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed	1	13	2	26
Financial Need	1	1	2	2
Population Density	1	10	2	20
Proximity to UKHC	1	9	2	18
ADHD Rates	2	16	1	8
Video Game Experience	1	7	2	14
Life Experience	1	3	2	6
Student/Teacher Relationship	2	24	1	12
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	1	5	2	10
Therapeutic Dosing Range	2	4	1	2
Sleeping Disorder Rate	2	8	1	4
Anxiety Disorder Rate	1	6	2	12
		117		156

- In order to test the **location** sensitivity of the trade model, we have included results from New York, NY., Chicago, IL., and Atlanta, GA. Even with a population as dense as these 3 major cities, the overall outcome is very similar with the 18-21 year old age group being the optimal treatment group.

New York City, New York Model

New York City, New York Model						
Characteristic	10-15 age group value	10-15 age group factor	10-15 Factor x Respondent Average (Score)	18-21 age group value	18-21 age group Factor	18-21 Factor x Respondent Average (Score)
Transportation	10	0.10	1.15	100	1	11.5
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed	0	0.00	0.00	100	1	11.75
Financial Need	17.8	0.25	1.53	70	1	6
Population Density	955.9	1.54	16.59	619.4	1	10.75
Proximity to NYU Medical Center	0.2	0.24	2.40	0.833	1	10
ADHD Rates	6.1	1.22	10.37	5	1	8.5
Video Game Experience	0.5	0.5	3.25	1	1	6.5
Life Experience	12.5	0.64	2.88	19.5	1	4.5
Student/Teacher Relationship	30	1.14	10.80	26.4	1	9.5
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	15.8	1.55	3.49	10.2	1	2.25
Therapeutic Dosing Range	35	1.40	5.25	25	1	3.75
Sleeping Disorder Rate	27	7.30	21.89	3.7	1	3
Anxiety Disorder Rate	21.9	0.87	2.62	25.1	1	3
			82.21			91
Scores using values as factors						
10-15 group						82.21
18-21 group						91
18-21 / 10-15						1.11

Chicago, Illinois Model

Chicago, Illinois Model						
Characteristic	10-15 age group value	10-15 age group factor	10-15 Factor x Respondent Average (Score)	18-21 age group value	18-21 age group Factor	18-21 Factor x Respondent Average (Score)
Transportation	10	0.1	1.15	100	1	11.5
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed:	0	0	0.00	1	1	11.75
Financial Need	17.8	0.25	1.53	70	1	6
Population Density	170.2	1.46	15.65	116.9	1	10.75
Proximity to UChicago Medical Center	0.2	0.18	1.77	1.13	1	10
ADHD Rates	6.1	1.22	10.37	5	1	8.5
Video Game Experience	0.5	0.5	3.25	1	1	6.5
Life Experience	12.5	0.64	2.88	19.5	1	4.5
Student/Teacher Relationship	15	0.52	4.90	29.1	1	9.5
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	15.8	1.55	3.49	10.2	1	2.25
Therapeutic Dosing Range	35	1.40	5.25	25	1	3.75
Sleeping Disorder Rate	27	7.30	21.89	3.7	1	3
Anxiety Disorder Rate	21.9	0.87	2.62	25.1	1	3
			74.74			91

	Scores using values as factors
10-15 group	74.74
18-21 group	91
18-21 / 10-15	1.22

Atlanta, Georgia Model

Atlanta, Georgia Model						
Characteristic	10-15 age group value	10-15 age group factor	10-15 Factor x Respondent Average (Score)	18-21 age group value	18-21 age group Factor	18-21 Factor x Respondent Average (Score)
Transportation	10	0.1	1.15	100	1	11.5
Parent/Guardian Approval Needed	0	0	0.00	100	1	11.75
Financial Need	17.8	0.25	1.53	70	1	6
Population Density	34.7	1.29	13.87	26.9	1	10.75
Proximity to Emory University Hospital	0.4	0.10	1.01	3.97	1	10
ADHD Rates	6.1	1.22	10.37	5	1	8.5
Video Game Experience	0.5	0.5	3.25	1	1	6.5
Life Experience	12.5	0.64	2.88	19.5	1	4.5
Student/Teacher Relationship	25	1.92	18.27	13	1	9.5
Metabolism/Obesity Risk	15.8	1.55	3.49	10.2	1	2.25
Therapeutic Dosing Range	35	1.40	5.25	25	1	3.75
Sleeping Disorder Rate	27	7.30	21.89	3.7	1	3
Anxiety Disorder Rate	21.9	0.87	2.62	25.1	1	3
			85.57			91

	Scores using values as factors
10-15 group	85.57
18-21 group	91
18-21 / 10-15	1.06

Conclusion, Adoption, and Further Analysis

The overall conclusion of this study is that the 18-21 year old age group in Lexington, Kentucky is the optimal population for future GBT/ADHD clinical studies.

These data and analyses will be used for the future adoption of the 18-21 year old age group for examining whether GBT has an effect on ADHD symptoms. For the next trial, a maximum of 60 days will be allotted to recruiting at least 16 subjects in order to draw scientific conclusions regarding the relationship between combination Game Based Therapy with pharmacological treatment and ADHD symptoms.

An unexplored option regarding alternative trade studies includes separating the initial survey question, which was, “Rank the age group characteristics in order of magnitude of effect on subject recruitment and IRB approval influence, with 1 being the least magnitude and 13 being the most,” into two separate questions. In turn, one question would ask solely about the magnitude of effect on subject recruitability and the other question would ask solely about the magnitude of effect on IRB approval. This analysis would have been beneficial in comparing the effect on survey responses, and subsequently the outcomes of similarly structured statistical analyses.

Supplementary Material

A special thanks to those who participated in the clinical trial characteristics ranking. Dr. Lodder is the principal investigator for the initial GBT trial for 10-15 year olds and has been constantly utilized for consults regarding this paper's purpose, execution, and reviewal. Dr. Patricia Freeman is a current pharmaceutical outcomes and policy professor at the University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy. Conner Ball is a current MBA candidate at the University of Kentucky.

Acknowledgements

Dr. Robert Lodder - UKCOP Professor

Dr. Patricia Freeman - UKCOP Professor

Conner Ball - PharmD/MBA candidate 2021

Dr. Penni Black - UKCOP Professor

References

1. American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed)*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
2. "Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder." *MentalHealth*. US Department of Health and Human Services. 8 August 2017.
<https://www.mentalhealth.gov/what-to-look-for/behavioral-disorders/adhd>
3. "Addressing Diagnosis and Treatment Gaps in Adults with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder." *The Primary Care Companion for CNS Disorders*. Physicians Postgraduate Press, Inc. 7 September 2017.
<https://www.psychiatrist.com/PCC/article/Pages/2017/v19n05/17nr02153.aspx>
4. Kessler RC, Adler L, Barkley R, et al. The prevalence and correlates of adult ADHD in the United States: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2006;163(4):716–723.
5. Spencer TJ, Biederman J, Mick E. Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: diagnosis, lifespan, comorbidities, and neurobiology. *Ambul Pediatr*. 2007;7(suppl 1):73–81.
6. Adler LA. Clinical presentations of adult patients with ADHD. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2004;65(suppl 3):8–11.
7. Manos MJ. Psychosocial therapy in the treatment of adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Postgrad Med*. 2013;125(2):51–64.
8. Rutledge, K. J., van den Bos, W., McClure, S. M., & Schweitzer, J. B. (2012). Training cognition in ADHD: current findings, borrowed concepts, and future directions. *Neurotherapeutics*, 9(3), 542-558.
9. Molina, B. S., Hinshaw, S. P., Swanson, J. M., Arnold, L. E., Vitiello, B., Jensen, P. S., ... & Elliott, G. R. (2009). The MTA at 8 years: prospective follow-up of children treated

- for combined-type ADHD in a multisite study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 48(5), 484-500.
10. Pelham, W. E., & Gnagy, E. M. (1999). Psychosocial and combined treatments for ADHD. *Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*, 5(3), 225-236.
 11. Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. *Annual review of psychology*, 64, 135-168.
 12. "What is Minecraft?" Accessed October 30, 2017. <http://parentinfo.org/article/what-is-minecraft>
 13. Tiiitto, M. 2019. Therapeutic Video Games and the Simulation of Executive Function Deficits in ADHD. University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy. Lexington, Kentucky.
 14. Kossiakoff, A., Sweet, W. (2003) *Systems Engineering Principles and Practice*. Hoboken, New Jersey. John Wiley and Sons.
 15. Heuristic Approaches to Problem Solving.
<https://www.101computing.net/heuristic-approaches-to-problem-solving/>

Statistical Analysis Chart References

Transportation References:

1. Biking: Survey: 100 Million Americans Bike Each Year, But Few Make it a Habit.
<https://usa.streetsblog.org/2015/03/04/survey-100-million-americans-bike-each-year-but-few-make-it-a-habit/>
2. Graduated Driver Licensing Program. Drive.KY.gov.
<https://drive.ky.gov/driver-licensing/Pages/Graduated-Driver-Licensing-Program.aspx>
3. University of KY Campus bus routes
<https://www.uky.edu/transportation/bus/campusshuttles>

Parental Approval Requirement:

4. Field, MJ. Ethical Conduct of Clinical Research involving Children. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Clinical Research Involving Children.<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK25560/>

Financial Need Rate:

5. Data Tables and Tools ACS.
<https://www.census.gov/acs/www/data/data-tables-and-tools/>
6. A Look at the Shocking Student Loan Debt for 2019. StudentLoanHero. Feb. 9, 2019.
<https://studentloanhero.com/student-loan-debt-statistics/>

Population Density for Lexington

7. Current Lexington, KY Population, Demographics, and stats in 2019, 2018. US Census Data. <https://suburbanstats.org/population/kentucky/how-many-people-live-in-lexington>

Proximity to UKHC

8. Google Maps - Distance from Morton middle, Windburn middle, Southern Middle, Crawford Middle, Tates Creek Middle, Sayre, Henry Clay, Lex Cath, Trinity Christian Academy Upper School, and Paul Dunbar to UK Chandler Hospital <https://www.google.com/maps>
9. UK Main Building distance to UK Chandler Hospital <https://www.google.com/maps>

ADHD Rates - Kentucky

10. CDC. 2011 data. https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/adhd/stateprofiles/stateprofile_kentucky.pdf
11. Dupaul GJ, Weyandt LL, O'Dell SM, et al. College students with ADHD: Current status and future directions. J Atten Disord. 2009;13:234–250. doi: 10.1177/1087054709340650

Student Teacher Relationship

12. 17. 2019 Largest Public High Schools in Kentucky. <https://www.niche.com/k12/search/largest-public-high-schools/s/kentucky/>
13. University of Kentucky FAQs - Average Class size <http://students.ca.uky.edu/faqs>
14. Why Students Don't Attend Office Hours <https://www.teachingprofessor.com/topics/for-those-who-teach/students-dont-attend-office-hours/>

Obesity Risk

15. Childhood Obesity Trends - The State of Obesity. <https://www.stateofobesity.org/childhood-obesity-trends/>
16. Serious Games for Diabetes, Obesity, and Healthy Lifestyle: Using an Alternate Reality Game to Increase Physical Activity and Decrease Obesity Risk in College Students. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3440154/>

Therapeutic Dosing Range

17. <https://www.mayoclinic.org/drugs-supplements/dextroamphetamine-and-amphetamine-or-al-route/proper-use/drg-20071758>
18. Dextroamphetamine. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK507808/>

Sleeping Disorder

19. Prevalence of Diagnosed Sleep Disorders in Pediatric Primary Care Practices.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3089951/>
20. The Prevalence of Sleep Disorders in College Students: Impact on academic Performance.
<https://www.csus.edu/faculty/M/fred.molitor/docs/Sleep%20and%20Academic%20Performance.pdf>

Anxiety Disorder Rate

21. Facts & Statistics - Anxiety and Depression Association of America.
<https://adaa.org/about-adaa/press-room/facts-statistics>
22. Mental Health Matters: Anxiety and Depression - BU Today.
<http://www.bu.edu/articles/2016/college-students-anxiety-and-depression>

Population Density for New York City, NY

23. Current NYC, NY Population, Demographics, and stats in 2019, 2018.
<https://suburbanstats.org/population/new-york/how-many-people-live-in-new-york>

Population density for Chicago, IL

24. Current Chicago IL Population, Demographics, and stats in 2019, 2018.
<https://suburbanstats.org/population/illinois/how-many-people-live-in-chicago>

Population Density for Atlanta, GA

25. Current Atlanta, GA Population, Demographics, and stats in 2019, 2018.
<https://suburbanstats.org/population/georgia/how-many-people-live-in-atlanta>

Proximity to NYU Medical Center

26. Average distance from Manhattan Village Academy, Norman Thomas HS, LREI Lower and Middle School to NYU
27. Distance between NYU to NYU Langone Medical Center

Proximity to UChicago Medical Center

28. Average distance from University of Chicago Charter School, University of Chicago Laboratory Schools, and King College Prep High School to UChicago Medical Center.
29. Distance between UChicago to UChicago Medical Center

Proximity to Emory University Hospital

30. Average distance from Druid Hills High School, Ben Franklin Academy, Samuel Inman Middle School.
31. Distance between Emory University to Emory University Hospital

Student/Teach Relationship for New York, NY

32. New York City citywide average class size
https://infohub.nyced.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/2018-19_november_class_size_report_-_webdeck_-_11-14-18.pdf?Status=Temp&sfvrsn=c46ddc95_2
33. NYU average class size
<https://www.collegedata.com/college/New-York-University?tab=profile-overview-tab>

Student/Teacher Relationship for Chicago, IL

34. Chicago Public Schools average class size
https://cps.edu/About_CPS/At-a-glance/Pages/Stats_and_facts.aspx
35. UChicago average class size
<https://www.collegedata.com/college/University-of-Chicago?tab=profile-overview-tab>

Student/Teacher Relationship for Atlanta, GA

36. Atlanta Public Schools average class size
<https://www.publicschoolreview.com/georgia/atlanta-public-schools/1300120-school-district>
37. Emory University average class size
<http://www.emory.edu/home/academics/faculty/index.html>