Dose-response relationship of extended-release methylphenidate for ADHD in adults: post-hoc analysis based on a systematic review

Boesen K, Jørgensen KJ, Gøtzsche PC

Corresponding author Kim Boesen, MD PhD Copenhagen Denmark boesen.kim@gmail.com

Abstract: 121 words Text: 987 words Tables: 1 Figures: 4

Submitted to MedRxiv: 8 December 2021

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Objective: To assess potential dose-response relationships of extended-release methylphenidate for ADHD in adults on efficacy outcomes.

Study design and setting: Post-hoc analysis based on a systematic review of extendedrelease methylphenidate (<u>https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012857</u>). Using data from clinical trials comparing multiple fixed-dose methylphenidate groups with placebo, we conducted subgroup meta-analyses for available efficacy outcomes.

Results and conclusion: Five trials used a fixed-dose design with multiple methylphenidate groups receiving different doses. All trials were pivotal industry sponsored studies conducted to obtain marketing authorisation. We analysed four efficacy outcomes: Self-rated ADHD symptoms (5 trials, 1807 participants), investigator-rated ADHD symptoms (5 trials, 1904 participants), quality of life (4 trials, 1158 participants), and peer-rated ADHD symptoms (2 trials, 879 participants). There were no dose-response relationships for any outcome.

Introduction

In a recent letter¹ commenting on our study² of missing clinical trials in new drug applications of extended-release methylphenidate for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in adults, the author wrote that, "there is substantial (if uncertain) body of evidence for the linear dose-response relationship" and that, "it is plausible that the doses used in the clinical trials have been too low." The author of the letter referred to a systematic review³ and network meta-analysis of ADHD medications to support the statement. We did not find that the systematic review³ provided support to this idea. We therefore tested the dose-response hypothesis on a dataset we had recently collected for a systematic review on extended-release methylphenidate for adult ADHD.⁴

Method

Dataset

We identified clinical trials using a fixed-dose design including two or more methylphenidate groups and a placebo group. We collated data from all available efficacy outcomes reported separately for the methylphenidate groups. We did not include flexible dose titration trials,

i.e. where participants are titrated to the highest tolerated dose, as this design is not appropriate to assess dose-response relationships. Data had been extracted already for our systematic review.⁴ For Weiss 2014, we included additional data from a Clinical Study Report⁵ published by Health Canada. The full dataset for this post-hoc analysis is available here: <u>https://osf.io/wrf65/?view_only=ef3340ea339c44bdad5f83732cf4ba84</u>.

Analyses

We made meta-analyses in RevMan 5.4 using the fixed-effects model with inverse variance weighting. To avoid double counting of the placebo groups, we split the placebo comparator by keeping the mean value and variation and dividing the total number of placebo participants with the number of methylphenidate groups. Results were reported as mean differences. We reported the rating scale ranges in the plots.

Results

We included five fixed-dose trials⁶⁻¹⁰ using four different extended-release formulations, each including between two and four fixed-dose methylphenidate groups (**Table 1**).

We analysed four efficacy outcomes: Self-rated ADHD symptoms (5 trials, 1807 participants) (**Figure 1**), investigator-rated ADHD symptoms (5 trials, 1904 participants) (**Figure 2**), quality of life (4 trials, 1158 participants) (**Figure 3**), and peer-rated ADHD symptoms (2 trial, 879 participants) (**Figure 4**). We did not observe a dose-response relationship for any of the four outcomes and the mean differences between the methylphenidate groups in each trial were small and most likely clinically irrelevant.

The largest mean difference observed was a 6.5-point difference on a self-rated symptom scale (range 0 to 78 points) in Spencer 2003⁶ between 30 mg and 40 mg dexmethylphenidate. For investigator-rated ADHD symptoms, the point estimates favoured the highest dose in all five trials, but the group differences were only a few points ranging from 1.5 to 5.5 points on a scale from 0 to 54 points. There is limited empirical knowledge on the minimal clinically relevant differences for ADHD rating scales, except for the quality of life outcome scale, Q-LES-QSF, which is estimated to be 3 points.¹¹

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic assessment of dose-response relationships of methylphenidate for ADHD in adults. Our analysis was not preregistered, which is a limitation, but data were systematically collected for our review.⁴ It is uncertain whether the trials were powered to demonstrate group differences but the mean differences between the dose groups were small lending no support to dose-response relationships. Other methods may be used to address this question, such as meta-regression, but it was not feasible due to the use of different methylphenidate formulations and doses in this analysis.¹² Notably, one method should not be used: a comparison across dose titration studies using the mean or median dose, which is unreliable because of the ecological fallacy.¹³ A systematic review¹⁴ of amphetamines for adult ADHD also did not find differences between 'lower' or 'higher' doses amphetamines versus placebo, although the used methodology was unclear.

We did not analyse harms due to potential selective reporting. As seen in our dataset, only a few harms outcomes were reported separately for the methylphenidate groups. In a comment¹⁵ on the most recently approved methylphenidate formulation, we highlighted that the FDA did not authorise the highest dose (100 mg controlled-release) as they found a "disproportionate" increase of certain adverse events compared to the lower doses (25, 45 and 70 mg).

In the letter,¹ the author further wrote, "the presumed optimal dose" is around 1 mg/kg. The supporting narrative review¹⁶ stated, "Doses around 1 mg/kg of methylphenidate are correlated with better efficacy, yet are rarely achieved in studies of adult patients". The statement seems illogical; if you can't "achieve" a given dose, i.e. titrate participants to a higher dose - likely because of adverse effects – it will obviously not be better than a lower dose. The narrative review (published in 2018) cited two methylphenidate systematic reviews; one that had been retracted in 2016 because of methodological shortcomings,¹⁷ making it an unfortunate choice of reference; and the other review¹⁸ used the inappropriate method of comparing mean doses across dose titration trials.

Finally, the assessed pivotal trials have serious methodological limitations, which would likely favour dose-response relationships. Most trials selected their participants based on their response to previous central stimulant exposure,⁴ and selective outcome reporting likely also favours a dose-response relationship, as it would be in the companies' interest to demonstrate such an effect. Inappropriate handling of missing data such as using the last observation carried forward (LOCF) method could also drive differences between the groups, as dropout rates and reasons for dropouts would vary, and as more dropouts are expected with higher doses. In two of the included fixed-dose trials, Casas 2008⁸ and Huss 2010,⁹ there was likely such inappropriate handling of missing data: For Casas 2008's highest dose (72 mg) and Huss 2010's two highest doses (60 mg and 80 mg), there were more participants designated as "responders" than actually completed the trials. The British drug regulator also made this observation about Casas 2008 in their public assessment report (p. 45).¹⁹

In conclusion, our results do not support a dose-response relationship of extended-release methylphenidate for adult ADHD.

Conflicts of interest None

Funding None

Acknowledgements None

Data sharing statement The full dataset: https://osf.io/wrf65/?view_only=ef3340ea339c44bdad5f83732cf4ba84.

References

- 1. Jaeschke R. Letter to the editor. J Clin Epidemiol 2021.
- Boesen K, Jørgensen KJ, Gøtzsche PC. Clinical trials were missing from regulatory documents of extended-release methylphenidate for ADHD in adults: A case study of public documents. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2021. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.10.027</u>.
- 3. Cortese S, Adamo N, Giovane CD, 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. Boesen K, Paludan-Müller AS, Gøtzsche PC, Jørgensen KJ. Extended-release methylphenidate for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in adults (review). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* (in press).
- Health Canada. Clinical Study Report. Study 063-010 Report Body. 27 July 2015. Available from: <u>https://clinical-information.canada.ca/ci-rc-vu.pdf?file=m5/53-clin-stud-rep/535-repeffic-safety-stud/adhd/5351-stud-rep-contr/report-body-red-3.pdf&id=187330</u> (Dec 2021).
- 6. Spencer TJ, Adler LA, McGough JJ, et al. Efficacy and safety of dexmethylphenidate extended-release capsules in adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Biol Psychiatry* 2007;61:1380-7.
- 7. NCT00246220. Available from: <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00246220</u> (Nov 2021).
- NCT00714688. Available from: <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT00714688</u> (Nov 2021).
- 9. NCT01259492. Available from: <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01259492</u> (Nov 2021).
- 10. NCT02139124. Available from: <u>https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT02139124</u> (Nov 2021).
- Mick E, Faraone SV, Spencer T, et al. Assessing the validity of the quality of life enjoyment and satisfaction questionnaire–short form in adults with ADHD. *J Atten Disord* 2008;11:504-9.
- 12. Gøtzsche PC, Hvidberg EF, Juul P. Rational choice of dose: Insufficient background knowledge? *Ration Drug Ther* 1986;20:1-7.
- 13. Encyclopædia Britannica. Ecological fallacy. Not dated. Available from: https://www.britannica.com/science/ecological-fallacy (Nov 2021).
- 14. Castells X, Blanco-Silvente L, Cunill R. Amphetamines for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2018;8:CD007813.
- 15. Boesen K, Jørgensen KJ, Gøtzsche PC. The US Food and Drug Administration's authorisation of Purdue's controlled-release methylphenidate for adult ADHD: comments on the regulatory practice. *J R Soc Med* 2021;114:377-80.
- 16. Franke B, Michelini G, Asherson P, et al. Live fast, die young? A review on the developmental trajectories of ADHD across the lifespan. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2018;28:1059-88.
- 17. Boesen K, Saiz LC, Erviti J, et al. Cochrane Collaboration withdraws a review on immediaterelease methylphenidate for adults with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Evid Based Med* 2017;22:143-7.
- Castells X, Ramos-Quiroga JA, Rigau D, et al. Efficacy of methylphenidate for adults with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: a meta-regression analysis. *CNS Drugs* 2011;25:157-69.
- Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency. Public Assessment Report. Concerta XL 27 mg prolonged-release tablets. UK/H/0544/004/MR. Available from: <u>https://mhraproductsproduction.blob.core.windows.net/docs/e16cca8676c72aff9c51ed19f</u> <u>93314a251e61a05</u> (Nov 2021).

Trial	Type of	Design	Groups	Reported outcomes
	methylphenidate			
Spencer 2003 ⁶	Dex-methylphenidate	RCT, DB, 5 weeks,	20mg – 30mg – 40mg	Self-rated symptoms;
	extended-release	industry-sponsored	- placebo	investigator-rated
		trial (Novartis)		symptoms; QOL
Medori 2005 ⁷	OROS	RCT, DB, 5 weeks,	18mg – 36mg – 72mg	Self-rated symptoms;
	methylphenidate	industry-sponsored	– placebo	investigator-rated
		trial (Janssen)		symptoms; QOL
Casas 2008 ⁸	OROS	RCT, DB, 13 weeks,	54mg – 72mg –	Self-rated symptoms;
	methylphenidate	industry-sponsored	placebo	investigator-rated
		trial (Janssen)		symptoms; QOL
Huss 2010 ⁹	Long-acting	RCT, DB, 9 weeks,	40mg – 60mg – 80mg	Self-rated symptoms;
	methylphenidate	industry-sponsored	– placebo	investigator-rated
		trial (Novartis)		symptoms; peer-
				rated symptoms
Weiss 2014 ^{5, 10}	Controlled-release	RCT, DB, 4 weeks,	25mg – 45mg – 70mg	Self-rated symptoms;
	methylphenidate	industry-sponsored	– 100mg – placebo	investigator-rated
		trial (Purdue Pharma)		symptoms; QOL;
				peer-rated symptoms

Table 1. Fixed-dose extended-release methylphenidate trials

DB= double blind, OROS = Osmotic-controlled Release Oral delivery System, RCT =

randomised clinical trial, QOL = quality of life.

Figure 1. Self-rated ADHD symptoms

	methy	pheni	date	p	olacebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean		Total				Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.1.1 Spencer 2003 (de	x-meth	ylphen	idate El	R; CAAI	RS, 0-7	8 point	ts)		
Spencer 2003 – 20mg	36	13.86	54	44.4	15.6	16	34.6%	-8.40 [-16.89, 0.09]	
Spencer 2003 – 30mg	37.7	16.76	54	44.4	15.6	16	31.8%	-6.70 [-15.56, 2.16]	
Spencer 2003 – 40mg	31.2	14.73	52	44.4	15.6	16	33.5%	-13.20 [-21.83, -4.57]	_
Subtotal (95% CI)			160			48	100.0%	-9.47 [-14.46, -4.47]	
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1$.	.15, df =	= 2 (P =	0.56); I	$^{2} = 0\%$					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.71	(P = 0.0)	002)						
1.1.2 Medori 2005 (OR	OS metl	hylphen	idate; (CAARS,	0-78 p	oints)			
Medori 2005 – 18mg	-10.4	12.9	93	-5.8	11.3	30	34.4%	-4.60 [-9.42, 0.22]	
Medori 2005 - 36mg	-11.3	12.42	95	-5.8	11.3	30	35.4%	-5.50 [-10.25, -0.75]	_
Medori 2005 - 72mg	-14.4	15.52	92	-5.8	11.3	30	30.2%	-8.60 [-13.74, -3.46]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			280			90	100.0%	-6.13 [-8.95, -3.30]	◆
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1$.	.34, df =	= 2 (P =	0.51); I	$^{2} = 0\%$					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 4.25	(P < 0.0	0001)						
1.1.3 Casas 2008 (ORO	S meth	ylpheni	date; C	AARS, (0-78 pc	oints)			
Casas 2008 – 54mg	35.6	16	90	40.3	14.5	49	48.2%	-4.70 [-9.94, 0.54]	
Casas 2008 - 72mg	35.3	14.7	92	40.3	14.5	49	51.8%	-5.00 [-10.05, 0.05]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			182			98	100.0%	-4.86 [-8.49, -1.22]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.	.01, df =	= 1 (P =	0.94); I	$^{2} = 0\%$					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.62	(P = 0.0)	009)						
1.1.4 Huss 2010 (long-	acting	methyl	ohenida	te; ASI	RS, 0-7	2 point	s)		
Huss 2010 – 40mg	38.9	14.49	154	44.9	13.41	53	32.8%	-6.00 [-10.27, -1.73]	_
Huss 2010 – 60mg	38.4	13.37	151	44.9	13.41	53	34.1%	-6.50 [-10.69, -2.31]	_
Huss 2010 – 80mg	36.6	14.07	151	44.9	13.41	53	33.1%	-8.30 [-12.55, -4.05]	_
Subtotal (95% CI)			456			159	100.0%	-6.93 [-9.38, -4.49]	◆
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$.	.62, df =	= 2 (P =	0.73); I	$^{2} = 0\%$					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 5.55	(P < 0.0	00001)						
1.1.5 Weiss 2014 (cont	rolled-	release	methyl	phenid	late; CA	ARS, 0	-78 poin	ts)	
Weiss 2014 – 100mg	59.1	12.51	61	61.2	11.61	18	23.9%	-2.10 [-8.31, 4.11]	
Weiss 2014 – 25mg	58.7	10.76	71	61.2	11.61	18	26.4%	-2.50 [-8.42, 3.42]	
Weiss 2014 – 45mg	57	12.63	66	61.2	11.61	18	24.3%	-4.20 [-10.37, 1.97]	
Weiss 2014 – 70mg	59.5	11.24	64	61.2	11.61	18	25.4%	-1.70 [-7.73, 4.33]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			262			72	100.0%	-2.61 [-5.65, 0.43]	-
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.	.37, df =	= 3 (P =	0.95); I	$^{2} = 0\%$					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.69	(P = 0.0))9)						
								_	
									-20 -10 o 1o
Test for subgroup differ	ancas. C	$hi^2 - 7$	41 df	- A (P -	- 0 12)	$1^2 - A^2$	5.0%		Favours [methylphenidate] Favours [placebo
rescrot subgroup unter	circes. C	- /	.+1, ul ·		- 0.12),	40			

Figure 2. Investigator-rated ADHD symptoms

		/lphenio	Jale	p	lacebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.2.1 Spencer 2003 (de	x-meth	ylpheni	date EF	R; ADH	D RS IV	, 0-54	points)		
Spencer 2003 – 20mg	23.1	11.65	57	29.6	13.6	18	33.6%	-6.50 [-13.47, 0.47]	_
Spencer 2003 – 30mg	23.5	11.8	54	29.6	13.6	18	33.0%	-6.10 [-13.13, 0.93]	_
Spencer 2003 – 40mg	20	11.5	54	29.6	13.6	18	33.4%	-9.60 [-16.59, -2.61]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			165			54	100.0%	-7.40 [-11.44, -3.36]	
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$.	.58, df =	= 2 (P =	0.75); I	$^{2} = 0\%$					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.59	(P = 0.0)	003)						
1.2.2 Medori 2005 (OR	OS meth	nylphen	idate; C	CAARS,	0-54 p	oints)			
Medori 2005 – 18mg	25	10.43	99	29.6	10.6	32	33.8%	-4.60 [-8.81, -0.39]	_
Medori 2005 – 36mg	25.8	10.88	101	29.6	10.6	32	33.2%	-3.80 [-8.04, 0.44]	_
Medori 2005 - 72mg	22.9	10.95	99	29.6	10.6	32	33.0%	-6.70 [-10.96, -2.44]	_
Subtotal (95% CI)			299			96	100.0%	-5.03 [-7.47, -2.58]	◆
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$.	.95, df =	= 2 (P =	0.62); I	$^{2} = 0\%$					-
Test for overall effect: Z									
1.2.3 Casas 2008 (ORO	S methy	pheni	date; C/	AARS, ()-54 pc	oints)			
Casas 2008 - 54mg		11.07	90	,	10.59	49	48.4%	-3.10 [-6.84, 0.64]	
Casas 2008 – 72mg		10.21	92		10.59	49	51.6%	-4.50 [-8.13, -0.87]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			182			98	100.0%	-3.82 [-6.43, -1.22]	•
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$.	.28, df =	= 1 (P =	0.60); 1	$^{2} = 0\%$					
Test for overall effect: Z									
1.2.4 Huss 2010 (long-	-acting	methvlr	ohenida	te: AD	HD RS.	0-54 r	oints)		
Huss 2010 – 40mg		12.62	160	,	11.64	54	,	-5.80 [-9.47, -2.13]	
Huss 2010 – 60mg		11.3	155		11.64	54	34.0%	-5.50 [-9.08, -1.92]	
Huss 2010 – 80mg		11.53	156		11.64	54		-7.00 [-10.59, -3.41]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	22.5	11.55	471	20.0	11.01		100.0%		•
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$.	.37. df =	= 2 (P =	0.83): 1	$^{2} = 0\%$					-
Test for overall effect: Z				070					
			-						
1.2.5 Weiss 2014 (cont	rolled-r	release	methyl	phenid	ate; AD	HD-5-	-RS, 0-54	points)	
Weiss 2014 – 100mg	18.7	11.48	74	26.1	11.99	20	25.2%	-7.40 [-13.27, -1.53]	
Weiss 2014 – 25mg	24.2	11.88	77	26.1	11.99	20	25.1%	-1.90 [-7.79, 3.99]	
Weiss 2014 – 45mg		12.45	73		11.99	20		-6.20 [-12.18, -0.22]	
Weiss 2014 – 70mg	24	11.25	73	26.1	11.99	20	25.4%	-2.10 [-7.95, 3.75]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			297			80	100.0%	-4.38 [-7.33, -1.44]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2.	.64, df =	= 3 (P =	0.45); I	$^{2} = 0\%$					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.91	(P = 0.0)	04)						
								-	
									-10 -5 0 5 1
		-	.25, df =						Favours [methylphenidate] Favours [placeb

Figure 3. Quality of life

	methylphenidate			F	lacebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	
1.3.1 Spencer 2003 (de	ex-meth	ylphenio	date ER	Q-LES	5-QSF, 1	ر 10–44	ooints))			
Spencer 2003 – 20mg	51.5	6.95	55	50.9	8.6	16	34.6%	0.60 [-4.00, 5.20]	_	
Spencer 2003 - 30mg	50.7	7.82	53	50.9	8.6	16	33.0%	-0.20 [-4.91, 4.51]		
Spencer 2003 - 40mg	51.8	8.11	52	50.9	8.6	16	32.4%	0.90 [-3.86, 5.66]	_	
Subtotal (95% CI)			160				100.0%	0.43 [-2.27, 3.14]		
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$				(P = C)	.95); l ²	= 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 0.31	(P = 0.7)	5)							
1.3.2 Medori 2005 (OR	OS meth	ylpheni	date; Q	-LES-0	QSF, 14	-70 poi	ints)			
Medori 2005 – 18mg	-5.6	12.3	82	-5	14.17	26	37.3%	-0.60 [-6.66, 5.46]	-	
Medori 2005 - 36mg	-4.7	15.68	86	-5	14.17	26	33.7%	0.30 [-6.08, 6.68]	_	
Medori 2005 - 72mg	-6.7	18.97	78	-5	14.17	26	28.9%	-1.70 [-8.58, 5.18]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			246			78	100.0%	-0.61 [-4.32, 3.09]		
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$	0.00; Chi ⁱ	$^{2} = 0.17$, df = 2	(P = 0)	.92); I ²	= 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 0.33	(P = 0.7)	4)							
1.3.3 Casas 2008 (OR	OS methy	/lphenic	late; Al	MA, no	t specif	ied)				
Casas 2008 – 54mg	-1.1	2.16	90	-0.4	1.93	49	49.7%	-0.70 [-1.40, 0.00]	-	
Casas 2008 – 72mg	-0.7	2.15	92	-0.4	1.93	49	50.3%	-0.30 [-1.00, 0.40]	+	
Subtotal (95% CI)			182			98	100.0%	-0.50 [-0.99, -0.00]	◆	
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$				(P = C)	.43); I ²	= 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 1.98	(P = 0.0)	5)							
1.3.4 Weiss 2014 (con	trolled-r	elease r	nethylp	henida	te; AAC	QoL, 0-	100 (bett	er))		
Weiss 2014 – 100mg	-63.6	17.21	67	-55	18.53	18	25.0%	-8.60 [-18.10, 0.90]		
Weiss 2014 – 25mg		16.61	72		18.53			-5.00 [-14.38, 4.38]		
Weiss 2014 – 45mg		18.84	70		18.53			-7.20 [-16.83, 2.43]		
Weiss 2014 – 70mg	-58.6	17.24	65	-55	18.53	18		-3.60 [-13.13, 5.93]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			274				100.0%	-6.09 [-10.84, -1.33]		
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$				(P = C)	.89); I ²	= 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 2.51	(P = 0.0)	1)							
									-10 -5 0 5 10	
	-								Favours [methylphenidate] Favours [placebo	
Test for subgroup differ	rences: C	$hi^{2} = 5.7$	/6, df =	3 (P =	0.12),	I ⁻ = 47.	.9%		· · · · ·	

Figure 4. Peer-rated ADHD symptoms

	methylphenidate place				olacebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Random, 95% CI				
1.4.1 Huss 2010 (long-	-acting I	nethylp	henida	te; CAA	RS, 0-7	'8 poin	ts)				
Huss 2010 – 40mg	-10.1	13.91	136	-4.6	11.94	49	33.3%	-5.50 [-9.58, -1.42]	_		
Huss 2010 - 60mg	-9	12.22	135	-4.6	11.94	49	36.0%	-4.40 [-8.33, -0.47]	_		
Huss 2010 - 80mg Subtotal (95% CI)	-10.4	15.66	137 408	-4.6	11.94	49 147		-5.80 [-10.05, -1.55] -5.20 [-7.55, -2.84]	•		
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.00; Chi ²	= 0.26	, df = 2	P = 0	.88); I ²	= 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 4.32 ((P < 0.0	001)								
1.4.2 Weiss 2014 (cont	rolled-r	elease r	nethylp	henida	te; CAA	RS, 0-	78 points	5)			
Weiss 2014 – 25mg	57.4	11.93	67	61	12.33	17	25.4%	-3.60 [-10.12, 2.92]			
Weiss 2014 – 45mg	58.9	12	66	61	12.33	17	25.3%	-2.10 [-8.64, 4.44]			
Weiss 2014 – 70mg	58.6	13.08	64	61	12.33	17	24.2%	-2.40 [-9.08, 4.28]			
Weiss 2014 – x100mg Subtotal (95% CI)	61.4	11.48	59 256	61	12.33	17 68				-	
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.00; Chi ²	= 0.76	df = 3	(P = 0)	.86); I ²	= 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z											
									-10 -5 0	5 10	
									Favours [methylphenidate]	5 10	
Test for subgroup differe	ences: Cl	$ni^2 = 2.5$	2, df =	1 (P =	0.11), I	$^{2} = 60$.	.3%		ravours [methyphenidate]	avours (placeb	