

University of Groningen

ADHD & Addiction

van Emmerik-van Oortmerssen, Katelijne

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Emmerik-van Oortmerssen, K. (2018). ADHD & Addiction: Prevalence, diagnostic assessment and treatment of ADHD in substance use disorder patients [Groningen]: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

CHAPTER 6

PSYCHIATRIC COMORBIDITY IN TREATMENT-SEEKING SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER PATIENTS WITH AND WITHOUT ATTENTION DEFICIT HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER; RESULTS OF THE IASP STUDY

Katelijne van Emmerik-van Oortmerssen*, Geurt van de Glind*, Maarten W. J. Koeter, Steve Allsop, Marc Auriacombe, Csaba Barta, Eli Torild H. Bu, Yuliya Burren, Pieter-Jan Carpentier, Susan Carruthers, Miguel Casas, Zsolt Demetrovics, Geert Dom, Stephen V. Faraone, Melina Fatseas, Johan Franck, Brian Johnson, Máté Kapitány-Fövényi, Sharlene Kaye, Maija Konstenius, Frances R. Levin, Franz Moggi, Merete Møller, J. Antoni Ramos-Quiroga, Arild Schillinger, Arvid Skutle, Sofie Verspreet, IASP research group‡, Wim van den Brink#, Robert A. Schoevers#.

* the first two authors contributed equally to this publication

the last two authors contributed equally to this publication

‡ See Acknowledgements section for members of the IASP research group

Addiction. 2014;109(2):262-272.

ABSTRACT

Aims: To determine comorbidity patterns in treatment-seeking substance use disorder (SUD) patients with and without adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), with an emphasis on subgroups defined by ADHD subtype, taking into account differences related to gender and primary substance of abuse.

Design: Data were obtained from the cross-sectional International ADHD in Substance use disorder Prevalence (IASP) study.

Setting: 47 centres of SUD treatment in 10 countries.

Participants: A total of 1,205 treatment seeking SUD patients.

Measurements: Structured diagnostic assessments were used for all disorders: presence of ADHD was assessed with the Conners' Adult ADHD Diagnostic Interview for DSM-IV (CAADID), presence of antisocial personality disorder (ASPD), major depression (MD), and (hypo)manic episode (HME) was assessed with the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview-Plus (MINI Plus), and the presence of borderline personality disorder (BPD) was assessed with the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis II (SCID II).

Findings: The prevalence of DSM-IV adult ADHD in this SUD sample was 13.9%. ASPD [odds ratio (OR) = 2.8, 95% confidence interval (CI) = 1.8-4.2], BPD (OR = 7.0, 95% CI = 3.1-15.6 for alcohol; OR = 3.4, 95% CI = 1.8-6.4 for drugs), MD in patients with alcohol as primary substance of abuse (OR = 4.1, 95% CI = 2.1-7.8) and HME (OR = 4.3, 95% CI = 2.1-8.7) were all more prevalent in ADHD+ compared to ADHD- patients ($p < 0.001$). These results also indicate increased levels of BPD and MD for alcohol compared to drugs as primary substance of abuse. Comorbidity patterns differed between ADHD subtypes with increased MD in the inattentive and combined subtype ($p < .01$), increased HME and ASPD in the hyperactive/impulsive ($p < .01$) and combined subtypes ($p < .001$) and increased BPD in all subtypes ($p < .001$) compared with SUD patients without ADHD. Seventy-five per cent of ADHD patients had at least one additional comorbid disorder compared with 37% of SUD patients without ADHD.

Conclusions: Treatment-seeking substance use disorder patients with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder are at a very high risk for additional externalizing disorders.

INTRODUCTION

Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a highly comorbid disorder in patients with substance use disorders (SUD).^{1,2} Moreover, both SUD and ADHD are associated with various other comorbid conditions. Substance use disorders are reported to co-occur with a variety of other disorders, with mood and anxiety disorders, borderline personality disorder (BPD), and antisocial personality disorder (ASPD) being the most frequently reported in the literature.^{3,4} ADHD is also associated with other comorbid conditions.^{5,6} Few studies have investigated the comorbidity of patients with both ADHD and SUD, reporting a consistently higher prevalence of additional psychiatric disorders in SUD patients with ADHD (ADHD+) compared to SUD patients without ADHD (ADHD-).⁷⁻¹⁰

Overall, these studies show that ADHD and SUD independently confer an enhanced risk of comorbidity with mood, anxiety, and personality disorders, and that a combination of ADHD and SUD results in an even higher risk. This pattern of multiple co-occurring mental disorders is associated with severe emotional and interpersonal problems in the daily life of patients and constitutes a serious challenge for clinicians. Moreover, SUD patients with ADHD are reported to have worse treatment outcomes for both SUD¹¹ and ADHD.¹² More knowledge about the complex patterns of co-occurring mental disorders in SUD patients with and without ADHD is important, because different patterns of comorbidity may be partly responsible for lower treatment retention and worse outcomes in patients with SUD and ADHD compared to those with SUD alone.

The main limitation of the currently available studies is that little or no attention is given to possible differences in comorbidity patterns in specific subgroups of SUD patients with and without ADHD due to the relatively small sample sizes of these studies. For example, the DSM-IV subtypes of ADHD (predominately inattentive, predominately hyperactive/impulsive, combined) seem to be associated with different comorbidity patterns in adolescent¹³⁻¹⁵ and adult ADHD¹⁶⁻¹⁹ patients. No gender differences in comorbidity were reported in adult ADHD patients.¹⁷ However, it is unknown whether or not these subgroups (ADHD types, gender) show different comorbidity patterns in a population of adult SUD patients with comorbid ADHD. Moreover, it is unknown whether different comorbidity patterns are associated with differences in the primary substance of abuse (alcohol versus illicit drugs) in this population. This information on comorbidity patterns in different subgroups of SUD patients with adult ADHD is needed for the development of targeted and integrated treatment interventions, which focus not only on addiction problems, but also take into account other disorders that are present. Although there are sporadic data on this subject in earlier papers, this is the first large-scale study to investigate the comorbidity patterns in SUD patients with and without adult ADHD.

The main objective of this paper is to determine comorbidity patterns in adult treatment seeking SUD patients with and without comorbid ADHD with special emphasis on possible differences in comorbidity patterns among SUD patients with different ADHD subtypes, taking into account possible differences related to gender and primary substance of abuse

(alcohol versus illicit drugs). Both internalizing and externalizing disorders will be studied, focusing on current major depressive disorder (MD), current (hypo)manic episode (HME), antisocial personality disorder (ASPD) and borderline personality disorder (BPD).

METHODS

This study was part of the International ADHD in Substance use disorders Prevalence study (IASP study) conducted by the ICASA research group (International Collaboration on ADHD and Substance Abuse).²⁰ In this two-stage study, a total of 3,558 treatment seeking SUD patients from 10 countries were screened for ADHD (screening phase). At a selection of study sites, all patients (both screen-positive and screen-negative) were asked to participate in an extensive psychiatric interview which took place within a few weeks after screening (full assessment phase). During this full assessment, all patients were evaluated for the presence of ADHD, SUD, and other comorbid psychiatric disorders by trained professionals. For a detailed description of the IASP study, the reader is referred to van de Glind et al.²¹ Here we provide a short summary of the methodology.

Participants

In the IASP study, patients aged 18-65 years referred consecutively to participating addiction treatment centers in the period July 2009 to November 2011 were invited to participate. A total of 47 centers in 10 countries (Australia, Belgium, France, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the USA) participated in the screening phase, including both inpatient and outpatient treatment facilities serving both alcohol and/or illicit drug dependent patients. Seven of these countries (France, Hungary, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland) also participated in the full assessment phase. There were no formal exclusion criteria for participation, but for practical reasons some patients could not participate in the study (e.g. incapacity to complete the screening questionnaire due to limited literacy, acute intoxication, or acute deterioration of a serious psychiatric or somatic disorder). Only patients with all measures of the full assessment phase were included in the current comorbidity study.

A total of 3,558 participants were included in the screening phase of the IASP study.²¹ Of these, 1,276 completed at least the CAADID in the full assessment phase. Both ADHD screen-positive cases and ADHD screen-negative cases were included in the sample. For different reasons, 71 participants had missing values on one or more of the other instruments of the full assessment, resulting in 1,205 patients with a complete set of assessments. The analyses in this report are based on these 1,205 patients. There were no significant differences between the study population (N=1,205) and the patients who dropped out (N=1,392) in terms of gender or in primary substance of abuse. However, the study sample was slightly older than the patients who dropped out in two of the countries: Norway (mean age difference 3.1 years, $p = 0.003$) and Spain (mean age difference 3.3 years, $p < 0.001$).

Detailed information on demographics, primary substance of abuse and recruitment setting

is provided in the supplementary material (see table S1 in supplementary material) and can be found in Van de Glind et al.²¹

Design and procedure

The IASP study was approved by the regional medical-ethical committees of all participating centers. All participants provided written informed consent prior to participation. They did not receive financial compensation, except for Australia, where participants received AUD \$20 remuneration for associated costs. In the screening phase of the study, a short questionnaire was completed covering demographic information, information on substance use, and an ADHD screener (all self-report). All participants were then invited to take part in the full assessment phase, which took place at the addiction treatment centre within two to four weeks after the screening, and included a face-to-face diagnostic evaluation for ADHD, SUD, current and lifetime major depression, current and lifetime (hypo)mania, borderline personality disorder and antisocial personality disorder. Patients had preferably reached abstinence by that time, but also in the case of ongoing substance use, the diagnostic evaluation was performed.

Measures

For a detailed description and indications regarding the reliability and validity of the assessment instruments, the reader is referred to the methods publication of the IASP study.²¹

The Conners' Adult ADHD Diagnostic Interview for DSM-IV (CAADID)²² was used for the diagnosis of DSM-IV ADHD. The CAADID is an extensive semi-structured interview addressing the presence of ADHD, and specifically requiring the presence of childhood ADHD symptoms before the onset of alcohol/drug use as well as the presence of adult ADHD symptoms. It also has additional criteria regarding age of onset of ADHD symptoms (before age seven years), pervasiveness of ADHD symptoms in multiple domains, the presence of ADHD symptom related impairments, and the presence of any other disorders (including SUD) that may account more effectively for the presence of ADHD symptoms. Modules of the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI Plus)²³ were used to assess MD, HME, and ASPD. The presence of BPD was evaluated with the relevant section of the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis II (SCID II).^{24,25} All diagnostic instruments were administered by interviewers trained in the assessment instruments.

In analyzing the data on MD, no distinction was made between major depressive episode, substance-induced major depressive episode, or major depressive episode following bereavement: all were subsumed under MD. Likewise, (hypo)mania also included substance induced (hypo)mania. Data are presented here for current major depression (MD) and current (hypo)mania (HME) only.

Data analysis

Because of the 3-level sampling structure, subjects within site within country, we used

2-level multi-level analyses. Although a 3-level structure seemed warranted, goodness-of-fit comparisons revealed that a 3-level model did not fit the data better than a 2-level model. Goodness-of-fit was assessed with the Deviance Information Criterion, (DIC)²⁶ based on Markov Chain Monte Carlo modeling, with Metropolis-Hastings sampling and 50.000 iterations. DIC is a generalization of the Akaike's Information Criterion.

Differences in demographic characteristics and primary substance of abuse were tested with a 2-level logistic regression analysis with site as level 2 variable and random slope, with the exception of the differences in age, which was tested with a 2-level linear regression analysis with site as level 2 variable and random slope. The relation between presence of ADHD and the presence of a specific comorbid disorder and the relation between ADHD subtype and the presence of a specific comorbid disorder was assessed with 2-level logistic regression analysis, with site as level 2 variable and random slope, comorbid disorder as dependent variable, ADHD (yes/no) as independent variable and age, gender, marital status, housing, employment status and primary substance of abuse (alcohol/drugs) as covariates. To assess whether gender and/or primary substance of abuse modified the relation between ADHD and a specific comorbid disorder, we added the gender by ADHD and primary substance of abuse by ADHD interaction to the logistic regression model. When the regression coefficient for an interaction term was statistically significant, results were stratified by categories of the effect modifier. The relation between presence of ADHD and number of comorbid disorders was assessed by a 2-level ordinal regression model with site as level 2 variable and random slope.

For all analyses, $p < 0.05$ was regarded as statistically significant. To correct for multiple testing of 4 disorders, we used Bonferroni correction (by dividing the significance threshold value by the number of tests).

In the current report, we provide unweighted estimates of the prevalence rates, which may be slightly different from the weighted estimates of ADHD in the IASP-paper on ADHD prevalence.²

All statistical analyses were conducted with MLwiN 2.27 (Centre for Multilevel Modelling, University of Bristol, Rasbash et al, 2013).

RESULTS

To decide whether a 2-level or a 3-level model was warranted we compared the DIC for the models used for the main analyses (table 2): for depression DIC 2-level model 1113.98, 3-level model 1113.83, for (hypo)mania DIC 2-level model 456.223, 3-level model 456.06; for ASPD, DIC 2-level model 1122.49, 3-level model 1122.80 and for BPD DIC 2-level model 893.88, 3-level model 893.64. The differences were marginal, consequently we decided to use the more parsimonious 2-level approach.

Study population characteristics

Adult ADHD was present in 13.9% of these treatment seeking SUD patients. Table 1 shows

that the majority of the patients were male (73.1% in the ADHD- group; 75.6% in the ADHD+ group) with a mean age of 40.7 (SD 11.3) years for the ADHD-group and a significantly younger mean age of 35.6 (SD 9.6) in the ADHD+ group. In the ADHD+ group significantly more subjects were single ($p<.001$), fewer were married or living with a partner ($p<.05$), and fewer were divorced ($p<.05$). Significantly more subjects in the ADHD+ group reported stimulants and cannabis as their primary drug of abuse, and significantly less subjects reported alcohol as their primary substance of abuse (all $p<.001$).

Table 1: Relation between comorbid ADHD, demographic characteristics and primary substance of abuse in treatment-seeking SUD patients.

Variable	ADHD- N = 1037	ADHD+ N= 168	OR ^{1,2,3,4}	95% CI OR	σ^2_u (SE) ⁵
Age: mean (SD) ²	40.7 (11.3)	35.6 (9.6)	-4.9 (0.9) ^{***}	-6.7 - -3.1	6.1 (3.0)
Male (%)	73.1	75.6	1.2	0.8 - 1.8	0.09 (0.06)
Marital status (1028/163) ⁶					
- Single (%)	51.7	71.2	2.0 ^{***}	1.4 - 2.5	0.16 (0.09)
- Married/living with partner (%)	28.1	18.4	0.6 [*]	0.4 - 0.9	0.02 (0.03)
- Divorced (%)	20.2	10.4	0.5 [*]	0.3 - 0.9	0.15 (0.10)
Housing (1002/161) ⁶					
- Homeless/shelter (%)	8.2	11.2	1.5	0.9 - 2.7	0.16 (0.13)
- Living alone (%)	41.2	49.1	1.1	0.8 - 1.6	0.32 (0.15)
- Living with others (%)	50.6	39.8	0.8	0.5 - 1.1	0.25 (0.11)
Employment status (1013/160) ⁶					
- Employed (%)	32.6	26.2	0.7	0.5 - 1.1	0.50 (0.22)
- Unemployed (%)	38.8	43.8	1.3	0.9 - 1.8	0.12 (0.07)
- Sick leave/disability (%)	28.6	30.0	1.1	0.7 - 1.6	0.76 (0.30)
Primary substance of abuse (1033/ 165) ⁶					
- Opioids(%)	10.4	11.5	0.8	0.5 - 1.4	4.79 (1.60)
- Stimulants(%)	12.6	30.3	3.1 ^{***}	2.0 - 5.1	0.98 (0.47)
- Cannabis(%)	9.7	17.0	1.7	1.0 - 2.9	2.02 (0.97)
- Other drug(%)	8.6	6.1	0.7	0.3 - 1.3	0.28 (0.19)
- Alcohol(%)	58.8	35.2	0.4 ^{***}	0.3 - 0.6	2.97 (1.04)

¹⁾ for all variables except 'age' multi-level logistic regression analysis with random intercept, independent variable ADHD (yes/no), comorbid condition as dependent variable, and site as level 2, σ_u^2 = level 2 variance of the intercept,

²⁾ for 'age' multi-level linear regression analysis with random intercept, independent variable ADHD (yes/no), age as dependent variable, and site as level 2, σ_u^2 = level 2 variance of the intercept, mean difference (SE) instead of OR;

³⁾ reference category: no ADHD;

⁴⁾ *: $p<.05$, ***: $p<.001$;

⁵⁾ in the logit scale, with the exception of 'age';

⁶⁾ number of patients with/without ADHD, this number can differ for specific outcome variables due to missing data

Comorbid disorders

Table 2 shows that all comorbid disorders were present more frequently in the ADHD+ group compared to the ADHD- group, with an exception for current depression in SUD patients with illicit drugs as their primary substance of abuse. The effect of ADHD on comorbid disorders was not modified by gender (no significant gender by ADHD interaction term). When Bonferroni correction for multiple testing was applied, all significant results in Table 2 remained statistically significant.

Table 2: Relationship of ADHD and comorbid psychiatric disorders in treatment-seeking SUD patients.

Comorbid disorder (1037/168)	ADHD-	ADHD+	OR ^{2,3,4,5}	95% CI	σ^2_u (SE) ⁶
Current depression(%) ⁷					
- primary substance alcohol (607/58) ¹	15.3	39.7	4.1***	2.1 – 7.8	0.63 (0.33)
- primary substance drugs (426/107) ¹	22.8	24.3	1.2	0.7 – 2.2	0.44 (0.28)
Current (hypo)mania(%)	4.1	14.9	4.3***	2.1 – 8.7	3.17 (1.58)
Antisocial personality disorder(%)	17.0	51.8	2.8***	1.8 – 4.2	0.40 (0.21)
Borderline personality disorder(%) ⁷					
- primary substance alcohol (607/58) ¹	8.2	34.5	7.0***	3.1 – 15.6	1.55 (0.85)
- primary substance drugs (426/107) ¹	16.7	29.0	3.4***	1.8 – 6.4	0.58 (0.37)

¹) number of patients with/without ADHD;

²) multi-level logistic regression analysis with random intercept, independent variable ADHD (yes/no), comorbid condition as dependent variable, and site as level 2, σ_u^2 = level 2 variance of the intercept;

³) presented is the odds ratio adjusted for age, gender, marital status, housing, employment status and primary substance of abuse (alcohol/drugs), Unadjusted odds ratios (95% CI) are: current depression/alcohol, OR = 4.4, 95% CI 2.4 – 8.1, $p < .001$; current depression/drugs, OR = 1.4, 95% CI 0.8 – 2.1; current (hypo)mania, OR = 5.3***, 95% CI 2.8 – 9.9; antisocial personality disorder, OR = 4.1***, 95% CI 3.1 – 6.0; borderline personality disorder/alcohol, OR = 8.5, 95% CI 4.2 – 17.5, $p < .001$; borderline personality disorder/drugs, OR = 2.8, 95% CI 1.7 – 4.9;

⁴) *** : $p < .001$;

⁵)reference category no ADHD;

⁶) in logit scale;

⁷)because the relation with ADHD is modified by primary substance of abuse, the results are presented separately for alcohol and drug use disorder patients. Pooled relation ADHD with depression $OR_{adj} = 2.1$, 95% CI 1.4-3.3, $p < .001$, $OR_{unadj} = 2.3$, 95% CI 1.5 – 4.4, $p < .001$; pooled relation ADHD with borderline personality disorder, $OR_{adj} = 4.7$, 95% CI 2.9-7.8, $p < .001$, $OR_{unadj} = 4.9$, 95% CI 3.2 – 7.6 $p < .001$.

Overall, 37% of the ADHD- group had at least one comorbid disorder, while 75% of the ADHD+ group had at least one additional comorbid disorder. Table 3 shows the number of comorbid disorders for SUD patients with and without ADHD. The patients with ADHD had an increased risk of having one or more comorbid disorders [odds ratio (OR) = 3.5 (2.5 – 4.9) $p < .001$ $\sigma^2_u = 0.495$ (0.212)].

Table 3: Presence of comorbid disorders¹ in patients with and without ADHD in treatment seeking SUD patients.²

Number of comorbid conditions ¹	no comorbid disorder N (%)	one comorbid disorder N (%)	two comorbid disorders N (%)	three comorbid disorders ³ N (%)	four comorbid disorders ³ N (%)
In patients without ADHD (N=1037)	653 (63.0)	272 (26.2)	82 (7.9)	26 (2.5)	4 (0.4)
In patients with ADHD (N=168)	42 (25.0)	68 (40.5)	39 (23.2)	10 (6.0)	9 (5.4)

¹) apart from ADHD;

²) multilevel ordinal logistic regression with site as level 2 variable and random slope. Dependent variable number of comorbid diagnoses and predictor ADHD (yes/no).

³) To make the regression model more stable the categories 3 and 4 comorbid disorders were pooled in this analysis. OR adjusted for age, gender, marital status, housing, employment status and primary substance of abuse (alcohol/drugs) OR = 3.5 (2.5 – 4.9) $p < .001$ $\sigma_u^2 = 0.495$ (0.212); OR_{unadjusted} = 4.5 (3.2 – 6.3) $P < .001$ $\sigma_u^2 = 0.399$ (.175)

Comorbidity in subtypes of ADHD

Finally, analyses were repeated to estimate the proportion of patients with comorbid disorders in patients with the different subtypes of current ADHD. Table 4 shows the results for patients with the inattentive, hyperactive/impulsive and combined subtypes of ADHD. BPD remained significantly more prevalent in SUD patients with all types of ADHD compared to SUD patients without ADHD. HME and ASPD were more prevalent in patients with the hyperactive/impulsive or combined subtype of ADHD, but not in patients with the inattentive ADHD subtype. MD was more prevalent in SUD patients with the inattentive and combined subtype of ADHD, but not in patients with the hyperactive/impulsive type, compared to SUD patients without ADHD.

Table 4: Relation of ADHD subtype with the presence of other comorbid disorders in treatment-seeking SUD patients.¹

	current depression		current (hypo)mania		Antisocial PD		Borderline PD	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
ADHD inattentive subtype versus no ADHD ²	3.04**	1.50 – 6.18	2.68	0.76 – 9.40	1.57	0.74 – 3.31	5.04***	2.28 – 11.12
ADHD hyperactive/imp. subtype versus no ADHD ²	1.05	0.47 – 2.31	3.64**	1.22 – 10.82	2.34**	1.16 – 4.73	4.02***	1.82 – 8.88
ADHD combined subtype versus no ADHD ²	2.64**	1.43 – 4.86	6.57***	2.61 – 16.6	4.51***	2.46 – 8.27	5.08***	2.61 – 9.89

¹) Multilevel logistic regression with site as level 2 variable and random slope. Comorbid disorder (depression/(hypo)mania/APD/Borderline) as dependent variable and subtype of ADHD as independent variable, with no ADHD as reference category. σ_u^2 (SE) depression 0.45 (0.24); (hypo)mania, 3.23 (1.62); Antisocial personality disorder 0.41 (0.21); Borderline personality disorder 0.73 (0.35), all σ_u^2 in logit scale. All odds ratios adjusted for age, gender, marital status, housing, employment status and primary substance of abuse (alcohol/drugs). ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

²) no ADHD adulthood n=982, ADHD adulthood attention deficit subtype n=44, ADHD adulthood hyperactive and impulsive subtype n=46 and ADHD adulthood combined subtype n=65. Total n=1,137 due to missing values on covariates.

DISCUSSION

Main findings

This study shows clearly that additional comorbid disorders are far more prevalent in treatment-seeking SUD patients with ADHD than in treatment-seeking SUD patients without ADHD. This applies to all four investigated disorders namely ASPD, BPD, HME and MD, with odds ratios ranging from 2.1 for MD up to 7.0 for BPD in SUD patients with alcohol as primary substance of abuse. Comorbidity patterns differed between ADHD subtypes with increased MD in the inattentive and combined subtype, increased ASPD and HME in the hyperactive/impulsive and combined subtypes, and increased BPD in all three types. These results also show different comorbidity patterns for alcohol versus drugs as primary substance. The vast majority (75%) of SUD patients with ADHD had at least one additional comorbid disorder, compared to “only” 37% for the SUD patients without ADHD.

Our results are in line with earlier reports in the literature that comorbidity is more prevalent in SUD patients with ADHD than in SUD patients without ADHD. These findings are of direct relevance for daily practice in addiction treatment centers. It shows that the subpopulation of SUD patients with ADHD, which constitutes 10-25% of treatment-seeking SUD patients, is suffering from substantially more comorbid disorders than SUD patients in general. Our finding of an ADHD prevalence of 13.9% is in line with a recent study reporting that 12% of treatment seeking SUD patients had undiagnosed ADHD; these patients suffered from increased impairment across several domains of daily life.²⁷ These findings also confirm the importance of the current trend to integrate psychiatric care and addiction treatment.²⁸

Strengths and limitations

This is by far the largest study to date to evaluate a SUD population for the presence of ADHD, ASPD, BPD, MD, and HME using the same standardized interviews by trained professionals. Earlier studies either reported on smaller samples (e.g. Chen et al.³ reported on 465 treatment seeking SUD patients) or on comorbid problems instead of comorbid diagnoses (e.g. Chan et al.⁴ reported on 1,956 adults and 4,930 adolescents). In addition, great care was taken to interpret symptoms and previous history correctly using validated instruments, which is especially important when diagnosing ADHD in SUD patients. Another strength of the study is the inclusion of different types of SUD patients (alcohol and/or drug dependent patients, inpatients and outpatients), men and women, and patients from several countries and different socio-economic and cultural backgrounds, altogether strongly enhancing generalizability. As there were only small differences in age between the study sample and the patients who dropped out before completing the full assessment, the study sample can be regarded to be representative of the total population in the IASP study. However, this study also has some important limitations. First, the presence of comorbid disorders was based on structured interviews (MINI-plus and SCID II), which in this population might be less suitable for accurate diagnostics as some of the symptoms that are assessed may be due to the effects of drug use. Diagnostic assessments were performed preferably

after initial stabilization of the SUD, but abstinence was not required. This may have led to an overestimation of the comorbidity rates due to the presence of substance-induced symptoms, both in SUD patients with and without ADHD. We cannot rule out, however, that SUD patients with ADHD use more substances and as a consequence have higher rates of substance-induced comorbidities, which may have resulted in an overestimation of the ORs. Ongoing substance use may also have had impact upon the validity of the ADHD diagnoses as ADHD symptoms could be mimicked or suppressed by the use of substances. Unfortunately, we had no information on the abstinence status of the included patients at the time of the full assessment. However, the requirement of the presence of ADHD symptoms before age seven makes it extremely unlikely that substance-induced ADHD symptoms were misclassified as adult ADHD. Another limitation is the cross-sectional design of the study, which prevents us from making causal inferences on the associations that we found. Although ADHD starts in early childhood by definition and will theoretically have preceded most comorbid psychiatric disorders, it is possible that for example depression causes ADHD-like inattention symptoms that may be misinterpreted as ADHD symptoms. However, the required criterion regarding the age of onset of ADHD symptoms and the careful interpretation of symptoms should have limited this confound. Furthermore, the information on the primary substance of abuse was obtained from self-report measures related to the current primary substance of abuse, and it included only current use of either alcohol or illicit drugs. This is probably a simplification of reality, as many patients use multiple substances and no clear distinction between primary and non-primary substance of abuse can be made. It is unclear how this may have had a specific impact on the comorbidity rates. Severity of substance use may be related to treatment type with inpatients using more substances, which in turn can have an effect on comorbidity. However, since we have no measures of severity of SUD over the participating wards, we have no measures to what extent the latter is true in our international sample. It should be noticed, however, that multi-level analyses were performed with site as level 2 and most analyses were controlled for the primary substance of abuse. The random slope in the multi-level analysis allows the prevalence of the dependent variable to differ between sites; when sites differ in severity of substance dependence/abuse, and this is related to the outcome, the analysis corrects for this (comparable to correcting for age in a regression model, which also allows for a separate slope for men and women). Therefore, we think that differences in severity are at least partially controlled for in the analyses. Possible differences between study sites in terms of, for example, accessibility to services and comprehensiveness of treatment are another limitation. Moreover, within the framework of the multi-center study, a pragmatic selection was made which disorders were evaluated in the full assessment. Although other disorders such as anxiety disorders are also important, they were not included in this study. Finally, the analyses using ADHD subtype were based on relatively small subgroups, leading to reduced power and possibly false negative conclusions.

Conclusions

Numerous studies have reported on the role of ASPD and its precursor conduct disorder (CD) in the development of SUD and found that CD increased the risk of later SUD in children with ADHD^{29, 30} although controversy remains as to the exact mechanism. Our increased levels of ASPD in the ADHD+ group were in line with these findings.

The high rate of comorbidity in our patient population also raises fundamental questions on the concept of comorbidity. Milberger et al. showed that ADHD was not just the result of overlapping symptoms present in depression, bipolar disorder, and anxiety disorders.³¹ However, if the presence of comorbidity is not explained by overlapping symptoms, one could still argue whether the combination of, for example, ADHD, borderline personality disorder and major depression should be seen as the simultaneous presence of three distinct disorders or, rather, as the expression of a common underlying pathophysiology. Consistent with this, family studies suggest that ADHD shares familial risk factors with substance use and other comorbid disorders,^{32, 33} although this may be different for alcohol use disorders and drug use disorders.³²

Another important issue is the interpretation of our findings regarding (hypo)manic episode. As the MINI Plus is used in a cross-sectional manner, emotional dysregulation can be interpreted falsely as (hypo) manic symptoms. This is important, as emotional dysregulation is frequently present in ADHD patients, especially in patients with combined or hyperactive/impulsive subtypes,³⁴ and requires a completely different treatment approach than bipolar disorder, with often a positive response to simulant medication.³⁵

The prominence and persistence of ADHD symptoms and subtypes has been shown to change over time with a decrease of hyperactive/impulsive symptoms and an increase of inattentive symptoms in longitudinal studies.³⁶ The high proportion of adult ADHD patients with the combined subtype, and our findings of increased levels of current (hypo)mania, APD and BPD in this combined subtype, suggest that a substantial part of those with persistent hyperactive/impulsive symptoms is at increased risk for development of SUD together with additional comorbid disorders. This group with persistent hyperactive/impulsive ADHD symptoms and increased drug use appears to be characterised by the presence of a broad range of externalizing disorders probably representing a shared vulnerability for this type of psychopathology.

The classification system that is currently used in psychiatry has been challenged and a more dimensional view on symptoms and clusters of symptoms has been proposed.³⁷ In the most recent revision of the DSM, a more dimensional view is proposed for the classification of personality disorders. In recent studies^{38, 39} in which Axis I and II disorders were studied in a large sample of young adult twins, evidence was found for a clustering of symptoms and disorders in externalizing and internalizing spectra across Axis I and Axis II disorders, which contributes to a more coherent view on clinical disorders and personality disorders. This four-factor model has been corroborated with findings from genetic research,³⁸ indicating that the association of disorders in our study might be due to a clustering of externalizing

symptoms with a shared underlying genetic structure.

The implications of these findings for patient management and treatment are not yet fully clear. For example, if a patient suffers from SUD, ADHD, BPD and a major depression at the same time, what should be the first focus of therapy? Moreover, if all these disorders are to be seen as the result of one underlying externalizing cluster of symptoms, how should this be treated? The discussion on the validity of our classification system is inevitably linked to the way we shape our treatment strategies. For example, Farchione et al. addressed this issue for the treatment of anxiety and mood disorders and postulated that the diversity of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) treatment protocols developed for single disorders is redundant, since in reality therapists are faced with patients who have multiple comorbid conditions.⁴⁰ Heterogeneity in the expression of emotional symptoms should in their view be seen as variation in the manifestation of an underlying broader syndrome, which requires a more unified approach in treating these symptoms. Mills et al.⁴¹ developed an integrated treatment for SUD patients with comorbid PTSD which encompassed CBT interventions for treatment of SUD and PTSD and reported a significant decline of PTSD symptom severity. Van den Bosch et al.⁴² developed and Verheul et al.⁴³ tested an integrated treatment for SUD patients with BPD using dialectical behaviour therapy. Van Emmerik-van Oortmerssen et al.⁴⁴ recently proposed an integrated treatment for SUD and ADHD. Future research should focus on additional development of integrated treatment programs for SUD patients with varying comorbid symptoms in the externalizing cluster. These integrated treatments could use CBT interventions to address symptoms across different disorders instead of focusing upon separate disorders. This is especially relevant as pharmacological treatments of ADHD in SUD patients have been less effective than expected.⁴⁵⁻⁴⁹

From a clinical perspective, it is of interest to investigate whether or not unfavorable treatment outcomes in SUD patients with ADHD are associated with particular comorbidities or clusters of disorders, in order to have better tools with which to identify the patients who are at risk for treatment drop out.

In summary, this multinational study confirms that psychiatric comorbidity is the rule, rather than the exception, for SUD patients with ADHD. It clearly demonstrates the need for adequate diagnostic and treatment interventions for this patient population and strongly supports the further integration of addiction treatment facilities with general mental health services.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following persons participated in this study: Atul Beniwal, Geert Bosma, Joanne Cassar, Therese Dahl, Constanza Daigre, Romain Debrabant, Louisa Degenhardt, Rutger-Jan van der Gaag, David Hay, Kari Lossius, Eva Karin Løvaas, Marion Malivert, Merete Möller, Carlos Roncero, Laura Stevens, Sara Wallhed, Anneke van Wamel, Jesse Young.

The authors would like to thank all patients who participated in the IASP study.

In the period of development of the study, the ICASA network received unrestricted grants

from the following pharmaceutical companies: Janssen Cilag, Eli Lilly & Company, Shire. Since becoming a formal foundation (September 2010), the ICASA network has operated independently from pharmaceutical funding, obtaining funding via the following sources:

- Participating institutes;
- The Noaber Foundation; The Waterloo Foundation, The Augeo Foundation.

The local institutes report the following funding sources:

The Netherlands, Amsterdam: No external funding was obtained. The participating institute, Arkin, paid for the costs involved, and used funding from Fonds NutsOhra for this project.

Norway, Bergen Clinics Foundation: Main external funding has been the Regional research council for addiction in West Norway (Regionalt kompetansesenter for rusmiddelforskning i Helse Vest (KORFOR)), funding a 50 % position. The remaining resources, including staff and infrastructure, have been from the Bergen Clinics Foundation.

Norway, Fredrikstad: The IASP was funded by the hospital, Sykehuset Østfold HF, not with money, but with 50 % of the salary of the participating professionals, then by two sources outside the hospital: The Regional center of Dual Diagnosis and the social - and Health directory.

Sweden, Stockholm: The study was funded by the Stockholm Centre for Dependency Disorders.

Belgium: The IASP project in Belgium received private funding.

France, Bordeaux: Financial support was received from two funding sources: a Research Grant PHRC (2006-2012) from the French Ministry of Health to M. Auriacombe and a French National Research Agency PRA-CNRS-CHU-Bordeaux award (2008-2010) to M. Fatseas.

Spain, Barcelona: Financial support was received from Plan Nacional sobre Drogas, Ministerio de Sanidad y Política Social (PND 0080/2011), the Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona and the Departament de Salut, Government of Catalonia, Spain .

Switzerland, Berne/Zurich: The IASP in Switzerland was funded by the Swiss Foundation of Alcohol Research (Grant # 209).

Hungary, Budapest: There was no direct funding, but the following grant was used: The European Union and the European Social Fund have provided financial support to the project under the grant agreement no. TÁMOP 4.2.1./B-09/1/KMR-2010-0003.

Australia: The IASP Screening Phase was funded by a strategic funding faculty grant from the Curtin University of Technology, Perth, Western Australia.

USA, Syracuse: No funding was obtained.

REFERENCES

1. van Emmerik-van Oortmerssen K, van de Glind G, van den Brink W, Smit F, Crunelle CL, Swets M, Schoevers RA. Prevalence of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder in substance use disorder patients: a meta-analysis and meta-regression analysis. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2012;122:11-19.
2. van de Glind G, Konstenius M, Koeter MW, van Emmerik-van Oortmerssen K, Carpentier PJ, Kaye S, Degenhardt L, Skutle A, Franck J, Bu ET, Moggi F, Dom G, Verspreet S, Demetrovics Z, Kapitany-Foveny M, Fatseas M, Auriacombe M, Schillinger A, Moller M, Johnson B, Faraone SV, Ramos-Quiroga JA, Casas M, Allsop S, Carruthers S, Schoevers RA, Wallhed S, Barta C, Alleman P, Levin FR, van den Brink W. Variability in the prevalence of adult ADHD in treatment seeking substance use disorder patients: results from an international multi-center study exploring DSM-IV and DSM-5 criteria. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2014;134:158-166.
3. Chen KW, Banducci AN, Guller L, Macatee RJ, Lavelle A, Daughters SB, Lejuez CW. An examination of psychiatric comorbidities as a function of gender and substance type within an inpatient substance use treatment program. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2011;118:92-99.
4. Chan YF, Dennis ML, Funk RR. Prevalence and comorbidity of major internalizing and externalizing problems among adolescents and adults presenting to substance abuse treatment. *J Subst Abuse Treat.* 2008;34:14-24.
5. Bernardi S, Faraone SV, Cortese S, Kerridge BT, Pallanti S, Wang S, Blanco C. The lifetime impact of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC). *Psychol Med.* 2012;42:875-887.
6. Kessler RC, Adler L, Barkley R, Biederman J, Conners CK, Demler O, Faraone SV, Greenhill LL, Howes MJ, Secnik K, Spencer T, Ustun TB, Walters EE, Zaslavsky AM. The prevalence and correlates of adult ADHD in the United States: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2006;163:716-723.
7. Carpentier PJ, van Gogh MT, Knapien LJ, Buitelaar JK, De Jong CA. Influence of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and conduct disorder on opioid dependence severity and psychiatric comorbidity in chronic methadone-maintained patients. *Eur Addict Res.* 2011;17:10-20.
8. Kim JW, Park CS, Hwang JW, Shin MS, Hong KE, Cho SC, Kim BN. Clinical and genetic characteristics of Korean male alcoholics with and without attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Alcohol Alcohol.* 2006;41:407-411.
9. Wilens TE, Kwon A, Tanguay S, Chase R, Moore H, Faraone SV, Biederman J. Characteristics of adults with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder plus substance use disorder: the role of psychiatric comorbidity. *Am J Addict.* 2005;14:319-327.
10. King VL, Brooner RK, Kidorf MS, Stoller KB, Mirsky AF. Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and treatment outcome in opioid abusers entering treatment. *J Nerv Ment Dis.* 1999;187:487-495.
11. Arias AJ, Gelernter J, Chan G, Weiss RD, Brady KT, Farrer L, Kranzler HR. Correlates of co-occurring ADHD in drug-dependent subjects: prevalence and features of substance dependence and psychiatric disorders. *Addict Behav.* 2008;33:1199-1207.
12. Castells X, Ramos-Quiroga JA, Rigau D, Bosch R, Nogueira M, Vidal X, Casas M. Efficacy of methylphenidate for adults with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: a meta-regression analysis. *CNS Drugs.* 2011;25:157-169.
13. Tamm L, Adinoff B, Nakonezny PA, Winhusen T, Riggs P. Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder subtypes in adolescents with comorbid substance-use disorder. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse.* 2012;38:93-100.
14. Elkins IJ, McGue M, Iacono WG. Prospective effects of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, conduct disorder, and sex on adolescent substance use and abuse. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2007;64:1145-1152.

15. Sobanski E, Bruggemann D, Alm B, Kern S, Philipson A, Schamalzried H, Hesslinger B, Waschkowski H, Rietschel M. Subtype differences in adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) with regard to ADHD-symptoms, psychiatric comorbidity and psychosocial adjustment. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2008;23:142-149.
16. Larsson H, Dilshad R, Lichtenstein P, Barker ED. Developmental trajectories of DSM-IV symptoms of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: genetic effects, family risk and associated psychopathology. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2011;52:954-963.
17. Friedrichs B, Igl W, Larsson H, Larsson JO. Coexisting psychiatric problems and stressful life events in adults with symptoms of ADHD - a large Swedish population-based study of twins. *J Atten Disord*. 2012;16:13-22.
18. Wilens TE, Biederman J, Faraone SV, Martelon M, Westerberg D, Spencer TJ. Presenting ADHD symptoms, subtypes, and comorbid disorders in clinically referred adults with ADHD. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2009;70:1557-1562.
19. Sprafkin J, Gadow KD, Weiss MD, Schneider J, Nolan EE. Psychiatric comorbidity in ADHD symptom subtypes in clinic and community adults. *J Atten Disord*. 2007;11:114-124.
20. ICASA. Website ICASA Foundation. Available at: <http://www.adhdandsubstanceabuse.org/>. (accessed: 26 April 2013) (Archived by WebCite® at <http://www.webcitation.org/6GAFo8jls>).
21. van de Glind G, van Emmerik-van Oortmerssen K, Carpentier PJ, Levin FR, Koeter MW, Kaye S, Skutle A, Franck J, Konstenius M, Bu ET, Moggi F, Dom G, Demetrovics Z, Fatséas M, Auriacombe M, Schillinger A, Kapitány-Fövény M, Verspreet S, Seitz A, Johnson B, Faraone SV, Casas M, Ramos-Quiroga JA, Allsop S, Carruthers S, Barta C, Schoevers RA, IASP research group, van den Brink W. The international ADHD in Substance use disorders Prevalence (IASP) study: background, methods and study population. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. 2013;22(3):232-244.
22. Epstein JN, Kollins SH. Psychometric properties of an adult ADHD diagnostic interview. *J Atten Disord*. 2006;9:504-514.
23. Sheehan DV, Lecrubier Y, Sheehan KH, Amorim P, Janavs J, Weiller E, Hergueta T, Baker R, Dunbar GC. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (M.I.N.I.): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 1998;59(suppl 20):22-33.
24. Williams JB, Gibbon M, First MB, Spitzer RL, Davies M, Borus J, Howes MJ, Kane J, Pope HG Jr, Rounsaville B, et al. The Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-III-R (SCID). II. Multisite test-retest reliability. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1992;49:630-636.
25. First M. B, Spitzer RL, Gibbon M, Williams JB, Benjamin L. *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis II Personality Disorders-Patient Edition (SCID-II, Version 2.0)*. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Press; 1995.
26. Spiegelhalter DJ, Best NG, Carlin BP, van der Linde A. Bayesian measures of model complexity and fit (with discussion). *J R Stat Soc Ser B*. 2002;64:191-232.
27. Huntley Z, Maltezos S, Williams C, Morinan A, Hammon A, Ball D, Marshall EJ, Keaney F, Young S, Bolton P, Glaser K, Howe-Forbes R, Kuntsi J, Xenitidis K, Murphy D, Asherson PJ. Rates of undiagnosed attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in London drug and alcohol detoxification units. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2012;12:223.
28. Santucci K. Psychiatric disease and drug abuse. *Curr Opin Pediatr*. 2012;24:233-237.
29. Molina BS, Pelham WE, Gnagy EM, Thompson AL, Marshal MP. Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder risk for heavy drinking and alcohol use disorder is age specific. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2007;31:643-654.
30. Lee SS, Humphreys KL, Flory K, Liu R, Glass K. Prospective association of childhood attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and substance use and abuse/dependence: a meta-analytic review. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2011;31:328-341.

31. Milberger S, Biederman J, Faraone SV, Murphy J, Tsuang MT. Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and comorbid disorders: issues of overlapping symptoms. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1995;152:1793-1799.
32. Biederman J, Petty CR, Wilens TE, Faraone SV, Purcell CA, Mick E, Monuteaux MC, Faraone SV. Familial risk analyses of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and substance use disorders. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2008;165:107-115.
33. Christiansen H, Chen W, Oades RD, Asherson P, Taylor EA, Lasky-Su J, Zhou K, Banaschewski T, Buschgens C, Franke B, Gabriels I, Manor I, Marco R, Muller UC, Mulligan A, Psychogiou L, Rommelse NN, Uebel H, Buitelaar J, Ebstein RP, Eisenberg J, Gill M, Miranda A, Mulas F, Roeyers H, Rothenberger A, Sergeant JA, Sonuga-Barke EJ, Steinhausen HC, Thompson M, Faraone SV. Co-transmission of conduct problems with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: familial evidence for a distinct disorder. *J Neural Transm*. 2008;115:163-175.
34. Skirrow C, Asherson P. Emotional lability, comorbidity and impairment in adults with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder. *J Affect Disord*. 2013;147:80-86.
35. Retz W, Stieglitz RD, Corbisiero S, Retz-Junginger P, Rosler M. Emotional dysregulation in adult ADHD: What is the empirical evidence? *Expert Rev Neurother*. 2012;12:1241-1251.
36. Faraone S, Biederman J, Mick E. The Age Dependent Decline Of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: A Meta-Analysis Of Follow-Up Studies. *Psychol Med*. 2006;36:159-165.
37. Luyten P, Blatt SJ. Integrating theory-driven and empirically-derived models of personality development and psychopathology: a proposal for DSM V. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2011;31:52-68.
38. Kendler KS, Aggen SH, Knudsen GP, Roysamb E, Neale MC, Reichborn-Kjennerud T. The structure of genetic and environmental risk factors for syndromal and subsyndromal common DSM-IV axis I and all axis II disorders. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2011;168:29-39.
39. Roysamb E, Kendler KS, Tambs K, Orstavik RE, Neale MC, Aggen SH, Torgersen S, Reichborn-Kjennerud T. The joint structure of DSM-IV Axis I and Axis II disorders. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 2011;120:198-209.
40. Farchione TJ, Fairholme CP, Ellard KK, Boisseau CL, Thompson-Hollands J, Carl JR, Gallagher MW, Barlow DH. Unified protocol for transdiagnostic treatment of emotional disorders: a randomized controlled trial. *Behav Ther*. 2012;43:666-678.
41. Mills KL, Teesson M, Back SE, Brady KT, Baker AL, Hopwood S, Sannibale C, Barrett EL, Merz S, Rosenfeld J, Ewer PL. Integrated exposure-based therapy for co-occurring posttraumatic stress disorder and substance dependence: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2012;308:690-699.
42. van den Bosch LM, Verheul R, Schippers GM, van den Brink W. Dialectical Behavior Therapy of borderline patients with and without substance use problems. Implementation and long-term effects. *Addict Behav*. 2002;27:911-923.
43. Verheul R, Van Den Bosch LM, Koeter MW, De Ridder MA, Stijnen T, Van Den Brink W. Dialectical behaviour therapy for women with borderline personality disorder: 12-month, randomised clinical trial in The Netherlands. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2003;182:135-140.
44. van Emmerik-van Oortmerssen K, Vedel E, Koeter MW, de Buijn K, Dekker JJ, van den Brink W, Schoevers RA. Investigating the efficacy of integrated cognitive behavioral therapy for adult treatment seeking substance use disorder patients with comorbid ADHD: study protocol of a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2013;13:132.
45. Konstenius M, Jayaram-Lindstrom N, Beck O, Franck J. Sustained release methylphenidate for the treatment of ADHD in amphetamine abusers: a pilot study. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2010;108:130-133.
46. Levin FR, Evans SM, Brooks DJ, Garawi F. Treatment of cocaine dependent treatment seekers with adult ADHD: double-blind comparison of methylphenidate and placebo. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2007;87:20-29.

47. Levin FR, Evans SM, Brooks DJ, Kalbag AS, Garawi F, Nunes EV. Treatment of methadone-maintained patients with adult ADHD: double-blind comparison of methylphenidate, bupropion and placebo. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2006;81:137-148.
48. Carpentier PJ, de Jong CA, Dijkstra BA, Verbrugge CA, Krabbe PF. A controlled trial of methylphenidate in adults with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder and substance use disorders. *Addiction.* 2005;100:1868-1874.
49. Riggs PD, Winhusen T, Davies RD, Leimberger JD, Mikulich-Gilbertson S, Klein C, Macdonald M, Lohman M, Bailey GL, Haynes L, Jaffee WB, Haminton N, Hodgkins C, Whitmore E, Trello-Rishel K, Tamm L, Acosta MC, Royer-Malvestuto C, Subramaniam G, Fishman M, Holmes BW, Kaye ME, Vargo MA, Woody GE, Nunes EV, Liu D. Randomized controlled trial of osmotic-release methylphenidate with cognitive-behavioral therapy in adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and substance use disorders. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2011;50:903-914.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplement 1 (S1): Number of sites per country, setting and respondents self-reported primary substance of abuse/dependence.

	France (n=216)	Hungary n=343)	Netherlands (n=403)	Norway (n=487)	Spain (n=432)	Sweden (n=325)	Switzerland (n=389)	USA (n=130)	Belgium (n=371)	Australia (n=462)	Total (n=3558)
Number of sites	1	2	1	11	1	10	3	1	3	14	47
Setting	Out. pt.	In pt.	Out. pt.	mixed	Out. pt.	Out. pt.	In pt.	Out. pt.	Out. pt.	Mixed	Mixed
Main problem Missing on primary substance of abuse (n)	0	0	0	273*	4	6	4	0	2	0	2896
Alcohol(%)	46.3	73.8	59.3	31.8	22.4	50.2	96.1	29.2	68.0	39.0	53.7
Drugs (%)	53.7	26.2	40.7	68.27	77.6	49.8	3.9	70.8	31.8	61.0	46.3
Opioids (%)	12.0	5.0	2.0	17.3	19.4	24.5	1.3	17.7	7.9	24.9	12.9
Stimulants(%)	7.9	5.8	14.1	26.6	39.0	10.0	0.5	6.2	11.9	17.5	14.8
Cannabis(%)	22.2	2.3	19.9	14.0	13.6	7.2	0.5	6.9	6.5	8.9	9.9
Other drugs(%)	11.6	13.1	4.7	10.3	5.6	8.2	1.6	40.0	5.7	9.7	8.7

Note: More than half of the Norwegian sample was drawn from another local study using the same methods. However in this study the primary substance of abuse was not reported

PART III:

DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENT
AND INTEGRATED TREATMENT
OF ADHD IN SUD PATIENTS

