

## University of Groningen

### Correction to

Becke, Miriam; Tucha, Lara; Weisbrod, Matthias; Aschenbrenner, Steffen; Tucha, Oliver; Fuermaier, Anselm B.M.

*Published in:*  
Journal of Neural Transmission

*DOI:*  
[10.1007/s00702-022-02533-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-022-02533-1)

**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:*  
2022

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

#### *Citation for published version (APA):*

Becke, M., Tucha, L., Weisbrod, M., Aschenbrenner, S., Tucha, O., & Fuermaier, A. B. M. (2022). Correction to: Non-credible symptom report in the clinical evaluation of adult ADHD: development and initial validation of a new validity index embedded in the Conners' adult ADHD rating scales (Journal of Neural Transmission, (2021), 128, 7, (1045-1063), 10.1007/s00702-021-02318-y). *Journal of Neural Transmission*, 129(10), 1315-1319. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-022-02533-1>

#### **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).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

#### **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.*



# Correction to: Non-credible symptom report in the clinical evaluation of adult ADHD: development and initial validation of a new validity index embedded in the Conners' adult ADHD rating scales

Miriam Becke<sup>1</sup> · Lara Tucha<sup>1,2</sup> · Matthias Weisbrod<sup>3,4</sup> · Steffen Aschenbrenner<sup>5</sup> · Oliver Tucha<sup>1,2</sup> · Anselm B. M. Fuermaier<sup>1</sup>

Published online: 17 August 2022  
© The Author(s) 2022

**Correction to:**  
**Journal of Neural Transmission (2021) 128:1045–1063**  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-021-02318-y>

Due to an administrative error, 73 individuals were wrongly assigned to the *Simulation Group*. Correction of this error consequently reduced its sample size from 242 to 169 individuals.

This did not affect the development of the ADHD Credibility Index (ACI). However, it resulted in an underestimation of the index' classification accuracy in its initial validation.

The corrected demographic data of the *Simulation Group* (see amended Table 1) differed from those of the other experimental groups as described in the original publication. Participants of this group were still significantly younger than participants in the *ADHD Groups* (credible:

$z=7.357$ , adjusted  $p<0.01$ ; non-credible:  $z=3.819$ , adjusted  $p<0.01$ ) and *Control Groups* (credible:  $z=20.681$ , adjusted  $p<0.01$ ; overreporting:  $z=3.557$ , adjusted  $p<0.01$ ). The gender distribution in this group also differed from the *Credible* ( $\chi^2(1)=42.518$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and *Overreporting Control Groups* ( $\chi^2(1)=20.289$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) as well as the *ADHD Groups* (credible:  $\chi^2(1)=16.176$ ,  $p<0.01$ ; non-credible:  $\chi^2(1)=13.327$ ,  $p=0.01$ ). In terms of education, instructed simulators differed from credible participants in the *Control Group* ( $z=-7.611$ , adjusted  $p<0.01$ ) and the *ADHD Group* ( $z=-3.660$ , adjusted  $p<0.01$ ), but not from overreporting controls ( $z=1.864$ , adjusted  $p=0.623$ ) or non-credible patients with ADHD ( $z=0.014$ , adjusted  $p=1.00$ ).

Correcting the *Simulation Group* further required the revision of Tables 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11. With the exception of the following findings, the pattern of results remained unchanged. The validity indicators under study showed overall **higher** sensitivity rates and **larger** effect sizes than previously reported. Rather than the small effect described in the original publication, the ACI yielded a large effect for the comparison of instructed simulators and credible adults with ADHD ( $d=1.29$ , 95% CI [0.49, 2.09]). As was previously the case, the largest effect could be observed on the Supposed Symptoms subscale, followed by Exaggerated Symptoms, Selectivity, and lastly Symptom Combinations (see amended Appendix 3). Additionally, changes in classification accuracy were noted for two DSM scales (see amended Table 6). While previously significant, ROC analysis showed a statistically non-significant result for the DSM Inattention (E) scale. In contrast, the DSM Total (G), yielded a statistically significant result upon correction. These changes did not affect the conclusions drawn from the results.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-021-02318-y>.

✉ Miriam Becke  
m.becke@rug.nl

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Clinical and Developmental Neuropsychology, Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands
- <sup>2</sup> Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Rostock, Gehlsheimer Str. 20, 18147 Rostock, Germany
- <sup>3</sup> Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, SRH Clinic Karlsbad-Langensteinbach, 76307 Karlsbad, Germany
- <sup>4</sup> Department of General Psychiatry, Center of Psychosocial Medicine, University of Heidelberg, 69115 Heidelberg, Germany
- <sup>5</sup> Department of Clinical Psychology and Neuropsychology, SRH Clinic Karlsbad-Langensteinbach, 76307 Karlsbad, Germany

**Table 1.** Descriptive data by group

	Neurotypical control group ( <i>n</i> = 1019)		ADHD group ( <i>n</i> = 122)		Simulation group ( <i>n</i> = 169)
	Credible ( <i>n</i> = 1001)	Overreporting ( <i>n</i> = 18)	Credible ( <i>n</i> = 100)	Non-credible ( <i>n</i> = 22)	
Age (years)					
Median (MAD)	49 (11)	32 (4)	34 (9)	31.50 (10.5)	20 (1)
Range	40	33	62	42	41
Sex (m/f)					
	494/504	13/5	46/54	13/9	38/131
%	49.4/50.3*	72.2/27.8	46.0/54.0	59.1/40.9	22.5/77.5
Education					
Years					
Median (MAD)	13 (3)	13 (3)	13 (3)	14 (2)	13 (1)
Range	10	10	16	15	14
ADHD Symptomatology					
Past <sup>a</sup>					
Median (MAD)			40.0 (10)	40.5 (14.5)	13.0 (6)
Range			70.0	53.5	48.0
Present <sup>b</sup>					
Median (MAD)			31.0 (6)	28.5 (5.5)	10.0 (4)
Range			53.0	40.0	45.0

MAD median absolute deviation

\*Three participants did not disclose their gender

<sup>a</sup>Wender Utah Rating Scale

<sup>b</sup>ADHD Self-Report Scale

**Table 2.** Summary statistics for ADHD Credibility Index (ACI) scores by group

	Neurotypical control group		ADHD group		Simulation group
	Credible	Overreporting	Credible	Non-credible	
Median (MAD)	2 (2)	22 (5)	11 (4)	10.5 (5.5)	20 (4)
ACI-A	0 (0)	5 (1)	2 (1)	2.5 (1.5)	5 (1)
ACI-B	0 (0)	5.5 (1.5)	3 (1)	2 (1)	5 (1)
ACI-C	0 (0)	6 (1)	3 (1)	2 (1)	5 (1)
ACI-D	0 (0)	6 (1.5)	2 (1)	2 (2)	5 (1)
Range					
Min-max	0–25	7–30	0–32	2–19	1–36
Mode					
ACI-A	0	24	5 <sup>a</sup>	5	19
ACI-B	0	5	2	1	5
ACI-C	0	5.5	3	1	6
ACI-D	0	6	2	2	5
ACI-D	0	6	3	2	5

MAD Median Absolute Deviation, ACI-A Supposed Symptoms Subscale, ACI-B Exaggerated Symptoms Subscale, ACI-C Symptom Combinations Subscale, ACI-D Selectivity Subscale

<sup>a</sup>Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown here.

**Table 5.** Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) of the ADHD Credibility Index (ACI) and CAARS Infrequency Index (CII) in the detection of simulated ADHD, non-credible adults with ADHD, and overreport on CAARS DSM Scales

	Base rate	Group		
		Simulation	Non-credible ADHD	Overreport
<b>ACI</b>				
Sensitivity		44.10%	0.0%	38.74%
Specificity		94.74%	94.74%	98.73%
PPV	10	48.21%	0.0%	77.23%
	20	67.69%	0.0%	88.41%
	30	78.22%	0.0%	92.90%
	50	89.34%	0.0%	96.83%
NPV	10	93.85%	89.50%	93.55%
	20	87.14%	79.12%	86.57%
	30	79.82%	68.85%	78.99%
	50	62.89%	48.65%	61.71%
<b>CII</b>				
Sensitivity		65.09%	27.27%	65.17%
Specificity		69.00%	69.00%	96.84%
PPV	10	18.92%	8.90%	69.65%
	20	34.42%	18.03%	83.77%
	30	47.36%	27.38%	89.85%
	50	67.74%	46.80%	95.38%
NPV	10	94.68%	89.52%	96.16%
	20	88.77%	79.14%	91.75%
	30	82.18%	68.88%	86.65%
	50	66.40%	48.69%	73.55%

Participants were classified as Overreporters if their *T*-Scores on any CAARS DSM Scale were  $\geq 80$

**Table 6.** Results of ROC analyses distinguishing credible adults with ADHD ( $n = 95$ ) from simulators ( $n = 161$ )

	AUC	SE	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
				Lower	Upper
ACI	0.825	0.027	< 0.01*	0.773	0.878
DSM inattention (E)	0.565	0.037	0.084	0.493	0.636
DSM hyperactivity/impulsivity (F)	0.820	0.028	< 0.01*	0.764	0.875
DSM total (G)	0.743	0.032	< 0.01*	0.681	0.805
CII	0.716	0.033	< 0.01*	0.652	0.780

*AUC* area under the curve, *ACI* ADHD Credibility Index, *CII* Conners' Infrequency Index

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$

**Table 8.** Results of ROC analyses distinguishing participants with unremarkable *T*-Scores on the DSM Scales ( $n = 1103$ ) from Overreporters ( $n = 191$ )

	Overreport on	AUC	SE	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
					Lower	Upper
ACI	Any DSM Scale	0.944	0.006	< 0.01*	0.932	0.957
	DSM inattention (E)	0.931	0.007	< 0.01*	0.917	0.946
	DSM hyperactivity (F)	0.959	0.006	< 0.01*	0.947	0.972
	DSM total (G)	0.954	0.006	< 0.01*	0.943	0.966
CII	Any DSM Scale	0.966	0.005	< 0.01*	0.957	0.976
	DSM inattention (E)	0.958	0.006	< 0.01*	0.947	0.969
	DSM hyperactivity (F)	0.978	0.004	< 0.01*	0.970	0.985
	DSM total (G)	0.970	0.004	< 0.01*	0.962	0.979

AUC Area under the Curve, ACI ADHD Credibility Index, CII Conners' Infrequency Index

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$

**Table 9.** Agreement between ADHD Credibility Index and overreport on DSM scales

Scale	Group	%	ADHD Credibility Index	
			Not suspect (%)	Suspect (%)
DSM inattention (E)	Control group	1.68	47.06	52.94
	ADHD group	47.37	88.89	11.11
	Simulation group	60.87	45.92	54.08
	Non-credible ADHD group	50.00	100.00	0.00
	Total	13.19	60.59	39.41
DSM hyperactivity/impulsivity (F)	Control group	0.39	25.00	75.00
	ADHD group	10.53	70.00	30.00
	Simulation group	45.96	37.84	62.16
	Non-credible ADHD group	5.00	100.00	0.00
	Total	6.90	41.57	58.43
DSM total (G)	Control group	1.18	25.00	75.00
	ADHD group	33.68	84.38	15.62
	Simulation group	67.70	45.87	54.13
	Non-credible ADHD group	35.00	100.00	0.00
	Total	12.41	54.38	45.62
ADHD Index (H)	Control group	0.30	33.33	66.67
	ADHD group	14.74	64.29	35.71
	Simulation group	11.80	0.00	100.00
	Non-credible ADHD group	5.00	100.00	0.00
	Total	2.87	29.73	70.27

Column denoted '%' shows the percentage of participants within the respective group, whose *T*-Scores fell into the suspect range (i.e.  $T \geq 80$ )

**Table 10.** Agreement between ADHD Credibility Index and existing validity indicators

Index	Group	Classification	%	ACI	
				% Not Suspect	% Suspect
Inconsistency Index	Control group	Not inconsistent	94.89	98.86	1.14
		Inconsistent	5.11	98.08	1.92
	ADHD group	Not inconsistent	76.60	93.06	6.94
		Inconsistent	23.40	100.00	0.00
	Simulation group	Not inconsistent	80.75	54.62	45.38
		Inconsistent	19.25	61.29	38.71
	Non-credible ADHD group	Not inconsistent	90.00	100.00	0.00
		Inconsistent	10.00	100.00	0.00
	Total	Not inconsistent	91.72	93.68	6.32
		Inconsistent	8.28	87.85	12.15
CII	Control group	Not suspect	98.23	99.80	0.20
		Suspect	1.77	44.44	55.56
	ADHD group	Not suspect	69.47	100.00	0.00
		Suspect	30.53	82.76	17.24
	Simulation group	Not suspect	36.02	87.93	12.07
		Suspect	63.98	37.86	62.14
	Non-credible ADHD group	Not suspect	70.00	100.00	0.00
		Suspect	30.00	100.00	0.00
	Total	Not suspect	87.94	99.21	0.79
		Suspect	12.06	49.36	50.64

**Table 11.** Agreement between ADHD Credibility Index (ACI) and CAARS Infrequency Index (CII)

ACI suspect?	CII suspect?		
	No	Yes	
No	1129	77	1206
Yes	9	79	88
	1138	156	

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

**Appendix 3. Effect Sizes (d) with 95%-Confidence Intervals**

	Credible ADHD group (n = 100) vs. simulation group (n = 169)			Credible ADHD group (n = 100) vs. non-credible ADHD group (n = 22)		
	d	Lower	Upper	d	Lower	Upper
ACI	1.292	0.486	2.098	0.146	-0.958	1.249
ACI-A	1.478	1.256	1.700	0.006	-0.297	0.309
ACI-B	1.203	0.970	1.436	0.306	-0.056	0.667
ACI-C	0.736	0.480	0.993	0.164	-0.207	0.535
ACI-D	0.994	0.761	1.227	0.073	-0.273	0.419

ACI ADHD Credibility Index, ACI-A Supposed Symptoms Subscale, ACI-B Exaggerated Symptoms Subscale, ACI-C Symptom Combinations Subscale, ACI-D Selectivity Subscale

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.