



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Two novel CBTs for adolescents with ADHD: the value of planning skills

Boyer, B.E.; Geurts, H.M.; Prins, P.J.M.; van der Oord, S.

DOI

[10.1007/s00787-014-0661-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-014-0661-5)

Publication date

2015

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Boyer, B. E., Geurts, H. M., Prins, P. J. M., & van der Oord, S. (2015). Two novel CBTs for adolescents with ADHD: the value of planning skills. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 24(9), 1075-1090. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-014-0661-5>

General rights

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), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Two novel CBTs for adolescents with ADHD: the value of planning skills

Bianca E. Boyer · Hilde M. Geurts · Pier J. M. Prins · Saskia Van der Oord

Received: 8 July 2014 / Accepted: 10 December 2014 / Published online: 31 December 2014
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2014

Abstract Adolescents with ADHD have planning problems, often affecting school- and social functioning. Evidence-based treatments for adolescents with ADHD are scarce and treatment drop-out rates are substantial. The effectiveness of two new, individual, short-term cognitive behavioral therapies (CBT) was investigated: One with an aim on improving planning skills and one solution-focused treatment (SFT) without such an aim. Motivational Interviewing elements were added to both treatments to enhance treatment compliance. In a multi-center randomized clinical trial, 159 adolescents (12–17 years) with ADHD were randomly assigned to one of both treatments. Pre-, post- and 3-month follow-up data were gathered on five domains:

Parent-rated ADHD, planning problems and executive functioning (primary outcomes), neuropsychological measures of planning, comorbid symptoms, general functioning, and teacher measures. Attrition was low in both treatments (5 %). Adolescents improved significantly between pre- and post-test with large effect sizes on all domains. Improvements remained stable or continued to improve from post-test to follow-up, also when controlling for medication use. Marginally significant differences were found in favor of the planning-focused treatment: parents and therapists evaluated this treatment more positively than SFT and the planning-focused treatment showed more reduction of parent-rated planning problems. Two new CBTs with integrated motivational components were feasible and attrition was low. ADHD symptoms and co-existing problems of the adolescents improved from pre-test to 3 months after treatment. As the planning-focused treatment was evaluated more positive and had marginal additional beneficial effects to SFT, especially planning-focused CBT seems promising to fill the gap in available treatments for adolescents with ADHD.

Clinical trials registration “Training adolescents with ADHD to plan and organize: Investigating short- and longterm effects of treatment”, <http://www.trialregister.nl/trialreg/admin/rctview.asp?TC=2142>, NTR2142.

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s00787-014-0661-5) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

B. E. Boyer · P. J. M. Prins · S. Van der Oord
Department of Developmental Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

B. E. Boyer · H. M. Geurts
Dutch Autism and ADHD Research Center, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

H. M. Geurts · P. J. M. Prins · S. Van der Oord
Centre for Cognitive Science, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

S. Van der Oord (✉)
Clinical Psychology, KU Leuven, Tiensestraat 102, Bus 3720,
3000 Leuven, Belgium
e-mail: saskia.vanderoord@ppw.kuleuven.be

Keywords ADHD · Adolescence · CBT · Treatment · Executive functioning · Planning

Introduction

In theories of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), three psycho-pathophysiological pathways are proposed to underlie ADHD behavior [1]: aberrant executive functioning (EF), with pronounced planning problems in adolescence [2, 3], deficits in motivation processes: a preference for immediate over delayed reinforcement and deviant sensitivity to reward and punishment [4], and deficits in temporal

processing that include problems with time estimation. In adolescence, specifically during secondary school, various environmental changes take place that particularly appeal to these pathways. The control and help of parents and teachers diminish as compared to childhood, whereas the transition to secondary school increases the need for EF and time estimation. Adolescents are expected to independently plan long-term projects, study for tests, and complete and turn-in assignments for multiple classes and teachers [5]. Also, compared to elementary school, cognitive demands and the number of homework assignments increase. In addition, increasing motivational deficits in adolescence [6] put a challenge on tasks with delayed reinforcement, such as paying attention in class or completing homework assignments. Therefore, it is not surprising that adolescents with ADHD are more likely to demonstrate more disruptive classroom behavior, show lower academic and occupational achievement, have higher suspension rates, drop out of school and have lower high school graduation rates than their typically developing peers [7]. Next to these academic problems, adolescents with ADHD show comorbid disorders that persist into adulthood with the most prevalent being oppositional defiant disorder (ODD), conduct disorder (CD), anxiety and mood disorders [2, 3, 8]. These problems underline the importance of effective treatment for this vulnerable group of adolescents.

Although effective for reduction of ADHD symptoms, pharmacological treatments often do not reduce the pronounced EF problems [9]. A model posited by Safren et al. states that a history of underachievement is caused by failure to compensate for the core impairments of ADHD (e.g., inattention, inhibition, and self-regulation). Therefore, aiming treatment at these compensatory functional skills like planning and organizing may improve ADHD symptoms as well as comorbid problems [10]. Psychosocial treatments for ADHD are often a mix of several behavioral, skills training, and cognitive techniques. Although it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the main focus, in general, treatments can be divided into behavioral treatments that generally focus on modifying the behavior of the child by operant techniques that are provided by parents, teachers or others (e.g., behavioral classroom interventions, contingency management), and behavioral training interventions that generally aim at improving the skills set of the child by directly training the individual (e.g., organizational interventions) [11]. In adolescent and adult samples, these behavioral skills training interventions also sometimes include cognitive techniques such as cognitive restructuring, and then they often are labeled as cognitive-behavioral treatments (CBT) [12].

In children, few studies focus on the effectiveness of organizational training interventions [11]. A randomized clinical trial (RCT) in children with ADHD, investigating the effects of a training intervention focused on enhancing planning skills, showed positive results as compared to a

waitlist-control group which maintained up to 1-year post-treatment [13]. However, compared to an active comparison group (a traditional behavioral treatment), there only was a significant difference in favor of the planning-focused training intervention on reduction of parent-rated organizational skills. In adolescents, treatments more often focus on training of planning skills, as deficits in planning skills often are very impairing in adolescence. An intensive school-based training intervention that aimed at enhancing several skills (i.e., planning, organizational and social functioning) showed significant and large improvements from pre- to post-treatment as compared to community care [14]. In addition, in a RCT a less intensive school-based training intervention focusing on enhancing planning skills showed superior effectiveness as compared to a waitlist control group as rated by parents, but not teachers, with maintenance of effects to 3-month follow-up ($N = 47$) [15]. Also, a randomized pilot study on a family based training intervention aiming at the improvement of academic and organizational skills showed improvement on academic measures rated by parents, but not teachers, as compared to treatment as usual (TAU) [16].

Nevertheless, most studies have focused on the effects of interventions without addition of cognitive techniques [17], while adolescents may have sufficient cognitive capacity to benefit from CBT [12, 18, 19]. Only one non-randomized study investigated the effects of a training intervention that included cognitive techniques; this study showed large pre- to post-treatment progress on a number of parent- and teacher-rated variables (e.g., ADHD symptoms, school measures). In addition, according to parents and teachers, adolescents with comorbid anxiety/depression benefited more from CBT, whereas adolescents with comorbid ODD benefited less from CBT [19]. In adults with ADHD, CBTs that are aimed at enhancing planning and organizing skills have been investigated in RCTs [20, 21]. Although the samples of these studies may not resemble the population of adults with ADHD (e.g., above average IQ of the study sample [21]), both RCTs showed positive results in comparison to active control groups from pre- to post-treatment, not only on reduction of the ADHD symptoms [20], but also on reduction of the planning-related problems [21].

All in all, RCTs in adolescent samples are scarce [but 14–16] and no RCTs have been conducted on the effects of planning-focused treatment including cognitive techniques (CBT) in adolescents with ADHD. Moreover, to date, most of the training-based interventions are quite intensive and often school-based (14–17 sessions [15, 19] or 5 months twice a week [14]), making implementation and dissemination in the current European mental health care system challenging (where funding mental health care in schools is currently not feasible). For wide dissemination, treatments must be feasible for clinicians to implement using the existing infrastructure [22].

Therefore, we compared two individual CBTs containing only eight sessions, thereby easy to implement. One intervention, Plan My Life (PML) [23], aimed at improving planning and organizing skills that are necessary in adolescent life, including special attention for school- and homework. In this treatment, adolescents were learned what strategies can be used for good planning (e.g., how to use a daily planner or a to do list) and maladaptive cognitions were changed (e.g., “I could not do it before, why would it work now?”). PML was compared to a CBT without the specific aim of enhancing planning skills to control for non-specific treatment effects. To make sure adolescents in this comparison treatment would not selectively drop-out, due to a lack of engagement as often reported in the literature [e.g., 3, 24], and to make sure that the treatment would be deemed equally “credible” as PML, this comparison CBT was a Solution-Focused Treatment (SFT). SFT was an “empty” treatment; i.e., there were no skills taught, there was no specific content, the adolescent had to decide for his/herself what he/she wanted to discuss [25]. The therapist then worked with the adolescent to identify what the adolescent already did well rather than focusing on what was going wrong (e.g., identifying what behavior and cognitions were helpful in periods when the problem was not present). SFT had a positive angle that may enhance treatment engagement, even though no skills were actively learned [26]. As having an ADHD diagnosis is predictive of treatment attrition [24], adherence is an important challenge in treatment development for adolescents with ADHD [3]. As MI has been shown to have a positive effect on treatment adherence in adolescents, in this study Motivational Interviewing (MI) was used throughout both treatments (integrated in the workbook as well as in the attitude of the therapist, see methods section) to augment treatment motivation [3, 27].

A multi-center RCT was conducted comparing both CBTs: a large sample of adolescents was assessed pre-treatment, post-treatment and at 3-month follow-up. Our first research question was therefore: do ADHD symptoms, planning and EF problems, comorbid symptoms and general functioning of adolescents with ADHD improve from pre- to follow-up test? Based on the non-randomized study by Antshel et al. [19], we expected improvement on all areas in both CBT groups. However, following the study of Antshel et al. [19], effects of CBT would be less pronounced on comorbid ODD and CD symptoms, but more pronounced on comorbid anxiety and depressive symptoms. The second research question was whether adolescents who received PML (aiming at planning skills) improve more than adolescents who received SFT (not specifically aiming at planning skills). This comparison of both treatments enabled us to make inferences about what the value is of focusing on enhancing planning skills in CBT.

Outcome measures included parent-rated ADHD symptoms and planning skills as primary outcomes, and EF measures, measures of comorbid problems and teacher measures. In addition, neuropsychological measures of planning skills were added as outcome measures to investigate whether effects of CBT were also apparent on a cognitive level. We expected that adolescents in both treatments would show improvement of ADHD, comorbid symptoms and planning skills, but following the model posited by Safren [10] and previous studies [13, 20, 21] the group receiving PML would improve more than the group receiving SFT, especially on ADHD symptoms, planning skills and EF (which were, therefore, our primary outcomes).

Methods

Participants

The study was presented to parents, adolescents and therapists as a study to determine which non-pharmacological treatment is most effective for adolescents with ADHD. Sixteen participating mental health care institutes in the Netherlands hang posters up and placed flyers in their waiting rooms, and therapists attended their clients to the possibility of following these treatments. Adolescents and their parents then applied for the study. For inclusion in the study, adolescents had to meet the following criteria: (1) a prior DSM-IV-TR diagnosis of ADHD [28] by a child psychiatrist or certified psychologist, (2) a confirmed ADHD diagnosis on the ADHD sections of the diagnostic interview schedule for children for DSM-IV parent version (DISC-IV) [29]. The DISC-IV is a structured diagnostic interview based on DSM-IV, which establishes ADHD group membership based on a diagnostic algorithm, including a check for the presence of cross-situational impairment, (3) between 12 and 17 years old, (4) attending secondary school, (5) sufficient understanding of the Dutch language (adolescents and parents), (6) a full scale IQ (FSIQ) >80 measured by the short version of the Dutch Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-III) [30], (7) in case the adolescent already received pharmacological treatment for ADHD, it had to be stable for 4 weeks prior to pre-testing. Adolescents were requested not to change medication status and dose between pre- and post-assessment. Participants on methylphenidate discontinued medication at least 24 h before assessments, allowing for a complete wash-out [31].

Adolescents were excluded if: (1) the adolescents themselves or their parents received alternative non-pharmacological treatment between pre- and post-assessment aimed at the participating adolescent. This included treatment not only in mental health care, but also out-of-school tutoring and




Fig. 1 Flow chart

in-school remedial services. When the adolescent or parents did receive alternative treatment, they could only participate if they stopped this treatment until post-test had taken place, (2) they had a comorbid autism spectrum disorder (because our pilot study showed that both treatments are unsuitable for these adolescents), (3) they had predominant addiction, depression with suicidal ideations, acute familial crisis or CD (DISC-IV-criteria were used to detect comorbid CD). Because these disorders bring forward risks for participants themselves or others, it was unethical to discourage additional treatment, (4) they received pharmacological treatment with Atomoxetine. Our study design included assessments with neuropsychological tests, during which medication was discontinued; Atomoxetine does not allow short-term interruption of treatment, thus these adolescents were excluded. Details of adolescent trial flow are presented in Fig. 1.

Procedure

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Amsterdam (2010-KP-1079). Upon referral to either participating center, inclusion criteria were checked

with an extensive phone screen. Before pre-test started, both the parent and the adolescent gave their informed consent. After pre-test, adolescents were randomly assigned to either PML ($N = 83$) or SFT ($N = 76$) using covariate adaptive randomization [32] by a blinded and independent researcher, and were stratified on gender and medication use (yes/no). Post-test took place within a week after treatment and follow-up test approximately 3 months after treatment, by blinded research assistants. Pre-test started with the WISC-III. All three assessments consisted of neuropsychological tasks that were counterbalanced, followed by a break after an hour and concluded with questionnaires. During all assessments, parents filled in questionnaires. All assessments and treatment took place in the same outpatient mental health care clinic where the participant applied for treatment.

Measures

Outcome measures

Outcomes were collected on five domains: (1) parent-rated ADHD, planning and EF (primary outcomes), (2)

neuropsychological measures of EF, (3) comorbid symptoms, (4) general functioning, (5) teacher measures. In addition, information on medication use was gathered (6). For more details on outcome measures, see Supplement 1.

1. *Parent-rated ADHD and EF* Disruptive Behavior Disorder (DBD) rating scale parent version [33, 34]: the ADHD symptoms scale was calculated summarizing the ADHD inattention and the ADHD hyperactivity/impulsivity scales, with a higher score indicating more symptoms of ADHD. Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function [35, 36] (BRIEF): plan/organize scale and total score. Higher scores on the BRIEF subscales indicate more EF problems.
2. *Neuropsychological measures of EF* four neuropsychological tests were used to measure planning skills of the adolescents: Tower test, Trail Making test (Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System [37]), Key Search test and Zoo Map test (Behavioral Assessment of the Dysexecutive Syndrome [38]).
3. *Comorbid symptoms* Child Depression Inventory [39, 40], Screen for Child Anxiety Related Emotional Disorders [41, 42], DBD [33, 34] summarized ODD and CD scales, Child Behavior Checklist [43, 44]: internalizing problems and externalizing problems scales.
4. *General functioning* School Attitude Questionnaire [45], Homework Problems Checklist [46], Conflict Behavior Questionnaire parent- and adolescent version [47], Impairment Rating Scale parent version [48] (IRS). Regarding questions of the IRS, a score below three implies normalization of functioning [49]. In this study, the IRS question measuring “the overall severity of this child’s problem in functioning and overall need for treatment” was used to measure general impairment and to assess how many adolescents normalized after treatment.
5. *Teacher measures* DBD teacher version [33, 34], BRIEF-teacher version [35, 36], IRS teacher version [48] and Classroom Performance Survey [50].
6. *Medication use* As medication use and dose could change between post- and follow-up assessment, medication use was an outcome measure in post- to follow-up analyses. Parents were asked about the use of medication (yes/no), type (MPH/Dexamphetamine) and dose of medication (daily dose¹) at post-test and at follow-up.

Evaluation of treatment

Parents and adolescents evaluated their treatment at post-test. Parents were asked to rate treatment on four 5-point Likert

scales, and adolescents on five 5-point Likert scales. For both parents and adolescents, a higher score indicated a more positive evaluation. Therapists were asked to answer the following three questions after being trained in both treatments: Which of the two treatments (1) has your preference? (2) do you think is best suitable for this population? (3) would you rather carry out? If the case would arise that therapists had a strong preference for one of both treatments, adherence and contamination were measured to monitor if treatment fidelity was affected (see “Treatment fidelity”).

Treatments

Similarities

Both PML and SFT were individual treatments consisting of eight adolescent sessions and two parental sessions (between adolescent session 2 and 3, and between adolescent session 5 and 6) of 45–60 min. In both treatments, the adolescent and therapist used a workbook. The treatments had an identical first session, which consisted of psychoeducation and formulating personal treatment goals. To reduce drop-out, MI was integrated in both treatments and also into the workbooks, in several ways: (1) the adolescents chose their own treatment goals (not those of their parents or teachers), which were written down and were always visible during treatment, (2) in the first part of each session (± 10 min), the past week was discussed and attention was paid to progression towards treatment goals, (3) medication use (when relevant) and school attitude were explored on scales in a MI manner, (4) assignments were not presented as “homework”, but were formulated as an experiment for the upcoming week. In that way, the adolescent was free to choose a treatment strategy that fitted his/her life and the strategy could be adjusted according to their experiences, (5) after every session, the adolescent evaluated the session on four visual analog scales regarding the therapist, importance and usefulness of the session subject, and their intention to try the new strategies, (6) whenever the adolescent was not motivated enough to finish a session, MI was conducted by discussing pros and cons of treatment until the adolescent indicated to have enough motivation for the treatment to continue, (7) in the attitude of the therapist: therapists were learned to use MI by emphasizing the autonomy of the adolescent, collaborate with them rather than taking an expert role, evoke and elicit reasons and concerns about change instead of imparting advise and, finally, to show empathy in a MI manner [51]. A final similarity between both treatments was that adolescents could earn a reward, which they got from their parents (e.g., doing an activity with their friends or family, choosing desert for a week or getting a present), when they attended all treatment sessions.

¹ Because some adolescents only use MPH during the school-week, school-week average dose is calculated.

Table 1 Content of both treatments

Session	PML	SFT
1	Psycho-education and treatment goals	Psycho-education and treatment goals
2	Finding new solutions for existing problems and use of daily planner	Solve self-formulated problem
Parent1	Treatment content and parenting goals	Solve self-formulated problem
3	Use of to do list and prioritizing	Solve self-formulated problem
4	Dividing big problems into small steps	Solve self-formulated problem
5	Concentration in the classroom and during homework	Solve self-formulated problem
Parent2	Household rules	Solve self-formulated problem
6	Planning homework	Solve self-formulated problem
7	Help from friends and family	Solve self-formulated problem
8	Relapse prevention	Repetition of solutions

PML plan my life, SFT solution-focused treatment

Plan my life

Plan my life [23] was a CBT in which at every session a fixed, planning skill focused, subject was discussed. Planning and organization strategies (such as a to-do list) were presented, of which the adolescent could compose the strategies he/she wanted to try the following week. Whenever needed, negative thoughts about the new strategy were challenged and helping thoughts formulated. Every session, strategies that had been tried during the past week were discussed, including successes, possible room for improvement, and associated cognitions. Also, the adolescent showed his/her daily planner and to do list of the past week. The two parental sessions aimed at finding a balance between keeping control of their child and letting go, by discussing which parenting goals were worth the struggle. Next, parents were taught how to formulate and implement rules in the household and how to facilitate positive communication with the adolescent.

In the SFT [25], at every session the adolescent discussed a problem he/she encountered. Following fixed questions, the adolescent was guided towards a solution for the posited problem. The fixed questions were: (1) What is the subject you chose? Describe the situation. (2) How is the present situation a problem for you? (3) How would you like it to be? (4) What are solutions you used in the past and what are other possible solutions to the problem? (5) Does the situation, as it is now, have advantages? (6) Would you like to change the situation now/later/not at all, (7) if you choose to change, what is your plan? if you choose to change later or not at all, what are your considerations (pros and cons)? Every session started with the therapist asking the adolescent what went well in the past week and whether the subject of last week had to be discussed again today. In the parental sessions, the same questions were asked regarding parenting problems. In this treatment, the therapist did not tell the

adolescent or parent what to do and did not teach them new skills, but guided them towards a solution, using the fixed questions.

Differences

Whereas in PML every week planning skills were actively learned by discussing a fixed subject, in SFT the adolescent/parent had to choose the subjects themselves and was guided to his/her own solution (see Table 1).

Therapists

To control for therapist effects [52], the 56 participating therapists provided both treatments. All therapists worked in one of the 16 participating mental health care institutes and were kept blind from the hypothesis that PML would have greater treatment effects than SFT. Within every institute two to nine therapists participated, who all at least had a master degree in psychology. Therapists varied in years of working experience ($M = 5.9$; $SD = 5.5$; range 0.3–25.0). The number of adolescents treated by the therapists was variable ($M = 4.2$; $SD = 2.1$; range = 1–10). Every other week therapists had supervision to discuss ongoing treatments, from a certified supervisor of the Dutch Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies. During supervision, role play was used to practice problem situations and video recordings of therapists' treatments were examined to provide corrective feedback of the therapists' performance whenever needed.

Treatment fidelity

To assure intervention fidelity, several actions were taken [53] including the use of workbooks, extensive training and bi-weekly therapist supervision (for a more extensive description see Supplement 2).

Measures of intervention fidelity

Recorded adherence and contamination Five digitally recorded sessions were randomly chosen from all sessions of each treatment condition to rate adherence (percentage of elements that are addressed in the right session of the right treatment) and contamination (percentage of elements that are addressed in one treatment although actually belonging in the other treatment), resulting in 100 rated sessions (i.e., 5.4 % of all sessions). For the adolescent sessions in both treatments, all sessions had to be conducted as described in the manual to reach 100 % adherence. Also, for the parental sessions in SFT, therapist had to conduct both sessions as described in the manual to reach 100 % adherence. In case of PML, however, the manual stated that the therapist could choose 2 out of 3 possible sessions to fill in the parent sessions. Therefore, when 2 out of 3 sessions are conducted in PML (i.e., 66 %), adherence is 100 %.

Therapist-reported adherence

Therapists filled in registration books to rate their treatment adherence. Percentages of addressed elements (i.e., adherence) for both adolescent and parent sessions were calculated.

Treatment diffusion

As in six sessions of SFT the discussed subject was chosen by the adolescent, diffusion from PML to SFT is measured by examining the chosen subject. The percentage of sessions in SFT devoted to a planning-related subject that is also discussed in PML (i.e., diffusion) was calculated.

Missing data

Intent-to-treat analyses were conducted. Missing parent and adolescent data were imputed using stochastic regression [54]. These missing data were not related to any subject characteristic and were as a result missing completely at random [55]. Unfortunately, there were high rates of missing teacher data (46.5 % missing at pre-test, 50.9 % at post-test, 63.5 % at follow-up). Replacement of missing values is not reliable at these high rates, thus the missing teacher data could not be imputed [56]. As a result, we conducted our main analyses on the first four domains, and we analyzed teacher data only exploratory.

Statistical analyses

Sample description and baseline comparison

To test for group differences in demographic variables at pre-test, independent *t* tests were used for continue

variables and Chi squared tests for categorical variables. To compare outcome variables between treatment groups at baseline, three MANOVAs were used: one on adolescent measures, one on parent-rated measures and one on the teacher-rated measures (see Table S1).

Treatment fidelity

Percentages of rated adherence and contamination were calculated for both recorded adolescent and parent sessions. Also, treatments were compared on therapist-reported adherence using independent *t* tests on the percentages of addressed elements for both adolescent and parent sessions. Finally, the percentage of diffusion of PML elements into SFT was calculated.

Medication change and additional treatment

Using Chi squared test, the number of adolescents that changed medication status or received additional non-pharmacological treatment was compared between treatment groups, from pre- to post-test as well as from post- to follow-up test. Possible changes in average MPH dose between post- and follow-up test and between treatment groups were analyzed using repeated measures analyses.

Treatment outcomes

The effects of both treatments were investigated on five different domains, of which the first four: (1) parent-rated ADHD, planning and EF (primary outcomes), (2) neuropsychological measures, (3) comorbid problems, and (4) general functioning, were analyzed using four separate repeated measure MANOVA's, with time (pre-, post-, follow-up test) as within variable and treatment (PLM and SFT) as between variable. Multivariate analyses were followed up with univariate analyses and within-subject contrasts to explore time effects and time \times treatment effects between pre- and post-test and between post- and follow-up test. To prevent type I error, Bonferroni correction was used, resulting in an alpha of 0.0125. The fifth domain, teacher measures, was analyzed exploratory due to missing data using two repeated measure MANOVAs with time (pre- to post-test in the first analysis, post- to follow-up test in the second analysis) as within variable and treatment (PLM and SFT) as between variable. The reason, for analyzing pre- to post-test and post- to follow-up test separately, was that this increases the number of responders (pre- to post-test $N = 30$, post- to follow-up test $N = 27$). Multivariate analyses were followed up with univariate analyses. In addition, with Chi squared test we assessed how many

adolescents normalized after both treatments, according to parent-rated IRS scores, and whether this number differed between treatments.

Covariates

To control for site-effects, analyses were repeated whilst co-varying for site. As after post-test adolescents could start or stop using medication and could start additional treatment, repeated measures MANOVAs were conducted on the post- and follow-up test scores, whilst co-varying for medication use at follow-up (yes/no) and receiving additional treatment after post-test (yes/no). Please note that both covariates have missing values resulting in smaller sample sizes, respectively: $N = 116$, $N = 132$.

Treatment evaluation

Adolescent and parent evaluations of treatment were investigated using independent t tests. Therapist evaluation was compared between treatments using binary tests of proportion.

Power analysis

Power analysis was conducted in $G \times$ power. Based on comparable research with adults ($ES = 1.1$ [57]), we expected PML to be an effective treatment, with large effect sizes ($ES > 0.8$ [58]). We also expected SFT to be an effective treatment (e.g., because of non-specific treatment factors), however, with a small to medium ES (between 0.2 and 0.5). Therefore, between both treatments we expected a medium ES (0.7) and we needed a total of 153 adolescents for sufficient power (alpha level = 0.0125, power = 0.8).

Results

Sample description and baseline comparison

There were no significant differences between treatment conditions on demographic characteristics (Table 2). The sample seemed representative for the broader group of adolescents with ADHD: 70.3 % of adolescents had the inattentive subtype, 73.5 % were boys and 78.1 % used psychotropic medication [2, 3]. At baseline, no group differences were found on the outcome measures (Table S1). Also, no differences appeared between drop-outs and completers on demographics and baseline measures. In both treatments, attrition was low and the length of treatment was comparable. PML showed significantly higher attendance rates than SFT at follow-up assessments.

Treatment fidelity

Recorded adherence and contamination

Based on the digitally recorded sessions, adherence was high in the adolescent sessions (PML = 86.0 %, SFT = 83.4 %) as well as in the parental sessions (PML = 66.0 %, SFT = 82.6 %) of both treatments. In addition, no contamination was found: no PML elements were rated in the SFT group and vice versa.

Therapist-reported adherence

Therapist report of adherence showed that on average 91.9 % (SD = 8.36, $N = 107$) of adolescent sessions and 90.8 % (SD = 11.07, $N = 91$) of parent sessions were carried out as described in the treatment manuals, with no significant difference in adherence between treatments.

Treatment diffusion

Sixty-seven workbooks were collected from the 76 adolescents who were treated with SFT (88.2 %). In 61.7 % of their sessions, the adolescents chose to discuss a planning-related problem. Of these planning subjects, 37.3 % was related to planning of school and homework, but note that in SFT no planning skills were taught by the therapists (no contamination, see above).

Medication change and additional treatment

Between pre- and post-test, a total of nine adolescents (5.6 %) changed medication dose, with no group differences (PML $N = 4$, SFT $N = 5$, $p = .59$, $\phi = 0.05$). Also, analyses showed no group differences in the number of adolescents who started ($N = 10$) or stopped ($N = 13$) medication between post- and follow-up test ($p = .703$, $\phi = 0.01$). Repeated measures analyses showed no within group difference in average MPH dose between post- and follow-up test ($p = .07$, $\eta^2 = 0.033$) and no difference between treatment groups ($p = .20$, $\eta^2 = 0.017$). Also, there were no between group differences in the number of adolescents who received additional non-pharmacological treatment between post- and follow-up test ($N = 13$, $p = .865$, $\phi = 0.00$).

Treatment outcomes

Time effects

Our first research question was whether ADHD symptoms, planning and EF problems, comorbid symptoms and

² Please note that this is the maximum adherence score.

Table 2 Sample description

	PML(<i>N</i> = 83)		SFT (<i>N</i> = 76)		Results
	M/N	SD/%	M/N	SD/%	
Age in years	14.4	1.2	14.4	1.3	$t(157) = 0.19, d = 0.00$
Gender (<i>N</i> boys)	63	75.9	54	71.1	$\chi^2(1) = 0.48, \phi = 0.06$
Parents highest completed education level ^a					
Father					$\chi^2(3) = 1.79, \phi = 0.01$
Low	3	3.6	6	7.9	
Average	14	16.9	12	15.8	
Higher	28	33.7	21	25.3	
Highest	34	41.0	32	42.1	
Mother					$\chi^2(3) = 5.46, \phi = 0.03$
Low	1	1.2	7	9.2	
Average	14	16.9	10	12.0	
Higher	36	43.4	31	40.8	
Highest	30	36.1	28	36.8	
FSIQ	102.5	11.6	104.3	11.9	$t(157) = -0.97, d = 0.15$
Age when diagnosed ^a	12.8	2.1	12.2	2.9	$t(133.35) = 1.64, d = 0.24$
ADHD Subtype (DISC-IV)					$\chi^2(2) = 5.06, \phi = 0.18$
ADHD-Inattentive	62	74.7	50	65.8	
ADHD-Hyperactive/impulsive	6	7.2	2	2.6	
ADHD-Combined	15	18.1	24	31.6	
Clinical comorbidity					
<i>N</i> odd	28	33.7	22	28.9	$\chi^2(1) = 0.42, \phi = 0.00$
<i>N</i> depression	17	20.5	15	19.7	$\chi^2(1) = 0.01, \phi = 0.00$
<i>N</i> anxiety disorder	10	12.0	4	5.3	$\chi^2(1) = 2.28, \phi = 0.01$
Medication status					
No medication	21	25.3	14	18.4	$\chi^2(2) = 2.13, \phi = 0.01$
<i>N</i> users dexamphetamine	1	1.2	3	3.9	
<i>N</i> users MPH	61	73.5	59	77.6	
<i>M</i> MPH IR dose schoolday ^a	25.0	20.2	26.8	19.7	$t(140) = -0.53, d = 0.09$
Treatment history					
<i>N</i> treated for ADHD prior to study ^a	21	25.3	21	25.3	$\chi^2(1) = 0.12, \phi = 0.00$
<i>N</i> treated for other prior to study ^a	13	15.7	16	21.1	$\chi^2(1) = 0.79, \phi = 0.00$
Treatment characteristics					
Length of treatment in weeks	9.3	2.6	9.1	2.9	$t(157) = .47, d = 0.07$
<i>N</i> Drop-outs	4	4.8	4	5.3	$\chi^2(1) = 0.02, \phi = 0.00$
Assessment attendance					
Post-test	79	95.2	67	88.2	$\chi^2(1) = 2.61, \phi = 0.02$
Follow-up test	77	92.8	59	77.6	$\chi^2(1) = 7.35^{**}, \phi = 0.05$

ADHD attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, DISC-IV subtype based on diagnostic interview schedule for children for DSM-IV parent version, FSIQ full scale IQ, MPH methylphenidate, MPH IR methylphenidate immediate release, ODD oppositional defiant disorder, PML plan my life, SFT solution-focused treatment

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; Cramer’s ϕ effect size: 0.10 is small, 0.30 is medium, 0.50 is large; Cohen’s d effect size: 0.2 is small, 0.5 medium, 0.8 large

^a On this variable, data are missing

general functioning of adolescents with ADHD improve from pre- to follow-up test. Results are shown in Tables 3 and 4. Analyses showed a consistent pattern: On all four

domains, omnibus tests showed significant within-group improvement over time, with large ES ($\eta\rho^2$ range = 0.319–0.452). Univariate follow-up analyses showed that on all

Table 3 Results of repeated measures MANOVAs comparing treatment effects of PML and SFT

Domain	PML						SFT						Results			
	Pre		Post		FU1		Pre		Post		FU		Time	Time × treatment	η^2	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F	F		
Parent-rated ADHD and EF																
Omnibus	25.56	9.48	18.66	9.64	18.41	9.76	24.97	9.16	19.99	9.69	20.02	8.21	<i>F</i> (6, 152) = 20.01***	0.441	<i>F</i> (6, 152) = 1.24	0.046
ADHD symptoms	154.53	20.23	142.70	20.56	141.44	22.83	153.04	19.28	148.13	23.31	143.71	18.17	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 49.95***	0.241	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 1.51	0.010
EF	28.00	4.47	25.70	4.70	25.10	5.39	28.38	4.35	27.50	5.29	26.77	3.66	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 32.52***	0.172	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 2.87	0.018
Planning skills													<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 20.06***	0.113	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 2.32	0.015
Neuropsychological tasks																
Omnibus	17.89	2.80	18.54	3.13	19.97	3.91	17.29	2.50	18.69	3.17	19.98	3.40	<i>F</i> (8, 150) = 15.49***	0.452	<i>F</i> (8, 150) = 0.97	0.049
Tower test	-0.91	2.31	-1.05	2.12	-1.34	2.06	-1.41	2.42	-1.09	2.57	-1.42	1.82	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 32.71***	0.172	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 0.92	0.006
Trail making test	0.37	0.28	0.49	0.33	0.59	0.44	0.39	0.37	0.50	0.34	0.71	0.60	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 1.07	0.007	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 0.68	0.004
Key search	0.11	0.06	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.11	0.06	0.12	0.08	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 36.12***	0.187	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 1.65	0.010
Zoo map													<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 2.24	0.014	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 0.87	0.005
Comorbid symptoms																
Omnibus	10.10	6.51	8.92	6.82	7.68	5.10	9.97	5.65	9.21	5.57	8.48	4.65	<i>F</i> (10, 148) = 11.36***	0.434	<i>F</i> (10, 148) = 1.08	0.068
Depression	27.03	19.42	20.49	16.17	18.86	14.39	24.06	18.25	19.54	18.17	18.53	16.17	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 16.85***	0.097	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 0.93	0.006
Anxiety	6.77	5.29	5.84	5.49	4.74	4.30	6.47	4.98	5.99	5.78	4.55	3.80	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 26.33***	0.144	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 0.95	0.006
ODD/CD	10.47	6.97	8.53	6.38	7.03	6.69	10.53	8.57	9.36	8.67	6.47	5.64	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 15.90***	0.092	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 0.21	0.001
Internalizing problems	11.31	7.43	9.46	6.27	9.21	6.78	10.39	7.35	10.40	7.89	8.21	6.16	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 29.74***	0.159	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 1.02	0.006
Externalizing problems													<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 13.71***	0.080	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 3.58*†	0.022
General functioning																
Omnibus	158.74	20.30	158.16	22.62	161.83	21.35	157.50	16.01	158.41	17.48	158.86	16.58	<i>F</i> (10, 148) = 6.93***	0.319	<i>F</i> (10, 148) = 1.14	0.072
School attitude	46.90	11.63	42.52	11.42	42.29	12.10	49.89	12.37	46.77	11.87	43.67	11.65	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 2.10°	0.013	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 0.89	0.006
Homework problems	10.93	7.32	10.02	8.16	9.49	7.95	9.92	6.83	9.43	6.72	7.38	6.77	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 19.38***	0.110	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 1.31	0.008
Parent-adolescent Conflict (parent)	9.25	8.01	8.57	7.69	8.16	7.95	8.63	7.02	7.57	6.99	6.90	6.90	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 9.55***	0.057	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 1.43	0.009
Parent-adolescent conflict (adolescent)													<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 3.29*†	0.020	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 0.16	0.001
Overall impairment	32.30	11.68	27.44	11.44	26.64	13.36	30.60	11.32	28.73	11.43	27.01	12.45	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 13.85***	0.081	<i>F</i> (2, 314) = 1.46	0.009

η^2 effect size: 0.01 is small, 0.06 is medium, 0.14 is large

ADHD attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, EF executive functioning, ODD/CD oppositional disruptive disorder/conduct disorder, PML plan my life, SFT solution-focused treatment

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; † no longer significant when controlling for site-effects; ° becomes significant when controlling for site-effects

Table 4 Within subject contrast from pre- to post test and post- to follow-up test

Domain	Time contrasts				Time × treatment contrasts			
	Pre to post		Post to FU		Pre to post		Post to FU	
	<i>F</i>	$\eta\rho^2$	<i>F</i>	$\eta\rho^2$	<i>F</i>	$\eta\rho^2$	<i>F</i>	$\eta\rho^2$
Parent-rated measures								
ADHD symptoms	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 71.88***	0.314	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.02	0.000	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 1.89	0.012	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.04	0.000
EF	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 29.86***	0.160	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 4.27* [†]	0.026	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 5.09*	0.031	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 1.32	0.008
Planning skills	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 18.83***	0.107	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 3.66	0.023	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 3.77*	0.023	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.04	0.000
Neuropsychological tasks								
Tower test	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 15.46***	0.090	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 17.27*** [†]	0.109	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 2.11	0.013	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.05	0.000
Trail making test	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.13	0.001	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 2.22	0.014	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.87	0.006	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.01	0.000
Key search	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 19.87***	0.112	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 23.70***	0.131	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.09	0.001	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 2.84	0.018
Zoo map	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 4.06*	0.025	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.82	0.005	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = .23	0.001	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 1.33	0.008
Comorbid symptoms								
Depression	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 7.68**	0.047	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 9.91** [†]	0.059	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.36	0.002	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.64	0.004
Anxiety	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 31.96***	0.169	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 2.39	0.015	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 1.06	0.007	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.13	0.001
ODD/CD	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 3.31	0.021	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 12.05*** [†]	0.071	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.33	0.002	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.20	0.001
Internalizing problems	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 11.38***	0.068	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 22.69***	0.126	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.71	0.004	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 2.29	0.014
Externalizing problems	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 4.07*	0.025	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 8.60** [†]	0.052	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 4.09*	0.025	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 5.50* [†]	0.034
General functioning								
School attitude	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.02	0.000	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 3.55	0.022	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.43	0.003	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 2.18	0.014
Homework problems	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 17.82***	0.102	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 4.66* [†]	0.029	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.50	0.003	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 3.48	0.022
Parent-adolescent conflict (parent)	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 2.50	0.016	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 6.54* [†]	0.040	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.22	0.001	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 2.24	0.014
Parent-adolescent conflict (adolescent)	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 2.60	0.016	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.99°	0.006	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.12	0.001	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.06	0.000
Overall impairment	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 15.31***	0.089	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 1.49	0.009	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 3.01	0.019	<i>F</i> (1, 157) = 0.17	0.001

$\eta\rho^2$ effect size: 0.01 is small, 0.06 is medium, 0.14 is large

ADHD attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, EF executive functioning, ODD/CD oppositional disruptive disorder/conduct disorder

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; [†]no longer significant when controlling for medication use or additional treatment; °becomes significant when controlling for medication use or additional treatment

outcome-measures a significant within-group improvement over time was found, except for school attitude and two of the neuropsychological tests (TMT, Zoo-map test).

Within-subjects contrasts showed significant improvements from pre to post-test on 10 of 17 outcome measures, with exception of ODD/CD, externalizing problems, school attitude, the two conflict measures, and the TMT and the Zoo-Map test. From post- to follow-up test, all measures showed maintenance of effects. In addition, six measures showed further improvement from post-test to follow-up. When site-effects affected results, this is reported in Table 3. If co-varying for medication use at follow-up and receiving additional treatment after post-test affected results, this is reported in Table 4.

Exploratory analyses on the fifth domain, teacher measures, showed comparable results. Multivariate tests showed significant within-group improvement over time from pre- to

post-test, $F(6,23) = 2.94, p = .03, \eta\rho^2 = 0.43$. Univariate within-group follow-up analyses showed that from pre- to post-test, teacher-rated EF and impairment significantly improved over time, $F(1,28) = 6.73, p = .02, \eta\rho^2 = 0.19$ and $F(1,28) = 7.39, p = .01, \eta\rho^2 = 0.21$, respectively. For teacher-rated ADHD symptoms, a trend was visible, $F(1,28) = 5.01, p = .03, \eta\rho^2 = 0.15$. On all variables, maintenance of effects was found from post- to follow-up test.

Time × treatment effects

The second research question was whether adolescents who received PML (aiming at planning skills) improve more than adolescents who received SFT (not specifically aiming at planning skills). Results are shown in Tables 3 and 4. Omnibus tests showed no time × treatment interactions: Treatments did not differ in their improvement from pre- to post- to follow-up

test, ES of time \times treatment interactions were medium (η^2 range = 0.046–0.072). Also univariate analyses showed no interactions, with one exceptional trend on the externalizing problems measure ($p = .03$). Complementary within-subject contrasts on the externalizing problems measure showed that PML improved more than SFT between pre- and post-test. However, SFT showed greater improvement than PML between post- and follow-up test, resulting in comparable follow-up scores for both on the externalizing problems measure.

Within-subject contrasts showed two more significant time \times treatment interactions on our primary outcomes: parent-rated EF and planning. On both measures, PML showed a trend towards greater improvement than SFT between pre- and post-test. Between group analyses showed better parent-rated planning skills in PML than SFT at post-test, $t(157) = -2.28$, $p = 0.02$,³ $d = 0.36$, and at follow-up test, $t(157) = -2.27$, $p = 0.03$ (see footnote 3), $d = 0.37$.

Exploratory analyses on the fifth domain, teacher measures, did not show time \times treatment interactions from pre- to post-test as well as from post- to follow-up test.

Normalization of impairment

A modest clinically significant within-group improvement was found on the number of adolescents, of which impairment was normalized from pre- to post test, $\chi^2(1) = 6.73$, $p = 0.009$, $\phi = 0.25$, that remained stable to follow-up test. The number of adolescents that showed normalization of functioning on the IRS increased from 5.8 % at pre-test to 13.7 % at post-test and to 15.2 % at follow-up. However, again no difference between both treatments was found.

Treatment evaluation

Therapists reported no preference for one treatment over the other ($p = 0.60$), but indicated to find PML best suitable for adolescents with ADHD ($z = 5.124$, $p = 0.00$) and that they preferred to carry out PML over SFT ($z = 2.586$, $p = 0.01$). Parents evaluated PML ($M = 16.83$, $SD = 2.40$) significantly more positive than SFT ($M = 15.59$, $SD = 3.56$; $t(111) = 2.18$, $p = 0.03$, $d = 0.39$). Adolescents evaluated PML ($M = 22.3$, $SD = 7.10$) slightly more positive than SFT ($M = 20.6$, $SD = 3.62$), but this difference did not reach significance ($p = 0.09$, $d = 0.30$).

Discussion

This study was the first large-scale, multi-site RCT for adolescents with ADHD, exploring the immediate and

middle- to long-term effects of two CBTs: one with and one without a focus on planning skills. Moreover, the study was conducted in Dutch mental health care, enhancing generalizability of findings to European clinical practice. Our first research question was whether ADHD symptoms, planning and EF problems, comorbid symptoms and general functioning of adolescents with ADHD improve from pre- to follow-up test. Our results demonstrated a consistent pattern: in both treatments attrition was low and there was an improvement of ADHD symptoms, planning and EF, comorbid symptoms, and general functioning with medium to large effect sizes. This improvement was maintained to follow-up 3 months later, or even continued to improve. These findings are in line with an earlier non-randomized study showing the positive effects of a planning-focused CBT in adolescents from pre- to post-test [19]. Also, we replicated the non-significant effects on the reduction of ODD, but significant effects on the reduction of comorbid symptoms of depression and anxiety [19]. In extension to the study by Antshel et al. (that showed improvement from pre- to post-test), our study showed maintenance of effects up to 3 months after treatment, which indicates generalization of learned skills. And, even though only a small number of teachers responded and analyses were only exploratory, teacher measures also showed significant improvements on measures of EF and impairment and a trend towards improvement of ADHD symptoms from pre- to post-test, with maintenance of effects to follow-up. However, even though significant improvements have been shown on self-reported, parent-reported and teacher-reported ratings in both treatments, only 15.2 % of adolescents showed normalization of functioning at follow-up. All in all, these results indicate towards the idea that adolescents had sufficient cognitive capacity to benefit from CBT [12], but were still impaired after treatment.

The second research question was whether adolescents who received PML (aiming at planning skills) improve more than adolescents who received SFT (not specifically aiming at planning skills). In general, findings showed no differences in improvement between PML and SFT; the most noteworthy being the lack of treatment difference with regard to improvement of ADHD symptoms. However, there were several marginal indications of additional beneficial effects of PML over and above the effects of SFT. As expected, PML resulted in marginally greater planning skills than SFT as rated by parents (primary measure), directly after treatment and again 3 months later (with small ES). These findings are in line with a RCT in children with ADHD [13] and a RCT in adults with ADHD [21] on the effects of similar treatment models that have shown pronounced effects on reduction of planning problems in comparison to an active control group. Also, adolescents in the PML group attended more follow-up assessments than

³ Due to Bonferroni correction $\alpha = .0125$, thus these p values are considered a trend.

adolescents receiving SFT, which may have been the result of improved planning skills or might have been caused by their satisfaction with the received treatment resulting in higher engagement than in SFT. However, this is speculative and needs to be further tested. In addition, parents evaluated PML more positive than SFT (and adolescents also marginally more positive), and therapists indicated to rather execute PML than SFT with adolescents with ADHD. Finally, it is remarkable that when adolescents got the chance to choose a subject for treatment in SFT, in 61 % of the sessions a planning-related topic was addressed. This suggests that—even though PML was as effective as SFT—enhancement of planning skills is an important topic in the lives of these adolescents. Taken together, even though adolescents positively improved during both treatments, PML appears to fit the needs of adolescents with ADHD and their parents better.

Finally, the effects of both CBTs were less pronounced on the neuropsychological measures of planning. Even though performance on the tower- and key search test improved during CBT (but with small ES and without treatment differences), the performance on the trail making test and zoo-map test did not improve at all. Based on these results, one might argue that effects of CBT that are visible in ratings of adolescent behavior are not associated with changes on a cognitive level. However, although the adolescents were impaired on parent-rated planning deficits at baseline, our sample showed no deficits in planning skills as assessed by neuropsychological tasks at baseline [59], making it hard to capture the effects of CBT on these outcomes. One might wonder whether neuropsychological measures of underlying mechanisms are suitable and sensitive for assessment of psychosocial treatment outcomes.

Limitations

First, our design lacked a waitlist control group or TAU group. One of the main aims of this study was exploring the long-term effects of CBT, which implies inclusion of TAU and waitlist control groups in the design of the study until follow-up. As effective non-pharmacological treatments for adolescents with ADHD are lacking in the Netherlands, TAU consists mainly of pharmacological treatment alone. To not withhold adolescents from potential effective treatments for longer periods of time, to assure participation of mental health institutions, and to reduce the chance of selective drop-out in TAU or waitlist control groups, we did not include such conditions.

Second, because of this lack of a waitlist control group, one could argue that symptoms of adolescents with ADHD improved as the effect of any intervention. Nevertheless, one would expect these placebo effects to deteriorate after active treatment whilst our results show maintenance or

even more improvement from post- to follow-up assessment on many outcome measures. Spontaneous recovery does not seem plausible, as we know ADHD is a persistent neuro-developmental disorder. Also, effect sizes of waitlist control groups are generally small [60]. For example, Langberg et al. [15] studied a sample of adolescents with ADHD comparable to this study, and showed within-group pre- to post-test effect sizes close to zero on measures of ADHD, planning and organization. However, it must be noted that no study of clinic-based CBT has been completed using a control condition that would allow conclusions related to the efficacy of that specific intervention. The only randomized study in adolescents with ADHD is a pilot study, comparing a family based training intervention aiming at the improvement of academic and organizational skills to TAU. This study showed improvement on academic measures as rated by parents, but not as rated by teachers [16]. Further, a study in children with ADHD did already establish the beneficial effects of a planning-focused treatment as compared to a waitlist control condition [13]. Taken together, RCTs that compare CBT to a less active- or waitlist control group are needed to determine the efficacy of CBT in adolescents with ADHD.

Third, one could question the representativeness of our sample: Parents were highly educated, the age of initial diagnosis was higher than usual ($M_{\text{age}} = 12.5$), and only a small percentage had a history of non-pharmacological treatment. Some might argue that this indicates a less impaired sample. However, in this study a high percentage of adolescents (78 %) already received pharmacological treatment before entering the study and still applied for additional non-pharmacological treatment, indicating impairment. Yet, as patients and their parents did apply for treatment themselves, this may have resulted in a higher than usual motivation for change.

Fourth, even though we strived towards blindness of therapists regarding our research questions (e.g., by presenting the study as a study designed to find out what treatment is most effective for adolescents with ADHD), we cannot assure they may have been aware of the hypothesis that PML was more effective than SFT on reduction of ADHD, planning and EF deficits. Finally, considerable differences in outcome have been demonstrated when blinded and non-blinded outcomes are used in treatment studies [61]. In this study, objective and more blinded measures of treatment outcome were scarce, due to high rates of missing teacher ratings. The improvements in teacher-rated planning skills and EF found in this study are based on a small number of teachers, who may have been responding because of the positive results of CBT, therefore, possibly creating an ascertainment bias. Also, ratings of high school teachers are often of limited validity, due to for example lack of engagement with their students, short amounts of

time spent with their students causing lack of knowledge and change of teachers every year that hampers repeated measuring [3]. In future studies, the use of blinded third party raters (e.g., clinicians), objective weekly monitoring of treatment effects (e.g., using checklists of the target behavior), or academic achievement measures are advised as more objective outcomes of treatment effectiveness.

Clinical implications

Whereas short, effective treatments for adolescents with ADHD are lacking, now two credible CBTs have been developed, which can be implemented not only in North America, but also within the European context. As treatments were investigated within existing mental health care, they are feasible and ready for immediate use in mental health care, which alleviates low-cost implementation and dissemination of the protocols. In this study, adolescents, who received either one of two short-term treatments, improved with regard to ADHD- and comorbid symptoms and secondary problems. Also, PML had marginal additional beneficial effects to SFT on the so pronounced and invalidating planning problems and it harvested high satisfaction rates in parents and therapists. Both were combinations of CBT and MI and the attrition rate in our study was low, suggesting that MI may have elevated motivation for treatment in adolescents with ADHD [3]. However, as only 15.2 % of adolescents showed normalization of functioning 3 months after treatment, most adolescents were still impaired. Therefore, one might argue that such a short-term CBT (consisting of only eight adolescent sessions and two parental sessions) does not cause normalization on the long term, and maybe for this reason more intensive treatments are needed [14]. Finally, even though more research is needed on the effects of CBT and MI in adolescents with ADHD, for now, two treatments have been developed that showed encouraging within group effects: only 5 % of adolescents dropped out of treatment and ADHD symptoms and co-existing problems of the adolescents improved from pre-test to 3 months after treatment. As PML is evaluated more positive and has marginal additional beneficial effects to SFT, especially PML seems like a promising asset to fill the gap in mental health care for adolescents with ADHD.

Acknowledgments We thank ZonMw for a research grant. We are grateful to the participating families, students and mental healthcare institutions Lucertis Kinder-en Jeugdpsychiatrie, Bosman GGZ, Jeugdriagg, GGZ Noord-Holland Noord, UvA-Minds, Symphora-groep RCKJP and Riagg for their collaboration. We thank Rietta Oberink, from the UvA, for advice on Motivational Interviewing, Saskia Nyst for her help coordinating the project, and Lisa Doove, from KU Leuven, for advice on statistical analyses.

Conflict of interest Bianca E. Boyer is co-developer and author of the manuals ‘Plan My Life’ and ‘Solution Focused Treatment’. She

receives royalties for the sales of both interventions. Saskia van der Oord has been a paid consultant for Janssen Pharmaceuticals in the development of a serious game “Healseeker”, aimed at training cognitive functions. Also, she is co-developer and author of the manuals ‘Plan My Life’ and ‘Solution Focused Treatment’. However, she has no financial interest in the sales of the interventions. Other authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Sonuga-Barke EJS, Bitsakou P, Thompson M (2010) Beyond the dual pathway model: evidence for the dissociation of timing, inhibitory, and delay-related impairments in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 49(4):345–355
2. Barkley RA (2004) Adolescents with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder: an overview of empirically based treatments. *J Psychiatry Pract* 10:39–56
3. Wolraich ML, Wibbelsman CJ, Brown TE et al (2005) Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder among adolescents: a review of the diagnosis, treatment, and clinical implications. *Pediatrics* 115:1734–1746
4. Luman M, Oosterlaan J, Sergeant JA (2005) The impact of reinforcement contingencies on ADHD: a review and theoretical appraisal. *Clin Psychol Rev* 25:183–213
5. Evans SW, Schultz BK, White LC, Brady C, Sibley MH, Van Eck K (2009) A school-based organization intervention for young adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *School Ment Health* 1:78–88
6. Spear LP (2011) Rewards, aversions and affect in adolescence: emerging convergences across laboratory animal and human data. *Dev Cogn Neurosci* 1:390–403
7. Weyandt LL, DuPaul GJ (2013) ADHD in adolescents (middle and high school). College students with ADHD. Springer, New York, pp 11–24
8. Kessler RC, Adler L, Barkley RA et al (2006) The prevalence and correlates of adult ADHD in the United States: results from the national comorbidity survey replication. *Am J Psychiatry* 163:716–723
9. Abikoff H, Nissley-Tsiopinis J, Gallagher R et al (2009) Effects of MPH-OROS on the organizational, time management, and planning behaviors of children with ADHD. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 48:166–175
10. Safren SA (2006) Cognitive-behavioral approaches to ADHD treatment in adulthood. *J Clin Psychiatry* 67:46–50
11. Evans SW, Owens JS, Bunford N (2014) Evidence-based psychosocial treatments for children and adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol* 43:527–551
12. Antshel KM, Olszewski AK (2014) Cognitive behavioral therapy for adolescents with ADHD. *Child Adolesc Psychiatric Clin N Am* 23:825–842
13. Abikoff H, Gallagher R, Wells KC et al (2013) Remediating organizational functioning in children with ADHD: immediate and long-term effects from a randomized controlled trial. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 81:113–128
14. Evans SW, Schultz BK, DeMars CE, Davis H (2011) Effectiveness of the Challenging Horizons after-school program for young adolescents with ADHD. *Behav Ther* 42:462–474
15. Langberg JM, Epstein JN, Becker SP, Girio-Herrera E, Vaughn AJ (2012) Evaluation of the homework, organization, and planning skills (HOPS) intervention for middle school students with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder as implemented by school mental health providers. *School Psych Rev* 41:342–364

16. Sibley MH, Pelham WE, Derefinko KJ, Kuriyan AB, Sanchez F, Graziano PA (2013) A pilot trial of supporting teens' academic needs daily (STAND): a parent-adolescent collaborative intervention for ADHD. *J Psychopathol Behav Assess* 35:436–449
17. Chronis AM, Jones HA, Raggi VL (2006) Evidence-based psychosocial treatments for children and adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Clin Psychol Rev* 26:486–502
18. Houghton S, Alsalmi N, Tan C, Taylor M, Durkin K (2013) Treating comorbid anxiety in adolescents with ADHD using a cognitive behavior therapy program approach. *J Atten Disord*. doi:10.1177/1087054712473182
19. Antshel KM, Faraone SV, Gordon M (2012) Cognitive behavioral treatment outcomes in adolescent ADHD. *J Atten Disord*. doi:10.1177/1087054712443155
20. Safren SA, Sprich S, Mimiaga MJ et al (2010) Cognitive behavioral therapy vs relaxation with educational support for medication-treated adults with ADHD and persistent symptoms: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 304:875–880
21. Solanto MV, Marks DJ, Wasserstein J et al (2010) Efficacy of meta-cognitive therapy for adult ADHD. *Am J Psychiatry* 167:958–968
22. Kataoka SH, Rowan B, Hoagwood KE (2009) Bridging the divide: in search of common ground in mental health and education research and policy. *Psychiatr Serv* 60:1510–1515
23. Kuin M, Boyer BE, Van der Oord S (2013) Zelf Plannen [Plan My Life]. Uitgeverij Lannoo-Campus, Houten
24. Johnson E, Mellor D, Brann P (2008) Differences in dropout between diagnoses in child and adolescent mental health services. *Clin Child Psychol Psychiatry* 13:515–530
25. Boyer BE, Kuin M, Van der Oord S (2014) Zelf Oplossingen Bedenken [Solution Focused Treatment]. Uitgeverij Lannoo-Campus, Houten
26. Viner RM, Christie D, Taylor V, Hey S (2003) Motivational/solution-focused intervention improves HbA1c in adolescents with type 1 diabetes: a pilot study. *Diabet Med* 20:739–742
27. Erickson SJ, Gerstle M, Feldstein SW (2005) Brief interventions and motivational interviewing with children, adolescents, and their parents in pediatric health care settings. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 159:1173–1180
28. American Psychiatric Association (2000) Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, 4th edn. text rev. Washington, DC
29. Shaffer D, Fisher P, Lucas CP, Dulcan MK, Schwab-Stone ME (2000) NIMH diagnostic interview schedule for children version IV (NIMH DISC-IV): description, differences from previous versions, and reliability of some common diagnoses. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 39:28–38
30. Kort W, Schittekatte M, Bosmans M et al (2005) Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-III: Handleiding. Pearson, Amsterdam
31. Greenhill LL (1998) Childhood attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: Pharmacological treatments. In: Nathan PE, Gorman J (eds) A guide to treatments that work. Oxford University Press, New York
32. Taves DR (1974) Minimization: a new method of assigning patients to treatment and control groups. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 15:443–453
33. Pelham W, Gnagy EM, Greenslade KE, Milich R (1992) Teacher ratings of DSM-III-R symptoms for the disruptive behavior disorders. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 31:210–218
34. Oosterlaan J, Scheres A, Antrop I, Roeyers H, Sergeant JA (2000) Handleiding bij de Vragenlijst voor Gedragsproblemen bij Kinderen VvGK. Swets Test Publishers, Lisse
35. Gioia GA, Isquith PK, Guy SC, Kenworthy L (2000) Behavior rating inventory of executive function. Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa
36. Smidts DP, Huizinga M (2009) Handleiding Executieve Functies Gedragsvragenlijst. Hogrefe, Amsterdam
37. Delis D, Kaplan E, Kramer J (2001) Delis-Kaplan executive function scale. The Psychological Corporation, San Antonio
38. Wilson BA, Alderman N, Burgess PW, Emslie H, Evans JJ (1996) Behavioral assessment of dysexecutive syndrome. Thames Valley Test Company, St. Edmunds
39. Sitarenios G, Kovacs M (1999) Use of the CDI the use of psychological testing for treatment planning and outcomes assessment. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New Jersey, pp 267–298
40. Timbremont B, Braet C (2002) Children's depression inventory, nederlandstalige versie. Handleiding. Swets and Zeitlinger, Lisse
41. Birmaher B, Khetarpal S, Brent D et al (1997) The screen for child anxiety related emotional disorders (SCARED): scale construction and psychometric characteristics. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 36:545–553
42. Muris P, Bodden D, Hale W, Birmaher B, Mayer B (2007) SCARED-NL: Handleiding bij de gereviseerde Nederlandse versie van de screen for child anxiety related emotional disorders. Boom Test Uitgevers, Amsterdam
43. Achenbach TM, Edelbrock C (1991) Manual for the child behavior checklist. University of Vermont Department of Psychiatry, Burlington
44. Verhulst FC, Van der Ende J, Koot HM (1996) Handleiding voor de CBCL/4-18. Sophia Kinderziekenhuis/Academisch ziekenhuis Rotterdam/Erasmus Universiteit, Rotterdam
45. Vorst HCM (2008) Schoolvragenlijst voor basisonderwijs en voortgezet onderwijs: Handleiding en verantwoording. Harcourt Assessment, Amsterdam
46. Anesko KM, Schoiock G, Ramirez R, Levine FM (1987) The homework problems checklist: assessing children's homework problems. *Behav Assess* 9:179–185
47. Prinz RJ, Foster SL, Kent RN, O'Leary KD (1979) Multivariate assessment of conflict in distressed and nondistressed mother-adolescent dyads. *J Appl Behav Anal* 12:691–700
48. Fabiano GA, Pelham WE (2002) Measuring impairment in children with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder. *The ADHD Report* 10:6–10
49. Fabiano GA, Pelham WE, Waschbusch DA et al (2006) A practical measure of impairment: psychometric properties of the Impairment Rating Scale in samples of children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and two school-based samples. *J Clin Child Adolesc* 35:369–385
50. Brady CE, Evans SW, Berlin KS, Bunford N, Kern L (2012) Evaluating school impairment with adolescents using the classroom performance survey. *School Psych Rev* 41:429–446
51. Naar-King S, Suarez M (2011) Motivational interviewing with adolescents and young adults. The Guilford Press, New York
52. Anderson T, Ogles BM, Patterson CL, Lambert MJ, Vermeersch DA (2009) Therapist effects: facilitative interpersonal skills as a predictor of therapist success. *J Clin Psychol* 65:755–768
53. Gearing RE, El-Bassel N, Ghesquiere A, Baldwin S, Gillies J, Ngeow E (2011) Major ingredients of fidelity: a review and scientific guide to improving quality of intervention research implementation. *Clin Psychol Rev* 31:79–88
54. Baraldi AN, Enders CK (2010) An introduction to modern missing data analyses. *J Sch Psychol* 48:5–37
55. Little RJA, Rubin DB (2002) Statistical analysis with missing data. Wiley, Hoboken
56. Scheffer J (2002) Dealing with Missing Data. *Res Lett Inf Math Sci* 3:153–160
57. Safren SA, Otto MW, Sprich S, Winett CL, Wilens TE, Biederman J (2005) Cognitive-behavioral therapy for ADHD in medication-treated adults with continued symptoms. *Behav Res Ther* 43:831–842
58. Cohen J (1992) Statistical power analysis. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 1(3):98–101

59. Boyer BE, Geurts HM, Van der Oord S (2014) Planning skills of adolescents with ADHD. *J Atten Disord*. doi:[10.1177/1087054714538658](https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054714538658)
60. Van der Oord S, Prins PJM, Oosterlaan J, Emmelkamp P (2008) Efficacy of methylphenidate, psychosocial treatments and their combination in school-aged children with ADHD: a meta-analysis. *Clin Psychol Rev* 28:783–800
61. Daley D, Van der Oord S, Ferrin M, Danckaerts M, Doepfner M, Cortese S, Sonuga-Barke EJS (2014) Behavioral interventions in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials across multiple outcome domains. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 53(8):835–847