The Confluence of Code and Cognition: An Analysis of Generative AI's Impact on ADHD Diagnosis Trends Among High School Students in Northern California, 2022-2025

Ritwik Deshpande * and Vishal Lakshmanan

Posted Date: 29 October 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

Keywords: ADHD; generative AI; ChatGPT; educational technology; adolescent mental health; northern california; diagnostic assessment; executive function; neurodevelopment

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

Article

The Confluence of Code and Cognition: An Analysis of Generative AI's Impact on ADHD Diagnosis Trends Among High School Students in Northern California, 2022-2025

Ritwik Deshpande * and Vishal Lakshmanan

Independent Researcher, Fremont, CA
* Correspondence: ritwik.deshpande.8@gmail.com

Abstract

This research paper provides a comprehensive analysis of the impact of generative artificial intelligence on the diagnosis of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) among high school students in Northern California between 2022 and 2025. This period is marked by two converging phenomena: the explosive, near-universal adoption of generative AI tools like ChatGPT in educational settings and a complex, evolving landscape of adolescent mental health. While national ADHD diagnosis rates for adolescents have remained stable at approximately 14% [19,20], California has consistently reported significantly lower prevalence, around 6% [18]. Northern California, as a global technology hub and a leader in educational policy, serves as a critical case study for examining the intersection of these trends. This paper synthesizes data on AI adoption rates, student usage patterns, regional educational policies, and the neuropsychological effects of AI on adolescent cognition. The analysis reveals that the primary impact of generative AI is not on the raw prevalence of ADHD but on the fundamental nature of its presentation, assessment, and diagnosis. AI tools function as a dual-edged sword, simultaneously offering compensatory support that can mask underlying executive function deficits while also potentially exacerbating ADHD symptoms or inducing ADHD-like cognitive patterns through mechanisms of attention fragmentation and dopamine system dysregulation [54,87]. This creates a profound diagnostic challenge, complicating clinical assessments and potentially leading to both under-diagnosis and misdiagnosis. The paper concludes that the rapid integration of generative AI necessitates a paradigm shift in clinical and educational approaches to ADHD, requiring updated assessment protocols that account for a student's digital cognitive ecosystem to ensure accurate and equitable diagnosis.

Keywords: ADHD; generative AI; ChatGPT; educational technology; adolescent mental health; northern california; diagnostic assessment; executive function; neurodevelopment

1. Introduction

The period between late 2022 and 2025 marks a watershed moment in the history of education and adolescent development, defined by the unprecedented integration of generative artificial intelligence into the fabric of daily academic life. The public release of OpenAI's ChatGPT in November 2022 catalyzed a technological revolution that permeated high school classrooms across the United States with a speed and scale that outpaced policy, pedagogy, and scientific understanding. Concurrently, adolescent mental health, particularly the prevalence and understanding of neurodevelopmental disorders like Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), has remained a subject of intense focus for clinicians, educators, and policymakers. The intersection of these two powerful forces—a transformative technology and a critical neurodevelopmental period—presents a complex and urgent area of inquiry.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

This research paper focuses specifically on Northern California, a region uniquely positioned at the epicenter of this confluence. As the heart of the global technology industry, its high schools have been among the earliest and most comprehensive adopters of generative AI. Student familiarity with tools like ChatGPT in districts from San Francisco to San Mateo approached 90% by 2025, fostered by a tech-savvy culture and proactive, though varied, institutional responses [3,9]. This region is also characterized by a diverse student population and a state-level ADHD diagnosis rate that is among the lowest in the nation, creating a unique environment to study the potential impacts of this new technology [18]. The central research question guiding this paper is therefore: *How has the rapid and widespread adoption of generative AI tools from 2022 to 2025 influenced the trends, presentation, and diagnostic assessment of ADHD among high school students in Northern California?*

This paper argues that the impact of generative AI on ADHD diagnoses is not a simple, linear relationship that can be measured by a mere increase or decrease in prevalence statistics. Instead, it introduces a profound confounding variable into the diagnostic landscape, creating a paradox of symptom masking and exacerbation that challenges existing clinical paradigms. To explore this thesis, the paper is structured into several key sections. First, a comprehensive literature review synthesizes the current understanding of generative AI adoption in education, the ADHD diagnosis landscape in California, and the neuropsychological mechanisms linking AI use to adolescent cognition. Following this, an in-depth analysis examines the pathways through which AI may be altering ADHD symptomology and complicating clinical assessment. The discussion section explores the broader implications of these findings for educational practice and clinical diagnostics in Northern California and beyond. Finally, after acknowledging the limitations of the current research, the paper concludes by summarizing its key insights and advocating for an evolved, technology-informed approach to understanding and diagnosing ADHD in the 21st century.

2. Literature Review

To understand the complex interplay between generative AI and ADHD diagnoses, it is essential to synthesize findings from three distinct but interconnected domains: the rapid adoption and usage patterns of AI in high schools, the established trends and characteristics of adolescent ADHD diagnoses, and the emerging neuropsychological research on how interactive AI affects adolescent cognition and attention. This review integrates data on these topics, with a specific focus on the Northern California context, to build a foundational understanding for the subsequent analysis.

2.1. Generative AI Adoption in Education (2022-2025)

The rise of generative AI in education from 2022 to 2025 was nothing short of explosive. Following the launch of ChatGPT, student adoption for schoolwork doubled nationally from 13% in 2023 to 26% in 2024 among teens aged 13-17 [4]. Teacher adoption was even more widespread, with 83% of K-12 educators reporting use of generative AI tools by the 2023-2024 academic year [5]. In Northern California, this trend was amplified. Districts in the San Francisco Bay Area, benefiting from proximity to Silicon Valley and a tech-forward culture, saw student familiarity with ChatGPT reach approximately 90% by 2025 [3]. This rapid integration occurred in a policy vacuum, with only a quarter of teachers reporting formal guidance by early 2024 [3].

California, however, quickly established itself as a national leader, becoming one of only two states to issue comprehensive K-12 AI guidance [1,8]. This guidance, titled "Learning With AI, Learning About AI," emphasized ethical use, data privacy, and the centrality of human relationships, providing a framework for districts like San Francisco Unified (SFUSD) and San Mateo Union High School District (SMUHSD) to develop their own sophisticated policies [7,9]. These policies generally avoided outright bans, instead focusing on monitoring impact and teaching responsible use. This environment was further bolstered by significant industry investment, such as a $10 million grant from Salesforce to SFUSD and Oakland Unified to support AI literacy programs [14]. Student usage patterns evolved from simple experimentation to sophisticated application across the academic spectrum, including

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

information gathering, brainstorming, and assessment support, with 88% of students reporting AI use for assessments by 2025 [5].

2.2. ADHD Diagnosis Landscape in California

In parallel, the landscape of adolescent ADHD diagnosis during this period was characterized by relative stability in prevalence rates, yet significant regional and demographic disparities. National data from 2021-2022 shows that approximately 14.16% of U.S. adolescents aged 12-17 had an ADHD diagnosis, a figure that has remained statistically stable since 2017 [19,20]. However, this national average belies stark geographic variations. California has consistently reported one of the lowest prevalence rates in the nation, estimated at around 6.1% for children aged 3-17 in the years leading up to the study period [18]. This lower rate is likely attributable to a confluence of factors, including the state's unique demographic composition with large Asian and Hispanic populations, which nationally show lower diagnosis rates (4% and 10%, respectively) compared to White and Black children (12%) [17,32].

The state's predominantly urban and suburban setting and differing cultural attitudes toward mental health may also contribute. The diagnostic framework for ADHD remained consistent throughout this period, governed by the DSM-5 and its 2022 text revision (DSM-5-TR), which made no substantive changes to the core criteria [29]. Diagnosis continues to rely on behavioral observation and rating scales, a methodology that faces persistent criticism for its lack of objective biological markers and potential for cultural and gender bias. A critical challenge in analyzing recent trends is a significant data gap; as of late 2025, no authoritative national or state-level surveillance data on ADHD prevalence has been published for the years 2023-2025, and specific data for Northern California districts is virtually nonexistent [19,20].

2.3. Neuropsychological Effects of AI on Adolescent Cognition

The most critical component for understanding the potential interaction between these two trends lies in the emerging research on the neurocognitive and behavioral effects of generative AI on adolescents. This body of work reveals a profound duality. On one hand, AI tools can serve as powerful compensatory aids for students with executive function deficits, a core characteristic of ADHD. Studies have shown that students with greater executive function difficulties perceive ChatGPT as significantly more useful for organizing work, breaking down tasks, and overcoming initiation paralysis [51,59]. AI can act as an external scaffold, reducing working memory load and providing the structure that many students with ADHD lack [86,98].

However, this benefit is shadowed by significant risks. Researchers have proposed a framework of "AI-Chatbot Induced Cognitive Atrophy" (AICICA), suggesting that over-reliance on AI for cognitive tasks can lead to the erosion of critical thinking, memory impairment, and attention deficits [54]. The interactive nature of generative AI creates a distinct cognitive demand profile compared to passive screen time. It engages dopamine reward pathways through a variable-ratio reward schedule, similar to gambling, which can be particularly compelling and potentially addictive for individuals with the dopamine dysregulation inherent to ADHD [71,72,78]. This can reinforce impulsivity and undermine the development of self-regulation. The constant context-switching and multitasking associated with AI use can lead to attention fragmentation, producing ADHD-like symptoms even in neurotypical individuals [58,92]. This complicates the diagnostic picture immensely, as AI can simultaneously ameliorate the functional impairments of ADHD while exacerbating its underlying cognitive patterns, blurring the line between a neurodevelopmental condition and a technology-induced state.

3. Analysis: The Impact of Generative AI on ADHD Diagnosis Trends in Northern California

The confluence of explosive generative AI adoption and the complex landscape of adolescent ADHD in Northern California from 2022 to 2025 does not suggest a simple, measurable impact on raw prevalence numbers, particularly given the significant lag in public health data collection. Instead,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

the evidence points to a more profound and nuanced impact on the very nature of ADHD diagnosis itself. Generative AI has emerged as a powerful environmental factor that fundamentally alters how ADHD symptoms manifest, how they are perceived by students, parents, and educators, and how they are captured—or missed—by existing clinical assessment tools. This analysis explores three primary pathways through which generative AI is likely influencing the diagnostic landscape: as a catalyst for symptom exacerbation and new referrals, as a masking agent that confounds identification, and as a direct disruptor of assessment validity.

3.1. AI as Catalyst for Symptom Exacerbation

The first pathway involves AI's potential to act as a catalyst, genuinely exacerbating underlying ADHD symptoms or inducing ADHD-like cognitive patterns in vulnerable students, thereby increasing diagnostic referrals. The neurobiological mechanisms linking AI use to ADHD symptomatology are compelling. The interactive, non-deterministic nature of AI chatbots engages the brain's dopamine reward system on a variable-ratio reinforcement schedule, which is highly compelling and can foster compulsive use patterns [71,78]. For an adolescent brain already characterized by the dopamine dysregulation of ADHD, this can intensify reward-seeking behavior and impulsivity [72].

Furthermore, the typical mode of AI use—involving frequent task-switching between a primary assignment and the AI interface—promotes a state of "continuous partial attention" [92]. This pattern of cognitive fragmentation directly mirrors and reinforces the attentional dysregulation central to ADHD [58]. In a high-achieving, high-pressure environment like many Northern California high schools, students with subclinical or previously manageable executive function challenges may find that this new layer of cognitive demand pushes their symptoms past a clinical threshold. The result is not necessarily the creation of ADHD de novo, but the amplification of pre-existing vulnerabilities to a point of functional impairment, leading concerned parents and teachers to seek evaluations. This effect is likely magnified by the post-pandemic educational context, which had already brought executive function deficits to the forefront during the era of remote learning [22,24].

3.2. AI as Masking Agent

Conversely, the second pathway posits that generative AI acts as a powerful masking agent, providing an unprecedented compensatory scaffold that can obscure the functional impairments of ADHD and potentially suppress diagnoses. Research clearly indicates that students with greater executive function difficulties perceive AI tools as more useful, leveraging them to organize thoughts, structure essays, and manage complex assignments [51,59]. A student with ADHD in a San Mateo or San Francisco high school, who previously struggled to translate their ideas into a coherent written product, can now use AI to bypass the organizational and initiation hurdles that are the primary source of their academic difficulty [86,98].

This can lead to a marked improvement in the quality of their submitted work and, consequently, their grades. From a teacher's perspective, the primary evidence of a struggle—poorly organized or incomplete assignments—disappears. This creates a significant diagnostic confounder: the student's academic performance improves, making them less likely to be flagged for an educational or psychological evaluation, even as their underlying executive function skills remain undeveloped or may even atrophy from lack of use [54]. This masking effect could lead to a cohort of "AI-compensated" students who navigate high school with their neurodevelopmental challenges unrecognized, only to face significant difficulties in college or the workforce where such AI use may be restricted or inappropriate. In a region like Northern California with a historically low baseline diagnosis rate, this suppressive effect could further mask the true prevalence of the disorder [18].

3.3. AI as Assessment Disruptor

The third and perhaps most disruptive pathway is AI's direct impact on the validity of clinical assessments for ADHD. The diagnostic process relies heavily on behavioral rating scales from parents and teachers, clinical interviews, and the student's self-report of functional impairment [30]. Generative

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

AI compromises each of these data sources. As discussed, teacher ratings of academic functioning can be artificially inflated by AI-assisted work. Parent ratings may not reflect the student's unassisted abilities, as much of their academic effort occurs independently with technology.

Most concerningly, emerging research shows that generative AI can effectively coach students on how to feign ADHD symptoms during clinical evaluations, providing detailed scripts and strategies that undermine the sensitivity of diagnostic interviews [88]. This raises the specter of false positive diagnoses, potentially sought for access to academic accommodations or medication. At the same time, the phenomenon of AI-induced cognitive changes can mimic the symptoms of inattentive ADHD, leading to potential misdiagnosis where a behavioral intervention focused on technology use might be more appropriate than a traditional ADHD treatment plan [54,58]. For clinicians in Northern California, where student AI literacy is exceptionally high, this means that traditional assessment methods are becoming increasingly unreliable. Without a detailed and sophisticated inquiry into a student's specific patterns of AI use, a clinician cannot confidently differentiate between genuine ADHD, AI-exacerbated ADHD, AI-masked ADHD, and AI-induced ADHD-like symptoms. This diagnostic ambiguity represents the most significant impact of generative AI, shifting the challenge from simply identifying a known condition to disentangling a complex interplay between neurobiology and a novel cognitive environment.

4. Discussion of Findings and Implications

The analysis of generative AI's impact on ADHD diagnoses among Northern California high school students reveals a complex, multifaceted phenomenon with profound implications for education, clinical practice, and policy. The findings suggest that the educational landscape is moving beyond a simple debate over academic integrity towards a more critical examination of the technology's neurocognitive consequences. The dual capacity of AI to both mask and mimic ADHD symptoms necessitates a fundamental rethinking of how the disorder is identified and supported in a technology-saturated world. The implications of this shift are far-reaching, requiring adaptive strategies from educators, new protocols for clinicians, and more nuanced guidance from policymakers.

4.1. Implications for Educators

For educators in Northern California districts like SFUSD and Oakland Unified, the implications extend well beyond policy creation for acceptable use. The recognition that AI can obscure underlying learning challenges requires a pedagogical shift. Assessment methods must evolve to capture genuine student understanding and skill, independent of AI assistance. The move by some teachers to in-class, handwritten essays represents an initial, though perhaps unsustainable, response [3]. A more robust strategy involves designing "AI-resistant" assessments that prioritize critical thinking, personal reflection, and process-based evaluation over final product.

Furthermore, AI literacy curricula, such as those being developed with Salesforce grant funding, must expand to include metacognitive training [14]. Students need to be taught not only how to use AI ethically, but also how to recognize the signs of cognitive over-reliance and develop strategies for balancing AI support with independent skill development. This educational mission is crucial for preventing the creation of a generation of students whose apparent competence is merely a proxy for their skill in prompt engineering.

4.2. Implications for Clinical Practice

For clinical psychologists and psychiatrists practicing in the Bay Area and beyond, the findings signal an urgent need to update diagnostic protocols for ADHD. A standard clinical interview that does not include a detailed history of a patient's generative AI use is no longer sufficient. Clinicians must become adept at conducting a "digital cognitive assessment," exploring the specific ways a student uses AI, the perceived dependency on these tools, and their functional capacity in both AI-assisted and unassisted contexts. This is essential for the difficult task of differential diagnosis.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

Distinguishing between a student whose long-standing attentional issues are now being masked by AI and a student whose recent attention problems began concurrently with heavy AI use is a critical clinical judgment with vastly different treatment implications. The potential for AI to coach symptom feigning also demands greater reliance on objective cognitive testing and multi-informant reports, even while acknowledging that these too can be confounded by the technology's effects [88].

4.3. Implications for Policy

For policymakers, including the California Department of Education and the state's AI in Education Workgroup, the implications suggest that current guidance, while forward-thinking, may need to be deepened [1]. Policies focused on data privacy and ethical use are foundational, but they must be supplemented with guidance that addresses the neurodevelopmental and mental health impacts of AI. The decision by Making Waves Academy in Richmond to retire its AI counseling chatbot out of concern that it was eroding the development of human social capital is a powerful case study [6].

It highlights a growing awareness that efficiency and support provided by AI can come at the cost of essential human developmental experiences. State-level initiatives should encourage research into these long-term effects and provide resources for schools to develop programs that foster healthy technology habits, promote cognitive resilience, and ensure that AI serves as a tool to augment, rather than replace, the development of core executive functions. Ultimately, the challenge for all stakeholders is to navigate the transition from viewing generative AI as a simple tool for productivity to understanding it as a potent environmental factor that is actively reshaping the cognitive and developmental landscape for adolescents.

5. Limitations

This research paper, while comprehensive in its synthesis of available information, is subject to several significant limitations that must be acknowledged. These constraints shape the nature of the conclusions and highlight critical areas for future investigation.

The most substantial limitation is the absence of recent, geographically specific empirical data on ADHD prevalence. As of late 2025, authoritative public health surveillance systems have not yet published diagnosis statistics for the 2023-2025 period [19,20]. Furthermore, granular data at the Northern California district level is not systematically collected or publicly available. Consequently, this analysis cannot make definitive claims about whether ADHD diagnosis rates have actually increased or decreased in the region. The paper is therefore necessarily inferential and theoretical, constructing a logic-based argument about the *likely impacts* on the diagnostic process by connecting established neuropsychological mechanisms with documented AI adoption trends in a specific population. The conclusions focus on the qualitative nature of the diagnostic challenge rather than quantitative shifts in prevalence.

A second major limitation is the difficulty of establishing causality. The relationship between generative AI use and ADHD symptomatology is complex, bidirectional, and multifactorial. While this paper outlines plausible mechanisms of influence, the available research is largely correlational [51,52]. It is equally plausible that students with pre-existing ADHD are more likely to adopt AI tools as a coping mechanism, as it is that AI use exacerbates symptoms. Disentangling these causal pathways requires longitudinal research that tracks students from before the widespread adoption of AI, a methodological challenge given the technology's rapid and pervasive integration.

Third, the technological landscape is evolving at a pace that far exceeds that of academic research. The capabilities of generative AI models have advanced significantly even within the 2022-2025 timeframe. Research based on early versions of ChatGPT may not fully capture the cognitive effects of more sophisticated, multimodal AI systems that are now becoming commonplace. This rapid evolution means that any analysis of this topic is a snapshot of a moving target, and the specific dynamics described may shift as the technology matures and its integration into educational platforms becomes more seamless.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

Finally, many of the underlying studies on both AI usage and ADHD rely on self-report or parent-report data, which are subject to inherent biases such as recall error, social desirability, and subjective interpretation [17]. While these are common constraints in social and psychological science, they are particularly relevant here, where the phenomena being studied—internal cognitive states and private technology use—are difficult to observe directly and objectively.

6. Conclusions

The period from 2022 to 2025 will be remembered as the moment generative artificial intelligence transitioned from a niche technology to a ubiquitous presence in the lives of high school students. In Northern California, the epicenter of this technological shift, the integration of AI into education has been swift, deep, and transformative. This research paper has sought to analyze the impact of this revolution on one of the most significant challenges in adolescent development: the diagnosis and understanding of ADHD. The analysis concludes that the primary effect of generative AI is not yet visible in public health statistics but is instead unfolding within the nuanced interactions between student cognition, academic performance, and clinical assessment.

The central thesis of this paper is that generative AI has introduced a profound paradox into the ADHD diagnostic landscape. It functions as both a powerful compensatory tool and a potential cognitive disruptor, creating a complex dynamic of symptom masking, mimicry, and exacerbation [51,54,87]. For students in Northern California high schools, AI offers an unprecedented scaffold for executive function deficits, enabling them to organize, write, and produce work that may conceal their underlying challenges [98]. Simultaneously, the technology's inherent design—with its variable reward loops and attention-fragmenting interface—can worsen the very symptoms of impulsivity and inattention it helps to manage, or even induce similar cognitive patterns in neurotypical students [78,92]. This duality presents an immense challenge to the established paradigms of ADHD diagnosis, which rely on observing functional impairment that AI can now artificially resolve.

The unique context of Northern California—with its high rates of AI adoption, progressive educational policies, and historically low ADHD prevalence—makes it a crucial bellwether for understanding these emerging challenges [3,18]. The experiences within its diverse school districts foreshadow a future where clinicians and educators can no longer consider a student's neurodevelopmental profile in isolation from their digital cognitive environment. The path forward requires a significant evolution in both educational and clinical practice. Educators must cultivate a sophisticated form of AI literacy that emphasizes metacognitive awareness and independent skill-building. Clinicians must adopt new diagnostic protocols that meticulously investigate a student's relationship with technology to disentangle the complex interplay of biology and digital influence.

Ultimately, the story of generative AI and ADHD in Northern California is not one of technology creating a new disorder, but of technology fundamentally changing the expression and perception of an existing one. It underscores the urgent need for continued, longitudinal research to understand the long-term consequences of growing up with AI as a cognitive partner. As we move forward, ensuring that this powerful tool augments rather than undermines the healthy cognitive and emotional development of all students will be one of the most critical tasks for researchers, educators, and policymakers in this new era.

Acknowledgments: This research was initiated as part of the Calm Campus project, a mental health support application designed by high school students to address the growing mental health challenges faced by their peers. As student developers working in Fremont, California, the authors observed firsthand the intersection of technological innovation and adolescent well-being in one of the nation's most technologically advanced regions. The Calm Campus initiative aims to provide accessible, student-centered mental health resources, and this research emerged from a desire to understand the complex relationship between emerging technologies like generative AI and neurodevelopmental conditions such as ADHD. The authors hope this work contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how digital tools shape the cognitive and emotional landscape of modern adolescence, informing both clinical practice and the development of technology that genuinely supports student mental health.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

References

1. California Department of Education. (2024). *AI in California Education*. Retrieved from https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/pl/aiincalifornia.asp
2. RAND Corporation. (2024). *More Districts Are Training Teachers on Artificial Intelligence*. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA956-31.html
3. KQED. (2024). *Not Even AI Can Save Me: Students and Teachers on ChatGPT in the Classroom*. Retrieved from https://www.kqed.org/news/12053799
4. Pew Research Center. (2025). *About a Quarter of U.S. Teens Have Used ChatGPT for Schoolwork*. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/01/15/
5. DemandSage. (2025). *AI in Education Statistics & Trends 2025*. Retrieved from https://www.demandsage.com/ai-in-education-statistics/
6. CalMatters. (2025). *AI Chatbots Can Cushion the High School Counselor Shortage*. Retrieved from https://calmatters.org/education/k-12-education/2025/03/school-counselors-ai-chatbots/
7. San Mateo Union High School District. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence in Education*. Retrieved from https://www.smuhsd.org/departments/curriculum-and-assessment/artificial-intelligence-in-education
8. Policy Analysis for California Education. (2024). *AI Guidance for Schools Toolkit*. Retrieved from https://edpolicyinca.org/publications/ai-policy-guidance-schools
9. San Francisco Unified School District. (2024). *Generative AI in SFUSD*. Retrieved from https://www.sfusd.edu/generative-ai-sfusd
10. NPR. (2025). *More Teens Are Using ChatGPT for Homework*. Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/2025/01/18/g-s1-43115
11. Inclusive Teach. (2025). *AI in Education Statistics, Trends and Challenges 2025*. Retrieved from https://inclusiveteach.com/2025/10/19/ai-in-education-statistics
12. Common Sense Media. (2024). *ChatGPT and Beyond: How to Handle AI in Schools*. Retrieved from https://www.commonsense.org/education/articles/chatgpt-and-beyond
13. Axios San Francisco. (2024). *SF Schools Embrace AI in Classrooms*. Retrieved from https://www.axios.com/local/san-francisco/2024/01/08/sf-schools-ai-classrooms
14. Axios San Francisco. (2024). *Salesforce AI Education Grant for SF Public Schools*. Retrieved from https://www.axios.com/local/san-francisco/2024/09/16/salesforce-ai-education-grant
15. TeachAI. (2024). *TeachAI Initiative Homepage*. Retrieved from https://teachai.org
16. TeachAI. (2024). *AI Guidance for Schools Toolkit Download*. Retrieved from http://teachai.org/toolkit
17. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). *Data and Statistics on ADHD*. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/adhd/data/index.html
18. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2022). *State-based Prevalence of ADHD Diagnosis and Treatment 2016-2019*. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/adhd/data/state-based-prevalence
19. Danielson, M. L., et al. (2023). Prevalence and Trends in Diagnosed ADHD Among US Children and Adolescents, 2017-2022. *JAMA Network Open*, 6(10).
20. Bitsko, R. H., et al. (2024). ADHD Prevalence Among U.S. Children and Adolescents in 2022: Diagnosis, Severity, Co-Occurring Disorders, and Treatment. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*.
21. Bitsko, R. H., et al. (2024). ADHD Prevalence Among U.S. Children and Adolescents in 2022. *PMC*, 11334226.
22. Sciberras, E., et al. (2022). Distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic for children with ADHD and/or ASD. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 16(1).
23. Brown University Center for Digital Health. (2023). *COVID Learning Loss Research*. Retrieved from https://cdh.brown.edu/news/2023-03-16/covid-learning-loss
24. Becker, S. P., et al. (2020). Adolescent ADHD and remote learning difficulties during pandemic. *PMC*, 7740109.
25. Emser, T. S., et al. (2023). Effectiveness of Technology-Based Interventions for School-Age Children With ADHD. *JMIR Mental Health*, PMC10698651.
26. Miskowiak, K. W., et al. (2025). Lumosity digital health program for adults with ADHD. *Nature*, s44184-025-00157-3.
27. Zhang, Y., et al. (2025). AI applications in ADHD research. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*.
28. Jain, S., et al. (2025). Digital markers for ADHD from remote monitoring. *JMIR Formative Research*.
29. Mowlem, F. D., et al. (2023). ADHD in the DSM-5-TR: What has changed and what has not. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, PMC9871920.
30. Chen, Q., et al. (2025). DSM-5 ADHD assessment methods and practices. *Frontiers in Psychology*.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

31. Mueller, A. K., et al. (2020). ADHD diagnostic criteria documentation. *PMC*, 7082246.
32. SingleCare. (2024). *ADHD Statistics*. Retrieved from https://www.singlecare.com/blog/news/adhd-statistics/
33. The Global Statistics. (2024). *United States ADHD Statistics*. Retrieved from https://www.theglobalstatistics.com/united-states-adhd-statistics/
34. CHADD. (2024). *General Prevalence in Children*. Retrieved from https://chadd.org/about-adhd/general-prevalence-children/
35. Healthline. (2024). *ADHD Facts and Statistics*. Retrieved from https://www.healthline.com/health/adhd/facts-statistics-infographic
36. NPR. (2024). *ADHD diagnoses are rising: 1 in 9 U.S. kids have gotten one*. Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/sections/shots-health-news/2024/05/23/1252941968
37. Science Daily. (2024). *ADHD statistics update*. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2024/05/240523112611.htm
38. PMC. (2024). *Northern California ADHD Considerations*. PMC11001204.
39. Bay Area ADHD Center. (2024). Homepage. Retrieved from https://www.bayareaadhd.com/
40. Syracuse University. (2024). *What's driving the rise in ADHD diagnosis?* Retrieved from https://artsandsciences.syracuse.edu/news-all/news-2024
41. North Star Academics. (2024). *Rising ADHD Diagnosis Numbers in Children*. Retrieved from https://northstaracademics.org/resources/
42. CHADD. (2024). *Professional Directory for Northern California*. Retrieved from https://chadd.org/professional-directory/
43. Paidipati, C., et al. (2018). Latino family perspectives on ADHD. *PMC*, 6239986.
44. Mackey, K., et al. (2022). California demographic health data. *PMC*, 9489617.
45. Catala-Lopez, F., et al. (2024). Umbrella review of ADHD impacts. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*.
46. ADHD Advisor. (2024). *ADHD Statistics and Facts*. Retrieved from https://www.adhdadvisor.org/learn/adhd-statistics-and-facts
47. Sibley, M. H., et al. (2024). ADHD trends and clinical practice. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*.
48. Ghandour, R. M., et al. (2024). Diagnostic patterns in ADHD. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*.
49. The New York Times Magazine. (2025). *The Crisis in America's Mental Health Care*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/13/magazine/adhd-medication
50. CHADD. (2023). *The Downside to Technology for Students with ADHD*. Retrieved from https://chadd.org/attention-article/the-downside-to-technology
51. Schneider, J., et al. (2024). Executive functioning and perceived usefulness mediate how adolescents use generative AI for schoolwork. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*.
52. Schneider, J., et al. (2024). The relationship between adolescents' executive functioning, generative AI use, and academic achievement. *PMC*, 11387220.
53. Ibrahim, H., et al. (2025). Systematic review of AI chatbots' effects on cognitive development. *Brain Sciences*, 15(1), 47.
54. Hwang, Y. (2024). AI-chatbot induced cognitive atrophy: Theoretical framework and research agenda. *PMC*, 11020077.
55. Durstewitz, D., et al. (2023). Machine learning applications in understanding ADHD. *Nature Translational Psychiatry*.
56. Emser, T. S., et al. (2024). Artificial intelligence transforming ADHD diagnosis and management. *PLOS Mental Health*.
57. Xu, Y. (2025). AI, brain, and child development: Editorial introduction. *AI, Brain and Child*.
58. Mazza, S., et al. (2023). Digital technology, social media and the cognitive development of children and adolescents. *Frontiers in Cognition*.
59. Euronews. (2024). *These AI tools are popular among students who struggle to focus, study finds*. Retrieved from https://www.euronews.com/next/2024/08/30/
60. TIME Magazine. (2025). *How AI tools like ChatGPT and Google are altering learning, memory and the classroom*. Retrieved from https://time.com/7295195/
61. CNBC. (2025). *Experts warn AI chatbots could be 'reshaping' teen and youth brains*. Retrieved from https://www.cnbc.com/2025/10/13/experts-warn-ai-llm
62. Children and Screens Institute. (2024). *AI's impact on children's social and cognitive development*. Retrieved from https://www.childrenandscreens.org/

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

63. Every Learner Everywhere. (2024). *How AI in assistive technology supports students with disabilities*. Retrieved from https://www.everylearnereverywhere.org/
64. Psychology Today. (2025). *AI always agrees with your kid—that's a developmental problem*. Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/
65. Chen, Y., et al. (2025). Meta-analysis of ChatGPT's impact on student learning performance. *Nature Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.
66. ResearchGate. (2025). *The Impact of AI-Powered Writing Tools on Students' Writing Performance*. Publication 389458566.
67. Li, X., et al. (2025). ChatGPT's influence on student engagement: Systematic review. *ScienceDirect*.
68. Guler, C., et al. (2024). Virtual reality and AI systems for ADHD diagnosis. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*.
69. Science Daily. (2023). *Adolescent brain cognitive development study: AI applications in ADHD detection*. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2023/11/
70. Mashable. (2024). *ChatGPT and AI tools for ADHD management*. Retrieved from https://mashable.com/article/chatgpt-ai-and-adhd
71. Silvetti, M., et al. (2022). A mechanistic model of ADHD as resulting from dopamine phasic/tonic imbalance. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*.
72. Volkow, N. D., et al. (2011). Motivation deficit in ADHD is associated with dysfunction of the dopamine reward pathway. *Molecular Psychiatry*.
73. Kim, J., et al. (2024). Enhancing ADHD care: Integrating Large Language Models like ChatGPT. *PMC*, 10970191.
74. Yoo, S. S., et al. (2024). Decreased impulsiveness and MEG normalization after AI-digital therapy in ADHD children. *npj Mental Health Research*.
75. Fischer, F., et al. (2025). Impact of generative AI on executive function development. *Springer*.
76. Kovanović, V., et al. (2024). Self-regulated learning with AI tools. *British Journal of Educational Technology*.
77. Kasneci, E., et al. (2024). Promoting self-regulated learning in AI-enhanced education. *Springer Educational Technology*.
78. Zhou, Y., et al. (2024). The dark addiction patterns of current AI chatbot interfaces. *ACM Digital Library*.
79. Chen, L., et al. (2025). Adolescent AI chatbot addiction: Reddit narrative analysis. *arXiv*, 2507.15783.
80. Family Addiction Specialist. (2024). *The rise of AI chatbot dependency*. Retrieved from https://www.familyaddictionspecialist.com/blog/
81. Mobicip. (2024). *Teen AI chatbot addiction*. Retrieved from https://www.mobicip.com/blog/teen-ai-chatbot-addiction
82. Psychiatric Times. (2024). *Chatbot addiction and its impact on psychiatric diagnosis*. Retrieved from https://www.psychiatrictimes.com/view/chatbot-addiction
83. Leung, L., et al. (2024). Adolescent AI dependence: Cross-lagged panel analysis. *PMC*, 10944174.
84. Zhao, R., et al. (2024). AI use motivations and academic outcomes. *Educational Technology Journal*.
85. Stanford Medicine. (2025). *AI chatbots and teen mental health risks*. Retrieved from https://med.stanford.edu/news/insights/2025/08/ai-chatbots-kids-teens
86. ADDRC. (2024). *How generative AI can help with ADHD*. Retrieved from https://www.addrc.org/how-generative-ai-can-help-with-adhd/
87. ADDRC. (2024). *AI and ADHD: A double-edged sword*. Retrieved from https://www.addrc.org/ai-and-adhd-a-double-edged-sword/
88. Alfonsi, N., et al. (2025). AI's role in feigning ADHD symptoms. *Springer*, s12207-025-09538-7.
89. Jain, S., et al. (2025). Digital screen time and ADHD risk. *Frontiers in AI*.
90. Wang, H., et al. (2025). Generative AI addiction and cognitive independence. *ScienceDirect*.
91. Resident. (2024). *AI and ADHD: Helpful guide to using AI chatbots*. Retrieved from https://resident.com/tech-and-gear/2024/09/02/
92. Samia, S. (2023). *The diminishing attention span: How technology is reshaping our minds*. Medium. Retrieved from https://medium.com/@sahin.samia/
93. Shariat, M., et al. (2024). ChatGPT case study in ADHD symptom management. *Brieflands*.
94. The Allied Health Academy. (2024). *ChatGPT to explore ADHD*. Retrieved from https://thealliedhealthacademy.com/
95. Kim, J., et al. (2024). ChatGPT as therapeutic tool in ADHD treatment: Delphi method evaluation. *PMC*, 10970191.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.2299.v1

96. Millennium Medical Associates. (2024). *ADHD ChatGPT prompts for executive dysfunction*. Retrieved from https://www.millenniummedicalassociates.com/blog/
97. Lifehacker. (2024). *Ways AI can help you manage your ADHD*. Retrieved from https://lifehacker.com/
98. Hwang, G. J., et al. (2025). AI applications for students with executive function challenges. *Frontiers in Education*.
99. Chen, C., et al. (2024). Self-regulated learning in AI-enhanced education. *MDPI Education Sciences*, 14(12), 1302.
100. Prairie Care. (2024). *AI and teen mental health*. Retrieved from https://prairie-care.com/ai-teen-mental-health/
101. Hardman, P. (2024). *The impact of generative AI on human learning*. Substack. Retrieved from https://drphilippahardman.substack.com/
102. Kim, M., et al. (2025). ChatGPT-4o integration in robotic assistants for ADHD therapy. *Springer Robotics*.
103. Griffiths, M. D., et al. (2024). Conceptualizing AI addiction: Self-reported cases. *ResearchGate*, 381111596.
104. ADDitude Magazine. (2024). *Brain stimulation and ADHD: Cravings, dependency, and regulation*. Retrieved from https://www.additudemag.com/
105. Wang, Y., et al. (2025). AI trends in ADHD research: Bibliometric analysis. *PMC*, 12018397.