NICOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY IN TORUŃ

QUALITY IN SPORT
eISSN 2450-3118 · Open Access · Peer-reviewed
apcz.umk.pl/QS Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

Cite as: KWIATKOWSKI, Mateusz, LEŻAŃSKA, Zofia, PAŁYGA, Emil, SOWIŃSKA, Joanna, CIEŚLAK, Aleksandra, DEMKOW, Sara, PALUSZKIEWICZ, Natalia, MARCINKOWSKA, Katarzyna, SIEMIŃSKA, Karolina and BRYG, Sandra. Social Media Influence on ADHD Self-Diagnosis and Misdiagnosis: A Narrative Review of Clinical Risks and Epidemiological Trends. Quality in Sport. 2026;59:72787. https://doi.org/10.12775/QS.2026.59.72787

ARTICLE TIMELINE
Received: 28.05.2026. Revised: 20.06.2026. Accepted: 20.06.2026. Published: 24.06.2026.

The journal has been awarded 20 points in the parametric evaluation by the Polish Ministry of Higher Education and Science (Annex to the announcement of 05.01.2024, No. 32553). Unique Journal Identifier: 201398. Scientific disciplines: Medical Sciences; Health Sciences.
Punkty Ministerialne z 2019 – aktualny rok 20 punktów. Załącznik do komunikatu Ministra Szkolnictwa Wyższego i Nauki z dnia 05.01.2024 Lp. 32553. Posiada Unikatowy Identyfikator Czasopisma: 201398. Przypisane dyscypliny naukowe: Nauki medyczne; Nauki o zdrowiu. © The Authors 2026.
OPEN ACCESS · CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 This article is published with open access under the License Open Journal Systems of Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Poland, and is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial Share Alike License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/), which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited. The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Social Media Influence on ADHD Self-Diagnosis and Misdiagnosis: A Narrative Review of Clinical Risks and Epidemiological Trends

Mateusz Kwiatkowski
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1099-1676
E-mail: m.kwiatkowski20019@gmail.com
Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

Zofia Leżańska
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6808-5006
E-mail: zosialezanska@gmail.com
Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

Emil Pałyga
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-6614-964X
E-mail: emilpalyga212@gmail.com
Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

Joanna Sowińska
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9507-6639
E-mail: sowinskajoan@gmail.com
Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

Aleksandra Cieślak
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4901-4341
E-mail: cieslakola2701@gmail.com

Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

Sara Demkow
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7192-7435
E-mail: saraanademkow@gmail.com
Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

Natalia Paluszkiewicz
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6367-1018
E-mail: natalia25paluszkiewicz@gmail.com
Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

Katarzyna Marcinkowska
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-2930-1805
E-mail: kasiamarcinkov@gmail.com
Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

Karolina Siemińska
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7712-4259
E-mail: karolisie223@gmail.com
Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

Sandra Bryg
ORCiD: https://orcid.org/0009-0003-6539-6595
E-mail: sandrabryg@gmail.com
Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Józefa Poniatowskiego 15, 40-055 Katowice, Poland

Corresponding Author
Mateusz Kwiatkowski
E-mail: m.kwiatkowski20019@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Social media platforms — TikTok in particular — have become a dominant gateway to health information for millions of adults. The hashtag #ADHD has accumulated over 36 billion views, yet more than half of the most-viewed videos contain clinically inaccurate content.

Aim: This narrative review examines the quality of social media ADHD content, its relationship to self-diagnosis and potential misdiagnosis, and the downstream clinical and epidemiological risks, with particular focus on adults aged 18–34.

Materials and Methods: A narrative review was conducted using PubMed/MEDLINE and PubMed Central. Search terms included: ADHD, social media, TikTok, self-diagnosis, misdiagnosis, cyberchondria, telehealth, and DSM-5-TR. English-language publications from 2018 to 2026, available in full text through PMC, were included. Editorials without original data and non-peer-reviewed sources were excluded.

Results: Content analyses show that 52–56% of popular TikTok ADHD videos are misleading by clinical standards. Exposure correlates with over-endorsement of ADHD symptoms in individuals not meeting diagnostic criteria. Social contagion effects have been documented, with online interest spikes preceding measurable referral surges. Epidemiological data from multiple countries confirm sharp increases in ADHD diagnoses and stimulant prescriptions since 2020, with new stimulant dispensations approximately 2.75-fold higher in Ontario by 2024 compared to 2016. Telehealth expansion reduced access barriers but introduced significant quality concerns.

Conclusions: Social media meaningfully shapes ADHD self-perception, with both beneficial effects — reduced underdiagnosis in historically overlooked groups — and harmful ones, including misdiagnosis and inappropriate stimulant prescribing. Clinicians must adapt their assessment practices to account for this new diagnostic landscape.

Key words: ADHD; social media; self-diagnosis; cyberchondria; telehealth

Introduction

Scroll through TikTok for five minutes looking at ADHD content and a recognizable pattern emerges: someone describes forgetting things, leaving tasks unfinished, feeling restless in meetings — and then reveals, with visible relief, that they finally understand why. The comment sections fill with 'this is literally me' and 'I need to get tested.' This dynamic, playing out billions of times across platforms, is no longer peripheral to clinical practice. It is reshaping who presents for assessment, what they expect, and how they interpret their own difficulties.

ADHD is a well-validated neurodevelopmental disorder. Its neurobiological foundations involve dysregulation of dopaminergic and noradrenergic systems, delayed cortical maturation in prefrontal regions, and a heritability estimated at 70–80% in twin studies[1,2,3]. These are not characteristics a TikTok video can reliably detect. Formal diagnosis under DSM-5-TR requires persistent, impairing symptoms across multiple settings with onset before age 12 — criteria that exclude most people who simply find ADHD content relatable[4,5].

The clinical implications of this social media influence are genuinely two-sided. Women with ADHD have historically been diagnosed years later than men, often because presentations are less disruptive and more easily masked; online communities have been meaningful spaces for recognition that formal pathways missed[6,7]. On the other hand, content analyses consistently show that the majority of popular ADHD videos are inaccurate, oversimplified, and structurally unable to engage with differential diagnosis — and exposure to this content measurably inflates self-reported symptoms in people who would not meet clinical criteria[9,22].

This narrative review synthesises evidence across three areas: the quality of ADHD content on social media platforms; epidemiological trends in diagnosis and prescribing; and the clinical risks arising when platform-driven self-identification substitutes for or heavily influences formal assessment.

ADHD: Epidemiology and Diagnostic Framework

Prevalence Trends

Global ADHD diagnoses have risen substantially since the 1990s. A systematic review and meta-analysis estimated adult ADHD prevalence at 2.58% globally, with wide variation by region and diagnostic methodology[10]. More recently, self-reported ADHD diagnosis rates climbed among US working-age adults, with the sharpest increases among women aged 25–44[11]. A critical review examining multiple decades of data concluded that the rise was real but heterogeneous — partly reflecting improved recognition of previously underdiagnosed groups, partly consistent with diagnostic creep, and not uniformly accompanied by increases in validated symptom scores across general populations[12,13].

The COVID-19 pandemic appears to have acted as a catalyst. In Ontario, Canada, new stimulant dispensations to adults were approximately 2.75-fold higher in June 2024 compared to January 2016 (a rise of ~175%), with the sharpest acceleration after March 2020; women aged 25–34 and nurse practitioners as prescribers were disproportionately represented in that growth[14]. Across multiple European countries, ADHD medication consumption increased

during and after the pandemic in what some analyses characterise as a catch-up trend for previously unmet need[15]. In Korea, adult diagnoses more than doubled between 2015 and 2018 alone[16].

Diagnostic Criteria and Their Complexity

DSM-5-TR requires, for adults, at least five inattentive symptoms and/or five hyperactive-impulsive symptoms, persisting for at least six months, with onset of several symptoms before age 12, present in two or more settings, causing clear functional impairment, and not better explained by another mental disorder[4,5]. Each criterion represents a real clinical challenge.

Retrospective ascertainment of childhood onset is notoriously unreliable: adults asked to recall symptoms from before age twelve are prone to reinterpreting past experiences through a newly acquired diagnostic framework[17]. The differential diagnosis is genuinely difficult — generalised anxiety disorder, major depressive disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, and even chronic sleep deprivation can produce inattention and executive impairment that is clinically indistinguishable from ADHD on a symptom checklist[18]. ADHD frequently co-occurs with anxiety and depression in a substantial proportion of cases, further complicating whether attention difficulties reflect a primary disorder or a secondary consequence of affective disturbance[18].

Social Media and ADHD: Content Quality and Misinformation

The Scale of Online ADHD Content

By early 2024, global social media use exceeded five billion users, with an average of approximately 2.5 hours of daily platform time. TikTok, with approximately 1.6 billion monthly active users, has become a major health information channel — in part because its recommendation algorithm is unusually effective at matching content to user behaviour, and in part because short-form video rewards emotional resonance over informational depth[19].

The hashtag #ADHD accumulated over 36 billion views on TikTok and grew from two million to over three million tagged videos within a single year[13,22]. Google Trends data confirm that online ADHD information-seeking increased in parallel, and that search spikes frequently coincide with viral posts rather than with independent health concerns[20]. Accounts with financial incentives — affiliate links, sponsored content — produce content with measurably higher rates of inaccuracy than accounts without such incentives[21].

Accuracy of ADHD-Related Content

Content analyses consistently reveal poor quality of ADHD information on social media platforms. Among the 100 most-viewed TikTok ADHD videos, 52% were classified as clinically misleading using the Patient Education Materials Assessment Tool for Audiovisual Materials (PEMAT-AV), with the majority scoring poorly on actionability and providing symptom descriptions without guidance on appropriate next steps[8]. A subsequent analysis of 125 highly liked videos uploaded between 2021 and 2023 replicated these accuracy concerns and additionally examined comment sections, demonstrating that viewers frequently self-identified with depicted symptoms regardless of whether these aligned with established clinical criteria[22].

Cross-platform research examining more than 5,000 posts found that 52% of ADHD-related TikTok content was inaccurate, with TikTok showing higher misinformation rates for neurodevelopmental conditions compared with other platforms[23]. Among the top 100 TikTok videos tagged #ADHD, fewer than half of symptom claims aligned with DSM-based diagnostic guidelines, and viewing frequency was found to correlate positively with over-endorsement of self-reported ADHD traits among young adults[9].

Recurring problems include the universalisation of symptoms — forgetfulness, difficulty concentrating, and procrastination are presented as diagnostic indicators rather than dimensional traits clinically significant only when persistent and impairing. Content focuses disproportionately on inattentive presentations because they are more broadly relatable, and differential diagnosis is essentially absent, meaning that anxiety, depression, and trauma — the most common clinical mimics — never enter the picture (Table 1)[24].

Algorithms, Confirmation Bias, and the Cyberchondria Loop

Social media platforms actively amplify exposure to relatable health content. A user who engages with one ADHD video is immediately served similar material, and since engagement metrics reward the most identifiable — and therefore most oversimplified — presentations, the algorithm structurally favours content that drives self-identification[25]. Confirmation bias has been shown to operate powerfully in online health information seeking, with individuals selectively attending to, retaining, and accepting information consistent with their pre-existing beliefs while filtering out contradictory evidence[26].

This dynamic resembles the cyberchondria loop documented in health anxiety research — a self-reinforcing cycle in which each exposure deepens conviction rather than resolving uncertainty[27,28,29]. Empirical work conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic confirmed that social media use for health information significantly elevated cyberchondria, with this effect persisting even when users sought factual public health guidance[30]. When applied to ADHD content, this mechanism helps explain how brief, repeated exposure to relatable symptom descriptions can progressively shift a viewer's self-perception toward an unconfirmed ADHD identity, independently of whether DSM-5-TR criteria would actually be met.

Table 1. Selected studies on social media, ADHD self-diagnosis, and epidemiological trends (2018–2026).

Author(s), Year	Study Design	Population / Sample	Key Findings
Yeung et al. (2022)	Content analysis	100 most-viewed TikTok ADHD videos	52% misleading per PEMAT-AV; poor actionability across all videos
Sieferle et al. (2025)	Cross-sectional + comments	125 most-liked TikTok ADHD videos (2021–2023)	High viewer self-identification regardless of clinical criteria; misleading content predominated
Hartnett et al. (2024)	Narrative review	Published clinical and epidemiological literature	Social contagion documented; viral spikes preceded referral surges to

Author(s), Year	Study Design	Population / Sample	Key Findings
			mental health services
Abdelnour et al. (2022)	Narrative review	Clinical and epidemiological studies	Diagnoses doubled in some cohorts; diagnostic creep debated alongside genuine recognition gains
Gimbach et al. (2024)	Retrospective observational	European population data post-COVID	Post-COVID catch-up in ADHD medication consumption; adults aged 18–34 most affected
Gomes et al. (2026)	Population-based time-series	Adults in Ontario, Canada (2016–2024)	Stimulant dispensations ~2.75-fold higher by June 2024 vs. January 2016 (~175% increase); sharpest acceleration post-March 2020; women 25–34 predominant
Karasavva et al. (2025)	Content + survey analysis	Top 100 TikTok ADHD videos + viewers	<50% of symptom claims aligned with DSM-5-TR; viewing time positively correlated with symptom over-endorsement
Bala et al. (2021)	Cross-sectional observational	General population, India, COVID-19	Social media use linked to elevated cyberchondria and information overload
Dekkers & van Hoorn (2022)	Narrative review	Adolescents with ADHD	ADHD associated with higher rates of problematic social media use; social deficits extended to online settings
Song et al. (2021)	Systematic review & meta-analysis	Global epidemiological studies	Adult ADHD global prevalence estimated at 2.58%; wide variation by region and diagnostic

Author(s), Year	Study Design	Population / Sample	Key Findings
			methodology

Note. PEMAT-AV = Patient Education Materials Assessment Tool for Audiovisual Materials; DSM-5-TR = Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition, Text Revision.

Clinical Risks of Social Media-Driven ADHD Self-Diagnosis

Misdiagnosis: False Positives and False Negatives

The most direct clinical risk is misdiagnosis. Conditions most commonly mistaken for ADHD include generalised anxiety disorder, major depressive disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, and bipolar disorder — all of which can produce inattention, restlessness, and impaired executive function (Table 2)[12,17,18]. When a patient arrives having already self-diagnosed via social media, the anchoring effect on the clinical encounter is substantial. Under time pressure, clinicians may find it practically difficult to redirect the consultation away from an entrenched self-diagnosis toward the more open differential the presentation actually requires[12,17].

The "Misinformation Mayhem" study[31] demonstrated that exposure to inaccurate TikTok ADHD content reduced the accuracy of participants' ADHD knowledge while paradoxically increasing their confidence in that knowledge, and heightened their intentions to seek both evidence-based and non-evidence-based treatment among college students — effects measurable after a single viewing session. These altered expectations arrive in the consulting room with the patient, and resetting them takes time that busy clinical settings often cannot provide.

Stimulant medications carry real risks when prescribed incorrectly. In patients with unrecognised anxiety disorders, they can worsen anxiety and disrupt sleep. In those with bipolar disorder, they may precipitate episodes. In all patients, cardiovascular effects and potential for misuse are non-trivial considerations — particularly in young adult populations already familiar with stimulants as study aids[32]. Social media content virtually never addresses these risks[8,9].

Table 2. Social media ADHD content versus DSM-5-TR clinical diagnostic criteria for adults.

Diagnostic Domain	Social Media ADHD Content	DSM-5-TR Clinical Criteria (Adults)
Symptom threshold	Everyday behaviours (forgetfulness, distraction) labelled as ADHD traits; no numeric cutoff applied	≥5 inattentive or hyperactive-impulsive symptoms required (adult threshold, DSM-5-TR)
Duration requirement	Rarely mentioned; no persistence criterion communicated	Symptoms must be present continuously for ≥6 months
Age of onset	Usually absent from video	Onset of several symptoms

Diagnostic Domain	Social Media ADHD Content	DSM-5-TR Clinical Criteria (Adults)
	content; treated as irrelevant	before age 12 is required
Functional impairment	Frequently omitted or framed as optional	Clear evidence of impairment in ≥2 settings (home, work, school, social)
Differential diagnosis	Anxiety and depression overlap largely ignored; no exclusion criteria discussed	Clinician must rule out mood, anxiety, trauma-related, and substance-use disorders
Assessment method	Self-identification through relatable video content	Structured clinical interview, validated rating scales, collateral history
Evaluating clinician	None; influencer, peer, or individual with lived experience	Licensed psychiatrist, psychologist, or appropriately trained specialist physician
Comorbidity screening	Absent in the vast majority of content	Required; ADHD commonly co-occurs with anxiety disorders and major depression
Actionability (PEMAT-AV)	Low; majority of videos score below the acceptable threshold	Comprehensive management plan including psychoeducation, therapy, and pharmacotherapy as indicated
Accountability	None; no regulatory, ethical, or professional oversight	Clinician is bound by professional ethics, licensing standards, and patient safety obligations

Note. DSM-5-TR = Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition, Text Revision; PEMAT-AV = Patient Education Materials Assessment Tool for Audiovisual Materials.

Telehealth Expansion and Diagnostic Quality

The suspension of the US Ryan Haight Act requirement for in-person evaluation before controlled substance prescribing, during the COVID-19 pandemic, created for the first time a complete pathway through which a person could receive an ADHD diagnosis and a stimulant prescription entirely online[33]. By 2021, approximately half of US adult ADHD care was delivered via telehealth[34]. The combination of low-barrier telehealth access and social media-driven self-diagnosis compounds the misdiagnosis risk: a patient can move from TikTok to prescription within days.

In June 2024, the US Department of Justice charged executives of an ADHD telehealth company with fraudulently prescribing stimulants to individuals who had not been appropriately assessed[34]. This extreme case illustrates what happens when diagnostic processes are systematically abbreviated. More broadly, the absence of in-person evaluation

removes clinically important information — behavioural observation, collateral history — that supports diagnostic accuracy[33,37].

The Double-Edged Sword: Reducing Underdiagnosis

Having documented the harms, it is important to acknowledge the genuine benefits. Women with ADHD are diagnosed an average of five to seven years later than men, reflecting genuine clinician bias, greater masking, and differences in symptom presentation[6,7]. Social media communities have been the first space where many of these women encountered an accurate description of their experience, subsequently triggering formal assessment that confirmed the diagnosis[6,7]. However, these benefits must be weighed against potential risks: Dekkers and van Hoorn[35] reviewed how adolescents with ADHD are particularly vulnerable to problematic social media use due to impulsivity and attention regulation difficulties, and noted that excessive exposure may potentially exacerbate inattention and hyperactivity symptoms, underscoring the need for clinical guidance on healthy social media engagement.

Clinicians who adopt a reflexively dismissive attitude toward patients who first identified their difficulties through social media may inadvertently reinforce the very diagnostic disparities those communities have worked to reduce[6,7]. The goal is not to reverse the reduction in ADHD stigma that social media has genuinely helped create, but to ensure its benefits are not negated by the quality problems in the content driving it[36].

Discussion

Something has genuinely changed. The pathway from first encountering ADHD to sitting in a clinical consultation has shortened dramatically, and the information encountered along the way is more likely than not to be inaccurate[22,23]. This is not a fringe phenomenon: the scale of ADHD content on TikTok alone, measured in tens of billions of views, means that a meaningful proportion of adults presenting for assessment in any given month will have pre-existing frameworks shaped by social media rather than clinical sources[8,20].

The evidence reviewed here is consistent in its findings: more than half of popular ADHD TikTok content does not meet basic accuracy standards[8,22]; exposure to this content drives self-identification in people who would not meet diagnostic criteria[9,24]; and the epidemiological picture — sharply rising diagnoses and prescriptions since 2020 — cannot be fully explained by genuine increases in unmet need, though such need clearly exists[12,13,14].

For clinical practice, the most immediate implication is that asking about online health research should become routine — not as a challenge to the patient's self-knowledge, but as an essential part of understanding the diagnostic framework they arrived with. A patient who has spent weeks watching ADHD TikTok videos before booking an appointment is, in a meaningful sense, a different clinical encounter than one who sought help after noticing persistent difficulties at work[9]. Understanding this shapes the consultation without dismissing the patient[17,31].

The telehealth regulatory environment requires closer attention. Remote ADHD assessment is feasible and valuable, and research supports its acceptability to many patients[37]. But the evidence reviewed here suggests that quality controls are insufficient in at least some settings[33,34]. Requiring validated rating scales and collateral history regardless of delivery modality would be a meaningful safeguard[33].

There is also a strong case for greater clinical engagement with social media itself. Health professionals who produce accurate, accessible content can meaningfully counterbalance misinformation[22]. This remains a minority activity among clinicians, but the argument for

changing that is getting harder to dismiss. The platforms will not self-regulate; the clinical community cannot continue to cede the health information space to creators with no clinical training and, in some cases, financial incentives to maximise self-identification[21].

Conclusion

Social media has become a significant, largely unregulated pathway into ADHD self-identification. It has genuine benefits — reducing stigma, improving recognition in historically underdiagnosed groups, and lowering the threshold for help-seeking in ways that clinical pathways failed to achieve. These are real and should not be dismissed.

But the content driving this process is, in the majority of cases, clinically inaccurate. It presents relatable behaviours as diagnostic criteria, ignores duration and impairment requirements, and offers no differential diagnosis. Exposure measurably inflates self-reported symptoms, and the resulting presentations to clinical services occur in a context — expanded telehealth access, time-pressured consultations, powerful anchoring effects — that makes maintaining diagnostic rigour harder than it was before.

The clinical community needs to respond at multiple levels: routinely asking about online health information as part of assessment; maintaining structured diagnostic practices resilient to anchoring bias; advocating for telehealth quality standards that do not sacrifice accuracy for access; and engaging more actively with social media to provide evidence-based alternatives to viral misinformation. The responsibility for managing the clinical consequences of social media influence on ADHD diagnosis rests with the healthcare system, because the platforms will not manage it themselves.

Disclosure

Author's contribution:

Conceptualization: Mateusz Kwiatkowski

Methodology: Mateusz Kwiatkowski, Natalia Paluszkiewicz

Software: Joanna Sowińska

Check: Sara Demkow, Aleksandra Cieślak, Katarzyna Marcinkowska

Formal analysis: Sandra Bryg, Emil Pałyga

Investigation: Natalia Paluszkiewicz, Karolina Siemińska

Resources: Emil Pałyga

Data curation: Zofia Leżańska

Writing-rough preparation: Mateusz Kwiatkowski, Karolina Siemińska, Joanna Sowińska

Writing review and editing: Mateusz Kwiatkowski, Aleksandra Cieślak

Visualization: Zofia Leżańska, Sandra Bryg

Supervision: Sara Demkow, Katarzyna Marcinkowska

Project administration: Mateusz Kwiatkowski

All authors have read and agreed with the published version of the manuscript.

Funding Statement: The study did not receive special funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Declaration of the Use of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the Writing Process

During the preparation of this work, the authors used Google Gemini and ChatGPT for the purpose of language improvement, readability enhancement, and text formatting. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the substantive content of the publication.

References

1. Faraone SV, Larsson H. Genetics of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Mol Psychiatry.* 2019;24(4):562-575. doi:10.1038/s41380-018-0070-0

2. Curatolo P, D'Agati E, Moavero R. The neurobiological basis of ADHD. *Ital J Pediatr.* 2010;36:79. doi:10.1186/1824-7288-36-79

3. Nigg JT, Sibley MH, Thapar A, Karalunas SL. Development of ADHD: etiology, heterogeneity, and early life course. *Annu Rev Dev Psychol.* 2020;2:559-583. doi:10.1146/annurev-devpsych-060320-093413

4. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.* 5th ed., text rev. American Psychiatric Association Publishing; 2022. doi:10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787

5. Koutsoklenis A, Honkasilta J. ADHD in the DSM-5-TR: what has changed and what has not. *Front Psychiatry.* 2023;13:1064141. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2022.1064141

6. Attoe DE, Climie EA. Miss. diagnosis: a systematic review of ADHD in adult women. *J Atten Disord.* 2023;27(7):645-657. doi:10.1177/10870547231161533

7. Wills V, Chakraborty R. A qualitative study on the experiences of adult females with late diagnosis of ASD and ADHD in the UK. *Healthcare (Basel).* 2026;14(2):209. doi:10.3390/healthcare14020209

8. Yeung A, Ng E, Abi-Jaoude E. TikTok and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a cross-sectional study of social media content quality. *Can J Psychiatry.* 2022;67(12):899-906. doi:10.1177/07067437221082854

9. Karasavva V, Miller C, Groves N, Montiel A, Canu W, Mikami A. A double-edged hashtag: evaluation of #ADHD-related TikTok content and its associations with perceptions of ADHD. *PLoS One.* 2025;20(3):e0319335. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0319335

10. Song P, Zha M, Yang Q, Zhang Y, Li X, Rudan I. The prevalence of adult attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: a global systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Glob Health.* 2021;11:04009. doi:10.7189/jogh.11.04009

11. London AS, Monnat SM, Gutin I. Self-reported ADHD diagnosis status among working-age adults in the United States: evidence from the 2023 National Wellbeing Survey. *J Atten Disord.* 2025;29(6):399-410. doi:10.1177/10870547251319861

12. Abdelnour E, Jansen MO, Gold JA. ADHD diagnostic trends: increased recognition or overdiagnosis? *Mo Med.* 2022;119(5):467-473. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9616454/

13. Hussain T, Neupane P, Khunger V. Exploring the escalating trends and variances in ADHD prevalence: a critical review. *Cureus.* 2025;17(9):e92423. doi:10.7759/cureus.92423

14. Gomes T, Wang T, Rebić N, Miller S, Paolozza L, Vigod SN, Tadrous M. Patterns of prescription stimulant initiation before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a population-based time-series analysis. *CMAJ.* 2026;198(9):E313-E325. doi:10.1503/cmaj.251065

15. Gimbach S, Vogel D, Fried R, Faraone SV, Banaschewski T, Buitelaar J, Döpfner M, Ammer R. ADHD medicine consumption in Europe after COVID-19: catch-up or trend change? *BMC Psychiatry.* 2024;24:112. doi:10.1186/s12888-024-05505-9

16. Lee SM, Cheong HK, Oh IH, Hong M. Nationwide rate of adult ADHD diagnosis and pharmacotherapy from 2015 to 2018. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18(21):11322. doi:10.3390/ijerph182111322

17. Waltereit R, Ehrlich S, Roessner V. First-time diagnosis of ADHD in adults: challenge to retrospectively assess childhood symptoms of ADHD from long-term memory. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2023;32(8):1333-1335. doi:10.1007/s00787-023-02244-2

18. Grogan K, Gormley CI, Rooney B, Whelan R, Kiiski H, Naughton M, Bramham J. Differential diagnosis and comorbidity of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and anxiety in adults. *Br J Clin Psychol.* 2018;57(1):99-115. doi:10.1111/bjc.12156

19. McCashin D, Murphy CM. Using TikTok for public and youth mental health: a systematic review and content analysis. *Clin Child Psychol Psychiatry.* 2022;28(1):279-306. doi:10.1177/13591045221106608

20. Zhao X, Coxe SJ, Timmons AC, Frazier SL. Mental health information seeking online: a Google Trends analysis of ADHD. *Adm Policy Ment Health.* 2022;49:357-373. doi:10.1007/s10488-021-01168-w

21. Hulsizer B, Passaro F. My socials told me I have ADHD: a cross-sectional study of ADHD symptomatology on social media. *J Soc Media Res.* 2025;2(3):211-225. https://jsomer.org/index.php/pub/article/view/29

22. Sieferle K, Guidi T, Dorr F, Bitzer EM. Quality and perception of ADHD content on TikTok: cross-sectional study. *JMIR Infodemiology.* 2025;5:e75973. doi:10.2196/75973

23. Carter A, Gracey F, Moody J, Ovens A, Chatburn E. Quality, reliability and misinformation in mental health and neurodivergence content on social media: a systematic review. *J Soc Media Res.* 2026;3(1):30-47. doi:10.29329/jsomer.84

24. Engel E, Gell S, Heiss R, Karsay K. Social media influencers and adolescents' health: a scoping review of the research field. *Soc Sci Med.* 2024;340:116387. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.116387

25. Shin D, Shin EY. Algorithmic amplification and polarization in social media. *Telemat Inform.* 2024;86:102049. doi:10.1016/j.tele.2023.102049

26. Meppelink CS, Smit EG, Fransen ML, Diviani N. Confirmation bias and health literacy in online health information seeking. *J Health Commun.* 2019;24(2):129-140. doi:10.1080/10810730.2019.1583701

27. Bhaumik U, Nayok S. Cyberchondria: an emerging entity in COVID-19 pandemic and thereafter. *Eur Psychiatry.* 2021;64(Suppl 1):S799. doi:10.1192/j.eurpsy.2021.799

28. Vasiliu O, Ciobanu AM. Diagnosis and therapeutic challenges in the exploration of cyberchondria. *Eur Psychiatry.* 2025. doi:10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.1037

29. Ambrosini F, Truzoli R, Vismara M, Vitella D, Biolcati R. The effect of cyberchondria on anxiety, depression and quality of life during COVID-19. *Heliyon.* 2022;8(5):e09437. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09437

30. Bala R, Srivastava A, Ningthoujam GD, Potsangbam T, Oinam A, Anal CL. Preventive behavior influenced by social media during COVID-19 mediated by cyberchondria and information overload. *J Prev Med Public Health.* 2021;54(1):22-30. doi:10.3961/jpmph.20.465

31. Schiros A, Bowman N, Antshel K. Misinformation mayhem: the effects of TikTok content on ADHD knowledge, stigma, and treatment-seeking intentions. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2025;34(11):3521-3533. doi:10.1007/s00787-025-02769-8

32. Cortese S, Adamo N, Del Giovane C, et al. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of medications for ADHD: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry.* 2018;5(9):727-738. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30269-4

33. Rolison MJ, Bloch MH. Revisiting best practices: a reflection on the online evaluation and treatment of ADHD and implications for future practice. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Ment Health.* 2023;17:43. doi:10.1186/s13034-023-00593-z

34. Karacuschansky A, Organick-Lee P, Horton K, Seiler N. Telehealth use in Medicaid: implications for quality care for ADHD and Tourette syndrome. *Public Health Rep.* 2025. doi:10.1177/00333549251357825. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12361170/

35. Dekkers TJ, van Hoorn J. Understanding problematic social media use in adolescents with ADHD: a narrative review and clinical recommendations. *Brain Sci.* 2022;12(12):1625. doi:10.3390/brainsci12121625

36. Hartnett Y, Cummings E. Social media and ADHD: implications for clinical assessment and treatment. *Ir J Psychol Med.* 2024;41(1):132-136. doi:10.1017/ipm.2023.40

37. Schofield FJ, Wilkie S, Nielsen EE, Brigden A, Jones MW, Isotalus HK. Digital health technologies for adults with ADHD: a scoping review. *Front Digit Health.* 2026;8:1746732. doi:10.3389/fdgth.2026.1746732. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12969067/