**S2. Table. Summary table of studies included in the present review.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **N (girls sample)** | **Mean age (range)** | **IQ**  | **Med use *n* (%)** | **Subtype****(n)** | **Outcome variables measured** ***Measure* (informant)** | **Outcome, girls with ADHD vs controls** | **Effect Size** |
| **Abikoff et al. (2002)** | 99 ADHD99 NC | 8.4 8.4(7-10) | Not reported | Not reported | All types | Externalising behaviour- *Classroom Observation Code* (staff observations) | Externalising behaviour- Higher rates of non-compliance- Higher rates of verbal aggression to other children- Higher rates of solicitation of teacherConfounding effects*Comorbidity*- ODD/CD modified the ADHD effect on  externalising behaviour- Anxiety did not modify the ADHD effect on any  observed behaviour | - |
| **Blachman & Hinshaw (2002)** | 140 ADHD-C & ADHD-I88 NC | 9.59.89.4(6-12) | Verbal IQADHD-C: 99.8ADHD-I: 101.1NC: 112.7 | Not reported | ADHD-CADHD-I | Peer interaction- *Sociometric nominations* (peer ratings) Friendship- *FQM* (self-ratings) | Peer interaction- More disliked and less liked by peersFriendship- Lower rates of friendship participation- Lower levels of friendship stability during first part  of camp (only significant for ADHD-C girls)- Lower levels of friendship stability during second  part of camp (only significant for ADHD-I girls)- Lower levels of friendship participation by the end  of camp was associated with increased peer dislikeConfounding effects*ADHD subtype*- Girls with ADHD with more friendships had higher  peer regard, but this was more pronounced in  ADHD-C than in ADHD-I.- ADHD-I girls had increased levels of relational  aggression within friendships- ADHD-C girls had increased levels of all negative  relationship features within friendships | ADHD-C vs NC: *d*=0.46ADHD-I vs NC: *d*= 0.44ADHD-C vs NC: *d*= 0.57ADHD-I vs NC: *d*= 0.35ADHD-C vs NC: *d*= 0.34ADHD-I vs NC: *d*= 0.68 |
| **Cardoos & Hinshaw (2011)** | 140 ADHD-C & ADHD-I88 NC | 9.59.89.4(6-12) | Not reported | 27 (19.3%) | ADHD-CADHD-I | Externalising behaviour- *CBCL* (parent ratings)- *TRF* (teacher ratings)Social skills and functioning- *CBCL* (parent ratings)Friendships- *Sociometric nominations* (peer ratings)Peer victimisation- *Sociometric nominations* (peer ratings) | Externalising behaviour- Increased levels of externalising behaviourSocial skills and functioning- Decreased levels of social competenceFriendships- Low number of friendships- The number of friendship moderated the impact of  ADHD in terms of internalising behaviour,  externalising behaviour, and social competence.Peer victimisation- Increased levels of victimization- Girls with NC friends were no more or less  protected from victimisation than those with all  ADHD friends  | *d*= 2.67*d*= 1.37*d*= 0.31*d*= 1.29 |
| **Elkins et al. (2011)** | 109 ADHD406 NC | 11.911.9(11) | Full Scale IQADHD-I 96.1ADHD-HI 101.4ADHD-C 98.8NC 102.3 | 33 (30.3%) | ADHD-CADHD-IADHD-H | Peer victimisation- *Single item question* (self-ratings)Peer functioning*-* *Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale-Popularity* *Scale*\* (self-ratings)- *Popularity rating* (teacher ratings)- *Rating on positive peers and deviant peers* (teacher ratings) | Peer victimisation- Increased levels of victimisationPeer functioning- Lower self-rated popularity- Lower teacher-rated popularity- Fewer positive peers- More negative peersConfounding effects*ADHD subtype*- The increased levels of victimisation was most  pronounced in girls with ADHD-I.  | ADHD-C vs NC: OR=4.80ADHD-I vs NC: OR=5.20ADHD-H vs NC: OR=2.54ADHD-C vs NC: *d*=-0.25ADHD-I vs NC: *d*=-0.69ADHD-H vs NC: *d*=-0.38ADHD-C vs NC: *d*=-0.10ADHD-I vs NC: *d*=-0.98ADHD-H vs NC: *d*=-0.37ADHD-C vs NC: *d*=-0.13ADHD-I vs NC: *d*=-0.89ADHD-H vs NC: *d*=-0.13ADHD-C vs NC: *d*=0.56ADHD-I vs NC: *d*=0.18ADHD-H vs NC: *d*=0.35 |
| **Greene et al.** **(2001)** | 127 ADHD114 NC | 11.212.2(6-18) | Not reported | Not reported | All types | Social skills and functioning- *SAICA* (parent ratings)- *CBCL* (parent ratings) | Social skills and functioning- Increased levels of social impairment- Decreased levels of social competence- Greater impairment on ‘activity with peers’ and  ‘problems with peers’- Lower levels of general functioning- Increased levels of social disability (15% ADHD,  1% NC)Confounding effects*Comorbidity*- ODD was associated with dysfunction at school,  spare-time problems, spare-time activities, problems  with peers, impaired activities with peers, problems with siblings, impaired activities with siblings and  problems with parents.- CD was associated with social dysfunction at  school, spare-time problems, and problems with  peers.- Anxiety Disorder was associated with spare-time  problems and problems with peers, and with  impairment on spare-time activities and activities  with peers | - |
| **Grskovic & Zentall (2010)** | 20 ADHD63 NC19 LD | 12.810.712.4(range not reported) | Standard IQADHD: 105.6LD: 113.1NC: 95  | Not reported | All types | Social skills and functioning- *ACTeRS* (teacher, parent and self-ratings)- *ACTeRS* Supplementary Descriptive  Assessment (parent and self-ratings) | Social skills and functioning- More social skills deficits.- Girls’ self-ratings of social skill problems were  associated with lower levels of self-esteemConfounding effects*Comorbidity*- LD was associated with more social problems, less  pro-social behaviour and lower self-concept. |  |
| **Lee & Hinshaw (2006)** | 140 ADHD-C& ADHD-I88 NC | 9.59.89.4(6-12) | Verbal IQADHD-HI: 99.8ADHD-I: 101.1NC: 113.1 | 23 (16.4%) | ADHD-CADHD-I | **Baseline measures**Externalising behaviour- *Observation* (staff observations)- *Laboratory measure* (self-ratings)Peer interaction- *Sociometric nominations* (peer ratings)**Follow-up measures**Social skills and functioning- *DSPS* (teacher ratings) | Peer interaction- Lower social preference- Lower peer status- Higher levels of externalising behaviour- Negative peer status predicted school suspensions  and expulsions- Initial peer status predicted negative social  preferenceConfounding effects*ADHD subtype*- ADHD-HI symptoms predicted adolescent conduct  problems, substance use and internalising  problems.- ADHD-I symptoms predicted academic  achievement, school suspensions and expulsions |  |
| **Ohan & Johnston (2007)** | 22 ADHD + ODD18 ADHD only40 NC | 10.810.610.9(9-12) | Not reported | 22 (55%) | ADHD-HIADHD-I | Externalising behaviour- *Parallel version of SCBS-T* (parent ratings)- *CSBS-T* (teacher ratings)- *Laboratory paradigm* (self-ratings)Social skills and functioning- *Parallel version of SCBS-T* (parent ratings)- *CSBS-T* (teacher ratings)- *Laboratory paradigm* (self-ratings) | Externalising behaviour- Increased levels of overt aggression- Increased levels of relational aggression, but less  rumour spreadingSocial skills and functioning- Lower levels of pro-social behaviour- Higher levels of awkward interactions- Although NC girls were less likely to send  relationally aggressive messages than the other  groups, their relationally aggressive messages were  more intense.Confounding effects*ADHD subtype*- ADHD-HI symptoms predicted overt and relational aggression- ADHD-I symptoms predicted relational aggression*Comorbidity*- ODD symptoms predicted overt and relational  aggression and less pro-social behaviour. | *d*= 0.77 (Mother-report)*d*= 2.03 (Lab: mesg. freq.)*d*= 0.87 (Lab: mesg. Int.)*d*= 0.82 (Mother-report)*d*= 1.19 (Teacher-report)*d*= 0.49 (Lab: mesg. freq.)*d*= -0.93 (Lab: mesg. int.)*d*= 0.41 (Lab: social excl.)*d*= -0.76 (Lab: rumour spr.)*d*= -0.68 (Mother-report)*d*= -0.22 (Teacher-report)*d*= -5.34 (Lab: mesg. freq.)*d*= -0.33 (Lab: mesg. int.)*d*= 5.44 (Lab: mesg. freq.)*d*= 0.70 (Lab: mesg. int.) |
| **Mikami & Hinshaw (2003)** | 91 ADHD58 NC | 9.59.1(6-12) | Verbal ComprehensionADHD-C: 100.6 ADHD-I: 102.8 NC: 113.7 Processing SpeedADHD-C: 100.2 ADHD-I: 99.4 NC: 108.1 | Not reported | ADHD-CADHD-I | Peer interaction- *Sociometric nominations* (peer ratings)Externalising behaviour*- CBCL Aggressive behaviour and*  *Delinquent Behaviour narrow-* *band Scale* (parent ratings)- *TRF* (teacher ratings)- *Observation* (staff observations and  observer observations) | Peer interaction- Higher levels of peer rejection- Peer rejection related to higher levels of problem  behaviour.- Peer rejection related to lower levels of protective  variablesExternalising behaviour- Higher levels of aggressive behaviour- Popularity with adults predicted lower levels of  aggressionConfounding effects*ADHD subtype*- Girls with ADHD-I were less peer-rejected and  displayed lower rates of aggressive behaviour  |  |
| **Mikami & Hinshaw (2006)** | Baseline:140 ADHD-C& ADHD-I88 NCFollow-up:127 ADHD82 C | Baseline:9.59.89.4(6-12)Follow-up:M not reported(11-18) |  |  | ADHD-CADHD-I | **Baseline measures**Peer interaction*- Sociometric nominations* (peer ratings)- Parent-reports - *DSPS* (teacher ratings)Externalising behaviour- *CBCL* Aggressive behaviour and  Delinquent Behaviour narrow-band Scale.  (parent ratings)- *TRF* (teacher ratings)- *Observation* (staff ratings and observer  ratings)**Follow-up measures**Externalising behaviour- *CBCL* (parent ratings)- *TRF* (teacher ratings)- *Self-Reported Delinquency Scale*\*\*\*\*  (self-ratings) | **Baseline**Peer interaction- Increased levels of peer rejection- Peer rejection associated with problem behaviourExternalising behaviour- Increased levels of externalising symptoms**Adolescent outcomes**Peer rejection- Increased levels of peer rejection- Peer rejection associated with problem behaviour- Peer rejection related to lower self-perceived  scholastic competence, lower engagement in goal- directed play when alone, and lower popularity with adults- Childhood peer rejection and ADHD diagnosis were associated with greater levels of internalising and  externalising behaviours, greater eating pathology, and lower levels of academic achievement.- Peer rejection and ADHD diagnosis predicted declining academic achievement into adolescence.Externalising behaviour- Higher levels of externalising symptoms |  |
| **Mikami & Lorenzi (2011)** | ADHD 21NC 20 | 8.198.10(6-10) | Verbal IQADHD 101.67NC 114.60 | 13 (28.6%) | ADHD-CADHD-I | Externalising behaviour- *TRF-Rule Breaking Behaviour subscale*  (teacher rating)- *Observation during free play sessions*;  Likert scale (staff observations)- *QPQ-Conflict Subscale* (parent ratings)Social skill and functioning- *DSAS* (teacher ratings)Peer interaction- *Sociometric nominations* (peer ratings) | Externalising behaviour- Higher levels of parent-reported playdate conflict.Peer interaction- Higher levels of teacher-reported peer rejection- Lower levels of teacher-reported peer acceptance- Fewer positive sociometric nominations receivedConfounding effects*Comorbidity*- Strong positive relationship between conduct  problems and teacher-reported peer rejection in girls  with ADHD.- Strong negative relationship between conduct  problems and positive peer nominations. | *d*= 1.19*d*= 1.09*d*= -1.90*d*= 0.10 |
| **Sciberras, Ohan & Anderson (2012)** | ADHD 22NC 20 | 15.1115.11(12-18) | Verbal IQADHD 91.3 NC 91.3  | 16 (72.3%) | ADHD-CADHD-I | Peer victimization*- SEQ* (self- and parent ratings)Externalising behaviour- *CSBS* (self- and parent ratings)Social skills and functioning- *Youth Self-report (YSR) version of CBCL*  (self-ratings) | Peer victimisation- Higher levels of overt victimisation- Higher levels of relational victimisation (parent- report only)Social skills and functioning- Higher levels of social problems- More clinically significant social problems | *d*= 0.74 (parent-report)*d*= 1.07 (self-report)*d*= 1.06*d*= 1.53 (parent-report)*d*= 1.19 (self-report) |
| **Thurber, Heller & Hinshaw (2002)** | ADHD 49C 30 | 9.79.3 (6-12) | Not reported | Not reported | ADHD-CADHD-I | Social skills and functioning- *Social goals interviews* (interview)Peer interaction- *Sociometric nominations* (peer ratings)Externalising behaviour- *Observation* (staff observations) | Social skills and functioning- Less negotiating actionsPeer interaction- More positive nominations- Less negative nominations- Anticipated more negative peer responses- Anticipated less positive peer responses- Aggressive behaviours were associated with  negative peer  Responses in girls with ADHD- Instrumental behaviours were associated with  positive and negative peer  Responses in girls with ADHDExternalising behaviour- More observed physical aggression- More self-reported aggressive actions to attain goals- Higher levels of ODD symptomatology |  |

Note: \* Hur, McGuer & Iacona (1998) \*\*Swanson (1992) \*\*\*Harter (1985) \*\*\*\*Elliott, Huizinga, & Ageton (1985) \*\*\*\*\*Molina (1995).

**ADHD-C**:Combined-type ADHD, **ADHD-HI**: Hyperactive/Impulsive-type ADHD, **ADHD-I**: Inattentive-type ADHD. **ADHDVRS**: ADHD V Rating Scale (DuPaul, 1996), **CBCL**: Child Behaviour Checklist (Achenbach, 1991), **CSBS-T**: Children’s Social Behaviour Scale-Teacher form (Crick, 1996), **CDI**: Children’s Depression Inventory (Kovacs, 1992), **COC**: Classroom Observation Code (Abikoff & Gittelman, 1985), **EDI-2**: Eating Disorders Inventory 2nd Edition (Garner, 1991), **DSPS**: Dishion Social Preference Scale (Dishion, 1990); **EAT**: Eating Attitudes Test (Garner, Olmstead, Bohr, & Garfinkel,1982), **FQM**: Friendship Qualities Measure (Grotpeter &Crick, 1996**)**, **GAF: DSM-II-R**: Global Assessment of Functioning**, K-SADS-E**: Schedule of Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for Children. Epidemiologic Version (Orvaschel & Puig-Antich, 1987), **NC**: Normal Controls, **ODD**: Oppositional Defiant Disorder; **ODDRS**: Oppositional Defiant Disorder Rating Scale (Hommerson et al., 2006), **QPQ**: Quality of Play Questionnaire (Frankel & Mintz), **SAICA**: Social Adjustment Inventory for Children and Adolescents (John et al., 1987), **SEQ**: Social Experience Questionnaire (Cullerton-Sen & Crick, 2005), **SUQ**: Substance Use Questionnaire (SUQ; Molina & Pelham, 2003), **TRF Scales**: Teacher-report Form (Achenbach, 1991), **WIAT**: Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (Wechsler, 1992), **WRAT-III**: Wide Range Achievement Test (Wilkinson, 1993).