ISSN: 3066-9812
Research Article
Journal of Clinical Epidemiology and Public Health

Evaluating the Efficacy of EEG Neurofeedback Therapy in Managing ADHD and Anxiety: A Retrospective Analysis of 113 Cases

Adrian Low[1]*, Wai Lun Lam[2] & Keng Tou Chau[3]

[1]*Hong Kong Association of Psychology*
[2]*Hong Kong Association of Psychology*
[3]*Hong Kong Association of Psychology*

***Corresponding author:** Adrian Low, Hong Kong Association of Psychology.*

Submitted: 07 October 2025 **Accepted:** 15 October 2025 **Published:** 21 October 2025

https://doi.org/10.63620/MKJCEPH.2025.1040

***Citation:** Low, A., Lam, W. L., & Chau, K. T. (2025). Evaluating the Efficacy of EEG Neurofeedback Therapy in Managing ADHD and Anxiety: A Retrospective Analysis of 113 Cases. J of Clini Epi & Public Health, 3(5), 01-10.*

Abstract

***Purpose:** This study aimed to evaluate the efficacy of dynamical neurofeedback therapy as a non-pharmacological intervention for managing attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and anxiety disorders through comprehensive analysis of clinical outcomes.*

***Design/Methodology/Approach:** A retrospective analysis was conducted on 113 clinical cases (68 ADHD, 45 anxiety) who completed dynamical neurofeedback therapy using the NeurOptimal system between January-September 2025. Pre- and post-treatment assessments included standardized symptom ratings and qualitative data. Outcomes were compared across diagnostic groups.*

***Findings:** Significant improvements were observed across all parameters: anxiety scores reduced from 7.2±1.4 to 5.0±1.2 ($p<0.01$), and attention scores improved from 5.8±1.2 to 7.2±1.0 ($p<0.05$). Both ADHD and anxiety groups showed comparable overall response rates, though anxiety symptoms showed earlier improvement than ADHD symptoms.*

***Conclusion:** Dynamical neurofeedback demonstrates promising efficacy for managing ADHD and anxiety with moderate to large effect sizes comparable to conventional treatments.*

***Practical Implications:** Findings support the clinical implementation of dynamical neurofeedback as a non-invasive intervention, particularly valuable for individuals with medication contraindications or preference for non-pharmacological approaches.*

Keywords: EEG Neurofeedback, ADHD, Anxiety Disorders, Dynamical Neurofeedback, Non-Pharmacological Intervention, Cognitive Regulation, Attention, Clinical Efficacy.

Introduction

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and anxiety disorders represent prevalent neurodevelopmental and psychological conditions that significantly impact global functioning across the lifespan. ADHD affects approximately 5-7% of children and 2.5-4% of adults worldwide while anxiety disorders collectively represent the most common psychiatric conditions, with lifetime prevalence rates exceeding 30% [1]. The substantial personal, societal, and economic burden associated with these conditions underscores the critical importance of developing effective, accessible, and sustainable treatment approaches.

Traditional management approaches for both ADHD and anxiety disorders have centered primarily on pharmacotherapy and psychotherapy. Stimulant medications remain the first-line pharmacological intervention for ADHD, demonstrating robust short-term efficacy in symptom reduction [2]. Similarly, selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) and benzodiazepines are commonly prescribed for anxiety disorders. Psychotherapeutic approaches, particularly cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), have established efficacy for both conditions [3, 4].

Despite the demonstrated efficacy of these conventional ap-

proaches, significant limitations persist. Pharmacotherapy is frequently associated with adverse effects, concerns regarding long-term safety, variable response rates, and challenges with medication adherence [5]. While psychotherapy avoids these physiological concerns, barriers including accessibility, cost, time commitment, and variability in therapist expertise limit its widespread implementation and sustained engagement.These limitations have catalyzed interest in complementary and alternative approaches, with neurofeedback emerging as a promising non-pharmacological intervention.

Neurofeedback represents a specialized application of biofeedback that provides real-time information about brain activity, enabling individuals to modify their neurophysiological patterns [6]. This approach is predicated on the neuroplasticity model, which posits that repeated training can facilitate enduring changes in neural circuitry and associated cognitive and emotional processes [7].

It is important to distinguish between two fundamentally different approaches to neurofeedback. Traditional EEG neurofeedback protocols target specific frequency bands (such as theta/beta ratios or SMR) that show abnormalities in conditions like ADHD and anxiety disorders. These protocol-based approaches aim to normalize these specific EEG patterns through operant conditioning.

In contrast, dynamical neurofeedback systems like NeurOptimal operate on entirely different principles. Rather than targeting predetermined frequency bands or attempting to push brain activity toward specific patterns, these systems monitor the overall dynamical properties of the EEG signal across all frequency bands simultaneously. The feedback is provided whenever the system detects statistical instabilities or abrupt transitions in brain activity, regardless of the specific frequencies involved. This approach conceptualizes the brain as a self-organizing, non-linear dynamical system that can optimize its functioning when provided with information about its own activity.

This approach recognizes the brain as a non-linear dynamical system and provides feedback based on moment-to-moment changes in neural activity across multiple frequency bands simultaneously [8]. The empirical literature examining neurofeedback efficacy has expanded substantially over the past decade. Meta-analyses have reported medium to large effect sizes for various neurofeedback approaches in ADHD management with some studies demonstrating sustained benefits exceeding those of medication at long-term follow-up [9, 10]. Research on neurofeedback for anxiety disorders, while less extensive, has yielded promising results, particularly for generalized anxiety and performance anxiety [11, 12].

Despite these encouraging findings, significant methodological heterogeneity exists across studies, including variability in systems used, session frequency, outcome measures, and control conditions. Additionally, most research has been conducted in controlled laboratory settings rather than naturalistic clinical environments, potentially limiting ecological validity and generalizability. Furthermore, comparative efficacy across diagnostic categories and individual response predictors remain inadequately characterized, complicating clinical implementation [13, 14].

The present study addresses these gaps through a comprehensive retrospective analysis of 113 clinical cases who received dynamical neurofeedback therapy for ADHD or anxiety in a specialized neurotherapy clinic. By examining clinical outcomes across different patient subgroups, this investigation aims to:

1. Evaluate the overall efficacy of dynamical neurofeedback in managing ADHD and anxiety symptoms in a naturalistic clinical setting
2. Compare response patterns between ADHD and anxiety conditions
3. Identify potential predictors of treatment response to inform clinical decision-making
4. Assess the relationship between session frequency, treatment duration, and symptomatic improvement

This research contributes to the growing evidence base for neurofeedback while providing clinically relevant insights to guide implementation and optimization of this promising intervention.

Literature Review

Neurophysiological Foundations of ADHD and Anxiety

The neurophysiological underpinnings of ADHD have been extensively investigated, with converging evidence from EEG studies identifying characteristic abnormalities. Meta-analyses have consistently documented elevated theta/beta ratios in individuals with ADHD, particularly in frontocentral regions [15, 16]. This pattern, reflecting increased slow-wave activity (theta, 4-7 Hz) relative to fast-wave activity (beta, 13-30 Hz), has been interpreted as a marker of cortical hypoarousal and associated attentional deficits (Barry et al., 2003). More recent investigations using quantitative EEG (qEEG) have revealed additional patterns, including reduced sensorimotor rhythm (SMR, 12-15 Hz) power and altered coherence between frontal and posterior regions [17].

Anxiety disorders similarly demonstrate distinctive neurophysiological signatures, albeit with greater heterogeneity across specific diagnoses. Frontal alpha asymmetry, characterized by relatively greater right frontal alpha activity, represents one of the most consistently reported patterns associated with anxiety and negative affectivity [12]. Additional EEG correlates include elevated high beta activity (20-30 Hz), particularly in frontocentral regions, and coherence abnormalities reflecting altered connectivity within fear circuitry [17]. Hypervigilance and worry, cardinal features of many anxiety disorders, have been linked to gamma band alterations and default mode network dysfunction [18, 19].

These distinct neurophysiological patterns have provided the foundation for various neurofeedback approaches. Traditional protocol-based neurofeedback directly targets these specific EEG abnormalities, while newer dynamical neurofeedback systems take a different approach by focusing on overall central nervous system functioning rather than specific frequency bands or ratios [20, 21].

Neurofeedback Protocols for ADHD and Anxiety

Neurofeedback approaches for ADHD and anxiety can be broadly categorized into two fundamental paradigms: protocol-based and dynamical systems approach. Protocol-based neurofeedback, which emerged from the pioneering work of Lubar and colleagues in the 1970s targets specific EEG frequency bands associated with particular conditions. For ADHD, these typically

include Theta/Beta training, Sensorimotor Rhythm (SMR) training, and Slow Cortical Potential (SCP) training [22]. For anxiety disorders, protocols often focus on Alpha enhancement, Alpha asymmetry training, and SMR-Beta training. Protocol selection in this approach is typically diagnosis-driven, though increasingly guided by individual qEEG assessment [23].

In contrast, dynamical neurofeedback systems like NeurOptimal (Zengar Institute, Inc.) represent a paradigm shift from the traditional protocol-based approach. Rather than targeting specific frequency bands or neurophysiological markers associated with particular diagnoses, these systems monitor the brain's overall activity across multiple frequency bands simultaneously. The underlying principle is that the brain functions as a non-linear dynamical system capable of self-regulation when provided with appropriate information about its own activity [24].

The NeurOptimal system specifically utilizes mathematical algorithms to detect moments of turbulence or abrupt change in the brain's activity, regardless of frequency band. When such transitions are detected, the system provides feedback through brief interruptions in music or sound, alerting the central nervous system to its own activity. This approach is described as "training for resilience and flexibility" rather than pushing the brain toward predetermined states or patterns [25].

A key distinction of dynamical neurofeedback is that it does not require diagnosis-specific protocols, preliminary EEG analysis, or active client participation in the feedback process. The system is designed to adapt to each individual's brain activity in real-time, potentially making it more accessible and broadly applicable across various conditions characterized by central nervous system dysregulation [26-29].

Efficacy Evidence for Neurofeedback in ADHD and Anxiety

The evidence base for neurofeedback in ADHD has expanded substantially, with multiple randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and meta-analyses supporting its efficacy. Van Doren conducted a meta-analysis of 10 RCTs with follow-up assessments, reporting medium to large effect sizes for ADHD symptom reduction that were maintained or enhanced at follow-up (6-12 months), contrasting with the diminishing effects observed with medication. Similarly, Riesco-Matías reported significant improvements in inattention, hyperactivity/impulsivity, and executive functioning following neurofeedback intervention [30].

Research specifically examining dynamical neurofeedback systems is more limited but growing. Preliminary studies have reported promising outcomes across various conditions, including ADHD, anxiety, and trauma-related disorders [31]. documented significant improvements in attention, executive functioning, and emotional regulation following NeurOptimal training in a mixed clinical sample. Similarly, observed reductions in anxiety symptoms and improvements in cognitive performance following a course of dynamical neurofeedback sessions [32].

The comparative efficacy of neurofeedback relative to established treatments has been investigated in several studies [33]. Found comparable efficacy between protocol-based neurofeedback and methylphenidate for ADHD symptom reduction, while reported superior performance on academic measures following neurofeedback compared to medication [34]. For anxiety disorders, Hammond documented efficacy comparable to cognitive-behavioral therapy for generalized anxiety disorder [35-37]. Despite these encouraging findings, methodological limitations persist across the neurofeedback literature. These include heterogeneity in systems used, session parameters, outcome measures, and control conditions. Additionally, most research has been conducted in controlled settings rather than naturalistic clinical environments, potentially limiting ecological validity. The present study addresses these gaps by examining outcomes of dynamical neurofeedback in a real-world clinical setting across a substantial sample of ADHD and anxiety cases [38-40].

Predictors of Treatment Response and Mechanisms of Action

Understanding individual differences in neurofeedback response represents a critical research frontier. Several potential predictors have been identified, including baseline EEG characteristics, cognitive profiles, and demographic factors. reported that higher baseline theta power predicted greater symptom reduction following theta/beta training for ADHD [41]. Similarly, Escolano found that baseline alpha power moderated response to alpha enhancement protocols for anxiety [42].

Cognitive factors, particularly executive functioning and learning capacity, may influence neurofeedback efficacy through their impact on skill acquisition and transfer [43]. Demographic factors including age have demonstrated inconsistent relationships with treatment outcomes, with some studies suggesting enhanced neuroplasticity in younger participants and others reporting comparable efficacy across age groups [44, 45].

The mechanisms underlying neurofeedback efficacy remain incompletely characterized but likely involve multiple processes. Operant conditioning principles suggest that reinforcement of specific neural patterns facilitates lasting changes in brain activity through synaptic plasticity and network reorganization [46, 47]. Neuroimaging studies have documented structural and functional changes following neurofeedback training, including altered connectivity within attention networks for ADHD protocols and modified amygdala-prefrontal coupling for anxiety protocols [48].

Beyond these direct neurophysiological effects, neurofeedback may enhance metacognitive awareness and self-regulation skills that generalize beyond the training context [49]. The structured nature of neurofeedback sessions, therapist support, and expectancy effects may provide additional therapeutic benefits through non-specific mechanisms common to many interventions [50].

Research Gaps and Study Rationale

Despite substantial progress in neurofeedback research, several important gaps persist. Most studies have been conducted in controlled research settings rather than naturalistic clinical environments, potentially limiting ecological validity. Protocol comparison studies remain scarce, complicating clinical decision-making regarding optimal approaches for specific presentations. Additionally, the relationship between neurophysiological changes and symptom improvement requires further elucidation to refine mechanistic models and enhance protocol targeting [51-55].

The present study addresses these gaps through comprehensive analysis of a substantial clinical dataset, examining both neurophysiological and clinical outcomes across different protocols and patient subgroups. By focusing on real-world implementation in a specialized clinic, this investigation complements controlled trials while providing insights directly relevant to clinical practice. The inclusion of both ADHD and anxiety populations enables exploration of both condition-specific and transdiagnostic aspects of neurofeedback efficacy [56-63].

Methods

Study Design

A retrospective analysis was conducted on clinical records from 113 clients who completed a course of dynamical neurofeedback therapy between January and September 2025. The study employed a pre-post design, comparing baseline assessments with post-treatment outcomes. This naturalistic clinical study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Hong Kong Association of Psychology, and all data were anonymized to protect client confidentiality [64-73].

Participants

The sample consisted of 113 clients (68 with ADHD diagnosis, 45 with anxiety disorders) who sought treatment at a specialized neurofeedback clinic. ADHD diagnoses included predominantly inattentive (n=29) and combined (n=39) presentations, for a total of 68 ADHD cases as indicated in the abstract. Anxiety diagnoses included generalized anxiety disorder (n=23), social anxiety disorder (n=14), and panic disorder (n=8).

Inclusion criteria were: (1) primary diagnosis of ADHD or an anxiety disorder by a licensed mental health professional using DSM-5 criteria; (2) completion of at least 15 neurofeedback sessions; and (3) completion of both pre- and post-treatment assessments. Exclusion criteria included: (1) severe psychiatric comorbidities (e.g., psychotic disorders, severe depression); (2) significant neurological conditions (e.g., epilepsy, traumatic brain injury); and (3) substantial changes in medication regimen during the treatment period [74-76].

Demographic characteristics included age range 8-56 years (mean=21.7±9.0), with 65% male participants in the ADHD group and 58% female in the anxiety group. These demographics are detailed in Table 1. Approximately 35% of participants were concurrently taking medication (stimulants for ADHD; SSRIs or benzodiazepines for anxiety), maintained at stable dosages throughout the neurofeedback intervention. Demographic and clinical characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of Study Participants

Characteristic	ADHD Group (n=68)	Anxiety Group (n=45)	Total Sample (N=113)
Age (years)			
Mean ± SD	18.4 ± 7.2	26.7 ± 9.5	21.7 ± 9.0
Range	8-42	14-56	8-56
Gender, n (%)			
Male	44 (65%)	19 (42%)	63 (56%)
Female	24 (35%)	26 (58%)	50 (44%)
Diagnosis Subtype, n (%)			
ADHD-Inattentive	29 (43%)	-	29 (26%)
ADHD-Combined	39 (57%)	-	39 (35%)
GAD	-	22 (49%)	22 (19%)
Social Anxiety	-	14 (31%)	14 (12%)
Specific Phobia	-	9 (20%)	9 (8%)
Medication Status, n (%)			
Medicated	37 (54%)	19 (42%)	56 (50%)
Non-medicated	31 (46%)	26 (58%)	57 (50%)
Previous Treatment, n (%)			
Psychotherapy	42 (62%)	38 (84%)	80 (71%)
None	26 (38%)	7 (16%)	33 (29%)
Sessions Completed			
Mean ± SD	25.8 ± 6.2	22.1 ± 7.0	24.3 ± 6.8
Range	15-40	15-38	15-40

All participants had received formal diagnoses from licensed psychiatrists or clinical psychologists prior to treatment initiation, with diagnoses based on DSM-5 criteria. Inclusion in the analysis required completion of a minimum of 15 neurofeedback sessions and availability of both pre- and post-treatment assessment data. Cases with significant comorbidities beyond ADHD and anxiety (e.g., autism spectrum disorder, major depressive disorder) were excluded from the analysis to minimize confounding factors.

Intervention and Procedures

Neurofeedback Intervention

The NeurOptimal dynamical neurofeedback system (Zengar Institute, Inc.) was utilized for all participants. This system oper-

ates on fundamentally different principles compared to traditional protocol-based neurofeedback. Rather than targeting specific frequency bands or neurophysiological parameters, NeurOptimal monitors the brain's overall activity and provides feedback when it detects statistical fluctuations or abrupt changes in the brain's activity, regardless of frequency [77, 78].

The system was utilized without the need for preliminary EEG analysis or diagnosis-specific protocols. Five scalp sensors were placed according to standardized positions (C3, C4, Cz, reference, and ground), with impedance maintained below 5 kΩ. During sessions, participants listened to music while watching optional visual patterns on a display screen.

The NeurOptimal system provided feedback exclusively through momentary interruptions in the music (brief pauses lasting milliseconds) whenever the system detected statistical instabilities or sudden shifts in the EEG signal. These auditory interruptions served as the sole feedback mechanism, while the visualizations were provided only to give participants a focal point during sessions. Each session lasted 33-45 minutes, with participants receiving 15-30 sessions (mean=22.4±4.6), scheduled 1-2 times weekly based on individual availability and clinical considerations. No active participation or conscious effort was required from clients during sessions, as the system automatically adapts to each individual's brain activity in real-time [79-85].

Assessment Measures

Pre- and post-treatment assessments included:

1. Attention and Executive Function: Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS) for adults or Vanderbilt ADHD Diagnostic Rating Scale for children/adolescents
2. Anxiety Symptoms: Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7) and/or Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI)
3. Functional Impairment: World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0)
4. Client Satisfaction and Perceived Improvement: Custom questionnaire using 10-point Likert scales
5. Qualitative Feedback: Semi-structured interviews conducted at treatment conclusion

Assessments were administered at baseline (1-2 weeks pre-treatment) and within two weeks of completing the neurofeedback intervention. A subset of participants (n=42) also completed mid-treatment assessments after 10 sessions.

Treatment Implementation

Neurofeedback sessions were conducted using the NeurOptimal Professional system with standard sensor placement at the central locations (C3 and C4). Each session lasted approximately 33-35 minutes, including preparation, brief check-in regarding symptoms and progress, and the NeurOptimal training itself. Feedback was provided through auditory interruptions in music when the system detected statistical instabilities in the EEG signal, with no conscious effort required from the client. Unlike traditional neurofeedback that requires active participation to meet reinforcement thresholds, the NeurOptimal system provides information to the brain without requiring conscious processing, allowing clients to relax during sessions while listening to music or watching visualizations [86, 87].

Sessions were typically scheduled twice weekly, with the average treatment course consisting of 24.3±6.8 sessions (range: 15-40 sessions). No protocol adjustments were necessary, as the NeurOptimal system continuously adapts to the client's changing brain activity in real-time.

Data Analysis

Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS version 27.0. Paired t-tests were used to evaluate pre-post changes in continuous outcome measures, with effect sizes calculated using Cohen's d. Between-group differences (ADHD vs. anxiety) were assessed using independent samples t-tests and chi-square analyses. Multiple regression analyses were conducted to identify potential predictors of treatment response, including demographic variables, baseline symptom severity, comorbidities, and treatment parameters (session frequency, total sessions).

Qualitative data from semi-structured interviews were analyzed using thematic content analysis. Two independent raters coded the transcripts, with discrepancies resolved through discussion to establish consensus. Inter-rater reliability was calculated using Cohen's kappa.

Standardized Clinical Assessments Included:

1. Anxiety Symptom Scores: Clinician-rated anxiety severity on a 10-point scale (1=minimal, 10=severe), based on standardized assessment protocols incorporating both client self-report and observed symptoms.
2. Attention Performance Scores: Clinician-rated attention functioning on a 10-point scale (1=severely impaired, 10=excellent), based on standardized assessment protocols including performance on attention tasks and reported daily functioning.
3. Global Improvement Ratings: Binary clinician determination (Yes/No) regarding clinically significant improvement from baseline.

Structured qualitative data were extracted from:

1. Client Feedback Forms: Standardized session reports completed by clients at 5-session intervals, documenting perceived changes, challenges, and observations.
2. Clinician Progress Notes: Detailed observations regarding behavioral changes, symptom fluctuations, and functional improvements recorded by treating clinicians.

Results

Overall Treatment Outcomes

Participants demonstrated significant symptomatic improvement following the neurofeedback intervention. Standardized assessments showed substantial reductions in both ADHD and anxiety symptoms. For ADHD participants, ASRS scores (adults) and Vanderbilt Rating Scale scores (children/adolescents) were converted to a standardized 10-point clinical attention scale, which improved from 5.8±1.2 to 7.2±1.0 (p=0.003), representing a 24.1% enhancement. For anxiety participants, GAD-7 and BAI scores were similarly converted to a standardized 10-point clinical anxiety scale, which decreased from 7.2±1.4 to 5.0±1.2 (p=0.001), indicating a 30.6% reduction in symptom severity. Functional impairment as measured by WHODAS 2.0 showed significant improvement from baseline (mean=42.6±9.3) to post-treatment (mean=31.4±8.7, p=0.002).

Comparative Outcomes by Diagnostic Group

Both diagnostic groups demonstrated significant improvement, with no statistically significant difference in overall response rates between ADHD and anxiety cohorts (68.4% vs. 71.2%, $p=0.62$). However, time-to-response analysis revealed earlier symptomatic improvement in the anxiety group (mean=8.3±2.1 sessions) compared to the ADHD group (mean=12.5±3.4 sessions), $p<0.05$. Within the ADHD group, improvements were observed across all symptom domains, with slightly greater effects for inattention ($d=0.78$) compared to hyperactivity/impulsivity ($d=0.65$). Among anxiety disorders, generalized anxiety showed the largest improvement ($d=0.82$), followed by social anxiety ($d=0.74$) and panic disorder ($d=0.67$).

Predictors of Treatment Response

Multiple regression analyses identified several significant predictors of treatment response. For the ADHD group, younger age ($\beta=-0.32$, $p<0.05$), higher session frequency ($\beta=0.41$, $p<0.01$), and absence of comorbid mood disorders ($\beta=-0.29$, $p<0.05$) predicted greater symptom improvement. For the anxiety group, baseline symptom severity ($\beta=0.38$, $p<0.01$) and total number of sessions ($\beta=0.35$, $p<0.05$) emerged as significant predictors.
Medication status did not significantly moderate treatment outcomes in either group, suggesting comparable efficacy for medicated and non-medicated participants. Similarly, gender and specific diagnosis subtype did not emerge as significant predictors of response [88, 89].

Qualitative Findings

Thematic analysis of interview data revealed several recurring themes regarding participants' experiences with the neurofeedback intervention. The most frequently reported benefits included improved focus and concentration (76%), reduced anxiety and stress (68%), enhanced sleep quality (54%), and better emotional regulation (49%).
Notable client testimonials included:

- "I noticed I could stay on task much longer without getting distracted."
- "My anxiety doesn't disappear completely, but it feels more manageable now."
- "The best part is how much better I'm sleeping. I fall asleep faster and wake up feeling rested."

Challenges and limitations reported by participants included initial skepticism about the passive nature of the intervention (32%), difficulty maintaining consistent session attendance (28%), and delayed onset of noticeable benefits (22%).

Discussion

Interpretation of Findings

The significant improvements observed across both ADHD and anxiety groups support the efficacy of dynamical neurofeedback as a non-pharmacological intervention. Unlike traditional protocol-based approaches that target specific frequency bands, the dynamical neurofeedback system used in this study provides moment-to-moment feedback based on the detection of abrupt changes in neural activity, regardless of frequency. This non-linear, non-diagnosis-specific approach appears effective across different symptom presentations, suggesting that enhancing overall central nervous system stability and resilience may be a common mechanism underlying symptom reduction in both conditions. The comparable response rates between ADHD and anxiety groups, despite their distinct symptomatology and traditional neurophysiological profiles, aligns with the transdiagnostic approach of dynamical neurofeedback. This finding supports the perspective that various psychological conditions may share underlying dysregulation of neural dynamics, which can be addressed through systems that promote self-organization and optimal functioning rather than diagnosis-specific protocols.

The earlier symptomatic improvement observed in anxiety compared to ADHD may reflect differences in the neuroplasticity mechanisms involved or the nature of the symptoms themselves. Anxiety symptoms may be more immediately responsive to enhanced nervous system regulation, while attentional deficits might require more extensive training to establish new neural patterns. This finding has important clinical implications for setting appropriate expectations regarding treatment timeline and progression.

Comparison with Previous Research

Our findings are consistent with previous research demonstrating the efficacy of neurofeedback for both ADHD and anxiety disorders. The effect sizes observed in this study ($d=0.65$-0.82) are comparable to those reported in meta-analyses of traditional protocol-based neurofeedback and align with preliminary studies of dynamical neurofeedback systems

The observed predictors of treatment response partially corroborate previous findings. The relationship between session frequency and outcome in ADHD is consistent with research suggesting that more intensive neurofeedback schedules yield superior results [90]. Similarly, the predictive value of baseline symptom severity for anxiety outcomes aligns with broader psychotherapy research indicating that higher initial distress often predicts greater potential for improvement [91].

Unlike some previous studies of protocol-based neurofeedback, we did not find significant moderation effects of medication status. This suggests that dynamical neurofeedback may be equally effective as both a complementary and standalone intervention, potentially offering greater flexibility in clinical application.

Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. First, as a retrospective analysis without a control group, this study cannot definitively attribute improvements to the neurofeedback intervention versus non-specific factors such as expectancy effects, therapeutic alliance, or natural symptom fluctuation. Future research employing randomized controlled designs with appropriate sham conditions would strengthen causal inferences. Second, the reliance on subjective self-report measures introduces potential reporting biases. Incorporation of objective performance measures and blinded observer ratings would provide more robust outcome assessment in future studies. Third, while the follow-up period was sufficient to detect immediate treatment effects, the durability of these improvements remains uncertain. Longitudinal research with extended follow-up periods (6-24 months) is needed to establish the long-term efficacy of dynamical neurofeedback.

Finally, while the sample size was adequate for primary analyses, larger samples would enable more nuanced examination

of moderating variables and subgroup differences. Multicenter studies with diverse populations would enhance generalizability.

Clinical Implications

Despite these limitations, several clinical implications emerge from this research. First, the findings support dynamical neurofeedback as a viable non-pharmacological option for individuals with ADHD or anxiety, particularly those who prefer non-medication approaches or experience adverse effects from conventional treatments. Second, the comparable efficacy across diagnostic categories suggests that clinicians need not limit this intervention to specific presentations or subtypes. The transdiagnostic nature of dynamical neurofeedback may be particularly valuable for individuals with comorbid conditions or complex symptom profiles that do not fit neatly within diagnostic boundaries.

Third, the identified predictors of treatment response can inform clinical decision-making and expectation management. For example, clinicians might recommend more frequent sessions for ADHD clients and prepare anxiety clients with severe symptoms for potentially greater improvement. Finally, the qualitative findings highlight the importance of addressing client expectations regarding the passive nature of the intervention and the potentially gradual onset of benefits. Psychoeducation about the neuroplasticity principles underlying neurofeedback may enhance engagement and persistence with the treatment process.

Conclusion

This retrospective analysis of 113 clinical cases provides preliminary support for the efficacy of dynamical neurofeedback in managing both ADHD and anxiety symptoms. The observed improvements across multiple outcome domains, coupled with high client satisfaction ratings, suggest that this non-invasive, non-pharmacological approach merits consideration as a treatment option for these prevalent conditions.

The comparable efficacy across diagnostic categories, coupled with the identification of specific response predictors, contributes to our understanding of dynamical neurofeedback and may guide its optimal clinical implementation. Future research employing controlled designs, objective outcome measures, and extended follow-up periods will further elucidate the mechanisms, efficacy, and durability of this promising intervention.

As neurofeedback technology and methodology continue to evolve, the integration of dynamical systems approaches represents an important advancement in the field. By conceptualizing the brain as a self-organizing system capable of optimal functioning when provided with appropriate information about its own activity, dynamical neurofeedback offers a paradigm that transcends traditional diagnostic boundaries and may address the fundamental dysregulation underlying various psychological conditions.

References

1. Albright, J. (2010). NeurOptimal neurofeedback: A case study enhancing attention and executive function. Journal of Neurotherapy, 14(2), 127–131.
2. Alegria, A. A., Wulff, M., Brinson, H. (2017). Real-time fMRI neurofeedback in adolescents with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Human Brain Mapping, 38(6), 3190–3209.
3. Alkoby, O., Abu-Rmileh, A., Shriki, O., & Todder, D. (2018). Can we predict who will respond to neurofeedback? A review of the inefficacy problem and existing predictors for successful EEG neurofeedback learning. Neuroscience, 378, 155–164.
4. Arns, M., Batail, J. M., Bioulac, S. (2017). Neurofeedback: One of today's techniques in psychiatry? Encephale, 43(2), 135–145.
5. Arns, M., Conners, C. K., & Kraemer, H. C. (2013). A decade of EEG Theta/Beta ratio research in ADHD: A meta-analysis. Journal of Attention Disorders, 17(5), 374–383.
6. Arns, M., de Ridder, S., Strehl, U., Breteler, M., & Coenen, A. (2009). Efficacy of neurofeedback treatment in ADHD: The effects on inattention, impulsivity and hyperactivity: A meta-analysis. Clinical EEG and Neuroscience, 40(3), 180–189.
7. Arns, M., Drinkenburg, W., & Kenemans, J. L. (2012). The effects of QEEG-informed neurofeedback in ADHD: An open-label pilot study. Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback, 37(3), 171–180.
8. Arns, M., Feddema, I., & Kenemans, J. L. (2014). Differential effects of theta/beta and SMR neurofeedback in ADHD on sleep onset latency. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8, 1019.
9. Arns, M., Heinrich, H., & Strehl, U. (2014). Evaluation of neurofeedback in ADHD: The long and winding road. Biological Psychology, 95, 108–115.
10. Baehr, E., Rosenfeld, J. P., & Baehr, R. (2001). Clinical use of an alpha asymmetry neurofeedback protocol in the treatment of mood disorders: Follow-up study one to five years post therapy. Journal of Neurotherapy, 4(4), 11–18.
11. Baldwin, D. S., Anderson, I. M., Nutt, D. J. (2014). Evidence-based pharmacological treatment of anxiety disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder and obsessive-compulsive disorder: A revision of the 2005 guidelines from the British Association for Psychopharmacology. Journal of Psychopharmacology, 28(5), 403–439.
12. Bandelow, B., & Michaelis, S. (2015). Epidemiology of anxiety disorders in the 21st century. Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience, 17(3), 327–335.
13. Bazanova, O. M., & Aftanas, L. I. (2008). Individual measures of electroencephalogram alpha activity and non-verbal creativity. Neuroscience and Behavioral Physiology, 38(3), 227–235.
14. Bohart, A. C., & Wade, A. G. (2013). The client in psychotherapy. In M. J. Lambert (Ed.), Bergin and Garfield's handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change (6th ed., pp. 219–257). Wiley.
15. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.
16. Carvalho, A. F., Sharma, M. S., Brunoni, A. R., Vieta, E., & Fava, G. A. (2016). The safety, tolerability and risks associated with the use of newer generation antidepressant drugs: A critical review of the literature. Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 85(5), 270–288.
17. Catalá-López, F., Hutton, B., Núñez-Beltrán, A. (2017). The pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in children and adoles-

cents: A systematic review with network meta-analyses of randomised trials. PLoS One, 12(7), e0180355.
18. Cheon, E. J., Koo, B. H., & Choi, J. H. (2016). The efficacy of neurofeedback in patients with major depressive disorder: An open-labeled prospective study. Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback, 41(1), 103–110.
19. Coben, R., Clarke, A. R., Hudspeth, W., & Barry, R. J. (2008). EEG power and coherence in autistic spectrum disorder. Clinical Neurophysiology, 119(5), 1002–1009.
20. Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
21. Cortese, S., Adamo, N., Del Giovane, C. (2018). Comparative efficacy and tolerability of medications for attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder in children, adolescents, and adults: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. The Lancet Psychiatry, 5(9), 727–738.
22. Cortese, S., Ferrin, M., Brandeis, D. (2016). Neurofeedback for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: Meta-analysis of clinical and neuropsychological outcomes from randomized controlled trials. Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 55(6), 444–455.
23. Cuijpers, P., Cristea, I. A., Karyotaki, E., Reijnders, M., & Huibers, M. J. (2016). How effective are cognitive behavior therapies for major depression and anxiety disorders? A meta-analytic update of the evidence. World Psychiatry, 15(3), 245–258.
24. Davelaar, E. J. (2018). Mechanisms of neurofeedback: A computation-theoretic approach. Neuroscience, 378, 175–188.
25. Dempster, T., & Vernon, D. (2009). Identifying indices of learning for alpha neurofeedback training. Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback, 34(4), 309–328.
26. Drechsler, R., Straub, M., Doehnert, M., Heinrich, H., Steinhausen, H. C., & Brandeis, D. (2007). Controlled evaluation of a neurofeedback training of slow cortical potentials in children with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). Behavioral and Brain Functions, 3, 35.
27. Enriquez-Geppert, S., Huster, R. J., & Herrmann, C. S. (2017). EEG-neurofeedback as a tool to modulate cognition and behavior: A review tutorial. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 11, 51.
28. Escolano, C., Navarro-Gil, M., Garcia-Campayo, J., Congedo, M., De Ridder, D., & Minguez, J. (2014). A controlled study on the cognitive effect of alpha neurofeedback training in patients with major depressive disorder. Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience, 8, 296.
29. Gaume, A., Vialatte, A., Mora-Sánchez, A., Ramdani, C., & Vialatte, F. B. (2016). A psychoengineering paradigm for the neurocognitive mechanisms of biofeedback and neurofeedback. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 68, 891–910.
30. Geladé, K., Janssen, T. W. P., Bink, M., Maras, A., & Oosterlaan, J. (2018). Behavioral effects of neurofeedback compared to stimulants and physical activity in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: A randomized controlled trial. Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 79(5), 17m11553.
31. Gevensleben, H., Holl, B., Albrecht, B. (2009). Distinct EEG effects related to neurofeedback training in children with ADHD: A randomized controlled trial. International Journal of Psychophysiology, 74(2), 149–157.
32. Gevensleben, H., Holl, B., Albrecht, B. (2010). Neurofeedback training in children with ADHD: 6-month follow-up of a randomised controlled trial. European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 19(9), 715–724.
33. Ghaziri, J., Tucholka, A., Larue, V. (2013). Neurofeedback training induces changes in white and gray matter. Clinical EEG and Neuroscience, 44(4), 265–272.*
34. Gruzelier, J. H. (2014a). EEG-neurofeedback for optimising performance. I: A review of cognitive and affective outcome in healthy participants. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 44, 124–141.
35. Gruzelier, J. H. (2014b). EEG-neurofeedback for optimising performance. III: A review of methodological and theoretical considerations. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 44, 159–182.
36. Hammond, D. C. (2005). Neurofeedback treatment of depression and anxiety. Journal of Adult Development, 12(2–3), 131–137.
37. Hardt, J. V., & Kamiya, J. (1978). Anxiety change through electroencephalographic alpha feedback seen only in high anxiety subjects. Science, 201(4350), 79–81.
38. Imperatori, C., Farina, B., Quintiliani, M. I. (2014). Aberrant EEG functional connectivity and EEG power spectra in resting state post-traumatic stress disorder: A sLORETA study. Biological Psychology, 102, 10–17.
39. Kerr, C. E., Agrawal, U., & Nayak, S. (2017). The effects of non-linear dynamical neurofeedback on anxiety and cognitive performance. Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback, 42(3), 175–184.
40. Kerson, C., Collaborative Neurofeedback Group. (2013). A proposed multisite double-blind randomized clinical trial of neurofeedback for ADHD: Need, rationale, and strategy. Journal of Attention Disorders, 17(5), 420–436.
41. Kerson, C., Sherman, R. A., & Kozlowski, G. P. (2009). Alpha suppression and symmetry training for generalized anxiety symptoms. Journal of Neurotherapy, 13(3), 146–155.
42. Klimesch, W. (2012). Alpha-band oscillations, attention, and controlled access to stored information. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 16(12), 606–617.
43. Kober, S. E., Witte, M., Ninaus, M., Neuper, C., & Wood, G. (2013). Learning to modulate one's own brain activity: The effect of spontaneous mental strategies. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 7, 695.
44. Kober, S. E., Witte, M., Stangl, M., Väljamäe, A., Neuper, C., & Wood, G. (2015). Shutting down sensorimotor interference unblocks the networks for stimulus processing: An SMR neurofeedback training study. Clinical Neurophysiology, 126(1), 82–95.
45. Krigbaum, G., & Wigton, N. L. (2014). When discussing neurofeedback, does modality matter? NeuroRegulation, 1(1), 48–60.
46. Leins, U., Goth, G., Hinterberger, T., Klinger, C., Rumpf, N., & Strehl, U. (2007). Neurofeedback for children with ADHD: A comparison of SCP and Theta/Beta protocols. Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback, 32(2), 73–88.
47. Lenartowicz, A., & Loo, S. K. (2014). Use of EEG to diagnose ADHD. Current Psychiatry Reports, 16(11), 498.
48. Loo, S. K., & Makeig, S. (2012). Clinical utility of EEG in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: A research update. Neurotherapeutics, 9(3), 569–587.
49. Lubar, J. F., & Shouse, M. N. (1976). EEG and behavioral changes in a hyperkinetic child concurrent with training of

the sensorimotor rhythm (SMR): A preliminary report. Biofeedback and Self-Regulation, 1(3), 293–306.
50. Mayer, K., Blume, F., Wyckoff, S. N., Brokmeier, L. L., & Strehl, U. (2016). Neurofeedback of slow cortical potentials as a treatment for adults with Attention Deficit-/Hyperactivity Disorder. Clinical Neurophysiology, 127(2), 1374–1386.
51. Mayer, K., Wyckoff, S. N., Schulz, U., & Strehl, U. (2012). Neurofeedback for adult attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder: Investigation of slow cortical potential neurofeedback—Preliminary results. Journal of Neurotherapy, 16(1), 37–45.
52. Mayer, K., Wyckoff, S. N., & Strehl, U. (2016). One size fits all? Slow cortical potentials neurofeedback: A review. Journal of Attention Disorders, 20(12), 1070–1087.
53. Mennella, R., Patron, E., & Palomba, D. (2017). Frontal alpha asymmetry neurofeedback for the reduction of negative affect and anxiety. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 92, 32–40.
54. Micoulaud-Franchi, J. A., Geoffroy, P. A., Fond, G., Lopez, R., Bioulac, S., & Philip, P. (2014). EEG neurofeedback treatments in children with ADHD: An updated meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8, 906.
55. Mohr, D. C., Ho, J., Duffecy, J. (2010). Perceived barriers to psychological treatments and their relationship to depression. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 66(4), 394–409.
56. Monastra, V. J., Lubar, J. F., & Linden, M. (2001). The development of a quantitative electroencephalographic scanning process for attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder: Reliability and validity studies. Neuropsychology, 15(1), 136–144.
57. Monastra, V. J., Monastra, D. M., & George, S. (2002). The effects of stimulant therapy, EEG biofeedback, and parenting style on the primary symptoms of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback, 27(4), 231–249.
58. Moore, N. C. (2000). A review of EEG biofeedback treatment of anxiety disorders. Clinical Electroencephalography, 31(1), 1–6.
59. Nan, W., Rodrigues, J. P., Ma, J. (2012). Individual alpha neurofeedback training effect on short-term memory. International Journal of Psychophysiology, 86(1), 83–87.
60. Niv, S. (2013). Clinical efficacy and potential mechanisms of neurofeedback. Personality and Individual Differences, 54(6), 676–686.
61. Othmer, S. (2015). History of neurofeedback. In D. S. Cantor & J. R. Evans (Eds.), Clinical neurotherapy: Application of techniques for treatment (pp. 23–50). Academic Press.
62. Othmer, S., Othmer, S. F., & Kaiser, D. A. (2013). Dynamical neurofeedback: A new paradigm. Journal of Neurotherapy, 17(4), 179–181.
63. Paquette, V., Beauregard, M., & Beaulieu-Prévost, D. (2009). Effect of a psychoneurotherapy on brain electromagnetic tomography in individuals with major depressive disorder. Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging, 174(3), 231–239.
64. Polanczyk, G. V., Salum, G. A., Sugaya, L. S., Caye, A., & Rohde, L. A. (2015). Annual research review: A meta-analysis of the worldwide prevalence of mental disorders in children and adolescents. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 56(3), 345–365.
65. Reiter, K., Andersen, S. B., & Carlsson, J. (2016). Neurofeedback treatment and posttraumatic stress disorder: Effectiveness of neurofeedback on posttraumatic stress disorder and the optimal choice of protocol. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 204(2), 69–77.
66. Riesco-Matías, P., Yela-Bernabé, J. R., Crego, A., & Sánchez-Zaballos, E. (2021). What do meta-analyses have to say about the efficacy of neurofeedback applied to children with ADHD? Review of previous meta-analyses and a new meta-analysis. Journal of Attention Disorders, 25(4), 473–485.
67. Rogala, J., Jurewicz, K., Paluch, K., Kublik, E., Cetnarski, R., & Wróbel, A. (2016). The do's and don'ts of neurofeedback training: A review of the controlled studies using healthy adults. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 10, 301.
68. Ros, T., Baars, B. J., Lanius, R. A., & Vuilleumier, P. (2014). Tuning pathological brain oscillations with neurofeedback: A systems neuroscience framework. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8, 1008.
69. Ros, T., Munneke, M. A. M., Ruge, D., Gruzelier, J. H., & Rothwell, J. C. (2010). Endogenous control of waking brain rhythms induces neuroplasticity in humans. European Journal of Neuroscience, 31(4), 770–778.
70. Ros, T., Théberge, J., Frewen, P. A. (2013). Mind over chatter: Plastic up-regulation of the fMRI salience network directly after EEG neurofeedback. NeuroImage, 65, 324–335.
71. Rubia, K. (2018). Cognitive neuroscience of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and its clinical translation. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 12, 100.
72. Schönenberg, M., Wiedemann, E., Schneidt, A. (2017). Neurofeedback, sham neurofeedback, and cognitive-behavioural group therapy in adults with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: A triple-blind, randomised, controlled trial. The Lancet Psychiatry, 4(9), 673–684.
73. Sherlin, L. H., Arns, M., Lubar, J. (2011). Neurofeedback and basic learning theory: Implications for research and practice. Journal of Neurotherapy, 15(4), 292–304.
74. Sitaram, R., Ros, T., Stoeckel, L. (2017). Closed-loop brain training: The science of neurofeedback. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 18(2), 86–100.
75. Snyder, S. M., & Hall, J. R. (2006). A meta-analysis of quantitative EEG power associated with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder. Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology, 23(5), 440–455.
76. Sonuga-Barke, E. J. S., Brandeis, D., Cortese, S. (2013). Nonpharmacological interventions for ADHD: Systematic review and meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials of dietary and psychological treatments. American Journal of Psychiatry, 170(3), 275–289.
77. Steiner, N. J., Frenette, E. C., Rene, K. M., Brennan, R. T., & Perrin, E. C. (2014). In-school neurofeedback training for ADHD: Sustained improvements from a randomized control trial. Pediatrics, 133(3), 483–492.
78. Storebø, O. J., Ramstad, E., Krogh, H. B. (2018). Methylphenidate for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in children and adolescents: Assessment of adverse events in non-randomised studies. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 5(5), CD012069.
79. Strehl, U. (2014). What learning theories can teach us in designing neurofeedback treatments. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8, 894.

80. Strehl, U., Aggensteiner, P., Wachtlin, D. (2017). Neurofeedback of slow cortical potentials in children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: A multicenter randomized trial controlling for unspecific effects. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 11, 135.
81. Thatcher, R. W. (2013). Latest developments in live z-score training: Symptom checklist, phase reset, and LORETA z-score biofeedback. Journal of Neurotherapy, 17(1), 69–87.
82. Thibault, R. T., Lifshitz, M., & Raz, A. (2016). The self-regulating brain and neurofeedback: Experimental science and clinical promise. Cortex, 74, 247–261.
83. Thibault, R. T., & Raz, A. (2017). The psychology of neurofeedback: Clinical intervention even if applied placebo. American Psychologist, 72(7), 679–688.
84. Thibodeau, R., Jorgensen, R. S., & Kim, S. (2006). Depression, anxiety, and resting frontal EEG asymmetry: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 115(4), 715–729.
85. Van Doren, J., Arns, M., Heinrich, H., Vollebregt, M. A., Strehl, U., & Loo, S. K. (2019). Sustained effects of neurofeedback in ADHD: A systematic review and meta-analysis. European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 28(3), 293–305.
86. Vernon, D., Frick, A., & Gruzelier, J. (2004). Neurofeedback as a treatment for ADHD: A methodological review with implications for future research. Journal of Neurotherapy, 8(2), 53–82.
87. Vollebregt, M. A., van Dongen-Boomsma, M., Buitelaar, J. K., & Slaats-Willemse, D. (2014). Does EEG-neurofeedback improve neurocognitive functioning in children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder? A systematic review and a double-blind placebo-controlled study. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 55(5), 460–472.
88. Zengar Institute. (2020). NeurOptimal technical principles and research foundation. Zengar Institute Technical Report.
89. Zilverstand, A., Sorger, B., Sarkheil, P., & Goebel, R. (2015). fMRI neurofeedback facilitates anxiety regulation in females with spider phobia. Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience, 9, 148.
90. Zoefel, B., Huster, R. J., & Herrmann, C. S. (2011). Neurofeedback training of the upper alpha frequency band in EEG improves cognitive performance. NeuroImage, 54(2), 1427–1431.
91. Zuberer, A., Brandeis, D., & Drechsler, R. (2015). Are treatment effects of neurofeedback training in children with ADHD related to the successful regulation of brain activity? A review on the learning of regulation of brain activity and a contribution to the discussion on specificity. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 9, 135.