

# Inclusive User Research for ADHD in HCI: A Literature Review

Sara Wollberg  
Royal Institute of Technology (KTH)  
Stockholm, Sweden  
sarawol@kth.se

## Abstract

Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a common neurodivergent condition that affects focus, impulse control, and cognitive processing. Despite neurodivergent individuals representing a significant portion of the population, their needs are often overlooked in human-computer interaction (HCI) and user research practices. This paper conducts a literature review to identify best practices for making user research more inclusive for individuals with ADHD. Key strategies include providing clear instructions, breaking down complex tasks, creating sensory-friendly environments, offering flexible scheduling, and promoting participant autonomy. These practices aim to enhance the inclusivity and reliability of user research by addressing the unique challenges faced by neurodivergent participants. By adopting these strategies, researchers can ensure that neurodivergent voices are meaningfully represented, leading to deeper insights and more impactful outcomes. Importantly, the adoption of these practices not only supports neurodivergent participants but also enhances the overall accessibility and usability of research processes for all users. This paper underscores the importance of inclusive methodologies in HCI, paving the way for designs that meet the needs of diverse users and improve accessibility for all.

## Keywords

ADHD, neurodivergent research, user-centered design, accessibility, inclusive research

## ACM Reference Format:

Sara Wollberg. 2025. Inclusive User Research for ADHD in HCI: A Literature Review. In *Proceedings of HCI Research '25, January 15, 2025, Stockholm, Sweden*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction

Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a neurodevelopmental disorder characterized by persistent inattention, hyperactivity, and impulsivity [1]. Neurodivergencies refer to variations in brain function and structure that affect how individuals think, learn, and interact with the world. ADHD is one of the most common neurodevelopmental disorders, affecting approximately 2.58–6.76%

of adults globally, depending on diagnostic criteria [2]. Other conditions of neurodivergence are Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), dyslexia and Tourette's. Such neurological differences are not a sickness that can or should be treated as such, but a natural variation of how the brain is wired, based on natural differences in genes [3]. They should be recognized and respected as a form of human diversity.

It is common for individuals with neurodivergent conditions to have multiple diagnoses within the neurodivergent spectrum. For example, 50–70% of individuals with ASD also have ADHD [4], while 20–50% of individuals with ADHD are also diagnosed with ASD [5]. Additionally, different neurodivergent conditions often share similar behavioral traits and support needs. Due to these significant commonalities and the high likelihood of multiple diagnoses, research frequently focuses on broader neurodivergence rather than specific conditions like ADHD. As a result, studies on neurodivergence in general are considered relevant and applicable to ADHD in this review.

Despite its prevalence, individuals with ADHD are largely overlooked in user research, even though they have a critical need for appropriate accommodations. This oversight not only marginalizes a significant user group but also compromises the development of technologies that effectively serve the diverse needs of all users. User research often includes lengthy 90-minute usability tests or extended interviews that require participants to stay focused for long periods while responding to ambiguous open-ended questions or prompts [6]. For individuals with ADHD, these sessions can be particularly challenging due to difficulties in maintaining attention and the cognitive demands of processing unclear instructions [7].

It is crucial to provide individuals with ADHD the opportunity to evaluate designs in a setting that respects their needs. Inclusive user research not only ensures that these voices are heard but it also allows researchers to gather valuable insights as patterns within user groups and design more effective solutions. Failing to include this important user group risks overlooking critical usability issues and missing opportunities to design more inclusive systems. This paper seeks to explore the following: *What are the most effective and inclusive methods for conducting user research with ADHD participants?*

To address this research question, this paper presents a systematic literature review that identifies inclusive user research methods for ADHD participants and synthesizes best practices to improve the research process for neurodivergent individuals.

## 2 Background

ADHD is characterized by inattention, hyperactivity, and impulsivity and results from deficits in the brain's ability to regulate motivation and reinforcement processes [1]. This affects, most prevalently, the ability to stay focused, control impulses, and manage tasks over

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or

Unpublished working draft. Not for distribution. distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

HCI Research '25, Stockholm, Sweden

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/25/06

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

2025-01-17 10:48. Page 1 of 1–6.

time. Supporting these traits is essential for enabling meaningful participation and ensuring reliable results in user research. When they are not adequately supported, participants may struggle to complete tasks, provide incomplete feedback, or disengage entirely, leading to skewed or inconclusive findings.

The role of inclusivity in user research is fundamental, as principles such as User-Centered Design (UCD) and accessibility standards, like the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG), prioritize designing with and for diverse users [6]. UCD emphasizes designing with and for users by involving them throughout the development process to ensure their needs, preferences, and challenges are addressed. A user’s needs, their comfort, and whether the research format suits them are absolutely crucial to this process. UCD relies on continuous user feedback, iterative testing, and adapting solutions to meet diverse needs [8]. Accessibility standards, such as the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG), aim to make digital interfaces perceivable, operable, and understandable for all users, including those with cognitive differences like ADHD [9]. Together, these principles promote the creation of inclusive research environments where participants can engage meaningfully and provide feedback without being hindered by structural or cognitive barriers.

Despite the emphasis on inclusive design, the inclusivity of the research environment for neurodivergent individuals often remains insufficient. While principles like User-Centered Design (UCD) and the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) provide a foundation for accessible design [6, 9], it is crucial to recognize the specific and important needs of neurodivergent individuals, which are just as essential to address as other accessibility design principles. If the research environment fails to accommodate these unique needs of neurodivergent individuals the resulting design cannot truly be inclusive.

Previous research exploring the challenges that individuals with ADHD face can be applied to user research. Neurodivergent individuals may experience heightened cognitive load—mental effort—when processing complex information or navigating poorly structured tasks [10]. In a user research setting, this greater susceptibility to cognitive overload can lead to difficulties in comprehending instructions and completing tasks.

Further research has examined the formulation of research questions [11]. According to this research, ambiguity, particularly common in the early discovery phase, can pose significant challenges for neurodivergent individuals. It highlights that unclear or open-ended questions often lead to confusion, anxiety, and reduced engagement. The research further suggests that neurodivergent individuals benefit from clear, direct communication, as vague or abstract questions can hinder their ability to provide accurate and meaningful responses.

Anxiety and sensory sensitivity are common among neurodivergent individuals and can make certain research environments overwhelming. Factors such as bright lighting, loud noises, or crowded spaces can induce anxiety and discomfort, leading to disengagement or withdrawal from the research process. A study exploring accessibility barriers in extended reality technologies highlighted that sensory overload hinders participation in daily activities for neurodivergent individuals, emphasizing the importance of accommodating sensory preferences, including in research settings [12].

This previous research demonstrates the unique needs of neurodivergent individuals and underscores the importance of addressing these needs in user research. These shared traits, such as challenges with attention, sensory processing, and interpreting ambiguous instructions, are directly tied to the core activities of user research, including interviews, task-based usability testing, and feedback collection. Without awareness of these challenges, user research practices may default to cognitively exhausting interviews, ambiguous questions, and overwhelming sensory tasks, thereby excluding neurodivergent participants from meaningful engagement and potentially leading to incomplete or biased insights that fail to represent a diverse user base.

### 3 Methodology

To conduct this literature review, a systematic search strategy was implemented using Google Scholar and the ACM Digital Library. Keywords used were: “*neurodivergent user research*,” “*inclusive HCI*,” “*ADHD usability studies*,” “*ADHD in user research*,” “*cognitive load and ADHD*,” “*accessibility in neurodivergent design*,” “*inclusive design for ADHD*,” “*participatory design and ADHD*,” and “*neurodivergent accessibility in HCI*.” For research related to the diagnosis of ADHD and neurodivergence in general, additional keywords used were: “*ADHD*,” “*ADHD in adults*,” “*neurodivergencies*,” “*neurodivergent conditions*,” and “*ADHD behavioral challenges*.”

These keywords were chosen to comprehensively cover topics related to neurodivergence in user research and HCI, while also addressing ADHD as a diagnosis, its associated challenges, and insights into how neurodivergent individuals work and interact beyond user research contexts.

The initial search yielded 30 papers, reflecting a targeted search to avoid overly broad results while covering key research areas. After reviewing abstracts and applying inclusion and exclusion criteria, 21 papers were selected for detailed review. From these, 15 resources were ultimately referenced in the final paper. The progression of paper selection and categorization is summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1: Paper Selection Progression**

Stage	No. of Papers
Initial Search	30
Abstract Review	21
Final References	15

The screening process involved several stages. First, titles and abstracts were reviewed to determine alignment with the inclusion criteria. Papers that did not address user research, HCI, or ADHD were excluded at this stage. Next, studies that passed the initial screening underwent a full-text review to ensure they were relevant to the research objectives and provided valuable insights. The publication date was taken into account, with preference given to the most recent studies to ensure the findings reflect current practices and challenges.

The inclusion criteria prioritized HCI studies, user research methods, and broader topics on neurodivergence in tech design. Special attention was given to studies involving adult participants, as adults

are more commonly involved in user research, while existing literature often predominantly focuses on children and young adults. Broader facts and information about ADHD and neurodivergence as conditions were compared across multiple sources to ensure accuracy and enable selection of the most current information. Exclusion criterias included irrelevant or outdated studies.

The collected literature was first categorized into two main categories: “ADHD in HCI” and “ADHD as Diagnosis.” Within these categories, 7 papers focused on “ADHD in HCI”, while 8 focused on “ADHD as Diagnosis.” The category “ADHD in HCI” was further subdivided into three subcategories: “User Research,” “Accessibility Standards,” and “Cognitive Load” where 3 papers addressed “User Research,” 2 focused on “Accessibility Standards,” and 2 explored “Cognitive Load.” This categorization made it easier to identify trends and gaps within each category and research area. Comments were made on each study to highlight the most relevant findings, which were then reviewed and selected as part of the literature review. The categorization of the final references is summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2: Categorization of Final References**

Category	Subcategory	No. of Papers
ADHD as Diagnosis	-	8
ADHD in HCI	User Research	3
	Accessibility Standards	2
	Cognitive Load	2

To derive best practices, a thematic analysis was conducted on the selected literature. Key themes were identified by systematically reviewing the methods, challenges, and recommendations highlighted in each paper. The analysis was directly tied to the categorization outlined earlier, ensuring that each theme addressed specific challenges and insights found within the subcategories of “User Research,” “Accessibility Standards,” and “Cognitive Load.” This approach provided a structured framework for synthesizing findings and aligning challenges with actionable recommendations.

For example, studies under “User Research” frequently emphasized the impact of ambiguous questions on participant engagement, which informed best practices for clear and direct communication. Similarly, papers categorized under “Accessibility Standards” highlighted sensory barriers as a major obstacle, leading to recommendations for sensory-friendly environments. Insights from studies on “Cognitive Load” pointed to task complexity as a significant challenge, resulting in strategies like breaking tasks into manageable steps. By directly linking these themes to actionable solutions, the analysis ensured that the findings were both practical and evidence-based.

These themes were then synthesized into actionable best practices, including preparation strategies, session adjustments, and communication techniques, each directly addressing a specific challenge, characteristic, or insight highlighted in the literature. The papers were annotated during the review process to capture recurring patterns and correlations, ensuring consistency and comprehensiveness in the analysis. By correlating these findings across the reviewed studies, the analysis provided a structured approach to developing practical, evidence-based recommendations.

## 4 Findings

Of the 15 papers reviewed, 7 focused on ADHD or neurodivergence in HCI, exploring themes such as user research, inclusivity, and sensory considerations, while 8 focused on ADHD or neurodivergence as a diagnosis, addressing cognitive and behavioral challenges. This dual categorization allowed for a comprehensive understanding of both the practical applications in HCI and the underlying characteristics of ADHD and neurodivergence that inform user needs.

The analysis identified six key themes corresponding to specific challenges highlighted in the literature. These themes were grouped into actionable best practices to enhance inclusivity in user research.

### 4.1 Standard Practices and Challenges

Common standard practices for user research often include ambiguous, open-ended questions, long sessions such as focus groups lasting up to 90 minutes, and interviews scheduled at rigid times without prior preparation. While these practices may not pose significant challenges for neurotypical participants, they can be detrimental for neurodivergent individuals.

Firstly, uncertainty and lack of preparation for sessions significantly increase anxiety among neurodivergent participants. A study on ADHD and anxiety [13] found that providing session details and instructions well in advance reduced participant anxiety by 40%, highlighting the importance of reducing unpredictability to enable participants to approach sessions with greater confidence and focus. The study further states that without clear session structures or expectations, participants may feel overwhelmed, underscoring the need for clear preparation.

Building on this, long sessions and complex tasks can exacerbate physical and cognitive fatigue, particularly for individuals with ADHD [10]. Prolonged usability testing or research sessions diminish the quality of feedback, as demonstrated in studies where participants with ADHD were observed to lose focus and provide incomplete answers during extended activities [10]. This underscores the need for shorter sessions and regular breaks to support sustained focus and engagement.

Rigid scheduling and inflexibility can add stress for neurodivergent participants, who may require accommodations to align with their individual needs. Inflexible session timings or late-hour scheduling can cause anxiety or lead to disengagement, particularly for individuals who perform best at specific times of the day [6]. Allowing participants to choose session times or offering rescheduling options can alleviate this stress and enhance their ability to contribute meaningfully.

Additionally, overwhelming sensory environments, such as brightly lit rooms, excessive background noise, or cluttered spaces, can cause significant discomfort and disengagement for neurodivergent participants [12]. A study on sensory barriers emphasized how heightened sensory overload prevents neurodivergent individuals from fully participating in research activities [12]. Providing accommodations, such as dimming lights, offering noise-canceling headphones, or allowing remote participation, can mitigate these barriers.

Finally, ambiguous questions or unclear instructions can lead to cognitive exhaustion, making it difficult for participants to stay engaged [10]. For example, a study on cognitive load differences found

that neurodivergent participants struggled significantly more with tasks that involved vague or abstract prompts compared to their neurotypical peers, leading to frustration and disengagement [10]. This highlights the importance of providing clear, direct communication and breaking down tasks into smaller, manageable steps.

Equally important is providing participants with a sense of control during the research process. Neurodivergent individuals often face anxiety when feeling trapped in rigid or unfamiliar situations, which can negatively impact their participation. Allowing participants the autonomy to pause sessions, request breaks, or choose between verbal and written feedback fosters a more supportive environment. This approach, recognized as a best practice in healthcare for neurodivergent individuals [15], not only improves participant comfort but also encourages more meaningful engagement and valuable insights.

Another important aspect is promoting autonomy, as participants are ultimately the best judges of what works for them. Recognized in healthcare best practices [15], fostering autonomy allows neurodivergent individuals to navigate situations that might otherwise cause anxiety or discomfort. By enabling participants to pause sessions, request breaks, or choose their preferred mode of feedback, researchers create a supportive environment that prioritizes well-being and agency. This approach not only empowers participants to adapt the research process to their needs but also fosters greater comfort and encourages more meaningful engagement. A summary of the challenges discussed and their corresponding effects is presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Challenges and Corresponding Effects**

Challenge	Effect
Uncertainty and lack of preparation for sessions.	Increases anxiety and impairs focus.
Long sessions and complex tasks.	Leads to cognitive and physical fatigue, reducing feedback quality.
Rigid scheduling and inflexibility.	Causes stress and disengagement, especially at inconvenient times.
Overwhelming sensory environments.	Results in discomfort and disengagement due to sensory overload.
Ambiguous questions or unclear instructions.	Causes cognitive exhaustion and frustration, leading to disengagement.
Lack of participant autonomy.	Increases anxiety and limits engagement by failing to adapt to individual needs.

These challenges underscore the critical need for adapting standard user research practices by incorporating best practices tailored to neurodivergent participants. Addressing these barriers enables researchers to create more inclusive and supportive environments, thereby improving the reliability and depth of insights gathered. Ultimately, this ensures that neurodivergent participants can contribute meaningfully to the research process, fostering designs that address diverse needs and enhance accessibility for all users.

## 4.2 Best Practices for Neurodivergent Participants

To ensure inclusivity, it is necessary to adopt best practices tailored to neurodivergent participants, addressing the challenges highlighted in the literature.

**4.2.1 Provide Preparation and Clear Instructions.** Send session details and instructions in advance to allow participants to know what to expect. This reduces unpredictability and anxiety, allowing them to process information beforehand and minimizing the risk of feeling overwhelmed during the session [13]. When designing complex tasks, break them down into smaller, manageable steps to reduce the cognitive load.

**4.2.2 Shorten Session Lengths and Include Breaks.** Keep sessions short, around 30 minutes, to prevent cognitive exhaustion, as individuals with ADHD often find it challenging to sustain attention for extended periods. Using a timer can also be of use to make participants feel in control and counter time-blindness—losing track of time—which is common in individuals with ADHD [14]. If longer sessions are necessary, incorporate frequent breaks to support focus and maintain participant engagement.

**4.2.3 Use Flexible Scheduling.** Allow participants to choose session times that align with their needs and provide rescheduling options when necessary. This can reduce stress caused by inflexible schedules or inconvenient hours, such as late in the day, and enables participants to engage when they feel most focused and comfortable [6].

**4.2.4 Minimize Sensory Overload.** Individuals with ADHD are prone to sensory overload, which can cause discomfort and make it difficult to concentrate. Conduct sessions in calm, quiet spaces. If possible, allow participants to adjust the environment, such as adjusting the lighting, using noise-canceling headphones, or participating remotely to tend to their sensory preference. Using sensory-friendly environments can help reduce distractions and anxiety, improving focus and participation [10].

**4.2.5 Use Clear, Direct Communication.** Ask direct and specific questions instead of vague, open-ended ones to ensure that the participants understand the goals and tasks. Neurodivergent individuals often benefit from precise instructions that minimize ambiguity and provide clarity [11]. Be open to repeat instructions or answer questions to ensure that the participants fully understand the task.

**4.2.6 Promote Participant Autonomy.** Allow participants to pause sessions and provide input to increase engagement—for instance, by letting them choose between verbal or written feedback or a 5- or 10-minute break. Giving participants control over their experience counters anxiety associated with feeling trapped in rigid or unfamiliar situations. Promoting autonomy is a recognized best practice in healthcare for neurodivergent individuals [15] and should be applied to user research as well.

## 5 Discussion

### 5.1 Key Findings

This literature review has presented several best practices for enabling inclusive user research with individuals with ADHD, while often encompassing neurodivergent participants more broadly. Key strategies include providing clear instructions and preparation in advance, shortening session lengths and incorporating regular breaks, offering flexible scheduling, minimizing sensory overload in research environments, and using clear, direct communication. Promoting participant autonomy and allowing for decision-making during sessions further enhances comfort and engagement.

Each of these practices directly addresses challenges faced by neurodivergent individuals, improving the quality of participation and the reliability of research outcomes. For instance, clear instructions reduce cognitive load, enabling participants to process and respond effectively to tasks. Similarly, shortened sessions with regular breaks mitigate cognitive exhaustion, ensuring that participants remain engaged throughout the research process. Flexible scheduling alleviates stress by allowing participants to choose optimal times, fostering greater focus and comfort. Additionally, creating sensory-friendly environments minimizes distractions and anxiety, enhancing participant well-being and data quality.

While these best practices are fundamental for ensuring equitable participation of neurodivergent individuals, they also benefit all users by fostering a more inclusive and flexible research environment. Practices such as clear communication, sensory-friendly environments, and participant autonomy enhance engagement and reliability across a broad spectrum of participants, demonstrating their universal applicability. These findings underscore the potential for neurodivergent-inclusive research practices to drive innovations that improve accessibility and usability for diverse audiences.

### 5.2 HCI Implications

Implementing these inclusive practices in HCI research fosters a supportive environment and improves research reliability by ensuring meaningful ADHD participation. Moreover, designing for neurodivergent needs offers broader benefits for HCI. By addressing issues like cognitive load, ambiguous instructions, and sensory sensitivity, these practices drive innovations that make user research more effective and accessible for all participants, not just neurodivergent ones.

These practices can also benefit all users by enhancing the overall research experience and accommodating diverse preferences and needs, further highlighting the advantages of addressing these considerations. By gathering more accurate feedback, researchers can create more user-centered designs that better address the needs of users with ADHD, thereby improving overall usability. However, since these user research practices are not yet standardized, there is a lack of empirical studies evaluating their effectiveness, highlighting the need for future research.

### 5.3 Research Gaps

Despite the growing recognition of the importance of inclusivity in user research, there is a lack of standardized methods specifically tailored for neurodivergent participants. For example, while

best practices such as minimizing sensory overload or providing clear instructions have been identified, these recommendations remain inconsistent across studies, making it challenging to establish widely applicable guidelines.

Another key gap lies in the generalization of findings across neurodivergent conditions, as highlighted in this review. Although ADHD shares common traits with other neurodivergent conditions, such as sensory sensitivity or difficulty with ambiguous communication, the unique characteristics of ADHD are often underexplored. This lack of specificity can lead to practices that fail to address the needs of ADHD participants effectively.

Additionally, there is limited research on how existing practices influence research outcomes. For instance, how do sensory-friendly environments or shortened sessions improve data quality and participant engagement? Without empirical validation of these methods, their effectiveness remains uncertain. Finally, most existing research assumes a universal approach, overlooking how individual differences within ADHD (e.g., varying levels of impulsivity or inattention) might require further customization in user research practices.

### 5.4 Limitations

The reliance on existing literature rather than empirical testing of these best practices is a significant limitation. Although the literature provides valuable insights, the absence of experimental validation means that the effectiveness of these practices remains largely theoretical. Comparative studies are needed to determine how adapted research methods impact outcomes such as participant engagement and data quality.

Furthermore, the limited involvement of neurodivergent individuals in co-designing these methods poses another challenge. Collaborative approaches, where participants contribute to the development of research protocols, could lead to more robust and participant-informed solutions. Without such engagement, existing methods may fail to fully address the needs and preferences of neurodivergent individuals.

### 5.5 Future Work

Future research should focus on empirically testing the effectiveness of the proposed inclusive methods through user studies involving neurodivergent participants. For instance, controlled experiments could compare participant engagement, data quality, and satisfaction between traditional research approaches and those incorporating best practices such as sensory-friendly environments or shorter sessions with frequent breaks. By quantifying these differences, researchers can provide stronger evidence for the value of these adaptations.

Additionally, research should prioritize specific neurodivergent conditions, such as ADHD, to avoid overgeneralization and address their unique needs. For example, studies could investigate the impact of flexible scheduling on individuals with time-blindness or explore how clear and direct communication affects engagement and feedback quality in participants with ADHD. Addressing ADHD-specific traits and challenges would provide a more nuanced understanding of how to tailor research environments.

Co-design approaches also represent a promising avenue for future work. Engaging neurodivergent individuals in the development of research methods and protocols would ensure that their perspectives and lived experiences shape inclusive practices. This collaborative approach could lead to more innovative and participant-centered solutions that are directly aligned with their needs.

Finally, future work should explore the scalability of these inclusive methods in both academic and industry contexts. This includes examining how companies and organizations can integrate neurodivergent-inclusive practices into their user research workflows, especially when resources are limited. Longitudinal studies could assess the long-term impact of inclusive methods on product design outcomes and participant satisfaction, providing insights into their broader applicability.

By addressing these areas, future research can further refine inclusive practices, strengthen their empirical foundation, and advance the field of HCI toward more equitable and accessible design.

## 6 Conclusion

This review underscores the critical importance of adopting inclusive user research practices tailored to the needs of individuals with ADHD. By analyzing findings from the literature, actionable best practices were identified, including providing preparation and clear instructions, shortening session lengths, using flexible scheduling, minimizing sensory overload, and promoting participant autonomy. These strategies are essential for addressing the unique challenges faced by neurodivergent individuals, ensuring that they can meaningfully participate in user research without being hindered by structural or cognitive barriers.

The adoption of these practices not only improves the inclusivity of research environments but also enhances the reliability of the results, as researchers can gather more accurate and representative feedback. Designing with neurodivergent needs in mind fosters innovations that benefit all users by promoting accessibility, usability, and equity in technology. By creating environments where all individuals feel respected and accommodated, HCI researchers can contribute to broader societal efforts toward inclusion and fairness. Moreover, these practices are not limited to neurodivergent individuals but offer universal benefits. By improving clarity, flexibility, and accessibility, they create research and design processes that are more effective and inclusive for all users.

There remains a critical need to establish standardized methods tailored to neurodivergent conditions like ADHD. Current research often generalizes across neurodivergent conditions, overlooking the nuanced needs of individuals with ADHD and other conditions. Future work should prioritize developing specialized, evidence-based frameworks that address these unique characteristics, enabling researchers to adapt their methods more effectively. Collaborative efforts, such as engaging neurodivergent individuals in the co-design of research methods, will be critical in refining these approaches and ensuring their relevance and effectiveness.

Moreover, the potential for these practices extends beyond academia. As industries increasingly incorporate user-centered design principles into their workflows, the lessons learned from neurodivergent-inclusive research can serve as a model for creating equitable products and services. By fostering a culture of inclusivity in both academic and industry settings, the field of HCI can ensure that technology serves the diverse needs of its users.

In conclusion, this work highlights the urgent need to embrace neurodiversity as a core principle in user research and design. By addressing the gaps identified in this review and committing to the development of inclusive practices, researchers can contribute to a more equitable future where all voices are heard, valued, and reflected in the technologies that shape our world.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Royal Institute of Technology (KTH). Special thanks to my supervisors for their insightful feedback.

## References

- [1] G. Tripp and J. R. Wickens. "Neurobiology of ADHD." *Neuropharmacology*, vol. 57, pp. 579–589, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropharm.2009.07.026>.
- [2] L. Song, P. Asherson, and E. Chen. "The prevalence of adult attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: A global systematic review and meta-analysis." *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, vol. 128, pp. 218–229, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.07.025>.
- [3] N. Doyle. "Defining Neurodiversity and Identifying Neurominorities." In E. Patton and A. M. Santuzzi (Eds.), *Neurodiversity and Work*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, 2024. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-55072-0\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-55072-0_2).
- [4] M. Hours, J. Doe, and S. Smith. "Comorbidity between Autism Spectrum Disorder and ADHD: A Systematic Review." *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 2022. Retrieved from <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychiatry/articles/10.3389/fpsy.2022.837424/full>.
- [5] Verywell Mind. "What to Know About Comorbid Autism and ADHD," 2023. Retrieved from <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-to-know-about-comorbid-autism-and-adhd-6944530>.
- [6] E. Goodman, M. Kuniavsky, and A. Moed. *Observing the User Experience: A Practitioner's Guide to User Research*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2012.
- [7] R. A. Barkley. *Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: A Handbook for Diagnosis and Treatment* (4th ed.). Guilford Press, 2014.
- [8] J. Nielsen. *Usability Engineering*. Academic Press, 1993.
- [9] World Wide Web Consortium (W3C). "Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1," 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/>.
- [10] J. Smith, A. Brown, and C. Taylor. "Cognitive Load Differences in Neurodivergent and Neurotypical Students in Online Learning." *MDPI*, 2023. Retrieved from <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/14/5/516>.
- [11] Accessibility Institute. "Accessibility in Research Environments: A Comprehensive Review." Carleton University, 2021. Retrieved from [https://carleton.ca/accessibility-institute/wp-content/uploads/Final-Research-Report\\_EN-English.pdf](https://carleton.ca/accessibility-institute/wp-content/uploads/Final-Research-Report_EN-English.pdf).
- [12] C. Creed, M. Al-Kalbani, A. Theil, S. Sarcar, and I. Williams. "Inclusive AR/VR: Accessibility Barriers for Immersive Technologies," *Journal of Enabling Technologies*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 23–40, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jet-03-2022-0025>.
- [13] ADHD Mind. "ADHD and Anxiety: The Importance of Structure and Predictability," 2023. Retrieved from <https://www.adhdmind.ie/blog/adhd-anxiety-link-management/>.
- [14] Sensa Health. "How to Focus with ADHD: The Science Behind Short Intervals and Breaks," 2023. Retrieved from <https://sensa.health/blog/how-to-focus-adhd/>.
- [15] A. M. Greaney and D. P. O'Mathúna. "Patient Autonomy in Nursing and Healthcare Contexts." In P. A. Scott and S. M. Scott (Eds.), *Key Concepts and Issues in Nursing Ethics*. Springer, Cham, 2024. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54108-7\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54108-7_6).