International Journal on Science and Technology (IJSAT)
E-ISSN: 2229-7677 ● Website: www.ijsat.org ● Email: editor@ijsat.org

Very-Low-Dose Methylphenidate and Functional Activation: Subtle Behavioral Change, Effort Modulation, and Risk-Controlled Research Design

Elias Rubenstein

Independent Researcher, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA
ORCID: 0009-0007-1956-653X

Abstract

Methylphenidate is usually discussed through two dominant frames: treatment of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and cognitive enhancement. Both frames are useful, but neither fully captures the question raised by very-low-dose use. The central question is not whether very-low-dose methylphenidate makes healthy adults globally smarter. The more precise question is whether subtle catecholaminergic stimulation can reduce executional friction between intention and action.

This paper presents a conceptual evidence-mapping review of very-low-dose methylphenidate as a possible functional activation tool. Functional activation is proposed as an outcome cluster, not as an assumed drug effect. It refers to the measurable transition from cognitive capacity to executed behavior: beginning an intended task, sustaining effort, tolerating low-salience work, resisting fatigue, and completing goal-directed action under conditions of high perceived effort.

The paper integrates historical prescribing records, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder dose-response evidence, pharmacokinetic and pharmacogenetic considerations, effort-based decision-making research, fatigue and apathy literature, behavioral-change theory, habit formation research, historical stimulant-use examples, comparative stimulant pharmacology, interaction-risk sources, drug-holiday literature, regulatory considerations, and neuroplasticity-related evidence. The term “very-low-dose methylphenidate” is used as the benefit-oriented term, while “threshold-dose” is used methodologically for the range in which subtle pharmacological activity may begin.

The central hypothesis is that very-low-dose methylphenidate may function as temporary behavioral scaffolding. It may not transform the person directly, but it may slightly increase the probability that intended constructive behavior is initiated, sustained, and repeated. If the activation window helps a person begin tasks, complete routines, tolerate effort, and experience mastery, longer-term benefit may arise from repeated constructive action, strengthened self-efficacy, and habit formation.

This hypothesis requires controlled testing rather than extrapolation from standard-dose or clinical populations. Methylphenidate is a prescription stimulant that is often controlled and carries recognized misuse, dependence, cardiovascular, sleep, appetite, interaction, and reinforcement risks. Therefore, future

research must include dose precision, formulation control, interaction screening, stimulant-stacking exclusion, placebo comparison, predefined endpoint hierarchy, drug-free intervals, monitoring for learned reliance, and stopping rules. Very-low-dose methylphenidate should therefore be understood as a pharmacological probe of functional activation and subtle behavioral change, not as a universal nootropic or a casual productivity aid.

Keywords: methylphenidate, Ritalin, very-low dose, threshold dose, functional activation, behavioral scaffolding, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, cognitive effort, task initiation, subtle behavioral change, self-efficacy, habit formation, coca, nicotine, fatigue, apathy, drug holidays, neuroplasticity, dependence risk, interaction risk, stimulant stacking, carboxylesterase 1

1. Introduction: Why Very-Low-Dose Methylphenidate Requires a Different Question

Methylphenidate is one of the most extensively studied psychostimulants in modern medicine. It is widely used for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and narcolepsy. Its pharmacological action is commonly described through inhibition of dopamine and noradrenaline transporters, thereby increasing catecholaminergic signaling in systems involved in attention, salience, effort, motivation, and behavioral control [1].

The dominant contemporary framing of methylphenidate is clinically useful but incomplete. It is usually described either as an ADHD medication or as a possible cognitive enhancer. Both descriptions are correct, but neither fully captures the question raised by very-low-dose use. The central question is not whether very-low-dose methylphenidate makes healthy adults globally smarter. The more precise question is whether subtle catecholaminergic stimulation can reduce executional friction between intention and action.

This paper argues that the potential benefit of very-low-dose methylphenidate lies in functional activation: easier task initiation, reduced mental inertia, increased willingness to exert effort, improved persistence during low-salience work, reduced subjective fatigue, and possible support of constructive learning windows through enhanced attention and salience. These effects are not separate from cognition; they are functional expressions of cognitive control and motivated behavior.

The term “microdosing” is used cautiously. Methylphenidate is not a psychedelic, and very-low-dose methylphenidate should not be treated as a psychedelic-style microdosing analogue. At the same time, very low doses should not be dismissed as inert. Low milligram doses can be pharmacologically active in sensitive populations, and catecholaminergic dose-response curves are nonlinear. For this reason, the paper uses “very-low-dose methylphenidate” as the benefit-oriented term and “threshold-dose” as the methodological term for the range in which subtle pharmacological activity may begin.

This paper is structured as a conceptual evidence-mapping review rather than a quantitative meta-analysis or formal scoping review. Its purpose is not to estimate an effect size for very-low-dose methylphenidate, because the available evidence is heterogeneous in population, dose, formulation, outcome, and study design. Instead, it maps converging and conflicting evidence across historical prescribing records, pharmacokinetic literature, pharmacogenetic literature, ADHD studies, effort-based decision-making research, fatigue and apathy studies, behavioral-change theory, habit formation research, historical

stimulant-use examples, comparative stimulant literature, interaction-risk sources, drug-holiday literature, regulatory considerations, and neuroplasticity-related findings.

The primary target of this paper is not a single diagnostic group, but the functional domain of intention-to-action translation. Evidence from ADHD, fatigue, apathy, and healthy-adult studies is therefore used to define and constrain the outcome model rather than to claim direct cross-population efficacy.

The scope of this paper is deliberately limited. It does not present very-low-dose methylphenidate as a clinical recommendation, an over-the-counter stimulant, or a general productivity aid. Rather, it defines a controlled research model for investigating whether very low or threshold doses may influence functional activation, effort valuation, task initiation, and repeated goal-directed behavior. The paper therefore focuses on hypothesis formation, endpoint definition, methodological safeguards, and ethical boundaries rather than clinical implementation.

This approach builds on prior low-dose psychoactive classification work, which argued that low-dose psychoactive use should be classified according to substance class, mechanism, dose-response relationship, perceptibility, tolerance, neuroplasticity, context, interaction potential, and evidence strength [2]. Under this classification, very-low-dose methylphenidate belongs to low-dose catecholaminergic functional activation, not to psychedelic microdosing.

The aim is to define a plausible benefit model and the research safeguards required to test it. The hypothesis is scientifically valuable because it is narrow, measurable, and ethically controllable: very-low-dose methylphenidate may temporarily support the execution of constructive behavior, but its benefit can only be evaluated through dose precision, interaction control, placebo comparison, drug-free intervals, and monitoring for learned reliance.

2. Functional Activation as an Outcome Cluster

Functional activation is proposed here as an outcome cluster, not as an assumed drug effect. It refers to the measurable transition from cognitive capacity to executed behavior: beginning an intended task, sustaining effort, tolerating low-salience work, resisting fatigue, and completing goal-directed action under conditions of high perceived effort. The construct is useful because many functional failures occur after intention has formed but before action is sustained. Very-low-dose methylphenidate is therefore not assumed to “activate” by definition; rather, the paper asks whether its catecholaminergic profile can measurably influence this intention-to-action transition.

This definition distinguishes functional activation from conventional cognitive enhancement without denying their overlap. Cognitive enhancement typically evaluates whether a drug improves memory, reasoning, reaction time, inhibition, working memory, processing speed, or test accuracy. Functional activation evaluates whether cognition is effectively mobilized into behavior: whether the individual begins the task, remains engaged, tolerates monotony, resists fatigue, and continues effort when immediate reward is low.

Many real-world functional failures are not primarily failures of intelligence. They are failures of initiation, persistence, wakefulness, effort valuation, or behavioral activation. A person may know what to do, understand the task, possess the required skills, and still fail to begin or persist. Very-low-dose

methylphenidate is scientifically interesting because its possible benefit belongs to this functional gap between capacity and action.

Five domains define the outcome cluster. First, task initiation refers to the latency and ability to begin an intended activity without excessive delay, avoidance, or subjective resistance. Second, attentional persistence refers to the capacity to remain engaged with a task, especially when the task is repetitive, effortful, or low in immediate reward. Third, fatigue resistance refers to reduced subjective tiredness, cognitive slowing, or mental exhaustion during sustained activity. Fourth, effort valuation refers to the perceived cost-benefit balance of mental work. Fifth, low-initiation state reduction refers to improved goal-directed engagement in clinical states where reduced motivation and initiation are central.

These domains overlap with cognitive control and executive function. This overlap is not a weakness; it is the reason the construct is useful. Functional activation does not deny cognitive involvement. It changes the primary endpoint. The question is not whether methylphenidate increases maximal cognitive capacity, but whether it changes the conditions under which cognitive capacity is mobilized into behavior.

A stimulant may fail to improve abstract reasoning while still altering task initiation, effort valuation, fatigue resistance, or persistence. Conversely, a stimulant may increase effort while worsening anxiety, sleep, cardiovascular load, over-arousal, inflexibility, or performance quality. Functional activation is therefore not a claim of general cognitive superiority. It is a behavioral and executive-function-related endpoint category.

3. Historical and Clinical Clues: Activation Before Enhancement

Methylphenidate was synthesized in the 1940s and introduced into clinical practice in the 1950s. Although it later became strongly associated with ADHD, early medical use was broader. United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) historical materials report that Ritalin was approved in 1955 for narcolepsy, depression, lethargy, chronic fatigue, barbiturate-induced coma, senility, and memory deficits in older adults [3]. This history is important because it shows that methylphenidate was not originally confined to a narrow attention model. It was also understood as an agent of wakefulness, reversal of slowing, and restoration of functional activity.

Early geriatric and psychiatric reports are relevant as historical context. Ferguson and Funderburk reported methylphenidate use in senile behavior in the 1950s [4]. Kaplitz later reported that methylphenidate was effective in withdrawn and apathetic geriatric patients, with improvement in mental status, ward behavior, target symptoms, and global clinical evaluations [5]. Gurian and Rosowsky reported successful treatment in very old patients using 1.25 to 5 mg methylphenidate, with sustained benefit and no evidence of tolerance or toxicity in the reported cases [6].

These historical studies should not be interpreted as modern efficacy evidence for very-low-dose methylphenidate in healthy adults. Their methodological limitations are substantial by contemporary standards. Their function in the present paper is narrower but still valuable: they reconstruct the activation-oriented medical identity of methylphenidate.

Historical reports are therefore used as heuristic and conceptual evidence, not as contemporary efficacy evidence. They justify hypothesis generation, not clinical recommendation. Their importance lies in showing that activation-oriented endpoints have long been part of methylphenidate's medical identity.

4. Mechanistic Rationale: Dopamine, Noradrenaline, Salience, and Effort

The mechanistic rationale for very-low-dose methylphenidate begins with catecholaminergic modulation. Methylphenidate inhibits dopamine and noradrenaline transporters, thereby increasing catecholaminergic signaling in brain systems involved in attention, motivation, effort, and behavioral control [1]. These systems do not merely support abstract cognition; they influence whether tasks are perceived as salient, effort is tolerated, and goal-directed action is sustained.

Very-low-dose methylphenidate is not best understood through a simple "more dopamine equals better performance" model. Catecholaminergic signaling follows nonlinear dynamics. Prefrontal cortical function is commonly described through an inverted-U model: insufficient catecholaminergic activity can impair cognitive control, while excessive catecholaminergic activity can produce over-arousal, anxiety, inflexibility, reduced performance, or narrow attentional focus [7]. This model builds on foundational work showing that dopamine D1 receptor modulation in the prefrontal cortex is centrally involved in working memory [8].

The inverted-U model strengthens the benefit argument rather than weakening it. It suggests that smaller doses may be more interesting than larger doses for functional activation because the target is not maximal stimulation. The target is a subtle shift in task salience, effort valuation, and action readiness. A dose that is too high may increase arousal but reduce flexibility, increase anxiety, or impair performance quality. A very-low dose, if effective, would be expected to operate closer to the threshold of functional engagement.

This model also explains why benefit is likely to be individual and context-dependent. Baseline catecholamine state, sleep, stress, anxiety, stimulant tolerance, caffeine, nicotine, task type, and motivation can shift the same dose to different positions on the response curve. A very-low dose may support engagement in one individual and be inert, anxiogenic, or inefficient in another.

The benefit hypothesis is therefore precise: very-low-dose methylphenidate may be useful not because it strongly stimulates the nervous system, but because it may subtly alter the salience and effort cost of beginning and sustaining goal-directed action. This is the functional activation hypothesis.

5. Very-Low-Dose Versus Threshold-Dose: Why Small Doses Are Not Inert

The term very-low-dose requires operational caution. In methylphenidate research, a dose should not be described as subtherapeutic merely because it is numerically small. Methylphenidate can be pharmacologically active at low doses in sensitive populations. The Preschool Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder Treatment Study (PATS) found that immediate-release methylphenidate produced significant symptom reductions at 2.5 mg, 5 mg, and 7.5 mg three times daily, whereas 1.25 mg three times daily was not statistically significant [9]. This finding cannot be transferred directly to adults, but it demonstrates that 2.5 mg is not automatically inert.

This paper therefore uses “very-low-dose” as the broader benefit-oriented term and “threshold-dose” as the methodological term for the range in which subtle pharmacological activity may begin. The term threshold-dose is preferable to “microdose” when discussing methylphenidate because it acknowledges individual variability. A dose that is below conventional adult initiation may still be perceptible in a stimulant-naive, low-body-weight, sleep-deprived, anxious, or highly sensitive person. It may also be functionally negligible in another person.

Methylphenidate pharmacokinetics further complicate the dose question. Oral methylphenidate undergoes substantial first-pass metabolism, and bioavailability varies between individuals. Methylphenidate is primarily metabolized by carboxylesterase 1 (CES1). Stage et al. showed that CES1 genotypes affect methylphenidate pharmacokinetics in healthy Danish subjects, and Lyauk et al. used population pharmacokinetic modeling in healthy adults to show that demographic and CES1-related factors contribute to interindividual variability [10,11]. This is especially important at very-low-dose levels, because the same nominal dose may be negligible in one participant and pharmacologically meaningful in another.

Methylphenidate is usually administered as racemic d,l-threo-methylphenidate, while d-methylphenidate is primarily responsible for central pharmacological activity and l-methylphenidate is cleared more rapidly. Enantioselective metabolism, first-pass effects, food state, alcohol exposure, formulation, gastric emptying, and tablet-splitting accuracy can all influence effective exposure. Markowitz et al. showed that ethanol coadministration can lead to detectable ethylphenidate formation in humans after methylphenidate and ethanol exposure [12]. This does not mean that ordinary very-low-dose exposure necessarily produces clinically meaningful ethylphenidate effects, but it does show why alcohol exposure and formulation conditions must be controlled.

Administration time should also be standardized. A strong claim that methylphenidate exposure is determined by circadian CES1 fluctuation in humans should not be made without direct methylphenidate-specific evidence. However, because metabolism, feeding state, sleep timing, cortisol rhythm, gastric emptying, and stimulant sensitivity can vary across the day, a threshold-dose study should administer all doses at the same clock time, preferably in a narrow morning window. Administration time should be recorded and treated as a protocol variable.

A mechanistically rigorous study should consider measuring plasma d-methylphenidate and l-methylphenidate separately using chiral analytical methods. Such measurement is especially relevant at threshold-dose levels, where small changes in exposure may determine whether the dose is functionally inactive, subtly activating, or clinically noticeable. If chiral pharmacokinetic measurement is not feasible, the limitation should be stated explicitly.

A rigorous threshold-dose protocol should standardize formulation and administration. Immediate-release methylphenidate should be used only if dose preparation is precise and externally controlled, preferably through pharmacy-compounded capsules rather than participant-split tablets. Modified-release formulations are less suitable for 1.25–2.5 mg threshold-dose testing because their release properties and dose precision are difficult to preserve at such low divided doses. Meal timing, macronutrient composition, alcohol abstinence, caffeine exposure, nicotine exposure, gastrointestinal conditions, and administration time should be standardized or recorded.

The relevant research question is whether a very-low-dose or threshold-dose range can be operationally defined and tested under controlled conditions, with attention to formulation, pharmacokinetics, pharmacogenetics, enantiomeric exposure, administration time, baseline state, interaction control, expectancy, and off-day functioning.

6. Low-Dose Signals in Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder

The strongest clinical evidence for methylphenidate remains ADHD. In ADHD, methylphenidate improves inattention, impulsivity, hyperactivity, and functional impairment. Most therapeutic studies use doses above the very-low-dose range discussed in this paper, but low-dose evidence remains important.
The PATS trial provides a key low-dose signal [9]. Its significance is not that it proves very-low-dose efficacy in adults. Its significance is more limited and more useful: it demonstrates that low milligram doses of immediate-release methylphenidate can be pharmacologically active in a sensitive population. The study therefore supports the need to treat very low doses as biologically relevant rather than automatically negligible.

The broader ADHD evidence base also supports methylphenidate's functional relevance. A network meta-analysis of ADHD medications found methylphenidate to be one of the central pharmacological treatments across age groups, with efficacy and tolerability varying by age and comparator [13]. In ADHD, functional impairment includes more than distractibility. It includes difficulty initiating tasks, sustaining effort, regulating motivation, and converting intention into action. Methylphenidate's benefit is therefore not only attentional in a narrow sense. It is also functional.

ADHD data should be used precisely. They do not prove that very-low-dose methylphenidate benefits healthy adults, but they show why task initiation, effort persistence, and action readiness are legitimate methylphenidate-relevant endpoints.

7. Potential Benefits: Task Initiation, Effort, Persistence, and Fatigue Resistance

The potential benefit of very-low-dose methylphenidate is functional rather than globally cognitive. Its plausible benefit is narrower and more behaviorally meaningful: lowering the activation threshold required to begin, sustain, and complete effortful work.

The first potential benefit is easier task initiation. Many people do not fail because they lack the ability to complete a task. They fail at the transition between intention and action. Methylphenidate's effects on catecholaminergic systems involved in salience and motivation make task initiation a plausible endpoint.
The second potential benefit is effort modulation. A task may be avoided not because it is impossible, but because effort feels too costly relative to reward. Volkow et al. showed that methylphenidate enhanced the saliency of a mathematical task when paired with the task [14]. Westbrook et al. showed that dopamine promotes cognitive effort by biasing the perceived benefits versus costs of cognitive work, and that methylphenidate can shift this cost-benefit structure [15]. Hofmans et al. further reported that methylphenidate increased choices of mental labor over leisure depending on striatal dopamine synthesis capacity [16]. These findings support the idea that methylphenidate can alter effort valuation, which is central to the functional activation model.

The third potential benefit is attentional persistence. Very-low-dose methylphenidate may help sustain engagement during repetitive, low-salience, or effortful tasks. This may appear not as a large gain in abstract reasoning or intelligence tests, but as greater time on task, lower avoidance, improved persistence under monotony, or reduced subjective resistance.

The fourth potential benefit is fatigue resistance. Clinical methylphenidate literature repeatedly includes fatigue-related populations. Blockmans et al. found that methylphenidate at 2 × 10 mg/day was significantly better than placebo in relieving fatigue and concentration disturbances in a minority of patients with chronic fatigue syndrome [17]. Hardy's review found possible effectiveness of methylphenidate for depressive symptoms, fatigue, apathy, and cognitive slowing in medically ill older adults and terminally ill adults [18]. These findings do not establish benefit in healthy adults, but they identify fatigue resistance as a methylphenidate-relevant endpoint.

The fifth potential benefit is improved engagement in low-initiation states. In Alzheimer disease, the ADMET 2 randomized clinical trial found that methylphenidate reduced apathy compared with placebo [19]. This should not be equated with ordinary procrastination in healthy adults. Neurodegenerative apathy and everyday task avoidance differ in pathophysiology, measurement, severity, and clinical meaning. However, the study supports the broader endpoint logic: methylphenidate has repeatedly been studied where the target problem is reduced initiation or engagement.

The benefit hypothesis can therefore be stated clearly: very-low-dose methylphenidate may have value as a short-acting functional activation tool if it improves task initiation, effort valuation, attentional persistence, or fatigue resistance without producing unacceptable overstimulation, inefficient effort, interaction effects, sleep disruption, cardiovascular burden, or learned reliance.

8. Behavioral Scaffolding and Subtle Everyday Change

The potential benefit of very-low-dose methylphenidate should not be understood as dramatic pharmacological transformation. Its most plausible value lies in low-amplitude changes in action probability: a slightly higher likelihood of beginning, continuing, and completing a goal-directed behavior. These changes may appear modest in isolation, but they may become meaningful when they repeatedly alter behavior in daily life.

Many long-term functional problems are maintained by small repeated failures of initiation. A person postpones the task, avoids the difficult step, interrupts effort too early, or chooses immediate relief over delayed completion. If very-low-dose methylphenidate reduces this behavioral friction even slightly, the main benefit may not be the acute drug effect itself. The main benefit may be the new behavior that becomes possible during the activation window.

This model can be described as behavioral scaffolding. Very-low-dose methylphenidate would not be the source of transformation itself. Rather, it may temporarily reduce the executional barrier that prevents intended behavior from occurring. If the activation window is paired with structured action plans, repeated task completion, and stable environmental cues, the longer-term benefit may arise from practiced behavior, strengthened self-efficacy, and gradual habit formation.

Bandura's theory of self-efficacy is relevant because perceived capability is shaped by mastery experiences and influences persistence, effort, and future action [20]. Gollwitzer showed that implementation intentions can strengthen the link between intention and behavior [21]. Wood and Neal described habits as learned associations between contexts and responses, while Lally et al. studied how repeated behavior in stable contexts can gradually increase automaticity [22,23]. These findings support the idea that repeated successful task initiation under stable conditions may become behaviorally meaningful over time.

The long-term benefit hypothesis is therefore behavioral rather than purely pharmacological. Very-low-dose methylphenidate may support a temporary state in which the person can perform the behaviors that later become more stable through repetition. The drug would not be the transformation itself. It would be a possible support for practicing the actions that produce transformation: beginning, continuing, completing, and repeating.

This distinction matters. A strong-dose stimulant model often emphasizes acute intensity, productivity, or performance. A very-low-dose functional activation model emphasizes threshold shifts: the small difference between not starting and starting, between abandoning a task and continuing, between avoidance and completion. These subtle shifts may be especially relevant for people whose main difficulty is not lack of intelligence or knowledge, but unstable execution.

The model also explains why the effect must remain below the level of obvious intoxication or forceful stimulation. If the dose produces strong euphoria, pressure, anxiety, overfocus, or compulsive productivity, the behavioral change may become drug-centered and dependence-prone. The desired effect is more modest: enough activation to make constructive behavior easier, but not so much activation that the individual attributes agency entirely to the substance.
Table 1 summarizes the proposed behavioral-scaffolding model and the corresponding methodological controls required to test it.

Table 1. Behavioral-scaffolding model of very-low-dose methylphenidate

Model component	Proposed role	Required control
Very-low-dose methylphenidate	Temporary reduction of executional friction	Dose precision, formulation control, timing control
Increased task salience	Greater likelihood of beginning planned work	Placebo control, expectancy assessment
Effort modulation	Lower perceived cost of sustained action	Performance-quality assessment
Repeated task completion	Strengthening of self-efficacy and routine	Objective timestamps, preregistered task windows
Habit formation	Gradual stabilization of behavior in context	Follow-up and off-day assessment
Learned reliance	Maladaptive attribution of agency to the stimulant	Drug-free intervals, craving monitoring, stopping rules

The table is conceptual rather than evidentiary. Its purpose is to translate the hypothesis into testable components and prevent the model from being interpreted as an already established effect.

Very-low-dose methylphenidate should therefore be studied not only through acute cognitive tests, but through repeated daily behavior. Relevant outcomes include whether participants initiate planned tasks more consistently, complete small routines, reduce avoidance loops, maintain structured work periods, and preserve off-day functioning. The key question is whether subtle pharmacological activation can support behavioral repetition that remains partly available after the drug window has ended.

9. Stimulants, Work Culture, and Behavior-Shaping Contexts

The benefit model becomes clearer when very-low-dose methylphenidate is placed within a broader historical and cultural pattern: stimulants often do not act merely as isolated pharmacological agents. They act within work cultures, rituals, routines, moral expectations, and social structures. Their effects are shaped by the context in which activation is used.

Coca leaf use in Andean and Inca-related contexts provides an important example. Coca should not be equated with purified cocaine, and its traditional use should not be reduced to intoxication. Coca leaf products have been described as an integral part of Andean cultural life and traditional medicine [24]. Historical and anthropological discussions associate coca with endurance, altitude adaptation, hunger and fatigue reduction, ritual, reciprocity, and social identity [24]. In this context, coca was not simply a stimulant in the modern recreational sense. It was embedded in social worlds where work, endurance, obligation, and participation were culturally valued.

The Coca example is not used as pharmacological evidence for methylphenidate. It is used as a cultural analogy showing that stimulant effects acquire behavioral meaning through structured goals, work norms, ritualized use, and social context. In such settings, stimulant effects are not interpreted only as private pharmacological sensations; they are integrated into structured forms of work, obligation, ritual, and participation. This provides a historical analogy for the present model: a stimulant may support behavior most constructively when activation is paired with clear goals, stable routines, and socially or personally meaningful tasks.

This distinction is central to very-low-dose methylphenidate. The potential benefit is not that methylphenidate produces virtue, discipline, or transformation by itself. The potential benefit is that subtle activation may make it easier to perform behaviors already selected as valuable: beginning work, maintaining a routine, completing small obligations, studying, organizing, or tolerating effort. If the goal is clear and the behavioral structure is constructive, the stimulant effect may support the practice of that structure. If the goal is unclear or the context is compulsive, the same activation may support unhealthy overwork, dependence, or performance anxiety.

The broader lesson is not that stimulant exposure necessarily produces dependence or maladaptive behavior. Rather, stimulants can shape behavior through repeated pairing. When activation is paired with meaningful work, structured routine, and self-efficacy, it may support constructive behavioral repetition. When activation is paired with compulsion, escape, identity insecurity, or productivity anxiety, it may strengthen dependence-like patterns. The pharmacological effect is therefore only one part of the model.

The surrounding intention, ritual, task structure, dosing pattern, and social meaning influence whether activation becomes constructive or maladaptive.

10. Healthy Adults: Why the Endpoint Must Be Functional

Healthy-adult studies show why the endpoint must be functional rather than globally cognitive. Methylphenidate does not produce uniform enhancement in healthy adults; effects are dose-, task-, and baseline-dependent, and may be small, inconsistent, or unfavorable in complex tasks [25–27]. Bowman et al. reported that so-called smart drugs, including methylphenidate, increased motivation or effort but reduced the quality of effort in a complex optimization task [28].

This does not negate the functional activation hypothesis. It narrows it. The relevant question is whether very-low-dose methylphenidate improves engagement, initiation, and persistence without reducing performance quality. The benefit model must therefore distinguish between effort quantity and effort quality. A drug that increases effort may still impair strategic efficiency. A person may work longer but make poorer decisions. A person may feel more engaged but become rigid, overfocused, or impulsive.

Future studies should therefore measure both engagement and performance quality. The plausible benefit of very-low-dose methylphenidate is not "smarter," but "more engaged" under controlled conditions. Even this claim must be tested under placebo control, performance-quality assessment, interaction control, and multiple-comparison correction.

11. Comparative Activation Agents: Boundary Markers for the Benefit Model

Very-low-dose methylphenidate belongs to a broader field of functional activation agents. The comparators in this section are not included as therapeutic alternatives to methylphenidate, but as boundary markers within the broader pharmacology of activation. They clarify what is distinctive about methylphenidate and prevent exaggerated claims.

Caffeine is the most common everyday stimulant. It increases wakefulness, vigilance, and fatigue resistance, and provides a baseline comparator for socially normalized activation. Theobromine, theophylline, and aminophylline belong to the methylxanthine family. Theobromine, found in cacao, is generally milder than caffeine; human studies indicate that its psychopharmacological effects differ from caffeine and may be weaker in vigilance-related outcomes [29]. Theophylline and aminophylline have been used in respiratory medicine as bronchodilators while also possessing central nervous system stimulant properties; their narrow therapeutic window illustrates the safety limits of activation pharmacology [30].

Ephedrine and Ephedra represent sympathomimetic activation. Their relevance lies in appetite suppression, bronchodilation, thermogenesis, fatigue resistance, and physical activation. A meta-analysis of Ephedra and ephedrine for weight loss and athletic performance found modest short-term weight loss effects but insufficient evidence for athletic performance and increased risk of psychiatric, autonomic, gastrointestinal symptoms, and palpitations [31].

Modafinil and armodafinil represent wakefulness-promoting agents. Their strength lies in sustained alertness and reduced sleep pressure. A systematic review of modafinil in healthy non-sleep-deprived

subjects found cognitive benefits in some domains, especially with more complex tasks, but its longer duration makes it different from short task-initiation agents [32].

Amphetamine and mixed amphetamine salts produce stronger catecholaminergic activation. They may produce stronger drive, energy, and motivation, but also greater concern regarding reinforcement, insomnia, appetite suppression, cardiovascular effects, and dependence. FDA prescribing information for stimulant medications explicitly recognizes abuse, misuse, and addiction risks [33].

Nicotine represents a cholinergic stimulant comparator. It acts through nicotinic acetylcholine receptors and has been studied for effects on attention, working memory, fine motor performance, and episodic memory [34]. Its relevance is twofold. First, it shows that subtle cognitive or motivational support can occur outside the catecholaminergic stimulant class. Second, it shows why route, speed of delivery, and behavioral pairing matter for dependence risk.

Nicotine should not be treated as a benign model, but dependence should also not be described as an unavoidable outcome of every intermittent, low-dose, cyclic, or medically controlled exposure. Nicotine replacement products deliver nicotine more slowly than cigarette smoke, and comparative research suggests lower abuse liability for replacement products, especially slower-delivery forms such as patches [35,36]. Long-term nicotine replacement therapy use can occur, but it is not an inevitable outcome of controlled exposure [37]. Nicotine therefore illustrates a central principle of this paper: functional activation and reinforcement risk must be evaluated together.

1,3-dimethylamylamine (DMAA), dimethylhexylamine or 2-aminoisoheptane (DMHA), 1,3-dimethylbutylamine (DMBA), beta-methylphenethylamine (BMPEA), and related supplement stimulants are boundary-case comparators. They show how activation claims can be commercialized in performance markets without adequate clinical standardization or safety evidence [38,39].

This comparison positions very-low-dose methylphenidate in a distinct intermediate category: more task-oriented than caffeine or theobromine, more cognitively targeted than ephedrine or beta-2 adrenergic agonists, shorter than modafinil, less forceful than amphetamines, and more medically characterized than DMAA-like stimulants. This is the pharmacological space in which a benefit hypothesis becomes plausible: short-acting, effort-relevant, medically characterized activation.

12. Interaction and Stimulant-Stacking Controls

Very-low-dose methylphenidate cannot be evaluated only by dose. Interaction control is a core safety and validity condition, because a low methylphenidate dose may become clinically more relevant when combined with catecholaminergic, adrenergic, serotonergic, cardiovascular, or metabolic agents.

The most important medication interaction concerns monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs). Concomitant use of methylphenidate with MAOIs, or use within 14 days after discontinuing an MAOI, is contraindicated because of the risk of hypertensive crisis [33]. This interaction demonstrates that low-dose exposure does not remove pharmacodynamic risk when converging mechanisms increase monoaminergic or pressor activity.

Cardiovascular interaction risk is also central. Methylphenidate may increase blood pressure and heart rate and may reduce the effectiveness of antihypertensive medication [33]. Any threshold-dose research protocol should therefore document cardiovascular history, blood pressure, pulse, antihypertensive medication, and concurrent sympathomimetic exposure. Pressor agents, decongestants, and stimulant-like supplements should be treated as confounders or exclusion criteria.

Alcohol and formulation effects require separate attention. Immediate-release and modified-release methylphenidate products differ in release profile, and alcohol may increase adverse central nervous system effects or alter the release characteristics of some formulations [33]. Research designs should therefore exclude alcohol during exposure windows and document formulation type, meal timing, caffeine intake, nicotine use, and sleep timing. The Markowitz et al. ethanol study further supports the need to exclude alcohol when methylphenidate pharmacokinetics are being interpreted [12].

Supplement stacking is a major interpretive and safety problem. Caffeine, ephedrine, pseudoephedrine, synephrine, yohimbine, nicotine, DMAA, DMHA, DMBA, BMPEA, higenamine, pre-workout products, fat-loss products, and other stimulant-like compounds may increase sympathetic load, anxiety, insomnia, appetite suppression, blood pressure, or heart-rate effects [31,34–39]. If such substances are used concurrently, benefit or harm cannot be attributed clearly to methylphenidate.

A rigorous study should therefore standardize or prohibit additional stimulants. Caffeine should be eliminated or fixed at a standardized dose. Energy drinks, pre-workout products, fat-loss products, sympathomimetic decongestants, yohimbine, synephrine, higenamine, DMAA-like compounds, and other stimulant-like supplements should be excluded. Nicotine exposure should also be recorded or standardized because it may affect attention, arousal, dependence risk, and cardiovascular measures. Sleep duration, meal timing, and alcohol exposure should be recorded. In stricter designs, urine or saliva screening may be considered to verify abstinence from non-permitted stimulants.

The practical conclusion is simple: very-low-dose methylphenidate research is not interpretable without interaction control. Low dose, pause days, and harm reduction are not separate issues; they form one safety and validity model.

13. Drug-Free Intervals and Learned Reliance

A benefit-oriented model of very-low-dose methylphenidate must include dependence-risk mitigation. Methylphenidate has recognized misuse and dependence potential [33]. This does not invalidate its functional activation potential, but it requires a methodologically responsible structure.

The relevant risk is not only acute adverse effects. It is also reward-coupled functioning. If methylphenidate makes work, study, writing, emotional regulation, or task initiation feel easier, the individual may begin to associate normal functioning with the substance. This association can develop even when the dose is low.

Methylphenidate can acquire reinforcing value when repeatedly paired with productivity, effort, confidence, or relief from fatigue. In humans, the corresponding concern is not only euphoria, but learned functional reliance: the belief that work, study, writing, emotional control, or task initiation is easier or only possible with the stimulant. This makes dose escalation a primary safety endpoint. The impulse to

double the threshold dose on a demanding day, redose during the same work session, or combine methylphenidate with caffeine or pre-workout stimulants should be recorded as evidence of reinforcement pressure.

Drug-free intervals are therefore not a peripheral detail. They are a methodological safeguard. In psychedelic microdosing, pause days are often discussed in relation to receptor tolerance and integration [2]. In stimulant use, the logic is different. Drug-free intervals help test whether functional capacity remains intact without the stimulant. They also help identify rebound fatigue, craving, subjective need, dose escalation tendency, sleep disruption, and productivity anxiety.

The clinical ADHD literature includes the concept of drug holidays, meaning planned interruptions of medication to evaluate ongoing need, side effects, or tolerance. Ibrahim and Donyai found that drug holidays are used internationally and may serve purposes including assessment, management, prevention, and negotiation [40]. A review of stimulant tolerance also identifies medication holidays as one of the clinical strategies discussed for tolerance management [41]. In very-low-dose methylphenidate research, drug-free intervals should be adapted as a harm-reduction and measurement principle rather than as an unsupervised cycling recommendation.

However, drug-free interval assessment is vulnerable to expectancy and nocebo effects. If participants know that a given day is an off-day, expectation alone may worsen perceived task initiation, fatigue, or motivation. A rigorous study should therefore use blinded or partially blinded intermittent designs, including placebo days that are subjectively indistinguishable from exposure days. Placebo-controlled days test acute pharmacological effects; scheduled non-exposure or washout periods test rebound, reliance, and functional recovery. These constructs should not be collapsed.

Carry-over effects must also be controlled. Even though immediate-release methylphenidate has a short plasma half-life, behavioral adaptation, sleep effects, reward learning, and expectancy may persist beyond plasma clearance. Therefore, washout periods should be defined empirically rather than assumed from half-life alone. A threshold-dose study should include sufficient washout intervals, randomization of condition order, testing for period effects, and sensitivity analyses excluding participants with persistent sleep disruption, rebound, or subjective reliance after exposure days.

Drug-free intervals serve the benefit model. They do not merely reduce risk. They help determine whether very-low-dose methylphenidate supports functioning or quietly trains reliance.

14. Research Design: How to Test the Benefit Without Overclaiming

A very-low-dose methylphenidate study must avoid endpoint inflation. Functional activation is a multidimensional construct, but a multidimensional construct cannot be tested by treating every measured variable as an independent primary endpoint. Task initiation, attentional persistence, fatigue resistance, effort valuation, craving, rebound, sleep, appetite, heart rate, blood pressure, subjective reliance, and routine completion may all be relevant, but testing them without statistical hierarchy would inflate the probability of false-positive findings.

A rigorous design should predefine one primary endpoint and a small number of secondary endpoints. For example, the primary endpoint could be latency to initiate a standardized effortful task, willingness to

choose an effortful task over an easier alternative, or consistency of initiating a preregistered daily routine during a predefined time window. If an ecological daily-routine endpoint is used, the routine should be operationalized before enrollment, time-stamped objectively where possible, and assessed under blinded placebo-controlled conditions to reduce expectancy and self-report bias. Secondary endpoints could include time on task, subjective fatigue, reaction-time variability, sleep latency, and routine completion. Safety endpoints should be analyzed separately and should include blood pressure, heart rate, appetite suppression, insomnia, irritability, craving, rebound, desire to redose, and dose-escalation pressure.

Multiple-comparison control should be specified before data collection. Depending on the structure of the study, this may include Bonferroni correction, Holm-Bonferroni correction, false discovery rate control, or a hierarchical testing sequence. Exploratory outcomes should be clearly labeled as exploratory and should not be used to claim efficacy. The statistical model should also account for within-subject correlations in crossover designs, baseline performance, stimulant exposure history, caffeine status, nicotine status, sleep duration, and period effects.

Because expected effects at threshold-dose levels are likely to be small, future studies should include an a priori power calculation and avoid interpreting underpowered exploratory findings as evidence of efficacy. Sample-size planning should be based on the predefined primary endpoint rather than on exploratory outcome clusters.

Task initiation is difficult to measure. In a laboratory, asking a participant to begin a task measures instruction-following and latency under artificial conditions. It does not fully capture free, intrinsically generated task initiation under real-life procrastination conditions. In a home or field setting, task initiation may be more ecologically valid, but it becomes more vulnerable to self-report bias, expectancy, environmental variability, unmeasured stimulant exposure, and uncontrolled daily demands.

A strong design should therefore combine laboratory endpoints with ecological measures. Laboratory endpoints may include latency to begin a standardized task, choice between effortful and low-effort task options, reaction-time variability, time on task, and persistence during monotonous work. Ecological endpoints may include time-stamped task engagement, digital activity logs, preregistered task windows, completion of small routines, and structured self-report collected under blinded placebo comparison.

Field measures should not be treated as pure behavioral truth. They require validation against objective timestamps, predefined task windows, and standardized task demands. If the study relies only on subjective reports such as “I started work more easily,” it risks measuring expectancy, mood, self-narrative, or productivity identity rather than pharmacological activation.

The strongest design is randomized, placebo-controlled, and preferably crossover. It should include active exposure days, placebo days, and drug-free or washout intervals under standardized sleep, caffeine, nicotine, meal, administration-time, and task conditions. Participants should be blinded whenever possible to reduce expectancy and nocebo effects. Dose escalation, desire to redose, stimulant stacking, and subjective reliance should be measured as safety endpoints rather than treated as incidental behaviors.

The methodological goal is not to maximize the number of positive findings. It is to determine whether a narrowly defined functional activation or behavioral-repetition endpoint survives placebo control,

multiple-comparison correction, interaction control, carry-over analysis, adequate statistical power, and performance-quality assessment.

15. Neuroplasticity, Salience, and Learning Windows

Neuroplasticity is central to the discussion but must be defined precisely. Neuroplasticity is not automatically beneficial. It refers to the nervous system's capacity to change. Such change can be adaptive, neutral, or maladaptive depending on dose, frequency, context, developmental stage, behavioral pairing, and reinforcement structure.

Methylphenidate modulates dopaminergic and noradrenergic systems involved in attention, salience, effort, learning, and reinforcement [1,14]. Under appropriate conditions, increased attention and salience may support adaptive learning. For example, if a person uses an improved attentional state to practice organization, study, impulse control, or task completion, methylphenidate may indirectly support the stabilization of functional behaviors.

This learning-window model is consistent with the behavioral-change logic described earlier. Mastery experiences can strengthen self-efficacy [20], implementation intentions can strengthen the transition from intention to action [21], and repeated behavior in stable contexts can gradually become more automatic [22,23]. Very-low-dose methylphenidate may therefore be studied as a possible support for repeated constructive action, not as an independent cause of personal transformation.

However, the same mechanisms can support maladaptive learning. If the stimulant is repeatedly paired with productivity, work confidence, study, emotional control, or self-worth, the nervous system may learn that these functions require pharmacological activation. In that case, neuroplasticity becomes reward-coupled dependence learning rather than healthy behavioral adaptation.

Carvallo et al. examined the effects of single and repeated methylphenidate administration on synaptic plasticity in rat hippocampal neurons. They reported that single and repeated exposure modulated synaptic plasticity in opposite directions through alpha-amino-3-hydroxy-5-methyl-4-isoxazolepropionic acid (AMPA) receptor-related mechanisms [42]. This finding does not establish equivalent effects in humans or at threshold-dose exposure, but it supports the methodological point that methylphenidate-related plasticity should not be treated as uniformly beneficial or dose-independent.

The paper therefore treats neuroplasticity as a bidirectional mechanism. Very-low-dose methylphenidate may support adaptive learning windows when paired with constructive behavior and intermittent exposure. It may support maladaptive reinforcement when paired with repeated productivity dependence, redosing, escalation, or absence of drug-free functioning checks. Future studies should therefore monitor paradoxical fatigue, anxiety, irritability, motor symptoms, tic emergence, craving, rebound, and dose-escalation pressure as safety outcomes.

16. Ethical and Regulatory Boundaries

Very-low-dose methylphenidate research must be ethically and legally cautious. Methylphenidate is a prescription stimulant with recognized misuse and dependence risks [33]. Although informal pharmacy access to prescription medicines may occur in some jurisdictions, such access should not be equated with

legal over-the-counter status. For research, ethical, and regulatory purposes, methylphenidate should therefore be treated as a prescription-only and often controlled stimulant whose use requires medical and regulatory supervision [33,43].

A responsible research model should include medical screening, cardiovascular monitoring, sleep tracking, adverse-event reporting, interaction screening, craving assessment, off-day function assessment, and monitoring for dose-escalation pressure. Because the central proposed benefit is functional activation, the central risk is also functional: the participant may begin to attribute productivity, confidence, or self-regulation to the stimulant.

The paper must distinguish therapeutic treatment from enhancement-oriented use. In ADHD, methylphenidate may restore impaired function under medical supervision. In healthy individuals, the expected benefit is smaller and the tolerance for risk should be lower. This distinction is essential.

Healthy-volunteer research is ethically possible only when exposure is minimal, the scientific question cannot be answered in a lower-risk population, and the protocol includes strict screening, informed consent, cardiovascular monitoring, interaction exclusion, placebo control, and stopping rules. Early studies may be more defensible in populations with clinically meaningful functional impairment, but carefully controlled healthy-volunteer studies could still be justified when the aim is mechanistic clarification rather than performance promotion.

Stopping rules should be explicit. Participation should be paused or terminated if a participant develops clinically meaningful blood pressure or heart-rate elevation, insomnia, severe anxiety, irritability, motor symptoms, tic emergence, craving, desire to redose, dose-escalation attempts, stimulant stacking, productivity anxiety, or belief that normal functioning is no longer possible without methylphenidate. Participants should receive debriefing and psychological support if substance-linked productivity anxiety or learned reliance emerges.

Comparative substances clarify the ethical boundary. Caffeine is normalized but can disrupt sleep and create dependence-like patterns. Ephedrine, DMAA-like compounds, nicotine, and certain beta-2 adrenergic agonists show how activation markets become risky when performance claims outrun safety evidence or when reinforcement is ignored [31,34–39]. Modafinil and amphetamines show that stronger pharmacological activation increases regulatory and dependence concerns [32,33]. Very-low-dose methylphenidate must therefore be studied within a structured benefit-risk framework.

17. Limitations

Direct trials of 1.25–2.5 mg methylphenidate in healthy adults remain limited, which defines a specific research gap rather than invalidating the functional activation model. Much supporting evidence comes from ADHD, pediatric, geriatric, palliative, medically ill, fatigue-related, apathy-related, or neurological populations. These findings define relevant endpoint domains rather than direct efficacy claims.

Historical studies do not meet modern standards for trial design, blinding, outcome measurement, or adverse-event reporting. Their role is historical and conceptual, not proof of contemporary efficacy. Comparative substances differ substantially in mechanism, legality, duration, safety, and evidence quality. They are not interchangeable alternatives. Their role is to map the broader domain of functional activation.

The dose-response discussion also has limits. Very-low-dose methylphenidate cannot be defined by milligram amount alone. Formulation, enantiomeric exposure, CES1 variability, metabolism, baseline catecholamine state, sleep, anxiety, stimulant tolerance, caffeine, nicotine, and other interacting substances can all alter response. Therefore, any future study must operationalize threshold dose through controlled conditions, not merely through nominal dose.

The behavioral-scaffolding model is also limited. Self-efficacy, implementation intentions, and habit formation research support the plausibility that repeated successful action can stabilize behavior [20–23]. They do not prove that very-low-dose methylphenidate produces such stabilization. The stronger conclusion is that very-low-dose methylphenidate may open a temporary functional window in which constructive behaviors can be practiced. Whether those behaviors persist after the drug window ends must be tested empirically.

The historical Coca comparison is heuristic rather than causal. It does not prove that Coca caused Inca work discipline or that traditional stimulant use can be directly translated into modern methylphenidate use. Its purpose is narrower: to show that stimulant effects acquire behavioral meaning through cultural context, work structure, ritual, obligation, and social norms [24].

The neuroplasticity discussion is also limited. The cited mechanistic evidence from Carvallo et al. comes from rat hippocampal neurons, not from threshold-dose human studies [42]. It should not be used to claim that very-low-dose methylphenidate reliably produces beneficial or harmful brain changes in humans. The stronger conclusion is that methylphenidate may influence salience, effort valuation, learning, and reinforcement, and that these processes can become adaptive or maladaptive depending on schedule and behavioral pairing.

The proposed research model is statistically constrained. Because functional activation is multidimensional, future studies must avoid endpoint inflation. A study that measures many outcomes without endpoint hierarchy, adequate power, and multiple-comparison correction may generate false-positive results. The strongest design is therefore narrow: one predefined primary endpoint, limited secondary endpoints, separate safety endpoints, placebo control, carry-over testing, power calculation, and correction for multiple comparisons.

These limitations define the research agenda. They do not erase the benefit hypothesis. The absence of direct threshold-dose trials defines the research gap: the relevant question has not failed; it has largely not yet been asked in the correct form.

18. Conclusion

Methylphenidate has been studied for decades, but the very-low-dose question remains underdeveloped because it is often forced into the wrong frame. The central question is not whether very low doses make healthy individuals globally smarter. The more precise question is whether subtle catecholaminergic stimulation can reduce executional friction between intention and action.

The evidence reviewed here supports a functional activation model. Historical methylphenidate use, low-dose ADHD data, pharmacokinetic and CES1 findings, effort-based decision-making research, fatigue and apathy literature, behavioral-change theory, habit formation research, historical stimulant-use

examples, and comparative stimulant evidence all point toward the same research domain: activation, effort, task engagement, and repeated goal-directed behavior.

The strongest version of the hypothesis is not that methylphenidate transforms the person directly. Rather, very-low-dose methylphenidate may provide temporary behavioral scaffolding. If the activation window helps a person begin tasks, complete routines, tolerate effort, and experience mastery, longer-term benefit may arise from repeated constructive action, strengthened self-efficacy, and habit formation.

This hypothesis is scientifically valuable because it is narrow, testable, and ethically controllable. It requires predefined endpoints, dose precision, interaction control, placebo comparison, performance-quality assessment, adequate statistical power, drug-free intervals, and monitoring for learned reliance. Very-low-dose methylphenidate should therefore be understood as a pharmacological probe of functional activation and subtle behavioral change, not as a universal nootropic or a casual productivity aid.

19. Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

20. Acknowledgement

No external funding was received for this article. The author is solely responsible for the conception, analysis, writing, and final approval of the manuscript. Artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted tools were used for language editing, structural refinement, and readability improvement. The author reviewed, revised, and approved the final manuscript and takes full responsibility for its content.

References

1. Swanson, J. M., & Volkow, N. D. (2003). Serum and brain concentrations of methylphenidate: Implications for use and abuse. Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 27(7), 615–621. DOI: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2003.08.013
2. Rubenstein, E. (2026). Beyond Psychedelic Microdosing: Therapeutic Potential, Neuropharmacology, and Safety Considerations in Low-Dose Psychoactive Use. Journal of Advances in Developmental Research, 17(1), 1–22. DOI: 10.71097/IJAIDR.v17.i1.1997
3. United States Food and Drug Administration. (2023). Drug Therapeutics & Regulation in the U.S. FDA History Exhibits. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/fda-history-exhibits/drug-therapeutics-regulation-us. Accessed June 22, 2026.
4. Ferguson, J. T., & Funderburk, W. H. (1956). Improving senile behavior with reserpine and Ritalin: New approach with use of methyl phenylpiperidylacetate. Journal of the American Medical Association, 160(4), 259–263. DOI: 10.1001/jama.1956.02960390009003
5. Kaplitz, S. E. (1975). Withdrawn, apathetic geriatric patients responsive to methylphenidate. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 23(6), 271–276. DOI: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.1975.tb00317.x
6. Gurian, B., & Rosowsky, E. (1990). Low-dose methylphenidate in the very old. Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry and Neurology, 3(3), 152–154. DOI: 10.1177/089198879000300305

7. Arnsten, A. F. T. (2009). Stress signalling pathways that impair prefrontal cortex structure and function. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 10(6), 410–422. DOI: 10.1038/nrn2648
8. Sawaguchi, T., & Goldman-Rakic, P. S. (1991). D1 dopamine receptors in prefrontal cortex: Involvement in working memory. Science, 251(4996), 947–950. DOI: 10.1126/science.1825731
9. Greenhill, L. L., Kollins, S., Abikoff, H., McCracken, J., Riddle, M., Swanson, J., McGough, J., Wigal, S., Wigal, T., Vitiello, B., Skrobala, A., Posner, K., Ghuman, J., Davies, M., Chuang, S., & Cunningham, C. (2006). Efficacy and safety of immediate-release methylphenidate treatment for preschoolers with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 45(11), 1284–1293. DOI: 10.1097/01.chi.0000235077.32661.61
10. Stage, C., Jürgens, G., Guski, L. S., Thomsen, R., Bjerre, D., Ferrero-Miliani, L., Lyauk, Y. K., Rasmussen, H. B., & Dalhoff, K. (2017). The impact of CES1 genotypes on the pharmacokinetics of methylphenidate in healthy Danish subjects. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 83(7), 1506–1514. DOI: 10.1111/bcp.13237
11. Lyauk, Y. K., Stage, C., Bergmann, T. K., Ferrero-Miliani, L., Bjerre, D., Thomsen, R., Dalhoff, K., Rasmussen, H. B., & Jürgens, G. (2016). Population pharmacokinetics of methylphenidate in healthy adults emphasizing novel and known effects of several carboxylesterase 1 (CES1) variants. Clinical and Translational Science, 9(6), 337–345. DOI: 10.1111/cts.12423
12. Markowitz, J. S., DeVane, C. L., Boulton, D. W., Nahas, Z., Risch, S. C., Diamond, F., & Patrick, K. S. (2000). Ethylphenidate formation in human subjects after the administration of a single dose of methylphenidate and ethanol. Drug Metabolism and Disposition, 28(6), 620–624. Available at: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10820132/
13. Cortese, S., Adamo, N., Del Giovane, C., Mohr-Jensen, C., Hayes, A. J., Carucci, S., Atkinson, L. Z., Tessari, L., Banaschewski, T., Coghill, D., Hollis, C., Simonoff, E., Zuddas, A., Barbui, C., Purgato, M., Steinhausen, H. C., Shokraneh, F., Xia, J., & Cipriani, A. (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. DOI: 10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30269-4
14. Volkow, N. D., Wang, G. J., Fowler, J. S., Telang, F., Maynard, L., Logan, J., Gatley, S. J., Pappas, N., Wong, C., Vaska, P., Zhu, W., & Swanson, J. M. (2004). Evidence that methylphenidate enhances the saliency of a mathematical task by increasing dopamine in the human brain. American Journal of Psychiatry, 161(7), 1173–1180. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.161.7.1173
15. Westbrook, A., van den Bosch, R., Määttä, J. I., Hofmans, L., Papadopetraki, D., Cools, R., & Frank, M. J. (2020). Dopamine promotes cognitive effort by biasing the benefits versus costs of cognitive work. Science, 367(6484), 1362–1366. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaz5891
16. Hofmans, L., Papadopetraki, D., van den Bosch, R., Määttä, J. I., Froböse, M. I., Zandbelt, B. B., Westbrook, A., Verkes, R. J., Cools, R., & Frank, M. J. (2020). Methylphenidate boosts choices of mental labor over leisure depending on striatal dopamine synthesis capacity. Neuropsychopharmacology, 45, 2170–2179. DOI: 10.1038/s41386-020-00834-1

17. Blockmans, D., Persoons, P., Van Houdenhove, B., Lejeune, M., Bobbaers, H., & Knockaert, D. (2006). Does methylphenidate reduce the symptoms of chronic fatigue syndrome? American Journal of Medicine, 119(2), 167.e23–167.e30. DOI: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2005.07.047
18. Hardy, S. E. (2009). Methylphenidate for the treatment of depressive symptoms, including fatigue and apathy, in medically ill older adults and terminally ill adults. American Journal of Geriatric Pharmacotherapy, 7(1), 34–59. DOI: 10.1016/j.amjopharm.2009.02.006
19. Mintzer, J., Lanctôt, K. L., Scherer, R. W., Rosenberg, P. B., Herrmann, N., van Dyck, C. H., Padala, P. R., Brawman-Mintzer, O., Porsteinsson, A. P., Drye, L. T., & Munro, C. A. (2021). Effect of methylphenidate on apathy in patients with Alzheimer disease: The ADMET 2 randomized clinical trial. JAMA Neurology, 78(11), 1324–1332. DOI: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2021.3356
20. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191–215. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191
21. Gollwitzer, P. M. (1999). Implementation intentions: Strong effects of simple plans. American Psychologist, 54(7), 493–503. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.54.7.493
22. Wood, W., & Neal, D. T. (2007). A new look at habits and the habit-goal interface. Psychological Review, 114(4), 843–863. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.114.4.843
23. Lally, P., van Jaarsveld, C. H. M., Potts, H. W. W., & Wardle, J. (2010). How are habits formed: Modelling habit formation in the real world. European Journal of Social Psychology, 40(6), 998–1009. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.674
24. Biondich, A. S., & Joslin, J. D. (2016). Coca: The history and medical significance of an ancient Andean tradition. Emergency Medicine International, 2016, Article ID 4048764. DOI: 10.1155/2016/4048764
25. Linssen, A. M. W., Sambeth, A., Vuurman, E. F. P. M., & Riedel, W. J. (2014). Cognitive effects of methylphenidate in healthy volunteers: A review of single dose studies. International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology, 17(6), 961–977. DOI: 10.1017/S1461145713001594
26. Ilieva, I. P., Hook, C. J., & Farah, M. J. (2015). Prescription stimulants' effects on healthy inhibitory control, working memory, and episodic memory: A meta-analysis. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 27(6), 1069–1089. DOI: 10.1162/jocn_a_00776
27. Roberts, C. A., Jones, A., Sumnall, H., Gage, S. H., & Montgomery, C. (2020). How effective are pharmaceuticals for cognitive enhancement in healthy adults? A series of meta-analyses of cognitive performance during acute administration of modafinil, methylphenidate and d-amphetamine. European Neuropsychopharmacology, 38, 40–62. DOI: 10.1016/j.euroneuro.2020.07.002
28. Bowman, E., Coghill, D., Murawski, C., & Bossaerts, P. (2023). Not so smart? "Smart" drugs increase the level but decrease the quality of cognitive effort. Science Advances, 9(24), eadd4165. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.add4165
29. Mitchell, E. S., Slettenaar, M., van der Meer, N., Transler, C., Jans, L., Quadt, F., & Berry, M. (2011). Differential contributions of theobromine and caffeine on mood, psychomotor

performance and blood pressure. Physiology & Behavior, 104(5), 816–822. DOI: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2011.07.027

30. Weinberger, M., & Hendeles, L. (1996). Theophylline in asthma. New England Journal of Medicine, 334(21), 1380–1388. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199605233342107
31. Shekelle, P. G., Hardy, M. L., Morton, S. C., Maglione, M., Mojica, W. A., Suttorp, M. J., Rhodes, S. L., Jungvig, L., & Gagné, J. (2003). Efficacy and safety of Ephedra and ephedrine for weight loss and athletic performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of the American Medical Association, 289(12), 1537–1545. DOI: 10.1001/jama.289.12.1537
32. Battleday, R. M., & Brem, A. K. (2015). Modafinil for cognitive neuroenhancement in healthy non-sleep-deprived subjects: A systematic review. European Neuropsychopharmacology, 25(11), 1865–1881. DOI: 10.1016/j.euroneuro.2015.07.028
33. United States Food and Drug Administration. (2023). Ritalin and Ritalin-SR prescribing information: Boxed warning, contraindications, and drug interactions. FDA Reference ID: 5214890. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2023/010187s078,018029s049lbl.pdf. Accessed June 22, 2026.
34. Valentine, G., & Sofuoglu, M. (2018). Cognitive effects of nicotine: Recent progress. Current Neuropharmacology, 16(4), 403–414. DOI: 10.2174/1570159X15666171103152136
35. Hartmann-Boyce, J., Chepkin, S. C., Ye, W., Bullen, C., & Lancaster, T. (2018). Nicotine replacement therapy versus control for smoking cessation. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2018(5), CD000146. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000146.pub5
36. West, R., Hajek, P., Foulds, J., Nilsson, F., May, S., & Meadows, A. (2000). A comparison of the abuse liability and dependence potential of nicotine patch, gum, spray and inhaler. Psychopharmacology, 149, 198–202. DOI: 10.1007/s002130000382
37. Shahab, L., Beard, E., Brown, J., & West, R. (2016). Prevalence and impact of long-term use of nicotine replacement therapy in UK stop-smoking services: Findings from the ELONS study. Nicotine & Tobacco Research, 18(5), 1038–1046. DOI: 10.1093/ntr/ntv227
38. United States Food and Drug Administration. (2023). DMAA in Products Marketed as Dietary Supplements. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/food/information-dietary-supplement-ingredient/dmaa-products-marketed-dietary-supplements. Accessed June 22, 2026.
39. Cohen, P. A., Travis, J. C., Vanhee, C., Ohana, D., & Venhuis, B. J. (2021). Nine prohibited stimulants found in sports and weight loss supplements: Deterenol, phenpromethamine (Vonedrine), oxilofrine, octodrine, beta-methylphenethylamine, 1,3-dimethylamylamine, 1,4-dimethylamylamine, 1,3-dimethylbutylamine and higenamine. Clinical Toxicology, 59(11), 975–981. DOI: 10.1080/15563650.2021.1894333
40. Ibrahim, K., & Donyai, P. (2015). Drug holidays from ADHD medication: International experience over the past four decades. Journal of Attention Disorders, 19(7), 551–568. DOI: 10.1177/1087054714548035

41. Handelman, K., & Sumiya, F. (2022). Tolerance to stimulant medication for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: Literature review and case report. Brain Sciences, 12(8), 959. DOI: 10.3390/brainsci12080959
42. Carvallo, C., Contreras, D., Ugarte, G., Delgado, R., Pancetti, F., Rozas, C., Piña, R., Constandil, L., Zeise, M. L., & Morales, B. (2018). Single and repeated administration of methylphenidate modulates synaptic plasticity in opposite directions via insertion of AMPA receptors in rat hippocampal neurons. Frontiers in Pharmacology, 9, 1485. DOI: 10.3389/fphar.2018.01485
43. International Narcotics Control Board. Country regulations for travellers carrying medicines containing controlled substances. Available at: https://www.incb.org/incb/en/travellers/country-regulations.html. Accessed June 22, 2026.