



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1002/eat.22823](https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22823)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Nazar, B. P., Peynenburg, V., Rhind, C., Hibbs, R., Schmidt, U., Gowers, S., Macdonald, P., Goddard, E., Todd, G., Micali, N., & Treasure, J. (2018). An examination of the clinical outcomes of adolescents and young adults with broad autism spectrum traits and autism spectrum disorder and anorexia nervosa: A multi centre study. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 51(2), 174-179. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22823>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 An examination of the clinical outcomes of adolescents and young adults with broad autism
2 spectrum traits and autism spectrum disorder and anorexia nervosa: a multi centre study.

3
4 Bruno Palazzo Nazar¹, Vanessa Peynenburg², Dr. Charlotte Rhind³, Dr. Rebecca Hibbs³, Prof.
5 Ulrike Schmidt³, Prof. Simon Gowers⁴, Dr. Pamela Macdonald³, Dr. Elizabeth Goddard³, Ms.
6 Gillian Todd⁵, Dr. Nadia Micali^{6,7} and Prof. Janet Treasure^{3*}

7
8 ¹Institute of Psychiatry - Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (IPUB-UFRJ), Brazil

9 ²University of Alberta, Department of Psychology, Edmonton, AB, Canada

10 ³King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, Department of
11 Psychological Medicine, Section of Eating Disorders, London, UK

12 ⁷University College London, Institute of Child Health, Behavioural and Brain Sciences Unit,
13 London, UK

14 ⁶Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, Department of Psychiatry, New York, NY, US

15 ⁴University of Liverpool, Adolescent Psychiatry, Chester, UK

16 ⁵South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

17

18

19 Manuscript word count: 1812

20 Abstract word count: 185

21

22

23

24 ***Corresponding author: Bruno Palazzo Nazar** | Address Rua Visconde de Pirajá 547 – sala
25 610 – Rio de Janeiro – Brasil – ZIP: 22415900 | Email: bruno.nazar@gmail.com | Telephone:
26 +5521 36473649

27

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Abstract

Objectives

To compare the clinical outcomes of adolescents and young adults with anorexia nervosa (AN) co-morbid with broad autism spectrum disorder (ASD) or ASD traits.

Method

The Developmental and Well-Being Assessment (DAWBA) and Social Aptitude Scale (SAS) were used to categorise adolescents and young adults with AN (N=149) into those with ASD traits (N=23), and those who also fulfilled diagnostic criteria for a possible/probable ASD (N=6). We compared both eating disorders specific measures and broader outcome measures at intake and twelve months follow-up.

Results

Those with ASD traits had significantly more inpatient/day-patient service use ($p=.015$), as well as medication use ($p<.001$) at baseline. Both groups All patients had high social difficulties and poorer global functioning (SDQ) at baseline , which improved over time but remained higher at 12 months in the ASD traits group ($p=.002$). However, the improvement in eating disorder symptoms at 12 months was similar between groups with or without ASD traits. Treatment completion rates between AN only and ASD traits were similar (80.1 vs. 86.5%).

Conclusion

Adolescents with AN and ASD traits show similar reductions in their eating disorder symptoms. Nevertheless, their social difficulties remain high suggesting that these are life-long difficulties rather than starvation effects.

1 **Introduction**

2

3 Neurodevelopmental disorders have been associated with Eating Disorders (ED), with
4 Attention-Deficit / Hyperactivity Disorder linked to Bulimia Nervosa (BN) and Binge Eating
5 Disorder (BED) (Nazar et al., 2016), and Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) to Anorexia
6 Nervosa (AN) (Baron-Cohen et al., 2013; Tchanturia et al., 2013). There has been interest in
7 the impact these might have upon treatment and prognosis (Westwood & Tchanturia, 2017).

8

9 In a Swedish cohort of AN adolescents, 32% had ASD traits at some time over the course of
10 18 years follow-up and this sub-group had a poorer long term prognosis (Anckarsäter et al.,
11 2012), with particular problems in mental and social functioning (Nielsen et al., 2015). In a
12 series of AN cases referred to a specialized child and adolescent service, 6.9% had broad
13 ASD traits (using the Autism-Spectrum Quotient [AQ]) and this sub-group were more likely
14 to progress to more intensive levels of care (day or inpatient) (Stewart, McEwen,
15 Konstantellou, Eisler, & Simic, 2017). In line with these findings, we have previously
16 reported that 19% of AN adolescents presenting for treatment had ASD traits with 4%
17 receiving a probable/possible ASD diagnosis (Rhind et al., 2014). These findings suggest that
18 people with AN and associated ASD traits may have a less favorable prognosis.

19

20 We therefore aimed to examine the 12 months outcomes of patients who had ASD traits and
21 those with a probable/possible ASD diagnosis in a sample of individuals with AN
22 participating in a randomized controlled trial.

23

24 **Method**

1 The present report is a secondary data analysis from the Experienced Carers Helping Others
2 (ECHO) trial. This trial aimed to assess the benefits of a carer intervention added to usual
3 treatment, where they received materials and telephone coaching to better cope with their
4 offspring's ED.

5

6 Participants were aged between 13-21 and consisted of 149 adolescents with AN or Atypical
7 AN, among which, 15.4% had ASD traits and 4% received a possible/probable ASD
8 diagnosis. Some baseline features have been described previously (Rhind et al., 2014) as well
9 as details regarding the original trial (Hibbs et al., 2015).

10

11 **Assessment Measures**

12 Details regarding measures can be found in the Supplementary materials and are summarised
13 below:

14 *The Developmental and Well-being Assessment (DAWBA)* (Goodman, Ford, Richards,
15 Gatward, & Meltzer, 2000). Both parent and patients completed the ED and ASD modules
16 for this computerized diagnostic instrument and trained psychiatrists confirmed the
17 psychiatric diagnosis afterwards (DSM-IV (American Psychiatric Association, 2000) and
18 ICD-10 (World Health Organization, 1993).

19 *Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)* (Goodman & Scott, 1999). An instrument
20 with five sub-scales (peer problems, prosocial difficulties, hyperactivity, emotional problems,
21 and conduct problems), completed both by parent and patients at baseline and 12 months.

1 *Social Aptitude Scale (SAS)*(Liddle, Batty, & Goodman, 2009). Parents report
2 retrospectively on their child's social development comparing their child's abilities to those of
3 their peers, completed at baseline only.

4 *The Short Evaluation of Eating Disorders (SEED)* (Bauer, Winn, Schmidt, & Kordy, 2005).
5 A 6-item measure of ED symptom severity. The outcomes include a three items severity
6 score for AN (ANTSI) and three items for BN (BNTSI). The score from each item can range
7 from 0 to 3 (0 = symptom not present; 3 = symptom is extreme).

8 *The Depression, Stress and Anxiety Scale (DASS-21)* (Henry & Crawford, 2005). A
9 shortened version of the DASS with good internal consistency on each of the sub-scales.

10

11 **Statistical Analyses**

12 Statistical analyses were completed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 22. The sample was
13 divided into two sub-groups (mutually exclusive) based on scores on the SAS using standard
14 cut off criteria (Liddle, Batty, & Goodman, 2009): (1) AN only (SAS above 16) (n=126); (2)
15 broad ASD traits (n=23). Among the latter group, six individuals formed the ASD diagnosis
16 subset which was also compared to AN only.

17 As the group with broad ASD traits is small, we report Cohen's d effect sizes to indicate the
18 magnitude of differences between groups. Cohen's effect sizes are understood as negligible
19 (<0.15), small ($0.15 \leq d < 0.40$), medium ($0.40 \leq d < 0.75$), large ($0.75 \leq d$).

20 Mann-Whitney U tests compared differences between sub-groups where the data was non-
21 parametrically distributed. Chi-square tests were performed for comparing proportions and
22 Spearman correlations for non-parametric associations.

1

2 **Results**

3 The baseline sociodemographic characteristics are presented in **Table 1** and the clinical
4 characteristics are presented in **Table 2**. Regarding ECHO treatment allocation, there were no
5 significant differences between AN only and broad ASD traits groups ($X^2 = .077$; $p = .782$).
6 Participants with broad ASD traits had had more general inpatient and day-patient days ($U =$
7 1077.0 , $z = 2.433$, $p = .015$) and had been more frequently admitted to an ED specialist
8 inpatient treatment (18.2% vs 5%; ($X^2 = 6.62$; $p = .02$). Furthermore, the ASD group
9 presented with more antipsychotic use ($X^2 = 11.74$; $p < .001$) prior to presentation. Baseline
10 SAS scores were significantly and inversely correlated with baseline antipsychotic use in the
11 total sample ($\rho = -.21$; $p = .017$). At baseline, ED symptoms were similar between groups
12 but the group with broad ASD traits had higher parental ($p < .0001$) and self-reported ($U =$
13 795.5 , $z = -2.16$, $p = .03$) total general difficulties on the SDQ.

14 There was no significant difference ($X^2 = .588$; $p = .44$) between the proportion of participants
15 who completed the 12 month follow-up in the AN only (80.1%) and the broad ASD traits
16 group (86.95%). Both groups had similar increases in BMI and *weight for height* from
17 baseline to 12 months, as well as similar reductions in ED symptoms. After 12 months, there
18 were no differences between the groups in medication use ($X^2 = 2.44$; $p = .111$) (**Table 1**).

19 Both groups had decreases in general difficulties (SDQ) over time. However, those in the
20 ASD group continued to have a higher level of total general difficulties (SDQ) at 12 month
21 ($U = 49.0$, $z = -3.10$, $p = .002$). Parents, in general, reported higher levels of problems than the
22 patients themselves but there was convergence between parent ($U = 485.0$, $z = -3.23$, $p =$
23 $.0001$) and patient reports ($U = 280.0$, $z = -3.68$, $p < .0001$). Significantly higher general
24 difficulties (SDQ) among those in the ASD traits group were found for both parent ($U =$

1 497.0, $z= 4.24$, $p< .0001$) and self-report ($U= 795.5$, $z= -2.16$, $p= .03$), and for the subscale
2 peer difficulties (SDQ), both on parent ($U= 422.0$, $z= -4.56$, $p< .0001$) and self-report ($U=$
3 629.5 , $z= -3.25$, $p< .0001$). SDQ results are presented in **Table 3** for AN only versus Broad
4 ASD traits group, and SDQ data from the ASD subset is presented in a different version of
5 this table on the **Supplementary materials**.

6

7 *The ‘ASD probable /possible diagnosis’ subgroup*

8 The social difficulties of the six participants (five possible, one definite) with an ASD
9 diagnosis improved over time ($d= 2.02$; $p= .03$) but, as expected, remained higher than in the
10 other group of patients. Other domains of difficulties also improved (**Table 2**).

11 We obtained an update on the clinical functioning of these six possible cases at two-years
12 post intake. Four of them had continued in treatment; one had persistent AN and low weight
13 ($BMI = 15.7 \text{ kg/m}^2$); another transitioned to Bulimia Nervosa and eventually reached a BMI
14 of 25kg/m^2 . One patient experienced continuing social and mood problems and another
15 severe OCD. The remaining two were not in treatment and were presumed to be well.

16

17 **Discussion**

18 The aim of this study was to examine the clinical course of young people with AN who also
19 had ASD traits (broad and narrow/diagnostic). The ASD traits group had a greater use of
20 intensive treatment (in/day-patient) and medication use before presentation to the specialist
21 clinic and more general difficulties (SDQ), both at baseline and after receiving specialist
22 treatment. However, eating disorder symptoms (BMI, *weight for height* and SEED) in the
23 broad and narrow/diagnostic groups did not differ from the comparison group both at

1 baseline and at 12 months. The majority of the narrow/diagnostic group continued to have
2 contact with mental health services two years after presentation, two of whom had a
3 persistent eating disorder. A poorer prognosis in the ASD group appears to relate to the more
4 severe general comorbidity than to the eating disorder outcomes alone.

5

6 The 15.4% (23/149) prevalence of SAS scores below cut-off (ASD traits group) in this
7 sample is the same as that found in a clinical cohort of AN and EDNOS cases (Stewart et al.,
8 2017). However, the computer generated probability of ASD diagnosis from the DAWBA in
9 the clinical cohort (Stewart et al., 2017) did not differ from community norms, whilst in our
10 sample, a trained psychiatrist reviewed the DAWBA and we found one probable and five
11 possible cases (Rhind et al., 2014). There were differences in the clinical specifiers between
12 these studies., . The clinical cohort (Stewart et al., 2017) included people with an age range of
13 9-18 (mean=14.6), whereas the current study included people from age 13-21 years
14 (mean=17). Previous studies suggest that the prevalence of ASD traits varies according to the
15 age/duration of illness of the sample included. For example, in a recent meta-analysis lower
16 levels of ASD traits were reported in children/adolescents than in adult samples (Westwood
17 et al., 2016). Also, the number of cases who met diagnostic criteria for ASD was higher in
18 inpatients with a more severe form of illness (Wentz et al., 2005).

19

20 In this study we found that although ED related symptoms and physical recovery did not
21 differ between groups, there was a greater severity of residual general comorbidity in the
22 group with ASD. The group with ASD traits had had more intensive treatment at baseline and
23 a large proportion of those with probable/possible diagnosis remained in treatment. In the
24 Swedish cohort followed up over 30 years, participants with ASD traits were found to have a
25 poorer global outcome (using Morgan and Russell scales) (Nielsen et al., 2015). Inpatients

1 with ASD traits and/or diagnosis also didn't improve as much as their non-ASD counterparts
2 from group Cognitive Remediation Therapy (Tchanturia, Larsson, & Adamson, 2016).
3 Interestingly, this study found that although people with ASD engaged with treatment as
4 much as non-ASD, the same was found in another adult inpatient sample (Huke, Turk,
5 Saeidi, Kent, & Morgan, 2014)

6

7

8 **Clinical Implications**

9

10 Patients with ASD comorbidity have a poorer global outcome (with residual problems that
11 relate to their ASD traits), although eating symptoms do appear for the most part to respond
12 to standard care. It is possible that this group need a form of psychosocial intervention which
13 focuses more on social identity and functioning (McNamara & Parsons, 2016). For example,
14 the addition of the New Maudsley method of collaborative care, which equips families with
15 skills training to improve their understanding and support for the individual, was found to
16 improve peer functioning and prosocial behavior in AN patients (Hibbs et al., 2015).

17

18 **Strengths and Limitations**

19 A major strength of this study was the use of multimodal and multi-informant assessments
20 measures (DAWBA; SAS; SDQ) and the setting within a RCT with repeated assessment
21 measures (*e.g.* monthly weight measures). Nevertheless, given the low prevalence of ASD
22 traits, the study may not have had sufficient power to detect different outcomes. Also, a full
23 cost effectiveness analysis has not been completed. Although this study was representative of
24 adolescents with AN presenting across the UK, there may have been a degree of selection, as
25 carers had to agree to participate in order for adolescents to be included in the study. Also, we

1 didn't use a structured clinical interview with patients to diagnose ASD and we didn't control
2 for the presence of other comorbidities. Finally, the use of a 6-item assessment (SEED) might
3 have impaired our analysis as it didn't cover all the aspects of ED symptomatology.

4

5 **Conclusion**

6 For the most part, the eating disorder symptoms in adolescents/young adults with AN and
7 ASD traits resolve in the same time frame, and to the same degree, as those of people with
8 AN without such traits. Continuing problems in social and emotional functioning occurred in
9 those with broad ASD traits and those with an ASD diagnosis.

10

11 **Acknowledgments**

12 This report/article presents independent research commissioned by the National Institute for
13 Health Research (NIHR) under its Research for patient benefit (RfPB) programme (PB –PG-
14 0609-19025). Research Title: Expert Carers Helping Others (ECHO) (IRAS Code: 55754 CSP:
15 55754). The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily
16 those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health. SL, JT and US receive salary support
17 from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Mental Health Biomedical Research
18 Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. US
19 is supported by an NIHR Senior Investigator Award. CR was supported by the Psychiatry
20 Research Trust

References

- 1
2 American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental*
3 *Disorders, Fourth Edition, Text Revision (DSM-IV-TR)* (4th edn, t, Vol. 1). Arlington,
4 VA: American Psychiatric Association.
5 <http://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890423349>
- 6 Anckarsäter, H., Hofvander, B., Billstedt, E., Gillberg, I. C., Gillberg, C., Wentz, E., &
7 Råstam, M. (2012). The sociocommunicative deficit subgroup in anorexia nervosa:
8 autism spectrum disorders and neurocognition in a community-based, longitudinal
9 study. *Psychological Medicine*, *42*(9), 1957–67.
10 <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711002881>
- 11 Baron-Cohen, S., Jaffa, T., Davies, S., Auyeung, B., Allison, C., & Wheelwright, S. (2013).
12 Do girls with anorexia nervosa have elevated autistic traits? *Molecular Autism*, *4*(1), 24.
13 <http://doi.org/10.1186/2040-2392-4-24>
- 14 Bauer, S., Winn, S., Schmidt, U., & Kordy, H. (2005). Construction, scoring and validation
15 of the Short Evaluation of Eating Disorders (SEED). *European Eating Disorders*
16 *Review*, *13*(3), 191–200. <http://doi.org/10.1002/erv.637>
- 17 Goodman, R., Ford, T., Richards, H., Gatward, R., & Meltzer, H. (2000). The Development
18 and Well-Being Assessment: description and initial validation of an integrated
19 assessment of child and adolescent psychopathology. *Journal of Child Psychology and*
20 *Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, *41*(5), 645–55. Retrieved from
21 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10946756>
- 22 Henry, J. D., & Crawford, J. R. (2005). The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety
23 Stress Scales (DASS-21): Construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical
24 sample. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *44*(2), 227–239.
25 <http://doi.org/10.1348/014466505X29657>
- 26 Hibbs, R., Magill, N., Goddard, E., Rhind, C., Raenker, S., Macdonald, P., Treasure, J.
27 (2015). Clinical effectiveness of a skills training intervention for caregivers in
28 improving patient and caregiver health following in- patient treatment for severe
29 anorexia nervosa : pragmagnostic randomised controlled trial. *British Journal of*
30 *Psychiatry*, *1*(September), 56–66. <http://doi.org/10.1192/bjpo.bp.115.000273>
- 31 Huke, V., Turk, J., Saeidi, S., Kent, A., & Morgan, J. F. (2014). The clinical implications of
32 high levels of autism spectrum disorder features in anorexia nervosa: a pilot study.
33 *European Eating Disorders Review : The Journal of the Eating Disorders Association*,
34 *22*(2), 116–21. <http://doi.org/10.1002/erv.2269>
- 35 Liddle, E. B., Batty, M. J., & Goodman, R. (2009). The Social Aptitudes Scale: an initial
36 validation. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *44*(6), 508–13.
37 <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-008-0456-4>
- 38 McNamara, N., & Parsons, H. (2016). “Everyone here wants everyone else to get better”:
39 The role of social identity in eating disorder recovery. *British Journal of Social*
40 *Psychology*, *55*(4), 662–680. <http://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12161>
- 41 Nazar, B. P., Bernardes, C., Peachey, G., Sergeant, J., Mattos, P., & Treasure, J. (2016). The
42 risk of eating disorders comorbid with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: A

- 1 systematic review and meta-analysis. *The International Journal of Eating Disorders*.
2 <http://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22643>
- 3 Nielsen, S., Anckarsäter, H., Gillberg, C., Gillberg, C., Råstam, M., & Wentz, E. (2015).
4 Effects of autism spectrum disorders on outcome in teenage-onset anorexia nervosa
5 evaluated by the Morgan-Russell outcome assessment schedule: a controlled
6 community-based study. *Molecular Autism*, 6, 14. [http://doi.org/10.1186/s13229-015-](http://doi.org/10.1186/s13229-015-0013-4)
7 0013-4
- 8 Rhind, C., Bonfioli, E., Hibbs, R., Goddard, E., Macdonald, P., Gowers, S., Treasure, J.
9 (2014). An examination of autism spectrum traits in adolescents with anorexia nervosa
10 and their parents. *Molecular Autism*, 5(1), 56. <http://doi.org/10.1186/2040-2392-5-56>
- 11 Stewart, C. S., McEwen, F. S., Konstantellou, A., Eisler, I., & Simic, M. (2017). Impact of
12 ASD Traits on Treatment Outcomes of Eating Disorders in Girls. *European Eating*
13 *Disorders Review : The Journal of the Eating Disorders Association*, 25(2), 123–128.
14 <http://doi.org/10.1002/erv.2497>
- 15 Tchanturia, K., Larsson, E., & Adamson, J. (2016). How anorexia nervosa patients with high
16 and low autistic traits respond to group Cognitive Remediation Therapy. *BMC*
17 *Psychiatry*, 16(1), 334. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-016-1044-x>
- 18 Tchanturia, K., Smith, E., Weineck, F., Fidanboyly, E., Kern, N., Treasure, J., & Baron
19 Cohen, S. (2013). Exploring autistic traits in anorexia: a clinical study. *Molecular*
20 *Autism*, 4(1), 44. <http://doi.org/10.1186/2040-2392-4-44>
- 21 Wentz, E., Lacey, J. H., Waller, G., Råstam, M., Turk, J., & Gillberg, C. (2005). Childhood
22 onset neuropsychiatric disorders in adult eating disorder patients. A pilot study.
23 *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 14(8), 431–7. [http://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-](http://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-005-0494-3)
24 005-0494-3
- 25 Westwood, H., Eisler, I., Mandy, W., Leppanen, J., Treasure, J., & Tchanturia, K. (2016).
26 Using the Autism-Spectrum Quotient to Measure Autistic Traits in Anorexia Nervosa: A
27 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Autism and Developmental*
28 *Disorders*, 46(3), 964–77. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-015-2641-0>
- 29 World Health Organization. (1993). *The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioral*
30 *Disorders: Diagnostic Criteria for Research*. World Health Organization, Ed. Geneva,
31 Switzerland.

32

33

34

35

Assessment Measures

Patient Assessment Measures. Patients and their parents completed a variety of structured interviews and self-report instruments to assess sociodemographic features, ED symptoms (BMI, SEED), broader clinical characteristics (DAWBA, SDQ, SAS, DASS-21), and clinical service use (CSRI) at intake, 6-months, and 12-months. These are all described below

The Developmental and Well-being Assessment (DAWBA). This is validated measure which generates DSM-IV and ICD-10 psychiatric diagnosis (Goodman, Ford, Richards, Gatward, & Meltzer, 2000). It has excellent discrimination between clinical and healthy cases (McEwen et al., 2016). In the present study, parents (informants) and patients independently completed the autism spectrum diagnostic (ASD) and eating disorders (ED) sections. The computerised interview includes screening questions and skip rules, as well as a free text component (Angold et al., 2012). The strengths and difficulties questionnaire (SDQ) and the social aptitude scale (SAS) form part of the assessment (see below). Afterwards, the computer generates a probability diagnosis that falls into any of six bands, ranging from less than 0.1% or up to 70% chance of a diagnosis. Finally, a psychiatrist trained in the instrument produces the final diagnostic assessment using all of these sources of information. Clinician ratings of the DAWBA were only available at intake.

Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). A 25 items self-report questionnaire on psychological attributes, with five subscales with five questions each (peer problems, prosocial difficulties, hyperactivity, emotional problems, and conduct problems) and seven scores (the five subscales, total score and impact from total score). It is completed both by informants, in this case parents (I = informants), and by patients (SR = self-reports). It has satisfactory reliability (internal consistency: $\alpha = .73$, cross-informant correlation: $\alpha = .34$, and retest stability: $\alpha = .62$) (Johnson, Hollis, Marlow, Simms, & Wolke, 2014). It is frequently used to compare groups and as a “before” and “after” measure instead of being given a cut-off (Goodman & Scott, 1999).

Social Aptitude Scale (SAS). This is a 10 item measure completed by informants on their child's retrospective social development. It explores behaviours representative of their social aptitude and peer relationships, in real life situations that demand complex social responses. Parents compare their child's abilities to their peers, answering whether they are “a lot worse than average”, “a bit worse than average”, “about average”, “a bit better than average”, or “a lot better than average”, which are graded on a likert scale from 0 to 4, on items such as “Can work out what people are really thinking and feeling”. The lowest possible score is 0 and the highest 40. A score of below 16 is suggestive of an ASD diagnosis with a sensitivity of .93 and a specificity of .93, a positive predictive value of .104 and a negative predictive value of .999. Thus, it can be used to investigate ASD traits or to screen for an ASD diagnosis. This measure taps into different constructs than the SDQ and has low to moderate correlation with it. (Liddle, Batty, & Goodman, 2009).

The Short Evaluation of Eating Disorders (SEED) A 6-item measure of ED symptom severity. The outcomes include a separate severity score for Anorexia Nervosa (ANTS) (3 items) and Bulimia Nervosa (BNTSI) (3 items). The score from each item

can range from 0 to 3 (0 = symptom not present; 3 = symptom is extreme). A cut-off score hasn't been suggested by authors (Bauer, Winn, Schmidt, & Kordy, 2005).

The Depression, Stress and Anxiety Scale (DASS-21) (Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995). A shortened version of the DASS-42 with good internal consistency on each of the three subscales (Depression, Anxiety and Stress). The subscales have 7 items each and are presented in a likert scale ranging from 0 to 3. It has been validated in the British population and all subscales have shown good internal consistency (Henry & Crawford, 2005).

Parent Measures

The Client Service Receipt Inventory (CSRI). A structured telephone interview conducted by clinical assessors CR and RH measuring use of specialist and generic health services completed by both the patient and parent. It was used to assess the duration (in weeks) and frequency (days/week) of both formal and informal care (adapted for this study). We divided service use into five categories: all inpatient or day patient days; visits to a GP, Practice Nurse (PN) or A&E; outpatient visits (dietician, psychologist, counsellor, ED group therapy, psychotherapist, community/other psychiatric nurse, alternative therapy, crisis intervention, or occupational therapist), family-related services (FBT, outreach, and social worker visits), and all other help (self-help, support groups, telephone help lines, message boards, and print/Internet sources).

Supplementary version of Table 3 - SDQ results across groups including ASD subset

	Diagnostic group	Baseline measures	12 months measure	Cohen's d (p-value) Baseline vs 12 months	Cohen's d AN only vs AN+Broad ASD (Baseline and 12-months)
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Self report)					
Total score	AN only	16.6 (\pm 5.6) N = 108	14.8 (\pm 6.6) N = 76	.31 (p= .007)	.06
	AN+Broad ASD	19.5 (\pm 7.0) N = 22	18.1 (\pm 5.4) N = 18	.29 (p= .058)	
	ASD subset	18.8 (\pm 6.43) N=6	17.33 (\pm 8.14) N=6	1.20 (p= .23)	N.A.
Impact from total score	AN only	4.3 (\pm 3.4) N = 108	2.6 (\pm 3.0) N = 76	.51 (p< .001)	.51
	AN+Broad ASD	4.6 (\pm 3.8) N = 22	4.7 (\pm 3.5) N = 18	- .03 (p= .94)	
	ASD subset	4.6 (\pm 3.32) N=6	4 (\pm 3.4) N=6	.26 (p= .25)	N.A.
Emotional Symptoms	AN only	6.6 (\pm 2.2) N = 108	5.6 (\pm 2.7) N = 76	.41 (p< .001)	.13
	AN+Broad ASD	6.9 (\pm 2.7) N = 22	6.2 (\pm 2.9) N = 18	.35 (p= .39)	
	ASD subset	6.3 (\pm 2.65) N=6	5.8 (\pm 3) N=6	.28 (p= .45)	N.A.
Hyperactivity	AN only	5 (\pm 2.1) N = 108	4.4 (\pm 2.3) N = 76	.29 (p= .032)	0
	AN+Broad ASD	5.3 (2.1) N = 22	4.7 (1.9) N = 18	.32 (p= .16)	
	ASD subset	5.5 (\pm 2.25) N=6	4.3 (\pm 2.42) N=6	1.49 (p= .10)	N.A.
Peer Problems	AN only	2.9 (\pm 1.9) N = 108	2.9 (\pm 1.8) N = 76	0 (p= .84)	.25
	AN+Broad ASD	4.6 (\pm 2.2) N = 22	5.1 (\pm 2.0) N = 18	- .29 (p= .97)	

	ASD subset	4.6 (<u>+2.58</u>) N=6	5.5 (<u>+2.16</u>) N=6	- .61 (p= .12)	N.A.
Conduct Problems	AN only	2.1 (<u>+1.6</u>) N = 108	1.9 (<u>+1.6</u>) N = 76	.11 (p= .18)	- .18
	AN+Broad ASD	2.7 (<u>+1.9</u>) N = 22	2.2 (<u>+1.6</u>) N = 18	.36 (p= .09)	
	ASD subset	2.3 (<u>+1.86</u>) N=6	1.6 (<u>+1.63</u>) N=6	.56 (p= .15)	N.A.
Prosocial	AN only	8.0 (<u>+1.6</u>) N = 108	7.6 (<u>+2.1</u>) N = 76	.20 (p= .02)	.17
	AN+Broad ASD	7.5 (<u>+2.0</u>) N = 22	7.4 (<u>+1.9</u>) N = 18	.06 (p= .49)	
	ASD subset	7.3 (<u>+1.81</u>) N=6	7.5 (<u>+1.51</u>) N=6	- .52 (p= .56)	N.A.
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Parent report)					
Total score	AN only	14.8 (<u>+6.6</u>) N = 100	12.4 (<u>+6.9</u>) N = 84	.38 (p= .015)	- .15
	AN+Broad ASD	20.6 (<u>+5.4</u>) N = 23	17.2 (<u>+4.9</u>) N=22	.55 (p= .006)	
	ASD subset	20.6 (<u>+5.92</u>) N=6	16.3 (<u>+6.43</u>) N=6	2.02 (p= .03)	N.A.
Impact from total score	AN only	3.5 (<u>+3.1</u>) N = 100	3.0 (<u>+3.4</u>) N = 84	.14 (p= .102)	- .22
	AN+Broad ASD	5.6 (<u>+2.9</u>) N = 23	4.4 (<u>+3.1</u>) N=22	.32 (p= .112)	
	ASD subset	6.6 (<u>+1.5</u>) N=6	4.1 (<u>+2.71</u>) N=6	.79 (p= .104)	N.A.
Emotional Symptoms	AN only	6.2 (<u>+2.5</u>) N = 100	5 (<u>+2.8</u>) N = 84	.44 (p= .001)	- .04
	AN+Broad ASD	7.7 (<u>+1.4</u>) N = 23	6.4 (<u>+2.2</u>) N=22	.64 (p= .009)	
	ASD subset	7.8 (<u>+1.32</u>) N=6	6.5 (<u>+2.88</u>) N=6	.56 (p= .22)	N.A.
Hyperactivity	AN only	3.7 (<u>+2.3</u>) N = 100	3.6 (<u>+2.6</u>) N = 84	.04 (p= .47)	.04
	AN+Broad ASD	4.4 (<u>+2</u>) N = 23	4.4 (<u>+1.8</u>) N=22	0 (p= .62)	
	ASD subset	4.3 (<u>+2.33</u>) N=6	3.5 (<u>+2.34</u>) N=6	.41 (p= .059)	N.A.
Peer Problems	AN only	2.5 (<u>+2.1</u>) N = 100	2.1 (<u>+1.6</u>) N = 84	.23 (p= .26)	- .24

	AN+Broad ASD	4.9 (\pm 1.7) N = 23	4.0 (\pm 2.3) N=22	.37 (p= .17)	
	ASD subset	6 (\pm 1.26) N=6	5.5 (\pm 2.66) N=6	.18 (p= .58)	N.A.
Conduct Problems	AN only	2 (\pm 1.6) N = 100	1.6 (\pm 1.5) N = 84	.25 (p= .09)	- .48
	AN+Broad ASD	3.6 (\pm 1.9) N = 23	2.4 (\pm 2) N=22	.80 (p= .003)	
	ASD subset	2.5 (\pm 2.16) N=6	.8 (\pm 2.6) N=6	.79 (p= .04)	N.A.
Prosocial	AN only	8.4 (\pm 1.5) N = 100	7.7 (\pm 1.9) N = 84	.37 (p= .92)	.77
	AN+Broad ASD	5.2 (\pm 2.3) N = 23	5.8 (\pm 2.2) N=22	- .26 (p= .36)	
	ASD subset	4.5 (\pm 1.97) N=6	5.8 (\pm 2.3) N=6	- .84 (p= .07)	N.A.

Legend: N.A. = Not Applicable; SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire; ASD = Autism Spectrum Disorder

- Angold, A., Erkanli, A., Copeland, W., Goodman, R., Fisher, P. W., & Costello, E. J. (2012). Psychiatric Diagnostic Interviews for Children and Adolescents: A Comparative Study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 51*(5), 506–517. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2012.02.020>
- Bauer, S., Winn, S., Schmidt, U., & Kordy, H. (2005). Construction, scoring and validation of the Short Evaluation of Eating Disorders (SEED). *European Eating Disorders Review, 13*(3), 191–200. <http://doi.org/10.1002/erv.637>
- Goodman, R., Ford, T., Richards, H., Gatward, R., & Meltzer, H. (2000). The Development and Well-Being Assessment: description and initial validation of an integrated assessment of child and adolescent psychopathology. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines, 41*(5), 645–55. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10946756>
- Goodman, R., & Scott, S. (1999). Comparing the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire and the Child Behavior Checklist: is small beautiful? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 27*(1), 17–24. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10197403>
- Henry, J. D., & Crawford, J. R. (2005). The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21): construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical sample. *The British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 44*(Pt 2), 227–39. <http://doi.org/10.1348/014466505X29657>
- Johnson, S., Hollis, C., Marlow, N., Simms, V., & Wolke, D. (2014). Screening for childhood mental health disorders using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: the validity of multi-informant reports. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology, 56*(5), 453–459. <http://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.12360>
- Liddle, E. B., Batty, M. J., & Goodman, R. (2009). The Social Aptitudes Scale: an initial validation. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 44*(6), 508–13. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-008-0456-4>

- Lovibond, P. F., & Lovibond, S. H. (1995). The structure of negative emotional states: comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33(3), 335–43. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7726811>
- McEwen, F. S., Stewart, C. S., Colvert, E., Woodhouse, E., Curran, S., Gillan, N., ... Bolton, P. (2016). Diagnosing autism spectrum disorder in community settings using the Development and Well-Being Assessment: validation in a UK population-based twin sample. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 57(2), 161–170. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12447>

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics

Legends: * = p-value of Mann-Whitney tests for medians or Chi-squares for

	AN only (SAS>16) N= 126	AN+Broad ASD (SAS< 16) N =23	AN only vs. AN+Broad ASD differences (Cohen's d; p-value)*	ASD subset N=6	Total sample N=149
Gender (Male:Female; %Female)	11:115 (91.26%)	1:22 (95.65%)	.16; .47	0:6 (100%)	12:137 (91.94%)
Age at baseline (years) Mean (SD)	16.9 (\pm 2.2)	17.0 (\pm 2.0)	.04; .84	16.97 (\pm 1.76)	16.9 (\pm 2.1)
Education in years	11.75 (\pm 2.05)	11.7 (1.67)	.02; .95	11.83 (\pm 1.72)	11.7 (\pm 2)
Age of onset in years (median, range)	14.0 (11.0-20.0)	14.3 (7.0 -19.0)	.12; .39	15 (7-16)	14.0 (7.0- 20.0)
Age of diagnosis in years (median,range)	15.0 (12.0-21.0)	15.5 (13.0-20.0)	.11; .95	15.0 (13.0- 20.0)	15.0 (12.0- 21.0)
Lowest BMI	15.4 (\pm 2.11)	15.7 (\pm 2.6)	- .13; .67	14.68 (\pm 1.03)	15.5 (\pm 2.21)
Illness duration in months	21.92 (\pm 22.19)	24.69 (\pm 23.7)	- .12; .58	17.83 (\pm 15.8)	22.34 (\pm 22.37)
Employment p-value					
Full- or part-time	10 (7.9%)	2 (8.6%)	.85	0%	12 (8.1%)
Students	105 (83.3%)	20 (87%)	.36	6 (100%)	125 (83.9%)
Other	11 (8.7%)	1 (4.3%)	.47	0%	12 (8.1%)
Living Arrangements at Intake p-value					
With parents	116 (92.1%)	21 (95.5%)	.64	6 (100%)	137 (91.9%)
Alone	0	1 (4.5%)	.01**	0%	1 (0.6%)
Friends/flatmates	4 (3.2%)	0	.39	0%	5 (3.4%)
Uni residence	4 (4.0%)	0	.39	0%	5 (3.4%)
Other	1 (0.8%)	0	.67	0%	1 (0.6%)

frequencies; **= significant at the <.05 level *=significant at the <.001 level**

Table 2. Comparisons of clinical characteristics from baseline to 12 month follow up

	Groups	Baseline	12 month Follow Up	Effect Size -Cohen's d (p-value)	Effect Size (Cohen's d)
BMI	AN only	17.0 (\pm 2.2) N=126	18.7 (\pm 2.4) N=101	- .73 (p< .001)	.08
	AN+Broad ASD	17.3 (\pm 2.6) N=23	19.2 (\pm 3.1) N=20	- .94 (p= .001)	
	ASD subset	16.74 (\pm 2.53) N=6	18.58 (\pm 2.3) N=6	-1.01 (p= .04)	N.A.
Weight for Height	AN only	82.4 (\pm 11.0) N=114	88.6 (\pm 11.8) N=98	- .52 (p< .001)	.07
	AN+Broad ASD	82.9 (\pm 13.3) N=22	90.9 (\pm 15.8) N=20	- .82 (p= .003)	
	ASD subset	77.09 (\pm 10.33) N=6	87.61 (\pm 11.58) N=6	-1.05 (p= .13)	N.A.
ANTSI	AN only	1.9 (\pm .6) N=121	1.4 (\pm .7) N=83	.76 (p< .001)	0
	AN+Broad ASD	1.8 (\pm .6) N=23	1.3 (\pm .7) N=16	.68 (p= .005)	
	ASD subset	1.91 (\pm .75) N=6	1.33 (\pm .76) N=6	.75 (p= .11)	N.A.
BNTSI	AN only	.8 (\pm .6) N=113	.5 (\pm .6) N=107	.48 (p< .001)	.52
	AN+Broad ASD	.6 (\pm .4) N=22	.6 (\pm .6) N=21	0 (p= .95)	

	ASD subset	.37 (\pm .34) N=6	.41 (\pm .46) N=6	-.09 (p= .67)	N.A.
DASS-21	AN only	65.7 (\pm 31.1) N=125	49 (\pm 31.2) N=91	.54 (p< .001)	.41
	AN+Broad ASD	63.1 (\pm 29.4) N=23	59.3 (\pm 34.9) N=19	.01 (p= .77)	
	ASD subset	61.3 (\pm 34.14) N=6	55.33 (\pm 28.61) N=6	.18 (p= .50)	N.A.
Using psychotropic medication N (%) #	AN only	27 (21.4%) N= 125	41 (32.5%) N= 89	.53 (p< .001)	.28** (small effect)
	AN+Broad ASD	8 (36.4%) N= 22	12 (54.5%) N= 12	.63 (p = .056)	
	ASD subset	2 (33.3%) N=6	3 (50%) N=6	N.A.	
Antidepressants	AN only	26 (20.6%) N= 126	37 (29.4%) N= 90	.45 (p< .001)	.20** (small effect)
	AN+Broad ASD	5 (22.7%) N= 22	9 (40.9%) N=18	.59 (p= .07)	
	ASD subset	2 (33.3%) N=6	3 (50%) N=6	N.A.	
Antipsychotics	AN only	1 (0.8%) N= 126	8 (6.3%) N=91	.40 (p = .003)	.08** (no effect)
	AN+Broad ASD	3 (13.6%) N=22	1 (4.5%) N=18	.27 (p= .39)	
	ASD subset	0 (0%) N=6	1 (16.7%) N=6	N.A.	

Legend: # = From total percentage including missing data; Cohen's q = calculated by the correlation difference as suggested by Cohen, 1988;

	Diagnostic group	Baseline measures	12 months measure	Cohen's d (p-value) Baseline vs 12 months	Cohen's d AN only vs AN+Broad ASD
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Self report)					
Total score	AN only	16.6 (\pm 5.6) N = 108	14.8 (\pm 6.6) N = 76	.31 (p= .007)	.06
	AN+Broad ASD	19.5 (\pm 7.0) N = 22	18.1 (\pm 5.4) N = 18	.29 (p= .058)	
	ASD subset	18.8 (\pm 6.43) N=6	17.33 (\pm 8.14) N=6	1.20 (p= .23)	N.A.
Impact from total score	AN only	4.3 (\pm 3.4) N = 108	2.6 (\pm 3.0) N = 76	.51 (p< .001)	.51
	AN+Broad ASD	4.6 (\pm 3.8) N = 22	4.7 (\pm 3.5) N = 18	- .03 (p= .94)	
	ASD subset	4.6 (\pm 3.32) N=6	4 (\pm 3.4) N=6	.26 (p= .25)	N.A.
Emotional Symptoms	AN only	6.6 (\pm 2.2) N = 108	5.6 (\pm 2.7) N = 76	.41 (p< .001)	.13
	AN+Broad ASD	6.9 (\pm 2.7) N = 22	6.2 (\pm 2.9) N = 18	.35 (p= .39)	
	ASD subset	6.3 (\pm 2.65) N=6	5.8 (\pm 3) N=6	.28 (p= .45)	N.A.
Hyperactivity	AN only	5 (\pm 2.1) N = 108	4.4 (\pm 2.3) N = 76	.29 (p= .032)	0
	AN+Broad ASD	5.3 (2.1) N = 22	4.7 (1.9) N = 18	.32 (p= .16)	
	ASD subset	5.5 (\pm 2.25) N=6	4.3 (\pm 2.42) N=6	1.49 (p= .10)	N.A.
Peer Problems	AN only	2.9 (\pm 1.9) N = 108	2.9 (\pm 1.8) N = 76	0 (p= .84)	.25
	AN+Broad ASD	4.6 (\pm 2.2) N = 22	5.1 (\pm 2.0) N = 18	- .29 (p= .97)	
	ASD subset	4.6 (\pm 2.58) N=6	5.5 (\pm 2.16) N=6	- .61 (p= .12)	N.A.
Conduct Problems	AN only	2.1 (\pm 1.6) N = 108	1.9 (\pm 1.6) N = 76	.11 (p= .18)	- .18
	AN+Broad ASD	2.7 (\pm 1.9)	2.2 (\pm 1.6)	.36	

		N = 22	N = 18	(p= .09)	
	ASD subset	2.3 (<u>+1.86</u>) N=6	1.6 (<u>+1.63</u>) N=6	.56 (p= .15)	N.A.
Prosocial	AN only	8.0 (<u>+1.6</u>) N = 108	7.6 (<u>+2.1</u>) N = 76	.20 (p= .02)	.17
	AN+Broad ASD	7.5 (<u>+2.0</u>) N = 22	7.4 (<u>+1.9</u>) N = 18	.06 (p= .49)	
	ASD subset	7.3 (<u>+1.81</u>) N=6	7.5 (<u>+1.51</u>) N=6	- .52 (p= .56)	N.A.
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Parent report)					
Total score	AN only	14.8 (<u>+6.6</u>) N = 100	12.4 (<u>+6.9</u>) N = 84	.38 (p= .015)	- .15
	AN+Broad ASD	20.6 (<u>+5.4</u>) N = 23	17.2 (<u>+4.9</u>) N=22	.55 (p= .006)	
	ASD subset	20.6 (<u>+5.92</u>) N=6	16.3 (<u>+6.43</u>) N=6	2.02 (p= .03)	N.A.
Impact from total score	AN only	3.5 (<u>+3.1</u>) N = 100	3.0 (<u>+3.4</u>) N = 84	.14 (p= .102)	- .22
	AN+Broad ASD	5.6 (<u>+2.9</u>) N = 23	4.4 (<u>+3.1</u>) N=22	.32 (p= .112)	
	ASD subset	6.6 (<u>+1.5</u>) N=6	4.1 (<u>+2.71</u>) N=6	.79 (p= .104)	N.A.
Emotional Symptoms	AN only	6.2 (<u>+2.5</u>) N = 100	5 (<u>+2.8</u>) N = 84	.44 (p= .001)	- .04
	AN+Broad ASD	7.7 (<u>+1.4</u>) N = 23	6.4 (<u>+2.2</u>) N=22	.64 (p= .009)	
	ASD subset	7.8 (<u>+1.32</u>) N=6	6.5 (<u>+2.88</u>) N=6	.56 (p= .22)	N.A.
Hyperactivity	AN only	3.7 (<u>+2.3</u>) N = 100	3.6 (<u>+2.6</u>) N = 84	.04 (p= .47)	.04
	AN+Broad ASD	4.4 (<u>+2</u>) N = 23	4.4 (<u>+1.8</u>) N=22	0 (p= .62)	
	ASD subset	4.3 (<u>+2.33</u>) N=6	3.5 (<u>+2.34</u>) N=6	.41 (p= .059)	N.A.
Peer Problems	AN only	2.5 (<u>+2.1</u>) N = 100	2.1 (<u>+1.6</u>) N = 84	.23 (p= .26)	- .24
	AN+Broad ASD	4.9 (<u>+1.7</u>) N = 23	4.0 (<u>+2.3</u>) N=22	.37 (p= .17)	
	ASD subset	6 (<u>+1.26</u>) N=6	5.5 (<u>+2.66</u>) N=6	.18 (p= .58)	N.A.
Conduct Problems	AN only	2 (<u>+1.6</u>) N = 100	1.6 (<u>+1.5</u>) N = 84	.25 (p= .09)	- .48

