Title: Alcohol use and cognitive functioning in young adults: an observational and Mendelian randomisation study

Liam Mahedy[1,2,3] (Ph.D.), Steph Suddell[1,2,3] (MSc), Caroline Skirrow[1,4], (Ph.D.), Gwen S. Fernandes[5] (Ph.D.), Matt Field[6] (Ph.D.), Jon Heron[5] (Ph.D.), Matthew Hickman[5] (Ph.D.), Robyn Wootton[1,2,3] (Ph.D.), Marcus R. Munafò[1,2,3] (Ph.D.)

Affiliations

[1]School of Psychological Science, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

[2]MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

[3]National Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centre at the University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

[4]Cambridge Cognition, Cambridge, UK.

[5]Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

[6]Department of Psychology, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.

Corresponding author: Liam Mahedy, School of Psychological Science, University of Bristol, 12a Priory Road, Bristol, UK, BS8 1TU.

Tel: +44 (0) 117 33 10616; Email: liam.mahedy@bristol.ac.uk

Abstract

Background and Aims: There have been few prospective studies of association between alcohol use and cognitive functioning in young people. We aim to examine whether alcohol use is a risk factor for deficient cognitive functioning in young adults.

Design: Longitudinal latent class analysis was used to derive patterns of binge drinking. Linear regression was used to examine the relationship between binge drinking and subsequent cognitive functioning. Two-sample Mendelian randomisation (MR) tested evidence for the causal relationship between alcohol use and cognitive functioning.

Setting: South West England.

Participants: The observational study comprised of 2086 adolescents and their parents (fully adjusted models) from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children.

Measurements: Binge drinking was assessed on five occasions from age 16 to 23 years. Cognitive functioning comprised working memory, response inhibition, and emotion recognition assessed at 24 years of age. 99-independent genome-wide significant SNPs associated with 'number of drinks per week' was used as the genetic instrument for alcohol consumption. Potential confounders were included.

Findings: Four binge drinking classes were identified: 'low-risk' (41%), 'adolescent-limited' (19%), 'adult-regular' (23%), and 'early-onset regular' (17%). There was not a consistent association between binge drinking and subsequent cognitive functioning. For example, we found insufficient evidence to support an association between early-onset regular binge drinking and cognitive functioning in the fully adjusted models: working memory (*b*=0.09, 95% CI=-0.10 to 0.28), response inhibition (*b*=0.70, 95% CI=-10.55 to 11.95), and emotion recognition (*b*=0.01, 95% CI=-0.01 to 0.02) compared to low-risk drinkers. Two-sample MR analyses similarly provided little evidence that alcohol use is associated with deficits in

working memory (*b*=0.14, 95% CI=-0.45 to 0.72), response inhibition (*b*=-0.31, 95% CI=-0.92 to 0.29), and emotion recognition (0.03, 95% CI=-0.55 to 0.61).

Conclusions: Binge drinking in adolescence and early adulthood may not be a strong predictor for deficient cognitive functioning in young adults.

54 **INTRODUCTION**

55 Alcohol use during adolescence, when the brain is still developing and undergoing
56 considerable structural and functional changes (1) is a major public health concern. The
57 association between binge drinking and cognitive functioning (i.e., working memory,
58 response inhibition, and emotion recognition) has received particular attention because some
59 cognitive functions do not peak until early adulthood (2–5) in parallel with maturation of the
60 prefrontal cortex (6,7).

61 There is a wealth of evidence from animal (8,9), neuroimaging (10–12), twin (13,14),
62 and cognitive neuroscience (15,16) studies suggesting that adolescent binge drinking is
63 negatively associated with cognitive functioning. However, the direction of this association
64 remains unclear as many of these results are based on evidence from small cross-sectional
65 studies. Studies that have examined this association using prospective data have largely
66 revealed mixed findings. For example, some studies have found that alcohol use preceded
67 deficits in domains of cognitive functioning (17–20), while other studies have provided
68 support for the opposite direction (21–23).

69 In an effort to strengthen the evidence we used a triangulation approach with
70 observational and genetic epidemiological methods to better understand the causal
71 relationships between drinking patterns and cognitive functioning in young adults using data
72 from Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). The aims were to investigate
73 (1) whether patterns of binge drinking (assessed between 16 to 23 years) were associated
74 with working memory, response inhibition, and emotion recognition assessed at age 24, and
75 (2) whether alcohol use was associated with cognitive functioning using two-sample
76 Mendelian randomisation (MR) (24). MR can reduce bias from residual confounding and
77 reverse causation by using genetic variants that are known to be associated with the exposure

78 (25). We expected to find that more regular binge drinking would be associated with deficient
79 cognitive functioning, and that this association would be supported by the MR analyses.
80
81 **METHODS**
82 *Design*
83 Longitudinal latent class analysis was used to derive heterogenous patterns of binge
84 drinking from ages 16 to 23 years. Linear regression was used to examine the relationship
85 between patterns of binge drinking and subsequent cognitive functioning. The young person
86 provided self-reported information on binge drinking and cognitive functioning. The clear
87 temporal ordering of exposure, outcome and confounders helps to rule out the possibility of
88 reverse causality. Two-sample MR tested evidence for the causal relationship between
89 alcohol use and cognitive functioning.
90 **Observational analyses**
91 *Participants and Procedure*
92 We used data from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC), an
93 ongoing population-based study that contains a wide range of phenotypic and environmental
94 measures, genetic information and linkage to health and administrative records. A fully
95 searchable data dictionary is available on the study's website
96 http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/. Approval for the study was obtained
97 from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees.
98 Informed consent for the use of data collected via questionnaires and clinics was obtained
99 from participants following recommendations of the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee at
100 the time. Consent for biological samples has been collected in accordance with the Human
101 Tissue Act (2004). All pregnant women residing in the former Avon Health Authority in the

south-west of England and had an estimated date of delivery between 1 April 1991 and December 1992 were eligible for the study (Phase I consisted of *N*=14,541). Of the 13,988 offspring alive at one year, a small number of participants have withdrawn fully from the study (*n*=41), leaving an eligible sample of 13,947. Detailed information about ALSPAC is available online www.bris.ac.uk/alspac and in the cohort profiles (26–28). A detailed overview of our study population, including attrition at the different measurement occasions is presented in Supplementary Material Figure S1.

Measures

A timeline of data collection is presented in Supplementary Material Figure S2.

Exposure: Binge drinking

Information on binge drinking was collected on five occasions via a questionnaire (Q) or during attendance at a study clinic (C). Median ages at response were: 16y 7m (Q), 17y 9m (C), 18y 8m (Q) 21y (Q), and 23y (Q) using the following question reflecting drinking over the past year "How often do you have six or more drinks on one occasion?". One drink was specified as ½ pint (568 ml) average strength beer/lager, one glass of wine, or one single measure (25ml) of spirits. Responses at each time point were used to derive a repeated 3 level ordinal variable with categories "Never/Occasional" (comprising of "Never" and "Less than monthly"), "Monthly" and "Weekly". Daily or almost daily was collapsed into the "Weekly" group.

Outcome variables

At 24 years of age (*M*=24.0 years; *SD*=9.8 months) participants attended a clinic-based assessment which included computerised cognitive assessments as part of a broader assessment battery of mental and physical health and behaviour. Data collection for the

online questionnaires was collected and manged by REDcap electronic data capture tools (29,30).

Working memory

The *N*-back task (2-back condition) was used to assess working memory. Participants were asked to monitor the series of numbers (0-9) and respond with a '1' keystroke when any number was the same as the one presented 2 trials previously, and a '2' keystroke if it was different. Forty-eight trials were presented, including eight 2-back matches. The *N*-back task (31) is widely used to measure working memory (17,32,33). A measure of discriminability (*d*') was chosen as the primary outcome measure given it is an overall performance estimate. High scores on *number of hits* indicated more accurate identification, while high scores on *false alarms* indicated less accurate identification. High scores on *d*', therefore, indicated a greater ability to distinguish signal from noise. Of the participants assessed with cognitive tasks at age 24 (*n*=3,312), *n*=182 did not provide any data on the task; *n*=70 were omitted due to negative *d'* scores and/or not responding to over 50% of the trials, leaving a sample of *n*=3,242.

Response inhibition

The Stop Signal Task (34) was used to assess response inhibition – the ability to prevent an ongoing motor response. Participants were asked to respond to visual stimuli (X and O response keys to X and O letters presented sequentially on a screen) unless a tone was heard (the stop signal) after the stimulus presentation, at which point they were required to withhold responding. The task consisted of 256 trials, which included a 4:1 ratio of trials without stop signals to trials with stop signals. Mean response times were calculated. An estimate of *stop signal reaction time* (SSRT) was calculated and used as the primary outcome as it is a reliable measure of inhibitory control, with shorter SSRT's indicating faster inhibition. SSRT data were available for *n*=3,201 participants.

149 *Emotion recognition*

150 Emotion recognition was assessed using a six alternative forced choice (6AFC) emotion
151 recognition task (35) comprising of 96 trials (16 for each emotion) which measures the ability
152 to identify emotions in facial expressions. In each trial, participants were presented with a
153 face displaying one of six emotions: anger, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness, or
154 surprise. Participants were required to select the descriptor that best described the emotion
155 that was present in the face, using the computer mouse. Emotion intensity varied across 8
156 levels within each emotion from the prototypical emotion to an almost neutral face. Each
157 individual stimulus was presented twice, giving a total of 96 trials. An overall measure of ER
158 (the number of facial emotions accurately identified) was used as the primary outcome. ER
159 data were available for *n*=3,368 participants. Further information on all three cognitive tasks
160 is presented in Supplementary material.

161 *Potential confounders*

162 We identified confounders from established risk factors for cognitive functioning that
163 could plausibly have a causal predictive relationship with earlier binge drinking including
164 income, maternal education, socioeconomic position, housing tenure, sex, and maternal
165 smoking during first trimester in pregnancy. Two measures were included to control for
166 cognitive function prior to alcohol initiation. Working memory at approximately 11 years and
167 experience of a head injury/unconsciousness up to 11 years. Finally, measures of cigarette
168 and cannabis use were collected at 4 timepoints between ages ~14 and ~16.5 years (up to the
169 first assessment of binge drinking). Further information is presented in Supplementary
170 material.

171 *Statistical methods*

172 *Observational analyses*

173 The observational analyses were conducted in two stages. First, longitudinal latent
174 class analysis was used to derive trajectories of binge drinking for individuals having at least
175 one measure of binge drinking (*n*=6,888). Starting with a single latent class, additional classes
176 were added until model fit was optimised. See supplementary material for a description of
177 model fit. Analyses were carried out using Mplus 8.1 (36).

178 Class membership was then related to covariates using the three-step method using
179 the Bolck-Croon-Hagenaars (37) method. The first stage estimated the latent class
180 measurement model and saves the weights. While, the second stage involved using these
181 weights which reflect the measurement error of the latent class variable. Linear regression
182 was used to examine the association between the continuous distal outcomes and latent class
183 membership controlling for the confounding variables. Results are reported as
184 unstandardised beta coefficients and 95% confidence intervals.

185 *Missing data*

186 6,888 participants (49%) provided self-report information on binge drinking on at least
187 one occasion. Of these, *n*=3,755 (55%) had available information on all covariates, while
188 *n*=2,086 (30%) had data on at least one outcome at age 24 years and all confounders. See
189 Table S1 for a detailed description of attrition.

190 *Mendelian randomisation (MR)*

191 Two-sample MR was used to test the hypothesised causal effect of alcohol use on
192 cognitive functioning. The two-sample MR approach requires summary level data from
193 GWAS, enabling SNP-outcome and SNP-exposure effects to be derived from different data
194 sources. As the genetic instrument for alcohol consumption we used the 99-independent
195 genome-wide significant SNPs associated with 'number of drinks per week', identified by the
196 GWAS & Sequencing Consortium of Alcohol and Nicotine use (GSCAN

197 https://gscan.sph.umich.edu/) based on a sample of *N*~1,000,000. As outcomes, we used
198 GWAS conducted in ALSPAC for each of our three primary outcome measures: i) working
199 memory assessed using *d'*; ii) response inhibition assessed using SSRT; and iii) emotion
200 recognition assessed using total number of recognised emotions.

201 Analyses were performed using the TwoSampleMR R package, part of MR-Base
202 (38). The inverse-variance weighted (IVW) approach was used as a primary analysis, with
203 three complementary estimation methods as sensitivity analyses which each make different
204 assumptions about the nature of horizontal pleiotropy (where the genetic variant associates
205 with the outcome via an independent pathway to the exposure): MR Egger (39), weighted
206 median (40), and weighted mode (41). To test the suitability of the MR Egger method, the I^2_{GX}
207 statistic was calculated to quantify the degree of regression dilution bias due to measurement
208 error of SNP-exposure effects (42). The mean F statistic as an indicator of instrument strength
209 was also calculated. Steiger filtering was conducted to confirm the direction of effect (43). A
210 consistent effect across all of these methods would provide the most confidence that any
211 observed effects are not due to pleiotropy.

212 **RESULTS**

213 *Observational analyses*

214 *Patterns of binge drinking*

215 The prevalence of both monthly and weekly binge drinking increased across time
216 apart from a slight decrease at age 23 years (Table S2). There was good agreement that a
217 four-class solution was adequate in explaining the heterogeneity in binge drinking based on
218 increasing Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) (44) and sample size adjusted Bayesian
219 Information Criterion (SSABIC) (45) values in the five-class model and an LRT value of *p*=0.05.
220 See Table S3 in the Supplementary Material for a comparison of model fit indices. The four-

221 class solution (Figure 1) comprised patterns of binge drinking that were labelled as 'low-risk'
222 (47.1%), 'adolescent-limited' (19.0%), 'adult-regular' (18.7%), and 'early-onset regular'
223 (19.0%). See Table S4 in the Supplementary Material for class validation. See Table S5 in the
224 Supplementary Material for a detailed description of confounding factors associated with
225 binge drinking class membership.

226 [Figure 1]

227 *Working memory – 2-back task*

228 Table 1 presents unadjusted and adjusted associations between patterns of binge
229 drinking from 16 to 23 years and working memory at age 24. There were unadjusted
230 associations for adult-regular (*b*=0.21, 95% CI=0.03 to 0.40) and early-onset regular (*b*=0.19,
231 95% CI=0.01 to 0.36) being associated with better working memory performance compared
232 to the low-risk binge drinking group. These associations were attenuated after adjustment for
233 sociodemographic confounders (adult-regular: *b*=0.14, 95% CI=-0.05 to 0.33; early-onset
234 regular: *b*=0.14, 95% CI=-0.07 to 0.30); working memory at age 11 years and participants who
235 experienced a head injury/unconsciousness before age 11 (adult-regular: *b*=0.12, 95% CI=-
236 0.06, 0.31; early-onset regular: *b*=0.06, 95% CI=-0.12 to 0.24), and cannabis and/or tobacco
237 use (adult-regular: *b*=0.12, 95% CI=-0.07 to 0.31; early-onset regular: *b*=0.09, 95% CI=-0.10 to
238 0.28). There was no evidence of an association between other patterns of binge drinking and
239 working memory performance. Furthermore, there was little evidence to suggest that
240 patterns of binge drinking were associated with the secondary outcomes (i.e., number of hits
241 and false alarms). Results of the secondary analyses are provided in Table S6 in the
242 Supplementary Material.

243 [Table 1]

244 *Response inhibition - stop signal task*

Table 2 presents unadjusted and adjusted associations between patterns of binge drinking and an overall measure of response inhibition. Although, there was evidence for adolescent-limited being associated with longer SSRT, indicating slower ability to inhibit responses (*b*=19.65, 95% CI=3.20 to 36.09) compared to the low-risk binge drinking group in the unadjusted models, omnibus Wald test values provided weak evidence of an overall association between binge drinking patterns and response inhibition in the fully adjusted model (Wald test=6.51 (3) *p*=0.09). There was no evidence of an association between other patterns of binge drinking and ability to inhibit responses. Furthermore, there was little evidence to suggest that patterns of binge drinking were associated with any of the secondary outcomes (i.e., Go reaction time, Go accuracy, and Stop accuracy). Results of the secondary analyses are provided in Table S7 in the Supplementary Material.

[Table 2]

Emotion recognition – 6AFC task

Table 3 presents unadjusted and adjusted associations between patterns of binge drinking and number of correctly identified emotions. Although there was evidence for adult-regular being associated with better performance on the task (*b*=0.02, 95% CI=0.00 to 0.03) compared to the low-risk binge drinking group in the unadjusted models, these associations were attenuated when controlling for confounders (fully adjusted model: *b*=0.01, 95% CI=-0.00 to 0.03). There was no evidence of an association between other patterns of binge drinking and number of correct hits. Furthermore, there was little evidence to suggest that patterns of binge drinking were associated with any of the secondary outcomes (i.e., anger, disgust, fear, happy, sad, and surprise). Results of the secondary analyses are provided in Table S8 in the Supplementary Material.

[Table 3]

269 *Mendelian randomisation*

270 GWAS did not identify any genome-wide significant SNPs (at the $p<5x10^{-8}$ level) for
271 any of the three cognitive outcomes, therefore we report the lead SNPs at a $p<5x10^{-6}$
272 threshold (Tables S9-S11). The full distribution of results can be seen in Manhattan plots
273 (Figures S3-S5). QQ plots, and corresponding lambda (λ) statistics, are displayed in Figures S6-
274 S8. The lead SNP for working memory was rs7992404 (chromosome 13, *b*=-0.17, CI=-0.20 to
275 -0.14, effect allele=T, $p=8.76x10^{-8}$, intergenic variant), emotion recognition: rs199934102
276 (chromosome 6, *b*=0.34, CI=0.28 to 0.40, effect allele=A, $p=8.19 \times 10^{-8}$, intronic variant within
277 gene CNKSR3), and response inhibition: rs9853329 (chromosome 3, *b*=-0.16, CI=-0.19 to-0.13,
278 effect allele=T, $p=5.33x10^{-7}$, intergenic variant).

279 The two-sample MR method provides little evidence to suggest that alcohol use (SNPs
280 associated with number of drinks per week) is a causal risk factor for deficits in cognitive
281 functioning (Table 4). Focusing on the IVW estimate as the primary measure, SNPs associated
282 with the number of alcoholic drinks per week were not associated with *d'* on the working
283 memory task (*b*=0.137 95% CI=-0.45 to 0.72; *p*=0.65); SSRT on the response inhibition task
284 (*b*=-0.313 95%CI=-0.92 to 0.29; *p*=0.31); or total hits in the emotion recognition task (*b*=0.028
285 95% CI=-0.55 to 0.61; *p*=0.93). There was no evidence of heterogeneity in the SNP-exposure
286 association (Tables S12 and S13 in the Supplementary material).

287 [Table 4]

288 **DISCUSSION**

289 We found insufficient evidence to suggest an association between binge drinking
290 between the ages of 16 and 23 and cognitive deficits at age 24 using a combination of
291 observational and genetic approaches. In the observational analyses, four patterns of binge
292 drinking across adolescence and early adulthood were identified. These patterns were not

293 associated with later measures of cognitive functioning in either the unadjusted or adjusted
294 models. In the genetic analyses, there was no evidence to suggest that number of drinks
295 consumed per week was a causal risk factor for deficits in cognitive functioning in the ALSPAC
296 sample.

297 *Comparison with previous studies*

298 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to assess the relationship between
299 alcohol use and cognitive functioning using a combination of observational and genetic
300 epidemiological approaches. Unlike the studies that have demonstrated a prospective
301 association between binge drinking and cognitive functioning in adolescence e.g. (17–20), we
302 found little evidence in support of this association. The contrast in findings could be due to a
303 number of possibilities. First, our study used a large population sample incorporating data
304 from over 2,000 participants spanning maternal pregnancy to 24 years of age. Previous
305 studies (19,20) used functional magnetic resonance imaging based on youths at high-risk for
306 substance use disorders (*n*=40 for both studies), while the study by Peeters and colleagues
307 (18) used a sample at high-risk for externalising problems (*n*=374 at baseline). Second, this
308 study assessed cognitive functioning in early adulthood, a time when cognitions are thought
309 to reach maturity (2–5), in comparison to all four studies who assessed cognitive functioning
310 up to 19 years of age. Examining peak levels of cognitive functioning helps to reduce the
311 possibility that cognitive functioning is influencing earlier alcohol use (i.e., reverse causation).
312 Third, as alcohol use behaviours typically change over time (46), repeated measures of binge
313 drinking were used in this study to capture heterogenous patterns across this sensitive period
314 in comparison to our previous study which assessed alcohol use on one occasion (17). Finally,
315 most of the previous studies (18–20) assessed cognitive functioning using a range of measures

316 compared to the more widely used measures in this study (i.e., *N*-back task, Stop signal task,
317 and 6AFC task).

318 Our findings support and extend those of Boelema and colleagues (47) who found
319 insufficient evidence to suggest that alcohol use prospectively affected maturation of
320 cognitive functions in a large prospective study of Dutch adolescents (48). Frist, Boelema and
321 colleagues examined cognitive functioning across adolescence, while we were able to
322 examine peak levels of cognitive functioning. Second, assessing binge drinking in young
323 adulthood allowed us to capture heterogenous patterns during the sensitive period (i.e.,
324 going to University or in full-time paid employment). Finally, WM performance was measured
325 in reaction times only, as opposed to the more comprehensive approach used in our study
326 (i.e., number of hits, false alarms, and *d'*).

327 *Limitations*

328 There are a number of limitations to this study. First, the ALSPAC cohort suffers from
329 attrition which reduces study power and also is higher among the socially disadvantaged (49)
330 (Table S1). We attempted to minimise the impact of attrition using sensitivity analyses. It is
331 possible that both the observational and two-sample MR analyses are underpowered. For
332 example, poor entropy (a measure of class separation) in the observational analyses could
333 indicate poor misclassification in the latent classes resulting in dilution of effect estimates.
334 Small sample size in the cognitive functioning GWAS is likely to be underpowered in the two-
335 sample MR analyses. Future studies should use larger observational samples and meta-
336 analyses of related cognitive measures in GWAS to help to increase power. Second, although
337 it is possible to either under- or over-estimate drinking behaviour using self-reported data,
338 participants completed questionnaires individually and were assured of their anonymity.
339 Third, although there is some debate in the literature surrounding the construct validity of

340 performance on the *N*-back task as an indicator of working memory ability, it has been argued
341 that using *N*-back performance indices from a signal-detection framework (i.e. d') may reveal
342 clearer insights about its validity as a measure of working memory performance (50–52).

343 Fourth, as we examined one potential causal pathway, it is possible that the
344 association could work in the opposite direction, that is, impairments in cognitive functioning
345 may precede (and increase the risk of developing) alcohol problems (18,23). We were
346 however able to include a number of measures to maximise the robustness of our findings:
347 (i) ascertaining the time order of exposures and outcomes; (ii) controlling for premorbid
348 working memory function and brain insults prior to the onset of alcohol use; and (iii) a number
349 of relevant confounders were included to help reduce the possibility of residual confounding.
350 It is possible that a common risk factor is influencing both binge drinking and deficits in
351 cognition, however the MR analyses helps to protect against this possibility by minimising
352 bias from reverse causation and residual confounding. Finally, genetic variants were based on
353 number of drinks per week, whereas the observational analyses used frequency of binge
354 drinking. Although not directly comparable, there was evidence of a dose-response
355 relationship between binge drinking patterns and the AUDIT-C measure, which taps into
356 quantity and frequency (see Supplementary material).

357 *Implications and Conclusions*

358 In order to rule out the possibility of deficient cognitive functioning preceding binge
359 drinking in adolescence, future research should use an equally robust approach to examine
360 the alternate hypothesis. We found insufficient evidence to suggest an association between
361 binge drinking between the ages of 16 and 23 and cognitive deficits at age 24 using a
362 combination of observational and genetic approaches, although both approaches are likely
363 to be underpowered.

364 **Acknowledgements:** The work was undertaken with the support of the MRC and Alcohol
365 Research UK (grant number MR/L022206/1). We acknowledge also support from The Centre
366 for the Development and Evaluation of Complex Interventions for Public Health Improvement
367 (DECIPHer); a UKCRC Public Health Research Centre of Excellence (joint funding (grant
368 number MR/KO232331/1) from the British Heart Foundation, Cancer Research UK, Economic
369 and Social Research Council, Medical Research Council, the Welsh Government and the
370 Wellcome Trust, under the auspices of the UK Clinical Research Collaboration); and the NIHR
371 School of Public Health Research. Support was also provided by the UK Medical Research
372 Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol (MM_UU_00011/7). LM,
373 RW, SS, and MRM are members of the UK Centre for Tobacco and Alcohol Studies, a UKCRC
374 Public Health Research Centre of Excellence. LM, REW, SS, and MRM are supported by the
375 NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at the University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust
376 and the University of Bristol. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors
377 and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the
378 Department of Health and Social Care. GWAS data were generated by Sample Logistics and
379 Genotyping Facilities at Wellcome Sanger Institute and LabCorp (Laboratory Corporation of
380 America) using support from 23andMe. The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome
381 (Grant ref: 102215/2/13/2) and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. This
382 publication is the work of the authors and LM and MRM will serve as guarantors for the
383 contents of this paper. A comprehensive list of grants funding is available on the website
384 (http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf). We
385 are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their
386 help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer
387 and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers,

388 receptionists and nurses. This publication is the work of the authors who will serve as
389 guarantors for the contents of this paper.
390

391 REFERENCES

392 1. De Bellis MD, Clark DB, Beers SR, Soloff PH, Boring AM, Hall J, et al. Hippocampal
393 volume in adolescent-onset alcohol use disorders. Am J Psychiatry. 2000;157(5):737–
394 44.

395 2. Fry AF, Hale S. Relationships among processing speed, working memory, and fluid
396 intelligence in children. Biol Psychol. 2000;54(1–3):1–34.

397 3. Kramer AF, de Sather JCMG, Cassavaugh ND. Development of attentional and
398 oculomotor control. Dev Psychol. 2005;41(5):760–72.

399 4. Davidson MC, Amso D, Anderson LC, Diamond A. Development of cognitive control
400 and executive functions from 4 to 13 years: evidence from manipulations of memory,
401 inhibition, and task switching. Neuropsychologia. 2006;44(11):2037–78.

402 5. Thomas LA, De Bellis MD, Graham R, LaBar KS. Development of emotional facial
403 recognition in late childhood and adolescence. Dev Sci. 2007;10(5):547–58.

404 6. Sowell ER, Delis D, Stiles J, Jernigan TL. Improved memory functioning and frontal
405 lobe maturation between childhood and adolescence: a structural MRI study. J Int
406 Neuropsychol Soc. 2001;7(3):312–22.

407 7. Sowell ER, Thompson PM, Holmes CJ, Jernigan TL, Toga AW. In vivo evidence for post-
408 adolescent brain maturation in frontal and striatal regions. Nat Neurosci. 1999;2:859.

409 8. White AM, Ghia AJ, Levin ED, Swartzwelder HS. Binge pattern ethanol exposure in
410 adolescent and adult rats: differential impact on subsequent responsiveness to
411 ethanol. Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2000;24(8):1251–6.

412 9. Risher M-L, Fleming RL, Boutros N, Semenova S, Wilson WA, Levin ED, et al. Long-
413 term effects of chronic intermittent ethanol exposure in adolescent and adult rats:
414 radial-arm maze performance and operant food reinforced responding. PLoS One.

415 2013;8(5):e62940–e62940.
416 10. Crews F, He J, Hodge C. Adolescent cortical development: a critical period of
417 vulnerability for addiction. Pharmacol Biochem Behav. 2007;86(2):189–99.
418 11. Chambers RA, Taylor JR, Potenza MN. Developmental neurocircuitry of motivation in
419 adolescence: a critical period of addiction vulnerability. Am J Psychiatry.
420 2003;160(6):1041–52.
421 12. Squeglia LM, Schweinsburg AD, Pulido C, Tapert SF. Adolescent binge drinking linked
422 to abnormal spatial working memory brain activation: differential gender effects.
423 Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2011;35(10):1831–41.
424 13. Wilson S, Malone SM, Thomas KM, Iacono WG. Adolescent drinking and brain
425 morphometry: A co-twin control analysis. Dev Cogn Neurosci. 2015;16:130–8.
426 14. Malone SM, Luciana M, Wilson S, Sparks JC, Hunt RH, Thomas KM, et al. Adolescent
427 drinking and motivated decision-making: a cotwin-control investigation with
428 monozygotic twins. Behav Genet. 2014;44(4):407–18.
429 15. Parada M, Corral M, Mota N, Crego A, Rodriguez Holguin S, Cadaveira F. Executive
430 functioning and alcohol binge drinking in university students. Addict Behav.
431 2012;37(2):167–72.
432 16. Gullo MJ, Loxton NJ, Price T, Voisey J, Young RM, Connor JP. A laboratory model of
433 impulsivity and alcohol use in late adolescence. Behav Res Ther. 2017;97:52–63.
434 17. Mahedy L, Field M, Gage S, Hammerton G, Heron J, Hickman M, et al. Alcohol use in
435 adolescence and later working memory: Findings from a large population-based birth
436 cohort. Alcohol Alcohol. 2018;53:251–8.
437 18. Peeters M, Monshouwer K, Janssen T, Wiers RW, Vollebergh WAM. Working memory
438 and alcohol use in at-risk adolescents: a 2-year follow-up. Alcohol Clin Exp Res.

439 2014;38(4):1176–83.
440 19. Squeglia LM, Pulido C, Wetherill RR, Jacobus J, Brown GG, Tapert SF. Brain response
441 to working memory over three years of adolescence: influence of initiating heavy
442 drinking. J Stud Alcohol Drugs. 2012;73(5):749–60.
443 20. Wetherill RR, Squeglia LM, Yang TT, Tapert SF. A longitudinal examination of
444 adolescent response inhibition: neural differences before and after the initiation of
445 heavy drinking. Psychopharmacology (Berl). 2013;230(4):663–71.
446 21. Peeters M, Janssen T, Monshouwer K, Boendermaker W, Pronk T, Wiers R, et al.
447 Weaknesses in executive functioning predict the initiating of adolescents' alcohol use.
448 Dev Cogn Neurosci. 2015;16:139–46.
449 22. Squeglia LM, Jacobus J, Nguyen-Louie TT, Tapert SF. Inhibition during early
450 adolescence predicts alcohol and marijuana use by late adolescence.
451 Neuropsychology. 2014;28(5):782–90.
452 23. Fernie G, Peeters M, Gullo MJ, Christiansen P, Cole JC, Sumnall H, et al. Multiple
453 behavioural impulsivity tasks predict prospective alcohol involvement in adolescents.
454 Addiction. 2013;108(11):1916–23.
455 24. Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, Li Y, Brazel DM, Chen F, et al. Association studies of up to
456 1.2 million individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and
457 alcohol use. Nat Genet. 2019;51(2):237–44.
458 25. Lawlor DA, Harbord RM, Sterne JAC, Timpson N, Davey Smith G. Mendelian
459 randomization: using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in
460 epidemiology. Stat Med. 2008;27(8):1133–63.
461 26. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, et al. Cohort Profile:
462 the 'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of

463 Parents and Children. Int J Epidemiol. 2013;42(1):111–27.
464 27. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, Boyd A, Golding J, Davey Smith G, et al.
465 Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers
466 cohort. Int J Epidemiol. 2013;42(1):97–110.
467 28. Northstone K, Lewcock M, Groom A, Boyd A, Macleod J, Timpson N, et al. The Avon
468 Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC): an update on the enrolled
469 sample of index children in 2019. Wellcome Open Res. 2019;4:51.
470 29. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic
471 data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for
472 providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform.
473 2009;42(2):377–81.
474 30. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, Neal LO, et al. The REDCap
475 consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. J
476 Biomed Inform. 2019;95(5):103208.
477 31. Kirchner WK. Age differences in short-term retention of rapidly changing information.
478 J Exp Psychol. 1958;55(4):352–8.
479 32. Wardle MC, de Wit H, Penton-Voak I, Lewis G, Munafo MR. Lack of association
480 between COMT and working memory in a population-based cohort of healthy young
481 adults. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2013;38(7):1253–63.
482 33. Rossi R, Zammit S, Button KS, Munafò MR, Lewis G, David AS. Psychotic experiences
483 and working memory: a population-based study using signal-detection analysis. PLoS
484 One. 2016;11(4):e0153148–e0153148.
485 34. Logan GD, Cowan WB, Davis KA. On the ability to inhibit simple and choice reaction
486 time responses: a model and a method. J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform.

487 1984;10(2):276–91.
488 35. Penton-Voak IS, Bate H, Lewis G, Munafo MR. Effects of emotion perception training
489 on mood in undergraduate students: randomised controlled trial. Br J Psychiatry.
490 2012;201(1):71–2.
491 36. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. User's Guide. 7th ed. Muthén LK, Muthén BO, editors. Los
492 Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén; 2016.
493 37. Bolck A, Croon M, Hagenaars J. Estimating latent structure models with categorical
494 variables: one-step versus three-step estimators. Polit Anal. 2004;12(1):3–27.
495 38. Hemani G, Zheng J, Elsworth B, Wade KH, Haberland V, Baird D, et al. The MR-Base
496 platform supports systematic causal inference across the human phenome. Elife.
497 2018 May;7.
498 39. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid
499 instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. Int J
500 Epidemiol. 2015;44(2):512–25.
501 40. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent estimation in Mendelian
502 randomization with some invalid instruments using a weighted median estimator.
503 Genet Epidemiol. 2016;40(4):304–14.
504 41. Hartwig FP, Davey Smith G, Bowden J. Robust inference in summary data Mendelian
505 randomization via the zero modal pleiotropy assumption. Int J Epidemiol.
506 2017;46(6):1985–98.
507 42. Bowden J, Del Greco M F, Minelli C, Davey Smith G, Sheehan NA, Thompson JR.
508 Assessing the suitability of summary data for two-sample Mendelian randomization
509 analyses using MR-Egger regression: the role of the I2 statistic. Int J Epidemiol.
510 2016;45(6):1961–74.

511 43. Hemani G, Tilling K, Davey Smith G. Orienting the causal relationship between
512 imprecisely measured traits using GWAS summary data. PLOS Genet.
513 2017;13(11):e1007081.
514 44. Schwarz G. Estimating the dimension of a model. Ann Stat. 1978;6:461–4.
515 45. Sclove L. Application of model-selection criteria to some problems in multivariate
516 analysis. Psychometrika. 1987;52:333–43.
517 46. Faden VB. Trends in initiation of alcohol use in the United States 1975 to 2003.
518 Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2006;30(6):1011–22.
519 47. Boelema SR, Harakeh Z, Van Zandvoort MJE, Reijneveld SA, Verhulst FC, Ormel J, et al.
520 Adolescent heavy drinking does not affect maturation of basic executive functioning:
521 Longitudinal findings from the TRAILS study. PLoS One. 2015;10(10):1–15.
522 48. Ormel J, Oldehinkel AJ, Sijtsema J, van Oort F, Raven D, Veenstra R, et al. The
523 TRacking Adolescents' Individual Lives Survey (TRAILS): design, current status, and
524 selected findings. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2012;51(10):1020–36.
525 49. Wolke D, Waylen A, Samara M, Steer C, Goodman R, Ford T, et al. Selective drop-out
526 in longitudinal studies and non-biased prediction of behaviour disorders. Br J
527 Psychiatry. 2009;195(3):249–56.
528 50. Kane MJ, Conway ARA, Miura TK, Colflesh GJH. Working memory, attention control,
529 and the N-back task: a question of construct validity. J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn.
530 2007;33(3):615–22.
531 51. Meule A. Reporting and interpreting working memory performance in n-back tasks.
532 Front Psychol. 2017;8:352.
533 52. Haatveit BC, Sundet K, Hugdahl K, Ueland T, Melle I, Andreassen OA. The validity of d
534 prime as a working memory index: results from the "Bergen n-back task". J Clin Exp

535 Neuropsychol. 2010;32(8):871–80.

536



Figure 1. Distribution of binge drinking response across latent classes at each timepoint (*n*=6,888). Class proportions based on estimated posterior probability[1]

[1] Overall, the low-risk group reported a low probability of binge drinking across all measurement occasions; adolescent-limited binge drinkers was mostly characterised by binge drinking in the earlier measurement occasions (but not later ones), adult-regular binge drinkers were mostly characterised by binge drinking in the later measurement occasions (but not earlier ones), while early-onset regular binge drinking was mostly characterised by binge drinking across all timepoints.

Table 1. Patterns of binge drinking from 16 to 23 years and working memory at age 24 (higher *d'* scores reflect better performance)

	Low risk	Adolescence limited	Adult limited	Early onset regular	
n=2,086 for all models	Reference group	*b* (95% CI)	*b* (95% CI)	*b* (95% CI)	Wald (df) *p* value
Unadjusted models					
Working memory *d'*	-	-0.15 (-.46, .17)	0.21 (.03, .40)	0.19 (.01, .36)	9.56 (3) *p*=0.02
Adjusted for SES					
Working memory *d'*	-	-0.15 (-.47, .17)	0.14 (-.05, .33)	0.14 (-.07, .30)	3.82 (3) *p*=0.28
Adjusted for SES/WM/HI					
Working memory *d'*	-	-0.17 (-.49, .15)	0.12 (-.06, .31)	0.06 (-.12, .24)	3.24 (3) *p*=0.36
Fully adjusted models					
Working memory *d'*	-	-0.15 (-.47, .17)	0.12 (-.07, .31)	0.09 (-.10, .28)	3.20 (3) *p*=0.36

Note. SES: socioeconomic status; WM: working memory at age ~11 years; HI: head injury/ unconsciousness up to age 11 years

Table 2. Patterns of binge drinking from 16 to 23 years and response inhibition at age 24 (shorter scores reflect faster reaction times)

	Low risk	Adolescence limited	Adult limited	Early onset regular	
n=2,086 for all models	Reference group	*b* (95% CI)	*b* (95% CI)	*b* (95% CI)	Wald (df) *p* value
Unadjusted models					
Stop signal reaction time	-	18.58 (2.62, 34.54)	-7.73 (-17.25, 2.09)	-5.42 (-15.62, 4.77)	10.14 (3) *p*=0.02
Adjusted for SES					
Stop signal reaction time	-	19.39 (3.33, 35.44)	-4.07 (-14.48, 6.34)	-2.66 (-13.30, 7.99)	6.92 (3) *p*=0.08
Adjusted for SES/WM/HI					
Stop signal reaction time	-	20.06 (4.07, 36.05)	-3.57 (-13.82, 6.69)	-0.05 (-10.72, 10.61)	7.40 (3) *p*=0.06
Fully adjusted model					
Stop signal reaction time	-	19.65 (3.20, 36.09)	-3.57 (-13.82, 6.69)	-0.70 (-11.95, 10.55)	6.51 (3) *p*=0.09

Note. SES: socioeconomic status; WM: working memory at age ~11 years; HI: head injury/ unconsciousness up to age 11 years

Table 3. Patterns of binge drinking from 16 to 22 and emotion recognition at age 24 (higher scores reflect better performance)

	Low risk	Adolescence limited	Adult limited	Early onset regular	
n=2,086 for all models	Reference group	*b* (95% CI)	*b* (95% CI)	*b* (95% CI)	Wald (df) *p* value
Unadjusted models					
Total hits	-	-0.02 (-.04, .01)	0.02 (.00, .03)	0.01 (-.01, .02)	8.14 (3) *p*=0.04
Adjusted for SES					
Total hits	-	-0.01 (-.04, .01)	0.01 (-.00, .02)	0.01 (-.01, .02)	4.17 (3) *p*=0.24
Adjusted for SES/WM/HI					
Total hits	-	-0.01 (-.04, .01)	0.01 (-.00, .02)	0.00 (-.01, .02)	3.89 (3) *p*=0.27
Fully adjusted model					
Total hits	-	-0.01 (-.04, .01)	0.01 (-.00, .03)	0.01 (-.01, .02)	3.68 (3) *p*=0.30

Note. SES: socioeconomic status; WM: working memory at age ~11 years; HI: head injury/ unconsciousness up to age 11 years

Table 4. Two-sample Mendelian randomization analyses of the effects of alcohol use on cognitive functioning

Exposure	Outcome	Method	N SNPs	Beta (95% CI)	P-value
Drinks per week	**Working memory**	Inverse-Variance Weighted	88	0.137 (-0.45, 0.72)	0.65
		MR Egger (SIMEX)	88	-0.381 (-2.13, 01.37)	0.67
		Weighted Median	88	0.421 (-0.52, 1.37)	0.38
		Weighted Mode	88	0.767 (-0.79, 2.32)	0.34
Drinks per week	**Response inhibition**	Inverse-Variance Weighted	88	-0.313 (-0.92, 0.29)	0.31
		MR Egger (SIMEX)	88	-0.729 (-2.63, 1.17)	0.46
		Weighted Median	88	-0.728 (-1.67, 0.21)	0.13
		Weighted Mode	88	-0.895 (-2.47, 0.68)	0.27
Drinks per week	**Emotion recognition**	Inverse-Variance Weighted	88	0.028 (-0.55, 0.61)	0.93
		MR Egger (SIMEX)	88	0.445 (-1.14, 2.03)	0.58
		Weighted Median	88	-0.157 (-1.01, 0.69)	0.72
		Weighted Mode	88	-0.180 (-1.78, 1.42)	0.82

Note: SIMEX = simulation extrapolation. SIMEX-corrected estimates were used based on regression dilution I^2_{GX} for number of drinks per week values between 0.3 and 0.9 (see Supplementary Table S9). SIMEX-corrected estimates are unweighted.