

1 Title: Prevalence of Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) in Greater Manchester,
2 UK: an active case ascertainment study

3

4 Robyn McCarthy MSc¹, Raja A.S. Mukherjee PhD^{1,2}, Kate M. Fleming PhD³,
5 Jonathan Green FRCPsych⁴, Jill Clayton-Smith MD⁵, Alan D. Price PhD¹, Clare S.
6 Allely PhD¹, Penny A. Cook PhD*¹
7 ***Correspondence to:** Penny A. Cook

8 School of Health and Society,

9 University of Salford,

10 Allerton Building

11 Frederick Road

12 Salford M6 6PU

13 p.a.cook@salford.ac.uk

14 Tel: +44(0)161 295 2804

15

16

17 1. School of Health and Society, University of Salford , UK

18 2. Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Service, Surrey & Borders NHS Trust, UK School of
19 Health and Society, University of Salford, UK

20 3. Institute of Population Health Sciences, University of Liverpool, UK Division of

21 4. Neuroscience & Experimental Psychology, University of Manchester, UK Royal
22 Manchester Children's Hospital, Manchester, UK

23 5. Royal Manchester Children's Hospital, Manchester, UK Division of Evolution &
24 Genomic Sciences, University of Manchester, UK

25 Funding

26 This project was funded by The Greater Manchester Health and Social Care
27 Partnership. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis,
28 decision to publish, or the preparation of the manuscript.

29 Conflicts of interest

30 RASM has received honoraria and support to attend international conferences from
31 various pharmaceutical companies related to ADHD including Takeda, Flynn and
32 Janssen. RASM is also a non-paid advisor to various ASD, ADHD and FASD
33 charities in England and Internationally (Australia and Europe). RASM has organised
34 conferences and obtained non educational grants from various sources including
35 Pharma and private hospitals. AP is an non-paid member of the Professional
36 Advisory Panel of the not-for-profit organisation, ÉNDpae. All other authors declare
37 that they have no competing interests.

38 Acknowledgments

39 We thank the parents, guardians, children, head teachers and staff at participant
40 schools. We also thank Róisín Reynolds and Rachael Nielsen from the Greater
41 Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership for their support. Philip May allowed
42 us to use the Maternal Risk Questionnaire, the University of New Mexico by the Fetal
43 Alcohol Syndrome Epidemiology Research Team initially developed in collaboration
44 with Sharon Wilsnack (University of North Dakota), and adapted and updated
45 multiple times for use in prevalence studies in the United States, South Africa, and
46 Italy. We thank those who represented families affected by FASD, led by Anna

47 Webster. We thank the members of an independent steering group, including Anna

48 Webster Jen Michaels, Joanne Higham, Mary Scanlon and Susan McGrail.

49

50 Abstract

51 **Background:** Despite high levels of prenatal alcohol exposure in the UK, evidence
52 on the prevalence of fetal alcohol spectrum disorders (FASD) is lacking. This paper
53 reports on FASD prevalence in a small sample.

54 **Methods:** A two-phase active case ascertainment study was conducted in three
55 mainstream primary schools in Greater Manchester, UK. Schools were located in
56 areas that ranged from relatively deprived to relatively affluent. Initial screening of
57 children aged 8-9 years used pre-specified criteria for elevated FASD risk (small for
58 age; special educational needs; currently/previously in care; significant
59 social/emotional/mental health symptoms). Screen positive children were invited for
60 detailed ascertainment of FASD using gold standard measures.

61 **Results:** Of 220 eligible children, 50 (23%) screened positive and 12% (26/220)
62 proceeded to phase-two assessment. Twenty had a developmental disorder, four
63 had FASD and four were assessed as possible FASD. The crude prevalence rate of
64 FASD in these schools was 1.8% (95%CI: 1.0%,3.4%) and when including possible
65 cases was 3.6% (2.1%,6.3%). None of these children had previously identified with a
66 developmental diagnosis.

67 **Conclusions:** FASD was found to be common in these schools, but limitations to the
68 sampling restrict inferences to a population prevalence. Most of these children's
69 needs had not previously been identified.

70 Keywords (5)

71 FASD; Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS); neurodevelopmental disorder; attention deficit
72 hyperactivity disorder (ADHD); Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)

73 Introduction

74 An estimated 10% of pregnancies globally are exposed to alcohol, a potent
75 teratogen that can lead to physical and neurodevelopmental birth defects (Popova et
76 al., 2017), collectively known as Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders (FASD) (Cook et
77 al., 2016). FASD is an umbrella term that includes the diagnoses of Fetal Alcohol
78 Syndrome (FAS), pFAS (partial Fetal Alcohol Syndrome), ARBD (Alcohol-Related
79 Birth Defects), and ARND (Alcohol-Related Neurodevelopmental Disorder)/ND-PAE
80 (Neurobehavioral Disorder Associated with Prenatal Alcohol Exposure).

81 The prevalence of FASD is 0.8% globally and highest in Europe, at 2% (Lange et al.,
82 2017a). There are no direct estimates of prevalence in the four countries with the
83 highest known rates of prenatal alcohol exposure (Ireland, Belarus, Denmark and
84 UK), all of which have rates of over 40% pregnancies exposed to alcohol (Popova et
85 al., 2017). For the UK, the modelled estimate suggests 3.2% of children and young
86 people may have FASD (Lange et al., 2017a). Where a cohort with high levels of
87 exposure (79% of mothers drank during the pregnancy, with 25% at binge levels)
88 was used, 6–17% of children screened positive for features of FASD (McQuire et al.,
89 2019). However, the lack of direct evidence of prevalence contributes to under-
90 investment in diagnostic, treatment and prevention services (Scholin et al., 2021).

91 Active case ascertainment studies, the basis of global and national prevalence
92 estimates (Lange et al., 2017a), are considered the ‘gold standard’ method of
93 estimating prevalence, and involve screening a cross section of the general
94 population of children (Roozen et al., 2016). Passive methods are less useful
95 because individuals with FASD are often not diagnosed (May & Gossage, 2001;
96 Morleo et al., 2011) for a number of reasons, including a lack of knowledge/training

97 among healthcare/educational professionals (Mukherjee et al., 2015); difficulty in
98 differentiating features of FASD from other commonly co-occurring disorders (e.g.
99 Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, ADHD, or Autism Spectrum Disorder, ASD)
100 (Mukherjee et al., 2011; Young et al., 2016).

101 The aim of this study was to provide direct evidence of the prevalence of FASD in a
102 small sample of UK children aged 8 to 9 years.

103 Materials and Methods

104 Setting

105 The setting was Greater Manchester, North West England (population 2.8 million),
106 an area with a higher than England average level of alcohol harm (Public Health
107 England, 2021), and relatively high deprivation (Ministry of Housing Communities
108 and Local Government, 2019).

109 This study was part of a wider initiative, the 'Preventing Alcohol Exposed Pregnancy
110 Programme' taking place in four of the ten Greater Manchester local authority areas.

111 The initiative also included increased awareness raising and interventions with
112 women who were pregnant or at risk of unplanned pregnancy (Reynolds et al., In
113 Press).

114 Design

115 We report on a cross-sectional study to detect cognitive impairments and associated
116 conditions, including FASD, using an Active Case Ascertainment method. Based on
117 the World Health Organization (WHO) standard protocol for FASD prevalence
118 studies (World Health Organisation, 2012), children in school year three/four (8-9
119 years of age at enrolment) who were able to communicate in English were invited to

120 take part in a two-phase approach. Children with a known risk factor for FASD went
121 to the second phase (full assessment: Figure 1). Child assessments took place
122 between July 2019 and March 2020. Restrictions related to the COVID-19 pandemic
123 prevented face to face data collection from mid-March 2020, at which point there
124 was one outstanding parent interview, which was conducted by telephone in March
125 2020.

126

127 **Sample size**

128 A sample size of 170 was adequate to get a preliminary indication of prevalence in a
129 selected sample of schools (based on estimated true prevalence=0.03,
130 precision=0.05; sensitivity=0.85; specificity=0.85). We aimed to recruit three schools
131 (assuming approximately 60 pupils in the relevant age category per school).

132 **School recruitment**

133 In this pragmatic, small-scale study, schools were purposefully selected. Key
134 informants (e.g. Heathy Schools Adviser, Education Psychologists) were consulted
135 and suggested four schools, all of which agreed to take part. One school was
136 excluded due to disengagement from the study and deviation from the protocol (see
137 supplementary file 1 for details of a partial dataset). We initially aimed to include a
138 specialist school providing Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) support. All
139 such schools within the study area were contacted. One such school agreed to take
140 part but withdrew after being unable to gain consent from any parents.

141 In February 2020, an extension of data collection was granted with the aim to recruit
142 further schools to increase the baseline sample size. Four additional schools were
143 recruited. However, the imposition of COVID-19 related restrictions, including

144 lockdown, meant that the study could not be completed in the second wave of
145 schools. Partial results are reported in Supplementary file 1.

146 Phase 1: Initial Screening

147 Parents of all eligible children were sent a letter describing the study with the option
148 to opt out, at least five days before data collection. Researchers were present in
149 school to assess physical measurements. Height was measured using a mobile
150 stadiometer, weight using Marsden MBF-6000 scales and head circumference
151 (OFC) using a Sec 201 measuring tape. To become eligible for phase 2 (full
152 assessment), one or more of the following criteria had to be met: height or weight
153 below the ninth centile or OFC below the second centile; identified by the school or
154 parents as having difficulties with learning, maladaptive behaviour, inattention or
155 hyperactivity issues; have an Education Health and Care plan; be a currently or
156 previously looked after child; already have diagnosed difficulties with behaviour
157 including ADHD or conduct disorder. Exclusion criteria: disabilities or behavioural
158 abnormalities known to be caused by well-characterised and already identified
159 genetic factors (e.g. Down Syndrome, Williams Syndrome) or by post-natal brain
160 injuries. These were excluded because the physical/behavioural stigmata overlap
161 with FASD in presentation, and an FASD label cannot be attributed as the primary
162 aetiological factor.

163 Phase 2a: Measures completed by parents/carers

164 Parents of those meeting criteria for phase 2 were sent information sheets and
165 consent forms to opt themselves and their child into the study either by email, letter
166 sent home, by telephone or in person by the Special Educational Needs Coordinator
167 or head teacher. Where children were currently under the care of the local authority
168 consent was obtained from the supervising social worker. For parent-report

169 assessments, most took place at school in a private room for two-hour sessions.
170 Where requested by the parent, assessments took place in their home.

171 Parent report assessments used the validated measures listed in Figure 1. The
172 medical history was taken using a structured questionnaire developed originally at
173 the University of New Mexico (May et al., 2011; May et al., 2018). The schedule
174 included questions on pre-pregnancy, pregnancy and current substance use
175 (alcohol, tobacco, prescription and illicit drugs), folic acid use in pregnancy and birth
176 complications. General questions on current alcohol consumption were asked first as
177 part of wider lifestyle set of questions, followed by questions about alcohol
178 consumption in pregnancy. If alcohol was consumed during pregnancy, further
179 questions ascertained the level and timing of consumption. Birth mothers were
180 interviewed privately in order to encourage open reporting of alcohol use. For looked
181 after children, fostered or adopted children, the parent/carer with most knowledge of
182 the child was interviewed.

183 [Phase 2b: Measurements on children](#)

184 Measurements took place in school during school hours. Dysmorphology of fetal
185 alcohol syndrome (FAS) facial characteristics was assessed from photographs
186 (using standardised alignment of the participant's head relative to the camera lens)
187 taken by trained researchers. Images were analysed by FAS Facial Photographic
188 Analysis Software (Astley, 2015) and validated by an experienced clinical geneticist.
189 Neurological impairment was assessed using the Developmental
190 NEuroPSYchological Assessment (NEPSY) to assess memory, attention, and
191 executive functions. The NEPSY subtests (Inhibition, Narrative Memory and Word
192 List Interference, Animal Sorting, Clocks and Memory for Faces) were those that had
193 been identified in previous FASD research (Rasmussen et al., 2013). The Wechsler

194 Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC V) (Kaufman et al., 2015) was used to assess
195 the child's cognition, as used in previous FASD studies (Raldiris et al., 2018).

196 Phase 2c: Ruling out genetic causes and case conference

197 The results of the assessments were compared to the case definition (Table 1),
198 derived from the WHO protocol for prevalence studies (World Health Organisation,
199 2012) and international guidelines (Cook et al., 2016). Where deficits met criteria in
200 three subdomains, and PAE was present, FASD was considered. Where a child had
201 all three sentinel facial features associated with FAS, FASD was considered in the
202 absence of reported PAE. For all those considered for FASD, a Microarray
203 Comparative Genomic Hybridisation (array CGH) test was used to rule out other
204 disorders that may present with a similar behavioural presentation of genetic origin
205 (Douzgou et al., 2012). A saliva sample was taken using the Oragene DNA OG-575
206 (DNAGenotek, 2020). The Oligo (Oxford Gene Technology, Oxford, UK) Hx60k array
207 was carried out by the North Western Regional Genetics Laboratory within
208 Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester.

209 Findings for each child discussed during case conferences attended by the study
210 team including clinicians with expertise in the diagnosis of FASD. Cases of FASD
211 were defined according to internationally recognised guidelines (Cook et al., 2016)
212 and possible cases were cases where FASD was suspected but information was
213 missing or unclear, for example regarding alcohol use.

214 Data analysis

215 Prevalence was estimated as the total number of children with FASD and probable
216 FASD as the numerator, and the total number of eligible children at the same site as
217 the denominator. This generates a conservative or minimum estimate of prevalence

218 as it assumed that all children who were not examined did not have FASD. To obtain
219 confidence intervals we accounted for clusters (schools) by using nonparametric
220 bootstrapping, resampling with replacement clusters with 10000 bootstrap runs.

221 [Ethical considerations](#)

222 Parents were invited to take part and were offered a report on their child's learning
223 and behaviour issues, which could include a range of learning difficulties, including
224 possible ASD, ADHD and FASD. The text of the information sheet made it clear that
225 the main objective was to ascertain FASD prevalence.

226 A small number of participants took part in genetic testing, which can occasionally
227 identify markers for other health conditions. The information sheet sought to ensure
228 that the parents/carers understood possible outcomes of the genetic test before
229 giving consent.

230 Ethical approval was granted by the University of Salford Ethics committee in May
231 2019 (reference: HSR1819-100).

232 [Results](#)

233 [Participating schools](#)

234 Schools represented a range of deprivation when measured by the index of multiple
235 deprivation. School 1 was located in one of England's 20% most deprived areas, and
236 school 3, 30%. School 2 was located among the 20% most affluent areas in
237 England.

238 [Flow of participants](#)

239 A total of 220 children were invited and 203 children took part in the phase 1 physical
240 measures (height, weight and OFC) (Figure 2). Fifty children were eligible for full

241 assessment (phase 2) because of screening positive on the physical measures,
242 parent/teacher concerns, already acknowledged as SEN, or currently or previously
243 being in local authority care (Table 2).

244 Full assessment took place with 26 children, four of whom had FASD and a further
245 four were identified as possible FASD (Table 2). Other developmental disorders
246 identified are detailed in supplementary file 2. Of the FASD cases, none had a prior
247 clinical diagnosis of any neurodevelopmental disorder or an Education, Health and
248 Care (EHC) Plan, and only one child had been identified by the school as having
249 special educational needs. Three out of the four cases had high risk prenatal alcohol
250 exposure reported, while in the fourth, alcohol was not reported but the child had
251 severe FAS facial features, was small for age, a low full scale IQ of 66, and a normal
252 CGH array (a summary of cases and possible cases assessed against the FASD
253 criteria is given in supplementary file 2).

254 Of the possible cases where FASD was suspected but not confirmed, none had a
255 clinical diagnosis of any neurodevelopmental disorder and only one had an EHC
256 Plan. All were on the schools' special educational needs register, had prenatal
257 exposure to alcohol, and had deficits in at least three subdomains. Of the 12 children
258 with a suspected disorder that was deemed unlikely to be FASD, 11 had some level
259 of prenatal exposure to alcohol.

260 **Prevalence Rates**

261 We calculated a conservative (minimum) prevalence of FASD of 1.8% (95% CI [1.0,
262 3.4]), and a conservative (minimum) prevalence that also included possible FASD of
263 3.6% (95%CI [2.1, 6.3]) within our study population.

264 Discussion

265 Prevalence of FASD

266 This is the first active case ascertainment study to be carried out in the UK, a country
267 with one of the highest rates of drinking in pregnancy in the world. These prevalence
268 estimates, though not necessarily generalisable to other communities, are in line with
269 a modelled population prevalence estimate for the UK of 3.2% (Lange et al., 2017b)
270 and consistent with a screening prevalence of 6-17% in a secondary analysis of data
271 from a cohort study of children born in the 1990s (McQuire et al., 2019). As per May
272 et al. (2018), our prevalence estimates could be considered as 'conservative'
273 because we assumed all those who we did not fully assess did not have FASD.
274 Further work examining the prevalence of FASD taking account of maternal
275 sociodemographic factors and trends in alcohol consumption would allow a more
276 precise estimate of the likely burden of this condition in the UK.

277 The study region (Greater Manchester) sees approximately 34,000 babies born per
278 year (ONS, 2020), yet diagnoses only around 36 cases of FASD per year
279 (unpublished data from a Freedom of Information request). This low rate of diagnosis
280 in relation to the example local prevalence we have demonstrated here suggests that
281 increased recognition and diagnostic capacity is required. Alongside this, support for
282 families affected by FASD is needed to prevent adverse secondary outcomes, such
283 as school exclusions, poor job prospects and mental ill-health (Alex & Feldmann,
284 2012; Streissguth et al., 2004).

285 Strengths and Limitations

286 We demonstrated successful engagement with the three schools, who made
287 intensive efforts on our behalf to recruit parents. The schools covered a range of

288 communities in different levels of deprivation, with two serving relatively deprived
289 populations and one relatively affluent. A larger, more definitive study would use a
290 random sampling technique, stratified by deprivation level, to select schools.

291 We were unable to obtain sufficient information for almost half (24/50) of the children
292 who were identified as being at higher risk of FASD. A further nine were actively
293 withdrawn before phase 1 screening and selection took place. It is not possible to
294 know whether the proportion of cases would have been higher or lower in these
295 groups that did not take part. It is also possible that there were cases of FASD in the
296 remaining 161 children with no apparent risk factors. It is possible the shame and
297 stigma associated with FASD or developmental disorders in general may have
298 impacted on participation.

299 Extensive effort was made to contact each parent, and for those not taking part, the
300 reasons were documented (see reasons given in Figure 2). The opportunity to have
301 children's needs assessed was the major incentive for schools to take part in the
302 study. For children in the care of foster parents, consent was required from the local
303 authority and this was particularly difficult to obtain.

304 We had initially hoped to include a further four schools in the prevalence
305 calculations, however, disruptions due to COVID-19 prevented completion in these
306 schools. Partial findings are presented in supplementary file 1.

307 We were not successful in collecting data in a Social Emotional and Mental Health
308 (SEMH) school despite recruiting an enthusiastic head teacher at such a school.
309 Anecdotally, parents felt they had nothing to gain by taking part as their child was
310 already benefiting from specialist support. Similarly, pupil referral units were not

311 included in this study. Together with SEMH schools, this is another setting where
312 FASD prevalence is anticipated to be higher than the mainstream school setting.

313 It is likely that prenatal alcohol exposure was underestimated in this study, as dose
314 and duration of alcohol consumption during pregnancy was calculated from
315 retrospective self-reporting, relying on recall of behaviours taking place 9 or 10 years
316 prior. Social desirability bias also affects reporting of alcohol consumption during
317 pregnancy (Smith et al., 2014) and we do not know how much the potential for
318 perceived shame associated with alcohol consumption in pregnancy may have
319 affected reporting.

320 A general limitation in studies that measure the prevalence of FASD is that the only
321 feature that is specific to damage caused by prenatal alcohol exposure is the
322 distinctive facial appearance. However, significant facial features are thought to only
323 occur in a minority of cases of FASD, and, likewise, in this study only two out of the
324 eight cases and possible cases showed these distinctive features. We ruled out
325 obvious genetic causes through chromosome microarray analysis and clinical
326 geneticist review. However, it is not possible to prove that the alcohol exposure
327 caused the deficits. The converse also true: it is not possible to rule out alcohol as an
328 important causal factor. Every effort was taken to reduce bias that may give rise to
329 false positives. The case definition used validated developmental assessments and
330 was described in advance in the study protocol and followed internationally
331 recognised guidance (Cook et al., 2016).

332 An improvement on our methodology would have been to include a random sample
333 of children for full assessment. This would have enabled us to obtain characteristics
334 of the birth mothers in a group of children without any risk factors for FASD, which

335 would have allowed more sophisticated modelling (and extrapolation) of the likely
336 prevalence in the entire population of 8-9 year olds (May et al., 2018). In this small-
337 scale study, we determined that this would have been difficult. Parents were
338 prepared to take part if they thought it might benefit their child, for example by getting
339 more information to inform their special educational needs or to obtain a diagnosis.
340 The fact that our assessment also identified possible ASD, ADHD and other
341 neurodevelopmental conditions was a significant 'pull factor' for schools and parents.
342 It was also notable that the only children actively opted into the study because of
343 parent concerns (and no other risk factor) were from the school in the most affluent
344 setting (school 2). Thus, motivations to take part may differ depending on
345 socioeconomic status. We would conclude that further research would be needed
346 into how to incentivise parents of children with apparently typical development to
347 take part.

348 **Conclusions**

349 This is the first study in the UK to directly assess FASD in a systematically
350 ascertained sample of children. It found FASD in 1.8% (1.0%-3.4%) of the population
351 studied, or 3.6% (2.1%,6.3%) when possible cases were also included. Due to the
352 small sampling frame of schools included and limitations of baseline information
353 obtained on contacted families, we can only conclude this represents local
354 prevalence data in typical mainstream schools rather than being able confidentially
355 to infer a 'population prevalence' of FASD. There are uncertainties too about this
356 prevalence found, since half the children screened positive were lost to full
357 ascertainment, and case identification may have been higher if all cases had been
358 seen. It was already suspected from modelling and screening studies that FASD is
359 highly prevalent in the UK (Lange et al., 2017a; McQuire et al., 2019). Confirmation

360 that this is the case in a sample of schools should be used to increase the
361 awareness of FASD, and invest in diagnostic services, treatment and support for
362 those affected by FASD.

363 References

364

365 Alex, K. & Feldmann, R. 2012. Children and adolescents with fetal alcohol syndrome
366 (FAS): better social and emotional integration after early diagnosis. *Klin*
367 *Padiatr*, 224, 66-71.

368 Astley, S. J. 2015. Palpebral fissure length measurement: accuracy of the FAS
369 Facial Photographic Analysis Software and inaccuracy of the ruler. *Journal of*
370 *Population Therapeutics and Clinical Pharmacology*, 22(1).

371 Cook, J. L., Green, C. R., Lilley, C. M., Anderson, S. M., Baldwin, M. E., Chudley, A.
372 E., Conry, J. L., Leblanc, N., Loock, C. A., Lutke, J., Mallon, B. F., Mcfarlane,
373 A. A., Temple, V. K. & Rosales, T. 2016. Fetal alcohol spectrum disorder: a
374 guideline for diagnosis across the lifespan. *Can. Med. Assoc. J.*, 188, 191-
375 197.

376 Dnagenotek 2020. Oragene 500-series. *Genotek*.

377 Douzgou, S., Breen, C., Crow, Y. J., Chandler, K., Metcalfe, K., Jones, E., Kerr, B. &
378 Clayton-Smith, J. 2012. Diagnosing fetal alcohol syndrome: new insights from
379 newer genetic technologies. *Arch. Dis. Child.*, 97, 812-817.

380 Kaufman, A. S., Raiford, S. E. & Coalson, D. L. 2015. *Intelligent testing with the*
381 *WISC-V, USA*, John Wiley & Sons.

382 Lange, S., Probst, C., Gmel, G., Rehm, J., Burd, L. & Popova, S. 2017a. Global
383 Prevalence of Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Among Children and Youth A
384 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Jama Pediatr*, 171, 948-956.

- 385 Lange, S., Probst, C., Gmel, G., Rehm, J., Burd, L. & Popova, S. 2017b. Global
386 Prevalence of Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Among Children and Youth: A
387 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*, 171, 948-956.
- 388 May, P. A., Chambers, C. D., Kalberg, W. O., Zellner, J., Feldman, H., Buckley, D.,
389 Kopald, D., Hasken, J. M., Xu, R., Honerkamp-Smith, G., Taras, H., Manning,
390 M. A., Robinson, L. K., Adam, M. P., Abdul-Rahman, O., Vaux, K., Jewett, T.,
391 Elliott, A. J., Kable, J. A., Akshoomoff, N., Falk, D., Arroyo, J. A., Hereld, D.,
392 Riley, E. P., Charness, M. E., Coles, C. D., Warren, K. R., Jones, K. L. &
393 Hoyme, H. E. 2018. Prevalence of Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders in 4 US
394 Communities. *JAMA*, 319, 474-482.
- 395 May, P. A., Fiorentino, D., Coriale, G., Kalberg, W. O., Hoyme, H. E., Aragon, A. S.,
396 Buckley, D., Stellavato, C., Gossage, J. P., Robinson, L. K., Jones, K. L.,
397 Manning, M. & Ceccanti, M. 2011. Prevalence of children with severe fetal
398 alcohol spectrum disorders in communities near Rome, Italy: new estimated
399 rates are higher than previous estimates. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health*,
400 8, 2331-51.
- 401 May, P. A. & Gossage, J. P. 2001. Estimating the prevalence of fetal alcohol
402 syndrome - A summary. *Alcohol Research & Health*, 25, 159-167.
- 403 Mcquire, C., Mukherjee, R., Hurt, L., Higgins, A., Greene, G., Farewell, D., Kemp, A.
404 & Paranjothy, S. 2019. Screening prevalence of fetal alcohol spectrum
405 disorders in a region of the United Kingdom: A population-based birth-cohort
406 study. *Prev. Med.*, 118, 344-351.
- 407 Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government 2019. The English Indices
408 of Deprivation. [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019)
409 [deprivation-2019](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019).

- 410 Morleo, M., Woolfall, K., Dedman, D., Mukherjee, R., Bellis, M. A. & Cook, P. A.
411 2011. Under-reporting of foetal alcohol spectrum disorders: an analysis of
412 hospital episode statistics. *BMC Pediatr.*, 11.
- 413 Mukherjee, R., Layton, M., Yacoub, E. & Turk, J. 2011. Autism and autistic traits in
414 people exposed to heavy prenatal alcohol: data from a clinical series of 21
415 individuals and nested case control study. *Advances in Mental Health and*
416 *Intellectual Disabilities*.
- 417 Mukherjee, R., Wray, E., Curfs, L. & Hollins, S. 2015. Knowledge and opinions of
418 professional groups concerning FASD in the UK. *Adoption and Fostering*, 39,
419 212-224.
- 420 Ons 2020. Births in England and Wales: summary tables.
- 421 Popova, S., Lange, S., Probst, C., Gmel, G. & Rehm, J. 2017. Estimation of national,
422 regional, and global prevalence of alcohol use during pregnancy and fetal
423 alcohol syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Global*
424 *Health*, 5, E290-E299.
- 425 Public Health England 2021. Public Health Profiles.
426 <https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/search/alcohol%20specific%20death>.
- 427 Raldiris, T. L., Bowers, T. G. & Towsey, C. 2018. Comparisons of intelligence and
428 behavior in children with fetal alcohol spectrum disorder and ADHD. *Journal*
429 *of attention disorders*, 22 (10), 959-970.
- 430 Rasmussen, C., Tamana, S., Baugh, L., Andrew, G., Tough, S. & Zwaigenbaum, L.
431 2013. Neuropsychological impairments on the NEPSY-II among children with
432 FASD. *Child Neuropsychology*, 19, 337-349.

- 433 Reynolds, R., Mccarthy, R. & Cook, P. A. In Press. We do things differently here: the
434 Greater Manchester approach to preventing alcohol-exposed pregnancy.
435 *Perspectives in Public Health*.
- 436 Roozen, S., Peters, G. J. Y., Kok, G., Townend, D., Nijhuis, J. & Curfs, L. 2016.
437 Worldwide Prevalence of Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders: A Systematic
438 Literature Review Including Meta-Analysis. *Alcoholism-Clinical and*
439 *Experimental Research*, 40, 18-32.
- 440 Scholin, L., Mukherjee, R. a. S., Aiton, N., Blackburn, C., Brown, S., Flemming, K.
441 M., Gard, P. R., Howlett, H., Plant, M., Price, A. D., Shields, J., Smith, L. A.,
442 Suttie, M., Zammitt, D. C., Cook, P. A. & Collaboration, U. F. R. 2021. Fetal
443 alcohol spectrum disorders: an overview of current evidence and activities in
444 the UK. *Arch. Dis. Child*.
- 445 Smith, L., Savory, J., Couves, J. & Burns, E. 2014. Alcohol consumption during
446 pregnancy: Cross-sectional survey. *Midwifery*, 30, 1173-1178.
- 447 Streissguth, A. P., Bookstein, F. L., Barr, H. M., Sampson, P. D., O'malley, K. &
448 Young, J. K. 2004. Risk factors for adverse life outcomes in fetal alcohol
449 syndrome and fetal alcohol effects. *J. Dev. Behav. Pediatr.*, 25, 228-38.
- 450 World Health Organisation 2012. WHO Global Prevalence Study on FASD. WHO
451 Research Initiative on Alcohol, Health and Development, WHO International
452 Collaborative Research Project on Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders (FASD).
- 453 Young, S., Absoud, M., Blackburn, C., Branney, P., Colley, B., Farrag, E., Fleisher,
454 S., Gregory, G., Gudjonsson, G. H., Kim, K., O'malley, K. D., Plant, M.,
455 Rodriguez, A., Ozer, S., Takon, I., Woodhouse, E. & Mukherjee, R. 2016.
456 Guidelines for identification and treatment of individuals with attention

457 deficit/hyperactivity disorder and associated fetal alcohol spectrum disorders

458 based upon expert consensus. *BMC Psychiatry*, 16, 324.

459

460

461 **Table 1**

462 **Table 1: Measures used and Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) domains**
 463 **of impairment**

Domain	Sub-domain	Measure
Growth		Height below 9 th percentile and Weight below 9 th percentile, medical history
Face		Photographic measurements 4 digit FAS Facial Measurement software.
Central Nervous System	Brain	OFC below 2 nd centile, medical history or brain scan report
	Hard/ Soft Neurological signs	SSP Defined differences in 2 or more domains History of formally diagnosed motor disorder e.g. dyspraxia History of epilepsy or other neurological issues (from medical history)
	Communication	CCC-2, Vineland communication domain. Defined by abnormality >1.5 standard deviations below the mean
	Cognition	WISC V: IQ 2 standard deviations from norm or 2 standard deviations between different subdomains
	Executive Function	BRIEF overall score: Score above clinical cut off range NEPSY executive function domain Score 1.5 standard deviations from norm or 2 standard deviations between subdomains
	Memory	WISC V, NEPSY Memory domain

	Attention	SDQ attention domain scores above clinical cut offs NEPSY attention domain
	Adaptive behaviour, social skills	SCQ (score above 15), SDQ (score above clinical cut off), Vineland Social domain, Vineland Daily Living Skills domain (both scores 1.5 standard deviations from mean)
	Academic	Teacher report, below average level, has EHC Plan
Alcohol consumption of birth mother		History information sheet

464

465 BRIEF: Behaviour Rating Inventory of Executive Function

466 CCC-2: Communication Checklist for Children

467 EHC Plan: Education Health and Care Plan

468 NEPSY: NEuroPSYchological Assessment

469 OFC: Occipitofrontal Circumference

470 SSP: Short Sensory Profile

471 SCQ: Social Communication Questionnaire

472 SDQ: Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

473 WISC-V: Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children Fifth UK Edition

474 Table 2

475 **Table 2: Screening and assessment data by school**

	School1 (baseline N=44)	School2 (baseline N=118)	School3 (baseline N=59)	Total (N=220)
Screened at stage one n (% of baseline)	38 (86)	109 (92)	56 (95)	203 (92)
Sex , n(% of baseline)				

Male	18 (40)	55 (46)	30 (51)	103 (47)
Female	20 (45)	54 (46)	26 (44)	100 (45)
Age, Years (y) & months (m)				
Median	8y11m	8y10m	8y6m	8y10m
[Interquartile range]	[8y9m, 9y5m]	[8y5m, 9y6m]	[8y3m, 8y11m]	[8y 5m, 9y4m]
(range)	(8y3m, 9y9m)	(8y0m, 9y10m)	(8y0m, 9y8y)	(8y0m, 9y10m)
Physical screen positive				
n (% of baseline)				
Height <9 th percentile	4 (9)	7 (6)	2 (3)	13 (6)
Weight <9 th percentile	2 (5)	3 (3)	2 (3)	7 (3)
OFC <2 th percentile	1 (2)	1(1)	1 (2)	3 (1)
Reason for recruitment n (% of invited)				
SEN	14(66)	7 (43)	5 (50)	26 (13)
SFA	3(14)	5 (31)	4 (40)	12 (6)
LAC	2(10)	3 (18)	1 (10)	6 (3)
SFA+SEN	2(10)	0	0	2 (1)
SFA + prevLAC	0	1 (6)	0	1 (0.5)
Parent opt-in	0	3 (16)	0	3 (1)
Invited to second phase	21	19	10	50
Phase two assessments	N=10	N=9	N=7	N=26
Referral reason (% of phase two participants)				
SEN	5 (50)	3 (33)	4 (57)	12 (46)
SFA	3 (30)	0	2 (29)	5 (19)
LAC	0	2 (22)	1 (14)	3 (12)
SFA and SEN	2 (20)	0	0	2 (8)
SFA and PrevLAC	0	1 (11)	0	1 (4)
parent opt in	0	3 (33)	0	3 (11)
Maternal Ethnicity, n(%)				
White UK	10 (100)	8 (89)	6 (86)	24 (92)
Non white	0	1 (11)	0	1 (4)
Not reported	0	0	1 (14)	1 (4)
Maternal educational qualifications, highest received n(%)				
<4 GCSEs	2 (20)		1 (14)	3 (12)
4+GCSEs	4 (40)		2 (29)	6 (23)
2+A levels	2 (20)	3 (33)	1 (14)	6 (23)

Degree	2 (20)	4 (44)	2 (29)	8 (30)
Missing data	0	2 (22)	1 (14)	3 (12)
Full assessment				
Deficits in three subdomains met, n(% of assessed)	8 (80)	7 (78)	6 (86)	21 (80)
FASD, n (% of assessed)				
FASD	1 (10)	3 (33)	0 (0)	4 (15)
FASD and possible FASD	3 (30)	4 (44)	1 (10)	8 (30)
Other outcomes				
ASD	0 (0)	2 (22)	3 (43)	5 (19)
ADHD	2 (20)	0 (0)	1 (14)	3 (12)
DLD	2 (20)	1 (10)	0 (0)	3 (12)
General learning disability	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (28)	2 (8)
No disorder	3 (30)	2 (20)	0 (0)	5 (19)
FASD prevalence per 100 [95% CI]				
FASD	2.3 [0.3,14.8]	2.5 [0.8, 7.4]	No observations	1.8 [1.0,3.4]
FASD and possible FASD	7.0 [2.2,19.8]	3.4 [1.3, 8.7]	1.7 [0.2,11.1]	3.6 [2.1,6.3]

476 SEN: on school educational needs register; SFA: small for age; LAC: 'looked after
477 child', i.e. under care of local authority; PrevLAC: previously looked after child, i.e.
478 adopted; OFC: occipital frontal circumference; GCSE: General Certificate of
479 Education, qualification usually taken at age 16 years; A level: Advanced Level,
480 qualification usually taken at age 18 years; FASD: fetal alcohol spectrum disorder;
481 ASD: autism spectrum disorder; ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; DLD:
482 developmental language disorder.

483

484

485 Table legends

486

487 Table 2: Measures used and Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) domains of
488 impairment

489 BRIEF: Behaviour Rating Inventory of Executive Function

490 CCC-2: Communication Checklist for Children

491 EHC Plan: Education Health and Care Plan

492 NEPSY: NEuroPSYchological Assessment

493 OFC: Occipitofrontal Circumference

494 SSP: Short Sensory Profile

495 SCQ: Social Communication Questionnaire

496 SDQ: Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

497 WISC-V: Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children Fifth UK Edition

498

499

500 Table 2: Screening and assessment data by school

501 SEN: on school educational needs register; SFA: small for age; LAC: 'looked after

502 child', i.e. under care of local authority; PrevLAC: previously looked after child, i.e.

503 adopted; OFC: occipital frontal circumference; GCSE: General Certificate of

504 Education, qualification usually taken at age 16 years; A level: Advanced Level,

505 qualification usually taken at age 18 years; FASD: fetal alcohol spectrum disorder;

506 ASD: autism spectrum disorder; ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; DLD:

507 developmental language disorder.

508 Figure legends

509 Figure 1. Study design

510

511 Figure 2. Flow of participants through the study.

512 SFA: small for age; SEN: on school educational needs register; LAC: ‘looked after

513 child’ i.e. in the care of the local authority; PrevLAC: previously looked after, i.e.

514 adopted.

515

516

517

518

519

Figure 1




Figure 2

