

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

Genetic and environmental etiology of the broad avoidant restrictive food intake disorder phenotype in 6- to-12-year-old Swedish twins

Lisa Dinkler, PhD¹, Paul Lichtenstein, PhD¹, Sebastian Lundström, PhD², Henrik Larsson, PhD^{1,3}, Nadia Micali, PhD^{4,5}, Mark J. Taylor, PhD¹, Cynthia M. Bulik, PhD^{1,6,7}

1 Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

2 Gillberg Neuropsychiatry Centre, Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

3 School of Medical Sciences, Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden

4 Mental Health Services in the Capital Region of Denmark, Eating Disorders Research Unit, Psychiatric Centre Ballerup, Copenhagen, Denmark.

5 Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, University College London, London, UK

6 Department of Psychiatry, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, United States

7 Department of Nutrition, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, United States

Corresponding author: Lisa Dinkler, PhD, Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Nobels Väg 12A, 17177 Stockholm, Sweden, +46 (0) 707466373, lisa.dinkler@ki.se

Manuscript word count: 2,899

Number of figures: 1

Number of tables: 4

Supplementary materials: eTables 1-3

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

Introduction

ARFID is a serious feeding and eating disorder formally recognized in DSM-5¹ in 2013, and first included in the ICD in 2022 (ICD-11).² Characterized by an extremely limited *range* or *amount* of food consumed, and resulting in persistent failure to meet nutritional and/or energy needs, ARFID is associated with considerable individual, family, and social impairment,³ and medical consequences^{4,5} can be life-threatening. Unlike anorexia nervosa, dietary restriction in ARFID is *not* motivated by body image concerns or drive for thinness, but rather based on *sensory sensitivity to food qualities* (e.g., texture, smell, taste), *lack of interest in food/eating* (i.e., low appetite), and/or *fear of aversive somatic consequences of food intake* (e.g., choking, vomiting, allergic reactions),¹ often in response to aversive eating experiences.⁶ With an estimated prevalence of 1-5%,^{7,8} ARFID is at least as common as autism⁹ and potentially as common as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder.¹⁰

The etiology of ARFID remains poorly understood and the genetics of ARFID remain understudied. Other eating disorders such as anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa have been shown to have moderate to high heritability,¹¹ and large-scale genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have successfully identified risk loci for anorexia nervosa, and underscored the importance of considering metabolic factors in its etiology.¹² In contrast, the heritability of ARFID is as yet unknown, although twin studies have been conducted on related phenotypes showing low to moderate heritabilities for macronutrient, micronutrient, and overall caloric intake (.21-.48)¹³ and fruit/vegetable liking (.37-.54),^{14,15} and moderate to high heritabilities for food fussiness (.46-.78),^{14,16} food neophobia (.58-.78),¹⁶⁻¹⁸ and appetite (.53-.84)¹⁹; for a comprehensive review see²⁰.

Importantly, the genetic epidemiology of ARFID is unknown because validated ARFID screening instruments are only starting to emerge. Until such measures have been developed and deployed, we can optimize available resources such as those held by the Swedish Twin Registry to create a diagnostic algorithm to identify an ARFID phenotype and study its prevalence, correlates, and etiology. The **aim of this study** was to determine the extent to which genetic and environmental factors contribute to the liability to ARFID. Based on the moderate to high heritability of other eating disorders (anorexia nervosa .48-.74, bulimia nervosa .55-.61, and binge-eating disorder .39-.45)²¹ and the above reported heritability estimates of ARFID-related traits, we expected at least moderate heritability of ARFID.

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

Methods

Participants

We leveraged existing data from the Child and Adolescent Twin Study in Sweden (CATSS), targeting all twins born in Sweden since July 1, 1992.²² CATSS is one of the largest twin studies in the world, contains a broad range of psychiatric and neurodevelopmental phenotypes, and is linked to the national population health and quality registers.²² Parents of twins are first invited to participate in CATSS at twin age 9 (the cohorts born July 1992 to June 1995 were assessed at age 12, CATSS-9/12). Zygosity was ascertained either using a panel of 48 single nucleotide polymorphisms, and/or an algorithm of five questions regarding twin similarity. CATSS and its linkage to the Swedish health registries was approved by the Regional Ethical Review Board in Stockholm, Sweden (02-289, 03-672, 2010/322-31/2, 2010/597-31/1, 2016/2135-31, 2018/1398-32).

This study included twins born 1992-2010 who were part of CATSS-9/12 (response rate ~69%). For this sample, data from the National Patient Register (NPR; diagnostic and procedure codes from inpatient care with full coverage since 1987 and ~80% of specialized outpatient care since 2001;²³ ICD-9 codes 1987–1996, ICD-10 codes since 1997) was available until the end of 2016 and data from the Prescribed Drug Register (PDR; all dispensations of prescribed drugs since 2005, active drug ingredients coded according to the Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical [ATC] Classification System) was available until the end of 2017.²⁴ We excluded twins with unknown zygosity (n=435) and missing co-twin (n=45). The final sample comprised 32,902 individuals (49.4% female; 81.1% age 9 and 18.9% age 12; i.e., 16,951 twin pairs (5,184 monozygotic [MZ], 5,936 dizygotic same-sex [DZ-ss], and 5,831 dizygotic opposite-sex [DZ-os]).

Identification of the ARFID phenotype

To identify children with an ARFID phenotype, we extracted all information relevant to the DSM-5 criteria for ARFID from CATSS, NPR, and PDR, and developed a composite measure including indicators of avoidant/restrictive eating and potential clinically significant consequences of the eating behavior (e.g., low weight/failure to thrive, nutritional deficiency, nutritional supplements, psychosocial impairment; *DSM-5 ARFID criterion A*), while considering exclusion criteria such as body image concerns (e.g., fear of weight gain) and medical conditions that could potentially explain the eating disturbance (*DSM-5 ARFID criteria C & D*; **Figure 1**). *DSM-5 ARFID criterion B* (eating disturbance is not better explained by lack of available food or an associated culturally sanctioned practice) could not be considered as such information was not available. Furthermore, the clinical diagnoses of

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

feeding and eating disorders and the specific CATSS items used to identify the ARFID phenotype are unlikely to reflect cultural practices causing the eating disturbance (**eTable 1**).

Figure 1 about here

All information from CATSS used in this study was reported by parents, either at twin age 9 (87.3% of the sample) or at twin age 12 (12.7% of the sample). To match this age range, we included diagnostic and procedure codes from the NPR, and prescribed drugs from the PDR, to assess *DSM-5 ARFID criterion A* between age 6 and 12 years (we chose age 6 to increase sensitivity for including potential consequences of the eating disturbance diagnosed earlier than age 9, which is the lower age bound for the parent-reports from CATSS). *DSM-5 ARFID criterion C* (eating disturbance not attributable to anorexia nervosa, bulimia nervosa, or body image disturbance) was evaluated using parent-reported fear of weight gain at age 9 or 12. To assess *DSM-5 ARFID criterion D* (eating disturbance not attributable to a concurrent medical condition or another mental disorder), we selected a range of medical conditions at any time before age 12 that could potentially explain an eating disturbance. However, in this epidemiological context, it is impossible to determine whether, in each specific case, the selected medical conditions are cause, comorbidity, or consequence of ARFID. Therefore, we did not simply exclude children with the selected medical conditions from the analyses, but rather conducted sensitivity analyses excluding these children. Furthermore, we wanted to ascertain that genetic and environmental influences on the ARFID phenotype are not only due to autism, which is highly heritable²⁵ and often co-occurs with ARFID.^{26,27} Therefore, we also conducted sensitivity analyses excluding children with an NPR diagnosis of autism at any point in their life (ICD-9: 299A, ICD-10: F84.0, F84.1, F84.5, F84.8, F84.9), as well as children scoring above cut-off (≥ 8.5) on the autism scale of the Autism-Tics, AD/HD and other Comorbidities inventory (A-TAC), which has been well-validated for autism.²⁸⁻³⁰ **eTable1** provides a full list of CATSS items, NPR diagnostic and procedure codes, and PDR ATC codes used to evaluate *DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and D*.

In summary, we conducted twin analyses for **four different “case” definitions (Figure 1): (1)** children who only meet *DSM-5 ARFID criterion A* (avoidant/restrictive eating with clinically significant impact that could be due to fear of weight gain in some children, **caseA**), **(2)** children who meet *DSM-5 ARFID criteria A and C* (excluding children with fear of weight gain, **caseAC**), **(3)** children who meet *DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and partially D* (excluding children with comorbid medical conditions, **caseACD_med**), and **(4)** children who meet both *DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and partially D* (excluding children with comorbid autism, **caseACD_aut**). Since medical conditions and autism are common comorbidities of ARFID,^{26,27,31} we deemed *caseACD_med* and *caseACD_aut* too conservative definitions of

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

ARFID and thus included these in sensitivity analyses. On the other hand, the *caseA* definition is too broad as it does not exclude children with fear of weight gain. We therefore consider *caseAC* to best reflect children with the ARFID phenotype.

Statistical Analyses

The twin design is based on comparing the relative similarity of MZ and DZ twins on a trait, capitalizing on the fact that MZ twins are genetically identical, whereas DZ twins share on average 50% of their segregating DNA. In contrast to non-twin siblings, twins are also matched for shared environmental influences by sharing the intrauterine environment and growing up in the same family at the same time. By comparing twin correlations, we can therefore estimate the contributions of additive genetics (*A*), shared environment (*C*) or dominant genetic effects (*D*), and non-shared environment (*E*) to a phenotype (albeit *C* and *D* cannot be estimated simultaneously as they confound each other in the classical twin design).

Here, we fitted univariate liability threshold models (which are based on dichotomous data but assume an underlying continuous distribution of liability to the categorical construct) to estimate the relative contribution of genetic and environmental variation to the liability to the ARFID phenotype for each of the four case definitions. As little is known about sex differences in ARFID (including sex differences in its clinical presentation, epidemiology, and etiology), we initially fitted a saturated model including quantitative and qualitative sex limitation to the observed data for all four case definitions (quantitative sex limitation: genetic and environmental variation influences phenotypic variance to differing degrees in females and males; qualitative sex limitation: different genetic and environmental influences in females and males).

Assumption testing for this saturated model revealed no violations of the assumed equal thresholds *across twin order* and *across zygosity* in same-sex twin pairs (**eTable 2**; see number of cases by sex and zygosity in **Table 1**). Twin correlations were estimated from a constrained saturated model, in which the thresholds were equated across twin order and across zygosity within sex (i.e., two thresholds were estimated, one for all females and one for all males). All DZ-ss twin correlations were less than half of the MZ twin correlations, indicating either *D* or sibling contrast effects (-s; i.e., parental emphasis on within-pair differences; **Table 2**). Twin correlations of MZ males were somewhat *higher* than twin correlations of MZ females, while twin correlations of DZ-ss males were somewhat *lower* than twin correlations of DZ females, suggesting *quantitative* sex differences. *Qualitative* sex differences were only indicated for one of the four case definitions (*caseACD_med*), where the twin correlation of DZ-os pairs was lower than the average of the twin correlations of DZ-

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

ss females and DZ-ss males. Qualitative sex differences and sibling contrast effects cannot be estimated in the same model as the model would be under-identified. Since there was little indication of *qualitative* sex differences, we fitted ADE-s models with only *quantitative* sex limitation. Sibling contrast effects were modeled by adding a causal pathway (-s) between one twin's phenotype and their co-twin's phenotype. Significance of individual parameters was tested by constraining them to be equal to zero. The best-fitting models were chosen based on the likelihood ratio test (the reduced model was favored if model fit did not deteriorate significantly). Data management was performed using SAS 9.4 software. Data analysis was performed in and OpenMx version 2.20.6³² in R 4.2.0 software.

Tables 1 & 2 about here

Results

Identification of the ARFID phenotype

In our sample of 33,902 individuals, we identified 797 children (2.4%) who had the ARFID *caseA* phenotype (i.e., not considering potential fear of weight gain) (**Figure 1, Table 1**). After excluding children with parent-reported fear of weight gain, 667 children were classified as having the ARFID *caseAC* phenotype, corresponding to a population prevalence of 2.0% (38.2% female). Two thirds (445/667, 66.7%) of children with the ARFID *caseAC* phenotype met *DSM-5 ARFID criterion A1* (low weight/failure to gain thrive), and 51.4% (341/667) met *DSM-5 ARFID criterion A4* (psychosocial impairment; **Table 1**). Only a small minority met *DSM-5 ARFID criterion A2* (nutritional deficiency, 4/667, 0.6%) or *DSM-5 ARFID criterion A3* (nutritional supplements, 49/667, 7.3%). For the sensitivity analyses, we further excluded 126 children with medical conditions that could potentially explain the eating disturbance (*caseACD*, n=541, 1.6%) and 128 children with autism (*caseACD_aut*, n=539, 1.6%).

Model fitting and heritability of the ARFID phenotype

According to likelihood ratio tests, model fits did not deteriorate significantly when quantitative sex limitation was dropped (**Table 3**). In addition, the ADE-s models *including* quantitative sex limitation were severely underpowered, as indicated by the large confidence intervals (CIs) for the A and D components, which also included zero for all case definitions (**Table 4**). We therefore fitted nested models of ADE-s models *without* sex limitation (**eTable 3**). AE-s models showed the best fit for all four case definitions (**Table 3**). Heritability of the ARFID *caseAC* phenotype was 0.79 (95% CI 0.71-0.86); with small but statistically significant non-shared environmental effects (0.21, 95% CI 0.14-0.29) and sibling contrast effects (-0.09, 95% CI -0.14 - -0.04; **Table 4**). Heritability was very similar across all four case definitions (point estimates: 0.77-0.80).

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

Tables 3 & 4 about here

Discussion

In light of the lack of large-scale epidemiological twin data on ARFID, we leveraged existing data to create four definitions of an ARFID phenotype. Combining data from parent-reports and national health registers, we identified 667 children (2%) with the ARFID phenotype and found that the ARFID phenotype is highly heritable. ARFID heritability was 0.79 (95% CI 0.71-0.86), placing it amongst the most heritable of psychiatric disorders (e.g., autism 0.64-0.91³³; schizophrenia 0.79³⁴; attention deficit hyperactivity disorder [ADHD] 0.77-0.88;³⁵ and bipolar disorder 0.50-0.71³⁶). Moreover, the heritability of the ARFID phenotype was higher than that of other eating disorders, namely anorexia nervosa (0.48-0.74), bulimia nervosa (0.55-0.61), and binge-eating disorder (0.39-0.45).²¹ Our results extend and confirm previous twin studies of other feeding-related phenotypes of moderate to high heritability such as appetite (.53-.84),¹⁹ food fussiness (.46-.78),^{14,16} and food neophobia (.58-.78).¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Sensitivity analyses excluding individuals with autism and medical conditions that could potentially explain the eating disturbance led to only very minor changes in heritability estimates, suggesting that these conditions did not account for the high heritability. Interestingly, our twin models revealed sibling contrast effects for ARFID, which are commonly observed in neurodevelopmental disorders including autism and ADHD,^{37,38} suggesting that parents' ratings of their twins' eating problems might amplify differences between their twins. Modeling these contrast effects led to an increase in the heritability estimate from 0.68 (in the AE model) to 0.79 (in the AE-s model). Qualitative sex differences (i.e., *different* genetic and environmental influences in males vs. females) did not seem to play an important role, whereas there was some indication for a *higher* heritability in males (i.e., quantitative sex difference). Although these were not significant, our models including sex limitations were underpowered and sex differences therefore need to be tested in future studies with larger sample sizes.

To construct the ARFID phenotype we were limited to existing data in CATSS, the NPR, and the PDR. Most cases (760/797, 95%) were identified via the parent-reported gate items “only wanted to eat particular types of food during a period after age 5” and “particularly sensitive to certain flavors, smells, or consistencies” (as opposed to being identified with a feeding or eating disorder between age 6 and 12; **Figure 1**). Therefore, the ARFID phenotype derived in this study is likely to reflect cases that include a *sensory-based avoidance* component (typically associated with selective eating). This is relevant as genetic and environmental influences might be differentially implicated across predominant ARFID presentations, for instance, the ARFID phenotype in people who had adverse conditioning

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

experiences such as choking on food might have a larger environmental contribution. Sensory-based avoidance is the most common presentation (62-73%) of ARFID in children,^{8,39} and the presentations are in no way mutually exclusive. More than half of children with ARFID have mixed presentations of sensory-based avoidance with fear-based avoidance or sensory-based avoidance with lack of interest.³⁹ Indeed, a high proportion of ARFID identified in this study was via low weight and failure to thrive (535/797, 67%), which are more commonly associated with lack of interest and fear-based avoidance.^{40,41} Future studies aimed at delineating differences in biological and environmental risk factors based on predominant clinical characteristics will require larger samples and more extensive phenotyping.

Strengths and Limitations

Our study had several strengths. We optimized existing data resources to provide the first heritability estimates of ARFID based on a sample size larger than typically reported in single site clinical samples. By triangulating questionnaire and health register data we accessed many different indicators of ARFID to carefully define the phenotype and specify exclusions for sensitivity analyses. Although our algorithm-derived definition of ARFID has not been validated, the prevalence and sex distribution were consistent with available published estimates (prevalence 0.3-3.2%,^{8,42,43} sex distribution ~1:1, with some studies finding a slight female preponderance^{8,42} and others finding a slight male preponderance^{44,45}), providing some confidence in the phenotype. Our study focused on ARFID in children aged 6-12 years, yet the disorder is not confined to the childhood years.^{46,47} Subsequent studies using different designs and samples should also include adults to further characterize this illness across the lifespan. Finally, even with a sample of ~34,000 twins, analyses were underpowered for testing sex differences. Future research should estimate ARFID heritability in even larger samples including older individuals by using validated measures appropriate for epidemiological studies, which are expected to be available in the upcoming years.

Conclusions

This study shows that, given the similar prevalence figures and sex distribution, existing register-based epidemiological data may be used to approximate ARFID, and that the resulting broad ARFID phenotype is highly heritable—with significant contributions from non-shared environmental factors—and distinguishable from other eating disorders characterized by fear of weight gain and older average age of onset. The high heritability of the ARFID phenotype provides strong support for future twin and molecular genetic studies of ARFID.

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the contribution of the participants in the Child and Adolescent Twin Study in Sweden (CATSS) and their families. We acknowledge the Swedish Twin Registry for access to data. The Swedish Twin Registry is managed by Karolinska Institutet and receives funding through the Swedish Research Council under the grant no 2017-00641.

Author Contributions

Dr Dinkler had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: Dinkler, Taylor, Bulik.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Dinkler.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

Statistical analysis: Dinkler, Taylor.

Obtained funding: Dinkler, Bulik, Lichtenstein, Lundström, Larsson.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Lichtenstein, Lundström, Larsson.

Supervision: Taylor, Bulik.

Funding

CMB is supported by NIMH (R56MH129437; R01MH120170; R01MH124871; R01MH119084; R01MH118278; R01 MH124871); Brain and Behavior Research Foundation Distinguished Investigator Grant; Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet, award: 538-2013-8864); and Lundbeck Foundation (Grant no. R276-2018-4581). LD is supported by the Mental Health Foundation (Fonden för Psykisk Hälsa, 2022) and Fredrik and Ingrid Thuring's Foundation (2021-00660). The funding organizations had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

Conflict of Interest Disclosures

Dr Dinkler reports speaker fees from Baxter Medical AB and Fresenius Kabi AB. Dr Larsson reports receiving grants from Shire Pharmaceuticals; personal fees from and serving as a speaker for Medice, Shire/Takeda Pharmaceuticals and Evolan Pharma AB; and sponsorship for a conference on attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder from Shire/Takeda Pharmaceuticals and Evolan Pharma AB, all outside the submitted work. Henrik Larsson is editor-in-chief of JCPP Advances. Dr Bulik reports: Shire (grant recipient, Scientific Advisory Board member); Lundbeckfonden (grant recipient); Pearson (author, royalty recipient). All grants and fees were received outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

Figures & Tables

Figure 1. Identification of the ARFID phenotype between age 6 and 12 years in 33,902 twins. Diagnoses (Dx), procedures (Tx), and prescribed drugs (Rx) were included if registered in the National Patient Register or the National Drug Register between age 6 and 12 years. Variables in italics and denoted with (*P*) are based on parent-reports in the Child and Adolescent Twin Study at twin age 9 or 12 years.

Table 1. Number of cases with the ARFID phenotype and proportion of cases meeting sub-criteria of DSM-5 ARFID criterion A by sex, zygosity, and case definition, n (%)

Table 2. Tetrachoric twin correlations and proband-wise concordance rates for the ARFID phenotype by zygosity, sex, and case definition

Table 3. Model fit statistics for ADE-s models with qualitative and quantitative sex limitation (quan SL) and nested models by case definition

Table 4. Variance component estimates for (A) ADE-s models with quantitative sex limitation and (B) the final model (AE-s without sex limitation)

Supplementary material

eTable 1. Variables from the Child and Adolescent Twin Study in Sweden (parent-reports), the National Patient Register (diagnostic and procedure codes), and the Prescribed Drug Register (ATC codes) used to evaluate DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and D

eTable 2. Assumption testing for models with quantitative sex limitation by case definition

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

eTable 3. Variance component estimates for ADE-s models without sex limitation and nested models by case definition (final models in bold)

References

1. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition*. American Psychiatric Association; 2013.
2. World Health Organization. *International Classification of Diseases, Eleventh Revision (ICD-11)*. 2019/2021.
3. Harshman SG, Jo J, Kuhnle M, et al. A Moving Target: How We Define Avoidant/Restrictive Food Intake Disorder Can Double Its Prevalence. *J Clin Psychiatry*. Sep 7 2021;82(5)doi:10.4088/JCP.20m13831
4. Aulinas A, Marengi DA, Galbiati F, et al. Medical comorbidities and endocrine dysfunction in low-weight females with avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder compared to anorexia nervosa and healthy controls. *Int J Eat Disord*. Apr 2020;53(4):631-636. doi:10.1002/eat.23261
5. Sharp WG, Berry RC, Burrell L, Scahill L, McElhanon BO. Scurvy as a Sequela of Avoidant-Restrictive Food Intake Disorder in Autism: A Systematic Review. *J Dev Behav Pediatr*. Jun/Jul 2020;41(5):397-405. doi:10.1097/DBP.0000000000000782
6. Reilly EE, Brown TA, Gray EK, Kaye WH, Menzel JE. Exploring the cooccurrence of behavioural phenotypes for avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder in a partial hospitalization sample. *European Eating Disorders Review*. 2019;27(4):429-435.
7. Schmidt R, Vogel M, Hiemisch A, Kiess W, Hilbert A. Pathological and non-pathological variants of restrictive eating behaviors in middle childhood: A latent class analysis. *Appetite*. Aug 1 2018;127:257-265. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2018.04.030
8. Dinkler L, Yasumitsu-Lovell K, Eitoku M, et al. Development of a parent-reported screening tool for avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder (ARFID): Initial validation and prevalence in 4-7-year-old Japanese children. *Appetite*. Jan 1 2022;168:105735. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2021.105735
9. Baio J, Wiggins L, Christensen DL, et al. Prevalence of Autism Spectrum Disorder Among Children Aged 8 Years - Autism and Developmental Disabilities Monitoring Network, 11 Sites, United States, 2014. *MMWR Surveill Summ*. Apr 27 2018;67(6):1-23. doi:10.15585/mmwr.ss6706a1
10. Polanczyk G, de Lima MS, Horta BL, Biederman J, Rohde LA. The worldwide prevalence of ADHD: a systematic review and metaregression analysis. *Am J Psychiatry*. Jun 2007;164(6):942-8. doi:10.1176/ajp.2007.164.6.942
11. Yilmaz Z, Hardaway JA, Bulik CM. Genetics and Epigenetics of Eating Disorders. *Adv Genomics Genet*. 2015;5:131-150. doi:10.2147/AGG.S55776
12. Watson HJ, Yilmaz Z, Thornton LM, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies eight risk loci and implicates metabo-psychiatric origins for anorexia nervosa. *Nat Genet*. Aug 2019;51(8):1207-1214. doi:10.1038/s41588-019-0439-2
13. Liu J, Tuvblad C, Raine A, Baker L. Genetic and environmental influences on nutrient intake. *Genes Nutr*. Mar 2013;8(2):241-52. doi:10.1007/s12263-012-0320-8
14. Fildes A, van Jaarsveld CH, Cooke L, Wardle J, Llewellyn CH. Common genetic architecture underlying young children's food fussiness and liking for vegetables and fruit. *Am J Clin Nutr*. Apr 2016;103(4):1099-104. doi:10.3945/ajcn.115.122945
15. Breen FM, Plomin R, Wardle J. Heritability of food preferences in young children. *Physiol Behav*. Jul 30 2006;88(4-5):443-7. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2006.04.016
16. Smith AD, Herle M, Fildes A, Cooke L, Steinsbekk S, Llewellyn CH. Food fussiness and food neophobia share a common etiology in early childhood. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. Feb 2017;58(2):189-196. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12647

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

17. Cooke LJ, Haworth CM, Wardle J. Genetic and environmental influences on children's food neophobia. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2007;86(2):428-433. doi:10.1093/ajcn/86.2.428
18. Knaapila A, Tuorila H, Silventoinen K, et al. Food neophobia shows heritable variation in humans. *Physiol Behav*. Aug 15 2007;91(5):573-8. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2007.03.019
19. Llewellyn CH, van Jaarsveld CH, Johnson L, Carnell S, Wardle J. Nature and nurture in infant appetite: analysis of the Gemini twin birth cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr*. May 2010;91(5):1172-9. doi:10.3945/ajcn.2009.28868
20. Kennedy HL, Dinkler L, Kennedy MA, Bulik CM, Jordan J. How genetic analysis may contribute to the understanding of avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder (ARFID). *J Eat Disord*. Apr 15 2022;10(1):53. doi:10.1186/s40337-022-00578-x
21. Yilmaz Z, Hardaway J, Bulik C. Genetics and epigenetics of eating disorders. *Adv Genom Genet*. 2015/03/10/ 2015;5:131-150. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/AGG.S55776>
22. Anckarsater H, Lundstrom S, Kollberg L, et al. The Child and Adolescent Twin Study in Sweden (CATSS). *Twin Res Hum Genet*. Dec 2011;14(6):495-508. doi:10.1375/twin.14.6.495
23. Ludvigsson JF, Andersson E, Ekblom A, et al. External review and validation of the Swedish national inpatient register. *BMC Public Health*. Jun 9 2011;11:450. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-11-450
24. Wettermark B, Hammar N, Fored CM, et al. The new Swedish Prescribed Drug Register--opportunities for pharmacoepidemiological research and experience from the first six months. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. Jul 2007;16(7):726-35. doi:10.1002/pds.1294
25. Taylor MJ, Rosenqvist MA, Larsson H, et al. Etiology of Autism Spectrum Disorders and Autistic Traits Over Time. *JAMA Psychiatry*. Sep 1 2020;77(9):936-943. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.0680
26. Nygren G, Linnsand P, Hermansson J, Dinkler L, Johansson M, Gillberg C. Feeding Problems Including Avoidant Restrictive Food Intake Disorder in Young Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder in a Multiethnic Population. Original Research. *Front Pediatr*. 2021-December-13 2021;9:780680. doi:10.3389/fped.2021.780680
27. Norris ML, Obeid N, Santos A, et al. Treatment Needs and Rates of Mental Health Comorbidity in Adolescent Patients With ARFID. Brief Research Report. *Front Psychiatry*. 2021-July-16 2021;12(1144):680298. doi:10.3389/fpsy.2021.680298
28. Larson T, Anckarsater H, Gillberg C, et al. The autism--tics, AD/HD and other comorbidities inventory (A-TAC): further validation of a telephone interview for epidemiological research. *BMC Psychiatry*. Jan 7 2010;10(1):1. doi:10.1186/1471-244X-10-1
29. Larson T, Lundstrom S, Nilsson T, et al. Predictive properties of the A-TAC inventory when screening for childhood-onset neurodevelopmental problems in a population-based sample. *BMC Psychiatry*. Sep 25 2013;13(1):233. doi:10.1186/1471-244X-13-233
30. Marland C, Lichtenstein P, Degl'Innocenti A, et al. The Autism-Tics, ADHD and other Comorbidities inventory (A-TAC): previous and predictive validity. *BMC Psychiatry*. Dec 16 2017;17(1):403. doi:10.1186/s12888-017-1563-0
31. Williams KE, Hendy HM, Field DG, Belousov Y, Riegel K, Harclerode W. Implications of Avoidant/ Restrictive Food Intake Disorder (ARFID) on Children with Feeding Problems. *Children's Health Care*. Oct 2 2015;44(4):307-321. doi:10.1080/02739615.2014.921789
32. Neale MC, Hunter MD, Pritikin JN, et al. OpenMx 2.0: Extended Structural Equation and Statistical Modeling. *Psychometrika*. Jun 2016;81(2):535-49. doi:10.1007/s11336-014-9435-8
33. Tick B, Bolton P, Happe F, Rutter M, Rijdsdijk F. Heritability of autism spectrum disorders: a meta-analysis of twin studies. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. May 2016;57(5):585-95. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12499
34. Hilker R, Helenius D, Fagerlund B, et al. Heritability of Schizophrenia and Schizophrenia Spectrum Based on the Nationwide Danish Twin Register. *Biol Psychiatry*. Mar 15 2018;83(6):492-498. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.08.017

Heritability of the ARFID phenotype

35. Faraone SV, Larsson H. Genetics of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Mol Psychiatry*. Apr 2019;24(4):562-575. doi:10.1038/s41380-018-0070-0
36. Johansson V, Kuja-Halkola R, Cannon TD, Hultman CM, Hedman AM. A population-based heritability estimate of bipolar disorder - In a Swedish twin sample. *Psychiatry Res*. Aug 2019;278:180-187. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2019.06.010
37. Taylor MJ, Martin J, Lu Y, et al. Association of Genetic Risk Factors for Psychiatric Disorders and Traits of These Disorders in a Swedish Population Twin Sample. *JAMA Psychiatry*. Mar 1 2019;76(3):280-289. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.3652
38. Ebejer JL, Medland SE, van der Werf J, et al. Contrast Effects and Sex Influence Maternal and Self-Report Dimensional Measures of Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Behav Genet*. 2015/01/01 2015;45(1):35-50. doi:10.1007/s10519-014-9670-x
39. Reilly EE, Brown TA, Gray EK, Kaye WH, Menzel JE. Exploring the cooccurrence of behavioural phenotypes for avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder in a partial hospitalization sample. *Eur Eat Disord Rev*. Jul 2019;27(4):429-435. doi:10.1002/erv.2670
40. Norris ML, Spettigue W, Hammond NG, et al. Building evidence for the use of descriptive subtypes in youth with avoidant restrictive food intake disorder. *Int J Eat Disord*. Feb 2018;51(2):170-173. doi:10.1002/eat.22814
41. Zickgraf HF, Lane-Loney S, Essayli JH, Ornstein RM. Further support for diagnostically meaningful ARFID symptom presentations in an adolescent medicine partial hospitalization program. *Int J Eat Disord*. Apr 2019;52(4):402-409. doi:10.1002/eat.23016
42. Kurz S, van Dyck Z, Dremmel D, Munsch S, Hilbert A. Early-onset restrictive eating disturbances in primary school boys and girls. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. Jul 2015;24(7):779-85. doi:10.1007/s00787-014-0622-z
43. Chen YL, Chen WJ, Lin KC, Shen LJ, Gau SS. Prevalence of DSM-5 mental disorders in a nationally representative sample of children in Taiwan: methodology and main findings. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci*. Jan 30 2019;29:e15. doi:10.1017/S2045796018000793
44. Sharp WG, Volkert VM, Stubbs KH, et al. Intensive Multidisciplinary Intervention for Young Children with Feeding Tube Dependence and Chronic Food Refusal: An Electronic Health Record Review. *J Pediatr*. Aug 2020;223:73-80 e2. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2020.04.034
45. Hilbert A, Zenger M, Eichler J, Braehler E. Psychometric evaluation of the Eating Disorders in Youth-Questionnaire when used in adults: Prevalence estimates for symptoms of avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder and population norms. *Int J Eat Disord*. Mar 2021;54(3):399-408. doi:10.1002/eat.23424
46. Nakai Y, Nin K, Noma S, Teramukai S, Wonderlich SA. Characteristics of Avoidant/Restrictive Food Intake Disorder in a Cohort of Adult Patients. *Eur Eat Disord Rev*. Nov 2016;24(6):528-530. doi:10.1002/erv.2476
47. Murray HB, Bailey AP, Keshishian AC, et al. Prevalence and Characteristics of Avoidant/Restrictive Food Intake Disorder in Adult Neurogastroenterology Patients. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. Aug 2020;18(9):1995-2002 e1. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2019.10.030

Table 1. Number of cases with the ARFID phenotype and proportion of cases meeting sub-criteria of DSM-5 ARFID criterion A by sex, zygosity, and case definition, *No. (%)*

	caseA	caseAC	caseACD_med	caseACD_aut
Number of cases				
Total sample (N = 33,902)	797 (2.4%)	667 (2.0%)	541 (1.6%)	539 (1.6%)
By sex				
Males (N = 17,151)	461 (2.7%)	412 (2.4%)	341 (2.0%)	319 (1.9%)
Females (N = 16,751)	336 (2.0%)	255 (1.5%)	200 (1.2%)	220 (1.3%)
By sex and zygosity				
MZ males (N = 4,984)	116 (2.3%)	97 (2.0%)	79 (1.6%)	75 (1.5%)
MZ females (N = 5,384)	95 (1.8%)	75 (1.4%)	51 (0.9%)	65 (1.2%)
DZ-ss males (N = 6,336)	166 (2.6%)	149 (2.4%)	125 (2.0%)	111 (1.8%)
DZ-ss females (N = 5,536)	125 (2.3%)	103 (1.9%)	87 (1.6%)	88 (1.6%)
DZ-os males (N = 5,831)	179 (3.1%)	166 (2.9%)	137 (2.4%)	133 (2.3%)
DZ-os females (N = 5,831)	116 (2.0%)	77 (1.3%)	62 (1.1%)	67 (1.2%)
Proportion of cases meeting sub-criteria of DSM-5 ARFID criterion A				
A1 - low weight/failure to thrive	535 (67.1%)	445 (66.7%)	349 (64.5%)	345 (64.0%)
A2 - nutritional deficiency	6 (0.8%)	4 (0.6%)	2 (0.4%)	2 (0.4%)
A3 - nutritional supplements	54 (6.8%)	49 (7.3%)	29 (5.4%)	30 (5.6%)
A4 - psychosocial impairment	375 (47.2%)	341 (51.4%)	291 (54.1%)	279 (52.1%)

caseA: children who only meet DSM-5 ARFID criterion A (avoidant restrictive eating with clinically significant impact that could be due to fear of weight gain in some children; caseAC: children who meet DSM-5 ARFID criteria A and C (excluding children with fear of weight gain; caseACD_med: children who meet DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and partially D (excluding children with comorbid medical conditions); caseACD_aut: children who meet both DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and partially D (excluding children with comorbid autism).

Table 2. Tetrachoric twin correlations and proband-wise concordance rates for the ARFID phenotype by zygosity, sex, and case definition

	Male		Female		
	MZ	DZ-ss	MZ	DZ-ss	DZ-os
Number of pairs	2,492	3,168	2,692	2,768	5,831
Twin correlations, <i>r</i> (95% CI)					
caseA	0.77 (0.66-0.85)	0.18 (-0.03-0.37)	0.63 (0.46-0.76)	0.31 (0.11-0.49)	0.24 (0.10-0.37)
caseAC	0.76 (0.64-0.85)	0.17 (-0.05-0.37)	0.69 (0.52-0.81)	0.28 (0.06-0.48)	0.23 (0.06-0.38)
caseACD_med	0.78 (0.65-0.87)	0.24 (0.01-0.44)	0.59 (0.33-0.77)	0.28 (0.03-0.50)	0.12 (-0.10-0.32)
caseACD_aut	0.73 (0.57-0.84)	0.13 (-0.15-0.38)	0.67 (0.49-0.81)	0.19 (-0.10-0.43)	0.17 (-0.03-0.35)
Proband-wise concordance rates					
caseA	0.38	0.06	0.23	0.10	0.07
caseAC	0.35	0.05	0.27	0.08	0.06
caseACD_med	0.35	0.06	0.16	0.07	0.03
caseACD_aut	0.29	0.04	0.25	0.05	0.04

Probandwise concordance rates were calculated as $2 \times \text{number of concordant pairs} / ([2 \times \text{number of concordant pairs}] + \text{number of discordant pairs})$. They indicate the probability that a co-twin of a proband is also a proband.

caseA: children who only meet DSM-5 ARFID criterion A (avoidant restrictive eating with clinically significant impact that could be due to fear of weight gain in some children; caseAC: children who meet DSM-5 ARFID criteria A and C (excluding children with fear of weight gain; caseACD_med: children who meet DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and partially D (excluding children with comorbid medical conditions); caseACD_aut: children who meet both DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and partially D (excluding children with comorbid autism)

Table 3. Model fit statistics for ADE models with quantitative sex limitation (quan SL) and nested models by case definition

Model	-2LL	Parameters	df	Comparison Model	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf	p
caseA							
Fully saturated	7356.57	15	33805	----	----	----	----
ADE-s with quan SL	7363.27	11	33813	Fully saturated	6.70	8	0.569
ADE-s	7367.08	6	33818	ADE-s with quan SL	3.81	5	0.578
ADE	7371.77	5	33819	ADE-s	4.69	1	0.030
AE-s	7367.08	5	33819	ADE-s	0.00	1	0.999
AE	7376.40	4	33820	ADE-s	9.32	2	0.009
E	7531.54	3	33821	ADE-s	164.46	3	<0.001
caseAC							
Fully saturated	6365.39	15	33795	----	----	----	----
ADE-s with quan SL	6374.05	11	33803	Fully saturated	8.65	8	0.372
ADE-s	6379.07	6	33808	ADE-s with quan SL	5.02	5	0.413
ADE	6384.02	5	33809	ADE-s	4.95	1	0.026
AE-s	6379.07	5	33809	ADE-s	0.00	1	1
AE	6389.62	4	33810	ADE-s	10.55	2	0.005
E	6522.86	3	33811	ADE-s	143.79	3	<0.001
caseACD_med							
Fully saturated	5395.78	15	33812	----	----	----	----
ADE-s with quan SL	5405.93	11	33820	Fully saturated	10.15	8	0.255
ADE-s	5410.16	6	33825	ADE-s with quan SL	4.23	5	0.516
ADE	5418.44	5	33826	ADE-s	8.28	1	0.004
AE-s	5410.16	5	33826	ADE-s	0.00	1	0.999
AE	5423.75	4	33827	ADE-s	13.59	2	0.001
E	5513.19	3	33828	ADE-s	103.03	3	<0.001
caseACD_aut							
Fully saturated	5404.21	15	33804	----	----	----	----
ADE-s with quan SL	5413.00	11	33812	Fully saturated	8.79	8	0.361
ADE-s	5416.84	6	33817	ADE-s with quan SL	3.84	5	0.573
ADE	5420.83	5	33818	ADE-s	4.00	1	0.046
AE-s	5417.13	5	33818	ADE-s	0.30	1	0.585
AE	5427.57	4	33819	ADE-s	10.73	2	0.005
E	5514.67	3	33820	ADE-s	97.83	3	<0.001

caseA: children who only meet DSM-5 ARFID criterion A (avoidant restrictive eating with clinically significant impact that could be due to fear of weight gain in some children; caseAC: children who meet DSM-5 ARFID criteria A and C (excluding children with fear of weight gain; caseACD_med: children who meet DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and partially D (excluding children with comorbid medical conditions); caseACD_aut: children who meet both DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and partially D (excluding children with comorbid autism).

Table 4. Variance component estimates for (A) ADE-s models with quantitative sex limitation and (B) the final model (AE-s without sex limitation)

(A) ADE-s with quantitative sex limitation

	Males			Females			Sibling contrast effects (-s)		
	A	D	E	A	D	E	Same sex males	Same sex females	Opposite sex twins
caseA	0.70 (0.00-0.89)	0.13 (0.00-0.85)	0.18 (0.11-0.29)	0.65 (0.00-0.81)	0.03 (0.00-0.68)	0.32 (0.19-0.60)	-0.10 (-0.17-0.01)	-0.04 (-0.13-0.09)	-0.04 (-0.15-0.31)
caseAC	0.83 (0.00-0.90)	0.00 (0.00-0.83)	0.17 (0.10-0.26)	0.56 (0.00-0.83)	0.14 (0.00-0.76)	0.30 (0.17-0.55)	-0.13 (-0.19--0.04)	-0.01 (-0.11-0.10)	-0.06 (-0.17-0.29)
caseACD_med	0.85 (0.32-0.91)	0.00 (0.00-0.00)	0.15 (0.09-0.25)	0.67 (0.02-0.83)	0.02 (0.00-0.74)	0.31 (0.17-0.62)	-0.12 (-0.18--0.04)	-0.08 (-0.19-0.06)	-0.13 (-0.23-0.28)
caseACD_aut	0.80 (0.00-0.88)	0.01 (0.00-0.83)	0.20 (0.12-0.32)	0.28 (0.00-0.81)	0.41 (0.00-0.80)	0.31 (0.18-0.58)	-0.12 (-0.19--0.03)	-0.02 (-0.13-0.10)	-0.04 (-0.20-0.29)


(B) AE-s without sex limitation (final model)

	A	D	E	s
caseA	0.78 (0.69-0.84)	-----	0.22 (0.16-0.31)	-0.09 (-0.13- -0.03)
caseAC	0.79 (0.71-0.86)	-----	0.21 (0.14-0.29)	-0.09 (-0.14- -0.04)
caseACD_med	0.80 (0.71-0.86)	-----	0.20 (0.14-0.29)	-0.12 (-0.16- -0.06)
caseACD_aut	0.77 (0.67-0.84)	-----	0.23 (0.16-0.33)	-0.10 (-0.16- -0.05)

caseA: children who only meet DSM-5 ARFID criterion A (avoidant restrictive eating with clinically significant impact that could be due to fear of weight gain in some children; caseAC: children who meet DSM-5 ARFID criteria A and C (excluding children with fear of weight gain; caseACD_med: children who meet DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and partially D (excluding children with comorbid medical conditions); caseACD_aut: children who meet both DSM-5 ARFID criteria A, C, and partially D (excluding children with comorbid autism).

Identification of the ARFID phenotype between age 6 and 12 years in 33,902 twins

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.08.22279706>; this version posted September 9, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).
 Variables in italics are parent-reported at age 9 or 12 years.



¹ Between age 6 and 12 years, three individuals received a diagnosis of anorexia nervosa (F50.0 or F50.1; one individual received both codes). For all three, the age at first diagnosis was 11 years. One individual was excluded in the next step (not caseAC) because of parent-reported fear of weight gain.

² In addition, 10 caseA individuals were removed due to missing response on this item.

³ Diagnostic codes for medical conditions that could potentially exclude an ARFID diagnosis were selected based on their presence in the sample, therefore, not all medical conditions that could potentially be an exclusion criterion for ARFID are listed here.