medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-ND 4.0 International license .

Screening for avoidant restrictive food intake disorder (ARFID) in primary care: clinical presentation and validation of the ARFID-Brief Screener in Swedish preschoolers

Lisa Dinkler[1,2,3], Katarzyna Brimo[2], Helena Holmäng[2], Kahoko Yasumitsu-Lovell[2,3,4], Ralf Kuja-Halkola[1], Anne-Katrin Kantzer[5], Zerina Omanovic[2], Narufumi Suganuma[3], Masamitsu Eitoku[3], Mikiya Fujieda[6], Elisabeth Fernell[2], Per Möllborg[7], Rachel Bryant-Waugh[8,9], Christopher Gillberg[2,4,], Maria Råstam[2,10]

1 Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
2 Gillberg Neuropsychiatry Centre, Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden
3 Department of Environmental Medicine, Kochi Medical School, Kochi University, Kochi, Japan
4 Kochi Gillberg Neuropsychiatry Centre, Kochi, Japan
5 Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, NU Hospital Group, Trollhättan, Sweden
6 Department of Pediatrics, Kochi Medical School, Kochi University, Kochi, Japan
7 Department of Paediatrics, Institute of Clinical Sciences, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden
8 Maudsley Centre for Child and Adolescent Eating Disorders, South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
9 Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
10 Department of Clinical Sciences Lund, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

Corresponding Author

Lisa Dinkler, PhD, Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Nobels Vag 12A, 17177 Stockholm, Sweden. lisa.dinkler@ki.se

Email addresses & ORCIDs

lisa.dinkler@ki.se	0000-0002-9901-4984
katarzyna.brimo@gu.se	0009-0007-1086-8769
helena.holmang@gu.se	0009-0004-0016-6980
kahoko.yasumitsu-lovell@kochi-u.ac.jp	0000-0002-8379-3514
ralf.kuja-halkola@ki.se	0000-0002-3765-2067
anne-katrin.kantzer@socialstyrelsen.se	0000-0002-3960-6398
zerina.omanovic@vgregion.se	
fujiedam@kochi-u.ac.jp	0000-0002-8975-0400
nsuganuma@kochi-u.ac.jp	0000-0003-1610-6216
meitoku@kochi-u.ac.jp	0000-0002-1715-9670
elisabeth.fernell@gnc.gu.se	0000-0003-4516-7747
info@skolhalsovard.com	0000-0002-2742-6154
Rachel.Bryant-Waugh@slam.nhs.uk	0000-0002-7449-6059
christopher.gillberg@gnc.gu.se	0000-0001-8848-1934
maria.rastam_bergstrom@med.lu.se	0000-0003-0819-3946

Funding

Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet; Råstam, 2018-02544; Gillberg, 538-2013-8864); Swedish Brain Foundation (Hjärnfonden) with support from Ulf Lundahls Minnesfond, Susanne Hobohms Stiftelse, and Team Rynkeby (Råstam, FO2020-0140, FO2022-0094); Japan Society for the Promotion of Science KAKENHI (Fujieda, JP18KK0263); Professor Bror Gadelius Memorial Foundation (Dinkler, 2019, 2020); AnnMari and Per Ahlqvist Foundation (Gillberg, 2018). The funding bodies were not involved in the design of the study; collection, analysis, interpretation of the data; or writing of the manuscript.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Conflict of interest

LD: reports speaker fees from Baxter Medical AB and Fresenius Kabi AB. Other authors have no conflict to declare.

Acknowledgements

We thank the participants and the staff at the 21 involved child health services centers in West Sweden for their assistance with data collection.

Ethical approval

The study was approved by Swedish Ethical Review Authority (Dnr 2020-01284, 2020-03908, 2021-01849). All participants gave written informed consent. All methods were conducted in compliance with the applicable guidelines and regulations.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Dinkler, Brimo, Holmäng, Yasumitsu-Lovell, Möllborg, Gillberg, Råstam
Data curation: Dinkler, Brimo, Holmäng
Formal analysis: Dinkler
Funding acquisition: Dinkler, Yasumitsu-Lovell, Fujieda, Suganuma, Gillberg, Råstam
Investigation: Dinkler, Brimo, Holmäng, Kantzer, Omanovic
Methodology: Dinkler, Kuja-Halkola, Bryant-Waugh, Råstam
Project administration: Dinkler, Råstam
Resources: Dinkler, Brimo, Holmäng, Fernell, Möllborg, Råstam
Software: Dinkler
Supervision: Bryant-Waugh, Gillberg, Råstam
Validation: Eitoku
Writing–original draft: Dinkler
Writing–review and editing: All authors
Visualization: Dinkler
Approved submitted version: All authors

Data Availability Statement

Data will be made available by the authors upon reasonable request.

Words

4,489

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Objective: Little is known about the prevalence and clinical presentation of avoidant restrictive food intake disorder (ARFID) in preschool children, and well-validated, parent-reported screening tools are lacking. This study evaluated the diagnostic validity of the parent-reported ARFID-Brief Screener in preschool children and examined prevalence and clinical characteristics of ARFID.

Method: Parents of 645 children (50.5% male, mean age 3.2 years) completed the ARFID-Brief Screener in connection with the 2.5- and 4-year routine check-ups at 21 child health services centers in West Sweden. Parents of all screen-positive and of randomly selected screen-negative children were invited to a clinical follow-up interview via phone. Co-occurring neurodevelopmental problems were assessed via questionnaire, clinical examination, and health care records.

Results: Of 42 (6.5%) children screening positive for ARFID, 29 were followed up via interview, and ARFID diagnosis was confirmed in 21 (positive predicted value 72%; other diagnostic metrics: negative predictive value 94%, sensitivity 91%, specificity 79%, and overall accuracy 84%. The adjusted prevalence of ARFID was 5.9%. All children with ARFID presented with both sensory-based avoidance and low interest, and the majority (65.2%) met criteria solely through DSM-5 criterion A4 (marked interference with psychosocial functioning). The ARFID group had significantly more co-occurring neurodevelopmental problems.

Discussion: ARFID is not rare among preschoolers, although prevalence might have been slightly overestimated here. The ARFID–Brief Screener showed high diagnostic validity, but follow-up assessments are necessary to confirm diagnoses and reduce false positives. Co-occurring neurodevelopmental problems were common in ARFID and may serve as early markers of increased ARFID risk.

Keywords: feeding disorders, eating disorders, children, general population, comorbidity, epidemiology

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Public Significance Statement

This study provides valuable insights into the occurrence of avoidant restrictive food intake disorder (ARFID) in preschool children, a group previously underrepresented in research. Our findings support the effectiveness of the ARFID-Brief Screener in identifying at-risk children, potentially enabling timely interventions and improving long-term outcomes. The higher prevalence of early-onset neurodevelopmental problems in children with ARFID suggest that they may serve as early markers of increased risk of ARFID.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

1. Introduction

Avoidant restrictive food intake disorder (ARFID) is a feeding and eating disorder characterized by severe limitations in food intake, leading to significant nutritional, medical, and psychosocial impairments (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; World Health Organization, 2022). Unlike other eating disorders, food restriction in ARFID is not primarily driven by preoccupation with body weight or shape but rather by *Low interest* in food, *Concern* about aversive consequences (e.g., choking, vomiting), and/or *Sensory* aversions (e.g., smell, taste, texture). In addition, ARFID typically has an earlier onset, often in early or middle childhood, particularly in the Low interest and Sensory profiles (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

Despite this, little is known about the prevalence and clinical presentation of ARFID in *preschool* children. Since its inclusion in DSM-5, several screening studies have assessed the prevalence of ARFID in the general population across various countries, genders, and age groups; however, few studies have focused on children under six (Sanchez-Cerezo et al., 2023). Consequently, the prevalence of ARFID in preschool children is largely unknown, hindering effective healthcare planning and resource allocation for this group.

A major challenge for prevalence studies is the lack of well-validated ARFID screening tools, particularly those based on parent-reports (Dinkler & Bryant-Waugh, 2021). To address this, we developed the ARFID-Brief Screener, a parent-reported questionnaire closely aligned with DSM-5 criteria. When tested among 4- to 7-year-old Japanese children, 1.3% screened positive for ARFID, with an approximately equal distribution between boys and girls (Dinkler et al., 2022a), consistent with other prevalence and sex distribution estimates (Sanchez-Cerezo et al., 2023). We also demonstrated the screener's convergent validity with anthropometric measures and restrictive food intake behaviors, offering initial support for this tool (Dinkler et al., 2022a). However, its diagnostic validity against clinical ARFID diagnoses remains unclear.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Identifying ARFID in preschoolers is particularly complex because selective ("picky") eating is common in children under six and is considered part of normative development, typically resolving without intervention by age six or seven (Bourne et al., 2023; Breiner et al., 2024; Cardona Cano et al., 2015). This makes distinguishing ARFID from typical selective eating challenging, increasing the risk of misdiagnosis. Normative selective eating might be prematurely labeled as ARFID, potentially overburdening healthcare resources. Conversely, parents of children with severe restrictive eating may be reassured that this issue is temporary, missing the opportunity for early identification and treatment of ARFID, which could lead to a chronic, potentially lifelong disorder (Breiner et al., 2024).

To differentiate ARFID from normative selective eating, it is important to assess any detrimental nutritional, medical, or psychosocial impacts, as outlined by DSM-5 and ICD-11. In addition, a better understanding of early risk factors and clinical characteristics in preschoolers with ARFID could aid this differentiation. For example, co-existing neurodevelopmental problems and medical conditions (e.g., constipation, allergies, congenital disorders, preterm birth) may indicate an increased risk of ARFID (Brosig et al., 2023; Dinkler et al., 2022b; Pivodic et al., 2024; Wronski et al., 2024), although this area remains underexplored in young children with ARFID.

To address these issues, the current study aimed to (1) evaluate the diagnostic validity of the ARFID-Brief Screener, (2) determine the prevalence of ARFID in the general population of Swedish preschool children, and (3) examine clinical characteristics of preschool children with versus without ARFID, including anthropometrics, ARFID severity and profiles, and co-occurring neurodevelopmental problems.

2 Methods

2.1 Participants

The study population consisted of Swedish children born between June 2016 and April 2020, visiting one of 21 child health services (CHS) centers in the Fyrbodal region, north of Gothenburg, West Sweden. Data were collected in connection with CHS routine check-ups at age 2.5 (children born February 2018–April 2020) and age 4 (children born June 2016–June 2018). Participating CHS staff

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

received one hour of training on ARFID and the study procedures. Screening questionnaires were gathered between November 2020 and June 2022. Follow-up telephone interviews, CHS records, and clinical examination data were collected until June 2023. This study was approved by the Swedish Ethical Review Authority (2020-01284, 2020-03908, 2021-01849).

The COVID-19 pandemic negatively impacted data collection and participation rates. Due to COVID-19-related restrictions and infections, many CHS visits were delayed, canceled, or conducted online, limiting parents' participation in the study. Additionally, CHS centers faced increased demands due to COVID-19 vaccination programs, which took priority. Of all 37 eligible CHS centers, 22 (59.5%) agreed to participate, though one CHS center dropped out during data collection. Approximately 5,000 children were expected to attend routine check-ups at the remaining 21 CHS centers between November 2020 and June 2022, with around 70% (n~3,500) of parents having sufficient Swedish or English skills to participate. Due to the pandemic, only about 50% of eligible participants (n~1,750) were invited by CHS staff, and of these, 670 participated (38.3%). After removing 25 participants due to invalid consent forms or unclear screening results, the final sample included 645 children (**Figure 1**).

2.2 Measures

Parents/guardians (henceforth referred to as *parents* for readability) initially completed the ARFID-Brief Screener and a questionnaire about neurodevelopmental problems. Parents of children who screened positive for ARFID, along with parents of randomly selected screen-negative children, were invited to complete an in-depth diagnostic interview for ARFID by phone. Additional data were collected via CHS records and clinical examinations for a subset of children (**Figure 1**).

2.2.1 ARFID–Brief Screener

The ARFID–Brief Screener is a short, parent-reported tool designed to screen for ARFID in children aged 2 to 17, assessing both current and lifetime perspectives (response options: "*No, never*", "*Yes, now*", and "*Yes, earlier*") (Dinkler et al., 2022a). Items and diagnostic algorithm align closely with the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

DSM-5 diagnostic criteria for ARFID (**Table S1**). Screening status was determined as shown in **Table 1**. In prior research, the ARFID–Brief Screener *v1* showed satisfactory convergent validity with problems related to mealtime behaviors, nutritional intake, selective eating, and satiety responsiveness, as well as with shorter height and lower body mass index (BMI) (Dinkler et al., 2022a). The current study used a revised version of the screener (ARFID–Brief Screener *v2*, **Table S1;** for modifications see Table S1 in (Dinkler et al., 2022a)).

2.2.2 Diagnostic interview for ARFID

Based on screening status, parents from three groups were invited to a telephone interview using the parent-report version of the Pica, ARFID, and Rumination Disorder Interview (PARDI) – a semi-structured diagnostic interview for ARFID (Bryant-Waugh et al., 2019): (1) all children screening positive for *current* ARFID, (2) all children screening positive for *previous* ARFID, and (3) randomly selected screen-negative children *with* current eating problems that did not meet ARFID criteria (**Table 1, Figure 1**). The PARDI provides a diagnostic decision for ARFID, a severity score, and three profile scores (Sensory, Low interest, Concern). A validation study in 9–23-year-olds supported this 3-factor structure and showed excellent discrimination between those with and without a clinical ARFID diagnosis for two of the three profile scores. For the Low interest subscale (AUC = .84 [.73, .94]), a clinical cut-off score of 1.1 correctly classified 83.1% of cases (sensitivity 82.6%, specificity 83.3%). For the Sensory subscale (AUC = .88 [.81, .96]), a clinical cut-off score of 0.6 correctly identified 84.4% of cases (sensitivity 83.3%, specificity 85.4%) (Cooper-Vince et al., 2022).

The PARDI was translated into Swedish by our team, which included both native and non-native speakers. Given the interview's semi-structured nature, precise wording was less critical; therefore, no back-translation was conducted. Interviewers (KB, HH) attended PARDI training delivered by RBW. To assess interrater reliability, ten participants were rated by both interviewers, with 100% agreement on the diagnostic decision and on whether criteria A2, A3, and A4 were met; agreement for criterion A1 was 90%. Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) for the three profile scores and the severity score ranged from 0.95 (95% confidence interval [CI] 0.83-0.99) to 0.97

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

(95% CI 0.89-0.99), indicating high interrater agreement. Screening questions related to weight and shape concerns, which could indicate another eating disorder and thus exclude an ARFID diagnosis, were omitted due to the young age of the children.

2.2.3 Co-occurring neurodevelopmental problems

Co-occurring neurodevelopmental problems were assessed via parent reports, CHS records, and clinical examinations.

ESSENCE-Q (parent report). All participants completed the 12-item *Early Symptomatic Syndromes Eliciting Neurodevelopmental Clinical Examinations Questionnaire* (ESSENCE-Q; Hatakenaka et al., 2016), along with the ARFID–Brief Screener. The ESSENCE-Q screens for early neurodevelopmental problems that might indicate the presence of neurodevelopmental conditions (NDCs) and the need for further clinical examination. This screener is used in clinical and research settings across multiple countries (Landgren et al., 2022). Responses are rated as *"Yes" (2), "Maybe/a little" (1)* or *"No" (0),* yielding a total score ranging from 0 to 24. Various cutoff values have been proposed for the parent-report version of ESSENCE-Q. In a Swedish school-based study of 11-year-olds, a cutoff value of ≥3 provided the highest accuracy (78%) with a negative predictive value (NPV) of 82% and a positive predictive value (PPV) of 71% (Landgren et al., 2022). In this study, we used a cutoff of ≥5, recognizing that feeding problems—one of the ESSENCE-Q items—were reported in all children with ARFID ("Yes": 91.3%, "Maybe/a little": 8.7%; **Table S3**). The feeding problems item was omitted from the ESSENCE-Q score when examining correlations with PARDI severity and profile scores.

Structured speech and language test (CHS records). We retrieved CHS records for children with PARDI data and an additional 29 randomly selected screen-negative children with no history of eating problems (**Figure 1**). From these records, we extracted results from the structured speech and language test, routinely conducted during the 2.5-year check-up, with ~97% coverage (Västa Götalandsregionen, 2021). Previous research indicates that children with delayed language

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

development are at significantly increased risk of NDCs, such as autism and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) (Miniscalco et al., 2006).

Diagnosed NDCs. Information on NDC diagnoses was collected from three sources: (1) the parent-reported PARDI health checklist, (2) CHS records, and (3) clinical examinations. Children who screened positive for ARFID and NDCs (either via ESSENCE-Q or via parent-reports in the PARDI health checklist; n=13) were referred to a child and adolescent psychiatry unit for preschool children, where an experienced psychiatrist (AKK, ZO) conducted the clinical examination.

2.3 Statistical Analyses

Analyses were conducted in R version 4.2.3 (R Core Team, 2022). The significance level was set at 0.05. Interrater reliability for the PARDI was evaluated using ICCs within the *irr* package (Gamer et al., 2019). The diagnostic validity of the ARFID-Brief Screener against clinical diagnoses from PARDI was tested using the *epiR* package (Stevenson et al., 2022). Three tests were conducted. Test A: screen-positive for *current* ARFID versus screen-positive for *previous* ARFID (group 1 vs. 2; **Tables 1 & 3, Figure 1**); Test B: screen-positive for *current* ARFID versus screen-negative with current eating problems (group 1 vs. 3); and Test C: screen-positive for *current* ARFID versus screen-positive for *previous* ARFID or screen-negative with current eating problems (group 1 vs. 2+3). We report sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy. Due to the imbalanced class distribution (more true negatives [no ARFID diagnosis] than true positives [ARIFD diagnosis]), we also report the F1 Score, combining precision (PPV) and recall (sensitivity) into a single metric, giving a balanced measure of diagnostic accuracy. Like other diagnostic metrics, the F1 score ranges from 0 (PPV=0 or sensitivity=0) to 1 (PPV=1 and sensitivity=1).

Crude prevalence was estimated as *number of children with ARFID diagnosis / total sample size.* We estimated *adjusted prevalence* assuming (1) the same proportion of children with ARFID among those interviewed with the PARDI as those not interviewed, and (2) that there were no individuals with ARFID in groups 4 and 5 (see formula in **Figure 1**).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Clinical characteristics of ARFID presentation and neurodevelopmental problems were compared between children with versus without an ARFID diagnosis according to the PARDI. Group differences were tested using Wilcoxon rank sum test for continuous variables and Pearson's Chi-squared test or Fisher's exact test for categorical variables using the *gtsummary* package (Sjoberg et al., 2021). Due to small group sizes and the main goal of describing clinical characteristics in the ARFID group (focusing on absolute values), we did not include covariates or correct for multiple testing. Additionally, the number of females in the ARFID group was too small to include sex as a covariate.

3 Results

Among the 645 children with valid ARFID-Brief Screener results, the sex distribution was equal (50.5% male), with slightly more participants recruited during the 2.5-year check-up (57.5%; **Table 2**). The average age at screening was 38 months, ranging from 20 to 59 months. Most respondents were mothers (83.8%). Current avoidant/restrictive eating problems were reported in 25.3% of all children. Children screening positive for *current* ARFID (n=42, 6.5%) had significantly lower BMIs and were more likely to have parents born outside Sweden; no differences were noted in parental education levels. Sample characteristics for all screening groups are provided in **Table S2**.

3.1 Diagnostic validity of the ARFID-Brief screener

Results from the three diagnostic validity tests are shown in **Table 3**. Test C (group 1 vs. 2+3), where screen-negative included both previous ARFID and screen-negative with current eating problems, showed that among 29 children screening positive for current ARFID, a diagnosis was confirmed in 21 (PPV 72%). Of the 33 screen-negative children interviewed with the PARDI, the absence of ARFID was confirmed for 31 children (NPV 94%). Sensitivity, specificity, overall accuracy, and F1 score were 91%, 79%, 84%, and 81%.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

3.2 Prevalence of ARFID in preschool children

Crude prevalence of ARFID was 3.6% (23/645). Adjusted prevalence was 5.9% ([42*(21/29)+ 25*(1/14)+111*(1/19)]/645; see formulas in *Statistical Analyses*).

3.3 Clinical characteristics of children with vs without ARFID

Children with versus without ARFID diagnosis derived from the PARDI were similar in age at screening, age at PARDI assessment, and expected height ("control variables", **Table 4**). The two groups were also similar in age at onset of eating problems. Although not statistically significant (p=.066), the proportion of males with ARFID (62.5%) was higher than in the non-ARFID group (41.0%). No significant differences were observed in anthropometric variables, though there was a trend towards lower BMI in children with ARFID. In the ARFID group, 26.1% were underweight (degree 1 or 2), 65.2% had normal weight, and 8.7% were overweight.

Most children with ARFID (65.2%) met criteria solely through criterion A4 (marked interference with psychosocial functioning), with only 13.0% showing a negative impact on weight and height (criterion A1), aligning with the non-significant anthropometric differences. A notable 26.1% of children with ARFID met two or three diagnostic criteria A1 to A4. PARDI severity and profile scores were significantly higher in children with ARFID compared to those without (**Table 4, Figure 2**). All children with ARFID scored above cutoff on both Sensory and Low interest profiles.

The ARFID group had significantly more co-occurring neurodevelopmental problems on ESSENCE-Q (p=0.026), with 43.5% of children with ARFID meeting cutoff (≥5) indicative of an NDC, compared to 28.2% in the non-ARFID group (p=0.220). Children with ARFID were nearly three times more likely to fail the language screen at 2.5 years (39.1% vs. 13.5%, p=0.023), further highlighting their elevated neurodevelopmental risk. Individual ESSENCE-Q item data are provided in **Table S3**; only sensory reactions were significantly more frequent in children with ARFID (p=0.039). The ESSENCE-Q score (excluding feeding problems) correlated significantly with the PARDI scores for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Severity (r=0.53, p=.009), Sensory profile (r=0.60, p=.002), and Concern profile (r=0.57, p=.004), but not with the Low interest profile score (r=-0.03, p=.900).

3.4 Analysis of sample representativeness

To address the potential threat to sample representativeness posed by the relatively low response rate (38.3%), we compared demographic variables (parents born in Sweden vs. foreign-born; parental education levels) using data from Statistics Sweden (www.scb.se). For the year 2021, when most of the data collection occurred, we filtered statistics for all individuals within a reasonable parental age range (20-49 years), given the age of the children in this study. We selected individuals living in the nine municipalities where the CHS centers were located and compared these statistics to those in our sample. Participating parents were somewhat more likely to be born in Sweden than the comparison population (81.0% vs. 72.8%), and they were also more highly educated (e.g., 13-14 years of education: 20.1% vs. 15.3%, 15+ years of education: 34.9% vs. 26.4%). It was not possible to determine whether individuals in the comparison population were parents.

4 Discussion

In a large sample of Swedish preschool children, this study evaluated the diagnostic validity of the ARFID-Brief Screener, estimated ARFID prevalence, and examined clinical characteristics in preschoolers with ARFID. The ARFID-Brief Screener demonstrated high diagnostic validity when compared to the clinical interview PARDI. With a sensitivity of 91%, the screener effectively identified children with ARFID, minimizing false negatives. This is crucial for population-level screening, where the priority is to ensure that nearly all cases are detected for further evaluation. The specificity of 79% indicates reasonable accuracy in identifying children without ARFID, although there was also a notable rate of false positives. However, this trade-off is acceptable in population-level screening, where the priority is minimizing missed cases. The PPV of 72% reflects that most children who screen positive truly have ARFID. Given the low prevalence of ARFID, this PPV is relatively high and underscores the screener's utility in identifying true cases. The NPV of 94% is particularly reassuring

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

for parents and healthcare providers, indicating that children who screen negative are unlikely to have ARFID. The overall accuracy of 84% and F1 score of 81% reflect the screener's balance between precision and recall, making it a valuable tool for the early ARFID identification in young children.

The crude prevalence of ARFID among Swedish preschoolers was 3.6%. This estimate likely represents a lower boundary of the true prevalence, as only a subset of children who screened negative were followed up with the PARDI (**Figure 1**), potentially missing additional cases. The adjusted prevalence of 5.9% offers a more accurate estimate, assuming that the proportion of true ARFID cases among those *without* follow-up interviews is similar to that among those who were followed up. However, this assumption may not hold true, as some parents declined participation. Some may have felt their child did not have significant problems and saw no need to participate, leading to an overestimation of PPV and prevalence, or they might have been unable to participate due to the child's severe problems, which would lead to an underestimation of PPV and prevalence. Additionally, early in the study, some screening sites may have inadvertently focused on recruiting children with known eating problems, possibly resulting in an overrepresentation of children with eating difficulties in our sample.

Despite these potential biases, our estimated prevalence aligns with the range reported in previous non-clinical samples of children and adolescents (0.3%-15.5%) (Sanchez-Cerezo et al., 2023). However, it is important to note that no previous studies specifically targeted preschool children. Variability across studies may arise from differences in age groups, cultural contexts, and assessment methods. Self-report instruments have yielded prevalence estimates of 0.3%-5.5% among 7-14-year-olds in Taiwan, Switzerland, and Germany (Chen et al., 2019; Kurz et al., 2015; Schmidt et al., 2018). In contrast, parent-report instruments have produced a broader range of estimates for 4-12-year-olds, ranging from 1.3% in Japan and 2.0% in Sweden, to 6.4% in the Netherlands, 15.2% in Israel, and 15.5% in Portugal (Dinkler et al., 2023; Dinkler et al., 2022a; Gonçalves et al., 2018; Iron-Segev et al., 2023; Sader et al., 2023). Using the ARFID-Brief Screener, our study found a higher prevalence in 2.5-4-year-old Swedish children (5.9%) compared to 4-7-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

year-old Japanese children (1.3%) (Dinkler et al., 2022a). This discrepancy may stem from the younger age of the Swedish sample and cultural differences in the perception and reporting of eating problems. From our experience, it is possible that discussing such issues is less culturally accepted in Japan than in Sweden, which may contribute to the lower prevalence reported in Japanese children. This highlights the importance of validating diagnostic tools across diverse populations.

When examining clinical characteristics among children with ARFID, we found that criterion A4, indicating marked interference with psychosocial functioning, was the most common criterion for diagnosis. The majority (87%) met this criterion, with 65% qualifying for ARFID based solely on A4, without notable impacts on weight, height, or nutrition. In contrast, only 13% of children with ARFID met criterion A1, which involves weight loss or failure to gain weight or grow. This finding is noteworthy as previous research typically shows that both A1 and A4 are the most commonly met criteria (Katzman et al., 2021; Watts et al., 2023). However, it has also been observed that younger children are less likely to meet the A1 criterion (Katzman et al., 2021; Zickgraf, Murray, et al., 2019). As suggested by Zickgraf and colleagues (Zickgraf, Lane-Loney, et al., 2019), psychosocial impairment may serve an early indicator of ARFID, with weight and nutritional issues emerging later, especially as parental control diminishes and energy demands increase during puberty. Supporting this, our study found that children with ARFID did not have significantly lower BMIs than those without ARFID. Additionally, the prevalence of criterion A2, which involves nutritional deficiencies, was notably low at 4.3%, consistent with our previous study in the Japanese child population (Dinkler et al., 2022a) but differing from higher rates observed in clinical samples (Katzman et al., 2021; Watts et al., 2023). This divergence might result from insufficient testing for nutritional deficiencies in epidemiological studies, unlike in clinical studies of ARFID.

Nonetheless, there is a risk of overdiagnosing criterion A4 in preschool populations. The impact of a child's eating behavior on family dynamics may be particularly pronounced in young children. Distinguishing between the child's stress and parental stress can be challenging, making it difficult to evaluate this criterion in young children. Currently, no clear guidelines exist on how best to evaluate criterion A4, and prevalence estimates can vary significantly based on definitions applied

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

(Harshman et al., 2021). To address this, we took specific care in evaluating A4, following the guidelines provided by the PARDI. We considered the criterion met if the child experienced significant difficulties, such as stressful mealtimes or challenges in social and daily functioning at preschool. To gauge impairment, we often employed the question "If these accommodations were not in place, would that cause your child difficulties?", as recommended in the PARDI. Commonly reported difficulties included frequent mealtime conflicts, anxiety and tantrums during meals, eating alone, and avoiding eating situations outside the home. Despite this careful evaluation, many cases were borderline, just meeting the threshold for criterion A4. It is, however, worth noting that even moderate selective eating in preschool children has been associated with significant psychopathology and family impairment, underscoring the need for clinical intervention. Early detection and intervention, regardless of the diagnosis, could prevent the progression of eating problems into more severe weight, nutritional, and health outcomes later in life.

When applying the previously suggested cutoff values for the PARDI Sensory profile and the PARDI Low interest profile (Cooper-Vince et al., 2022), all children with ARFID met cutoffs for *both* profiles, supporting the notion that these profiles are commonly associated with early onset and are typically present in younger children (Katzman et al., 2021; Sanchez-Cerezo et al., 2024; Zickgraf, Lane-Loney, et al., 2019). Moreover, this finding aligns with previous research showing that children with the Sensory profile or a combined Sensory and Low interest profile typically have BMIs within the normal weight range (Sanchez-Cerezo et al., 2024), as was also observed in our study. However, the fact that all children with ARFID, and most children without ARFID, met both profiles indicates that the previously identified cutoff values, established in older age groups, may not be entirely applicable to preschool children.

Consistent with prior research (Dinkler et al., 2022b; Sanchez-Cerezo et al., 2023; Watts et al., 2023; Wronski et al., 2024), we found that children with ARFID were at higher risk of co-occurring neurodevelopmental problems compare to those without ARFID, with 43.5% having a likely NDC. Our findings also revealed that a higher load of neurodevelopmental problems was associated with greater ARFID severity and higher scores on the Sensory profile, which is consistent with previous

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

findings for autism specifically and aligns with the notion that eating problems in children with autism (and other NDCs) may be more challenging to treat (Bourne et al., 2022; Watts et al., 2023). Although the load of neurodevelopmental problems was also associated with higher scores on the Concern profile, these scores were generally very low (all <1.5, theoretical range: 0-6). Regarding specific neurodevelopmental problems, ARFID was associated with delayed language development and sensory sensitivity. These factors may serve as early markers of increased ARFID risk and could be better predictors than common early feeding problems that are part of normative development, thereby aiding in the early detection of ARFID (Dinkler et al., 2022b).

Strengths and limitations

The study has several strengths, including a large sample size (n=645) and the use of a two-step process involving screening and clinical interviews. It contributes to the scarce literature on ARFID in preschool children and provides the first estimate of ARFID prevalence in this population, aiding in effective planning and allocation of healthcare resources. Additionally, this study is the first to provide diagnostic validity data for a parent-reported ARFID screener, offering a validated instrument for use in general child healthcare. The high NPV of the ARFID-Brief-Screener is a particular strength. However, potential biases affecting validity and prevalence estimates should be considered, as discussed earlier. These biases likely led a slight overestimation of validity figures and prevalence. In addition, it was not possible to blind interviewers to the screening status, which could have contributed to an overestimation. Lastly, our analysis of sample representativeness suggests that participanting parents may have been more affluent than the whole eligible population; however, it is unclear to what extent this might have impacted our results, as it is not known whether parental socioeconomic status is associated with ARFID. In this study, parental education levels did not differ significantly between children with and without an ARFID diagnosis in the PARDI.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our study provides valuable insights into the occurrence of ARFID in preschool children, a group previously underrepresented in research. Our findings support the effectiveness of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

the ARFID-Brief Screener in identifying at-risk children, potentially enabling timely interventions and improving long-term outcomes. However, the moderate specificity and PPV indicate that follow-up assessments are necessary to confirm diagnoses and reduce false positives. With an estimated prevalence of 5.9%, ARFID is not uncommon among Swedish preschoolers. While this prevalence falls within the range reported in previous studies, it likely represents a slight overestimation due to selection biases. All children with ARFID in our study exhibited sensory-based avoidance and low interest in eating, with concern about aversive consequences being uncommon. Most children met diagnostic criteria through psychosocial impairment, a challenging criterion to evaluate in this age group. Co-occurring neurodevelopmental problems were common and may serve as early markers of increased risk of ARFID. Similarly, ARFID in preschool children should alert clinicians to the possibility of co-existing autism, ADHD, and other neurodevelopmental conditions. Further studies are needed to validate our findings in different samples.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

References

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition*. American Psychiatric Association.

Bourne, L., Bryant-Waugh, R., Mandy, W., & Solmi, F. (2023). Investigating the prevalence and risk factors of picky eating in a birth cohort study. *Eat Behav*, *50*, 101780. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2023.101780

Bourne, L., Mandy, W., & Bryant-Waugh, R. (2022). Avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder and severe food selectivity in children and young people with autism: A scoping review. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, *64*(6), 691-700. https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.15139

Breiner, C. E., Knedgen, M. M., Proctor, K. B., & Zickgraf, H. F. (2024). Relation between ARFID symptomatology and picky eating onset and duration. *Eat Behav*, *54*, 101900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2024.101900

Brosig, L., Duplois, D., Hiemisch, A., Kiess, W., Hilbert, A., Schlensog-Schuster, F., & Schmidt, R. (2023). Birth-related, medical, and diagnostic characteristics in younger versus older children with avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder (ARFID). *J Eat Disord*, *11*(1), 190. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40337-023-00908-7

Bryant-Waugh, R., Micali, N., Cooke, L., Lawson, E. A., Eddy, K. T., & Thomas, J. J. (2019). Development of the Pica, ARFID, and Rumination Disorder Interview, a multi-informant, semi-structured interview of feeding disorders across the lifespan: A pilot study for ages 10-22. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *52*(4), 378-387. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22958

Cardona Cano, S., Tiemeier, H., Van Hoeken, D., Tharner, A., Jaddoe, V. W., Hofman, A., Verhulst, F. C., & Hoek, H. W. (2015). Trajectories of picky eating during childhood: A general population study. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *48*(6), 570-579. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22384

Chen, Y. L., Chen, W. J., Lin, K. C., Shen, L. J., & Gau, S. S. (2019). Prevalence of DSM-5 mental disorders in a nationally representative sample of children in Taiwan: methodology and main findings. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci*, *29*, e15. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796018000793

Cooper-Vince, C. E., Nwaka, C., Eddy, K. T., Misra, M., Hadaway, N. A., Becker, K. R., Lawson, E. A., Cooke, L., Bryant-Waugh, R., Thomas, J. J., & Micali, N. (2022). The factor structure and validity of a diagnostic interview for avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder in a sample of children, adolescents, and young adults. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *55*(11), 1575-1588. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.23792

Dinkler, L., & Bryant-Waugh, R. (2021). Assessment of avoidant restrictive food intake disorder, pica and rumination disorder: interview and questionnaire measures. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, *34*(6), 532-542. https://doi.org/10.1097/YCO.0000000000000736

Dinkler, L., Wronski, M. L., Lichtenstein, P., Lundstrom, S., Larsson, H., Micali, N., Taylor, M. J., & Bulik, C. M. (2023). Etiology of the Broad Avoidant Restrictive Food Intake Disorder Phenotype in Swedish Twins Aged 6 to 12 Years. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *80*(3), 260-269. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.4612

Dinkler, L., Yasumitsu-Lovell, K., Eitoku, M., Fujieda, M., Suganuma, N., Hatakenaka, Y., Hadjikhani, N., Bryant-Waugh, R., Rastam, M., & Gillberg, C. (2022a). 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*, *168*, 105735. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2021.105735

Dinkler, L., Yasumitsu-Lovell, K., Eitoku, M., Fujieda, M., Suganuma, N., Hatakenaka, Y., Hadjikhani, N., Bryant-Waugh, R., Rastam, M., & Gillberg, C. (2022b). Early neurodevelopmental problems and risk for avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder (ARFID) in 4-7-year-old children: A Japanese birth cohort study. *JCPP Adv*, *2*(3), e12094. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcv2.12094

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Gamer, M., Lemon, J., Fellows, I., & Singh, P. (2019). *irr: Various Coefficients of Interrater Reliability and Agreement. R package version 0.84.1*. In

Gonçalves, S., Vieira, A. I., Machado, B. C., Costa, R., Pinheiro, J., & Conceiçao, E. (2018). Avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder symptoms in children: Associations with child and family variables. *Children's Health Care*, *48*(3), 301-313. https://doi.org/10.1080/02739615.2018.1532796

Harshman, S. G., Jo, J., Kuhnle, M., Hauser, K., Murray, H. B., Becker, K. R., Misra, M., Eddy, K. T., Micali, N., Lawson, E. A., & Thomas, J. J. (2021). A Moving Target: How We Define Avoidant/Restrictive Food Intake Disorder Can Double Its Prevalence. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *82*(5). https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.20m13831

Hatakenaka, Y., Fernell, E., Sakaguchi, M., Ninomiya, H., Fukunaga, I., & Gillberg, C. (2016). ESSENCE-Q - a first clinical validation study of a new screening questionnaire for young children with suspected neurodevelopmental problems in south Japan. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, *12*, 1739-1746. https://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S108411

Iron-Segev, S., Best, D., & Stein, D. (2023). Symptoms of Avoidant/Restrictive Food Intake Disorder (ARFID) in the Orthodox and Secular Jewish Communities in Israel. *J Relig Health*, *62*(1), 268-286. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-022-01565-x

Katzman, D. K., Spettigue, W., Agostino, H., Couturier, J., Dominic, A., Findlay, S. M., Lam, P. Y., Lane, M., Maguire, B., Mawjee, K., Parikh, S., Steinegger, C., Vyver, E., & Norris, M. L. (2021). Incidence and Age- and Sex-Specific Differences in the Clinical Presentation of Children and Adolescents With Avoidant Restrictive Food Intake Disorder. *JAMA Pediatr*, *175*(12), e213861. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.3861

Kurz, S., van Dyck, Z., Dremmel, D., Munsch, S., & Hilbert, A. (2015). Early-onset restrictive eating disturbances in primary school boys and girls. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *24*(7), 779-785. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-014-0622-z

Landgren, V., Svensson, L., Knez, R., Theodosiou, M., Gillberg, C., Fernell, E., Landgren, M., & Johnson, M. (2022). The ESSENCE-Questionnaire for Neurodevelopmental Problems - A Swedish School-Based Validation Study in 11-Year-Old Children. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, *18*, 2055-2067. https://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S374930

Miniscalco, C., Nygren, G., Hagberg, B., Kadesjo, B., & Gillberg, C. (2006). Neuropsychiatric and neurodevelopmental outcome of children at age 6 and 7 years who screened positive for language problems at 30 months. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, *48*(5), 361-366. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0012162206000788

Pivodic, A., Hansson, M., Lofqvist, C., Savman, K., Elfvin, A., Jacobson, L., Dinkler, L., Hallberg, B., Ley, D., Morsing, E., Lundgren, P., Gyllen, J., Pfeiffer-Mosesson, C., & Hellstrom, A. (2024). Challenges of parenting children born before 24 weeks of gestation. *Acta Paediatrica*, *n/a*(n/a). https://doi.org/10.1111/apa.17350

R Core Team. (2022). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/.* In https://www.R-project.org/

Sader, M., Harris, H. A., Waiter, G. D., Jackson, M. C., Voortman, T., Jansen, P. W., & Williams, J. H. G. (2023). Prevalence and Characterization of Avoidant Restrictive Food Intake Disorder in a Pediatric Population. *JAACAP Open*, *1*(2), 116-127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaacop.2023.05.001

Sanchez-Cerezo, J., Nagularaj, L., Gledhill, J., & Nicholls, D. (2023). What do we know about the epidemiology of avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder in children and adolescents? A systematic review of the literature. *European Eating Disorders Review*, *31*(2), 226-246. https://doi.org/10.1002/erv.2964

Sanchez-Cerezo, J., Neale, J., Julius, N., Croudace, T., Lynn, R. M., Hudson, L. D., & Nicholls, D. (2024). Subtypes of avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder in children and adolescents: a latent class analysis. *EClinicalMedicine*, *68*, 102440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2024.102440

Schmidt, R., Vogel, M., Hiemisch, A., Kiess, W., & Hilbert, A. (2018). Pathological and non-pathological variants of restrictive eating behaviors in middle childhood: A latent class analysis. *Appetite*, *127*, 257-265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.04.030

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Sjoberg, D. D., Whiting, K., Curry, M., Lavery, J. A., & Larmarange, J. (2021). Reproducible Summary Tables with the gtsummary Package. *R Journal*, *13*(1), 570-594. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2021-053

Stevenson, M., Sergeant, E., Nunes, T., Heuer, C., Marshall, J., Sanchez, J., Thornton, R., Reiczigel, J., Robison-Cox, J., Sebastiani, P., Solymos, P., Yoshida, K., Jones, G., Pirikahu, S., Firestone, S., Kyle, R., Popp, J., Jay, M., Reynard, C., . . . Rabiee, A. (2022). *epiR: Tools for the Analysis of Epidemiological Data. R package version 2.0.52.* In

Västa Götalandsregionen. (2021). *Barnhälsovård i Västra Götaland. Sammanfattning Årsrapport 2020 [Child Health Services in Västra Götaland. Summary Annual Report 2020]"*. https://www.vgregion.se/halsa-och-vard/vardgivarwebben/uppdrag-och-avtal/central-barnhalsovard/arsrapport-barnhalsovarden-i-vastra-gotaland/

Watts, R., Archibald, T., Hembry, P., Howard, M., Kelly, C., Loomes, R., Markham, L., Moss, H., Munuve, A., Oros, A., Siddall, A., Rhind, C., Uddin, M., Ahmad, Z., Bryant-Waugh, R., & Hubel, C. (2023). The clinical presentation of avoidant restrictive food intake disorder in children and adolescents is largely independent of sex, autism spectrum disorder and anxiety traits. *EClinicalMedicine*, *63*, 102190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2023.102190

World Health Organization. (2022). *International Classification of Diseases Eleventh Revision (ICD-11)*. https://icd.who.int/browse11

Wronski, M. L., Kuja-Halkola, R., Hedlund, E., Martini, M. I., Lichtenstein, P., Lundstrom, S., Larsson, H., Taylor, M. J., Micali, N., Bulik, C. M., & Dinkler, L. (2024). Co-existing mental and somatic conditions in Swedish children with the avoidant restrictive food intake disorder phenotype. *medRxiv*, 2024.2003.2010.24304003. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.10.24304003

Zickgraf, H. F., Lane-Loney, S., Essayli, J. H., & Ornstein, R. M. (2019). Further support for diagnostically meaningful ARFID symptom presentations in an adolescent medicine partial hospitalization program. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *52*(4), 402-409. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.23016

Zickgraf, H. F., Murray, H. B., Kratz, H. E., & Franklin, M. E. (2019). Characteristics of outpatients diagnosed with the selective/neophobic presentation of avoidant/restrictive food intake disorder. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *52*(4), 367-377. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.23013

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Flowchart showing participation, data availability, screening groups, and ARFID status.

Formula used to estimate adjusted prevalence: *(number of children screening positive for current ARFID * proportion with ARFID diagnosis among children screening positive for current ARFID + number of children screening positive for previous ARFID * proportion with ARFID diagnosis among children screening positive for previous ARFID + number of children screening negative with current eating problems * proportion with ARFID diagnosis among children screening negative with current eating problems) / total sample size.*

ARFID: avoidant restrictive food intake disorder; CHS: child health services; PARDI: Pica, ARFID, and Rumination Disorder Interview.



Figure 2. Distribution of PARDI profile scores (a-c) and PARDI severity score (d).

ARFID: avoidant restrictive food intake disorder; PARDI: Pica, ARFID, and Rumination Disorder Interview.

Table 1. Identification of screening status according to ARFID–Brief Screener v2 and available data by screening status

Group	Screening status	**Criterion A0: avoidant/restrictive eating** (items #1, #2)	**Criteria A1-A4: Consequences of avoidant/restrictive eating** (items #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8)	**N screened** (Total N=645)
1	Screen-positive for current ARFID	*Current* avoidant/restrictive eating: “Yes, now” to at least one of items #1–#2	*Current* consequences: “Yes, now” to at least one of items #3-#8	42
2	Screen-positive for previous ARFID	*Current* **OR** *previous* avoidant/restrictive eating: “Yes, now” **OR** “Yes, earlier“ to at least one of items #1–#2	*Earlier* consequences: “Yes, earlier” to at least one of items #3–#8 **AND** no “Yes, now” to any of items #3–#8 (i.e., not screen-positive for current ARFID)	25[1]
3	Screen-negative with current eating problems	*Current* avoidant/restrictive eating: “Yes, now” to at least one of items #1–#2	*Never* any consequences: “No, never” to all of items #3–#8	111[1]
4	Screen-negative with previous eating problems	*Previous* avoidant/restrictive eating: “Yes, earlier” to at least one of items #1–#2	*Never* any consequences: “No, never” to all of items #3–#8	25[1]
5	Screen-negative with no history of eating problems	*Never* avoidant/restrictive eating: “No, never” to both items #1–#2	*Never* any consequences: “No, never” to all of items #3–#8 **OR** all NA due to skipping rule	442[1]

To identify screening status, only DSM-5 criterion A was evaluated. ARFID–Brief Screener does not include a question for criterion B, and the criterion C question was omitted due to the young age of the children. A question to evaluate criterion D is included in the screener, but it has not proven useful and was therefore excluded from the screening algorithm. Please see Table S1 for the items and response options of the ARFID–Brief Screener v2.
[1] Summarized to one group in Table 2.
ARFID: avoidant restrictive food intake disorder

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Sample characteristics overall and comparing children screen-positive for current ARFID to children from all other screening groups

Characteristic	**Overall** N = 645[1]	**Screen-positive for current ARFID** N = 42	**All other screening groups summarized** N = 603	**p-value**[1]
Sex				0.942
Female	319 (49.5%)	21 (50.0%)	298 (49.4%)	
Male	326 (50.5%)	21 (50.0%)	305 (50.6%)	
Age at screen (months)	38.0 (9.0), 20.4-59.1	39.2 (9.6), 24.4-51.4	38.0 (9.0), 20.4-59.1	0.552
Routine check-up				0.308
2.5 years	371 (57.5%)	21 (50.0%)	350 (58.0%)	
4 years	274 (42.5%)	21 (50.0%)	253 (42.0%)	
Current BMI	16.4 (1.5), 12.7-24.4	15.3 (1.4), 12.7-18.8	16.5 (1.4), 13.4-24.4	**<0.001**
Respondent				0.454
Mother	538 (83.8%)	36 (87.8%)	502 (83.5%)	
Father	93 (14.5%)	4 (9.8%)	89 (14.8%)	
Mother & Father	11 (1.7%)	1 (2.4%)	10 (1.7%)	
Mother born in Sweden	521 (80.8%)	27 (64.3%)	494 (81.9%)	**0.005**
Father born in Sweden	511 (79.8%)	27 (64.3%)	484 (80.9%)	**0.009**
Mother's education[2]				0.360
Less than compulsory school (<9y)	11 (1.7%)	1 (2.4%)	10 (1.7%)	
Compulsory school (9y)	32 (5.0%)	3 (7.1%)	29 (4.8%)	
High school (12y)	184 (28.7%)	16 (38.1%)	168 (28.0%)	
Further education (13-14y)	145 (22.6%)	9 (21.4%)	136 (22.7%)	
University/college degree (15+y)	269 (42.0%)	13 (31.0%)	256 (42.7%)	
Father's education[2]				0.172
Less than compulsory school (<9y)	14 (2.2%)	2 (4.8%)	12 (2.0%)	
Compulsory school (9y)	45 (7.1%)	5 (11.9%)	40 (6.8%)	
High school (12y)	286 (45.4%)	14 (33.3%)	272 (46.3%)	
Further education (13-14y)	111 (17.6%)	10 (23.8%)	101 (17.2%)	
University/college degree (15+y)	174 (27.6%)	11 (26.2%)	163 (27.7%)	
DSM-5 Criterion A0				----
Yes, currently	163 (25.3%)	42 (100.0%)[3]	121 (20.1%)	
Yes, earlier	40 (6.2%)	0 (0.0%)[3]	40 (6.6%)	
No, never	442 (68.5%)	0 (0.0%)[3]	442 (73.3%)	

Sample characteristics for each screening group separately are presented in Table S2.
[1] Categorical variables: n (%); Pearson's Chi-squared test (all expected cell counts ≥5) or Fisher's exact test (any expected cell count <5). Continuous variables: M (SD), Min-Max; Wilcoxon rank sum test. [2] "y" indicates total number of total school years. [3] By definition: meeting criterion A0 (avoidant/restrictive eating) was required for this screening group.

Table 3. Diagnostic validity of the ARFID-Brief Screener v2 (Screen +/-) against the clinical interview PARDI (Disorder +/-).

	Test A (group 1 vs. 2)			**Test B** (group 1 vs. 3)			**Test C** (group 1 vs. 2+3)		
Classification tables									
		ARFID dx in PARDI	No ARFID dx in PARDI		ARFID dx in PARDI	No ARFID dx in PARDI		ARFID dx in PARDI	No ARFID dx in PARDI
	Screen +	21	8	Screen +	21	8	Screen +	21	8
	Screen -	1	13	Screen -	1	18	Screen -	2	31
Statistical tests									
Statistic	Estimate (95%CI)			Estimate (95%CI)			Estimate (95%CI)		
Sensitivity	0.95 (0.77-1.00)			0.95 (0.77-1.00)			0.91 (0.72-0.99)		
Specificity	0.62 (0.38-0.82)			0.69 (0.48-0.86)			0.79 (0.64-0.91)		
Positive predictive value	0.72 (0.53-0.87)			0.72 (0.53-0.87)			0.72 (0.53-0.87)		
Negative predictive value	0.93 (0.66-1.00)			0.95 (0.74-1.00)			0.94 (0.80-0.99)		
Accuracy	0.79 (0.64-0.90)			0.81 (0.67-0.91)			0.84 (0.72-0.92)		
F1 Score[1]	0.82 (0.55-0.88)			0.82 (0.65-0.91)			0.81 (0.76-0.94)		

Three tests were conducted. Test A: screen-positive for *current* ARFID versus screen-positive for *previous* ARFID (group 1 vs. 2, cf. Table 1); Test B: screen-positive for *current* ARFID versus screen-*negative* with current eating problems (group 1 vs. 3); and Test C: screen-positive for *current* ARFID versus screen-positive for *previous* ARFID or screen-*negative* with current eating problems (group 1 vs. 2+3).
[1] Bootstrapped confidence intervals
ARFID: avoidant restrictive food intake disorder; PARDI: Pica, ARFID, and Rumination Disorder Interview.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 4. Demographic and clinical characteristics including ARFID presentation and neurodevelopmental problems in children with versus without ARFID diagnosis (dx) in the PARDI

Characteristic	No ARFID dx in PARDI N = 39	ARFID dx in PARDI N = 23	p-value[1]
Demographics			
Sex			0.066
Female	23 (59.0%)	8 (34.8%)	
Male	16 (41.0%)	15 (65.2%)	
Routine check-up			0.470
2.5 years	24 (61.5%)	12 (52.2%)	
4 years	15 (38.5%)	11 (47.8%)	
Age (Screen), months	37.1 (9.0), 28.4-51.1	38.7 (9.5), 24.4-50.7	0.502
Age (PARDI), months	40.2 (8.9), 29.8-56.2	41.4 (10.0), 25.8-60.3	0.810
Δ Time PARDI – Screen, months	3.1 (1.8), 0.9-8.2	2.7 (1.9), 0.8-9.9	0.197
Age at onset of eating problems, months	12.8 (10.2), 0.0-40.0	12.4 (9.7), 0.0-36.0	0.892
Mother born in Sweden	34 (87.2%)	17 (73.9%)	0.302
Father born in Sweden	30 (76.9%)	17 (73.9%)	0.789
Mother's education			0.362
Less than compulsory school (<9y)	1 (2.6%)	1 (4.3%)	
Compulsory school (9y)	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.7%)	
High school (12y)	13 (33.3%)	8 (34.8%)	
Further education (13-14y)	12 (30.8%)	4 (17.4%)	
University/college degree (15+y)	13 (33.3%)	8 (34.8%)	
Father's education			0.263
Less than compulsory school (<9y)	1 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	
Compulsory school (9y)	2 (5.3%)	3 (13.0%)	
High school (12y)	23 (60.5%)	9 (39.1%)	
Further education (13-14y)	4 (10.5%)	6 (26.1%)	
University/college degree (15+y)	8 (21.1%)	5 (21.7%)	
Anthropometrics			
Expected height in SD (PARDI)	0.0 (0.8), -1.7-2.0	-0.2 (1.0), -2.5-2.2	0.323
Height in SD (PARDI)	-0.3 (1.1), -4.0-2.0	-0.2 (1.0), -2.0-1.4	0.965
Weight in SD (PARDI)	-0.5 (1.1), -2.5-1.5	-0.6 (1.2), -3.4-1.8	0.692
BMI (PARDI)	15.9 (1.4), 13.7-19.4	15.7 (1.4), 12.7-18.5	0.466
BMI (Screen)	15.9 (1.4), 13.8-19.4	15.7 (1.4), 12.7-18.7	0.562
Δ BMI PARDI – Screen	0.0 (0.2), -1.0-0.4	0.0 (0.1), -0.2-0.5	0.903
BMI in SD (PARDI)	-0.3 (1.2), -3.0-2.0	-0.7 (1.1), -3.0-1.2	0.220
BMI in IOTF category (PARDI)			0.864
Underweight degree 2 (BMI 16.0 - <17.0)[2]	3 (7.7%)	2 (8.7%)	
Underweight degree 1 (BMI 17.0 - <18.5)[2]	4 (10.3%)	4 (17.4%)	
Normal weight (BMI 18.5 - <25.0)[2]	29 (74.4%)	15 (65.2%)	
Overweight (BMI 25.0 - <30.0)[2]	3 (7.7%)	2 (8.7%)	
ARFID criteria (Screener)			
Criterion A1: Yes, currently	6 (15.4%)	7 (30.4%)	0.203
Criterion A2: Yes, currently	0 (0.0%)	3 (13.0%)	0.047
Criterion A3: Yes, currently	1 (2.6%)	6 (26.1%)	0.009
Criterion A4: Yes, currently	3 (8.1%)	15 (65.2%)	<.001

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Characteristic	No ARFID dx in PARDI N = 39	ARFID dx in PARDI N = 23	p-value[1]
ARFID criteria (PARDI)			
Criterion A0 met	22 (56.4%)	23 (100.0%)[3]	----
Criterion A1 met	0 (0.0%)[3]	3 (13.0%)	----
Criterion A2 met	0 (0.0%)[3]	1 (4.3%)	----
Criterion A3 met	0 (0.0%)[3]	6 (26.1%)	----
Criterion A4 met	0 (0.0%)[3]	20 (87.0%)	----
Stressful mealtimes (Q42)	0 (0.0%)[3]	14 (70.0%)	----
Social difficulties (Q47)	0 (0.0%)[3]	6 (30.0%)	----
Daily functioning difficulties (Q48)	0 (0.0%)[3]	12 (60.0%)	----
# of criteria met (of A1-A4)			----
0	39 (100.0%)[3]	0 (0.0%)[3]	----
1	0 (0.0%)[3]	17 (73.9%)	----
2	0 (0.0%)[3]	5 (21.7%)	----
3	0 (0.0%)[3]	1 (4.3%)	----
>1 criterion met	0 (0.0%)[3]	6 (26.1%)	----
Only criterion A4 met (A1-A4)	0 (0.0%)[3]	15 (65.2%)	----
ARFID profiles (PARDI)			
Severity score (TR 0-6)	1.1 (0.7), 0.2-3.0	2.8 (0.6), 1.9-4.3	<0.001
Sensory profile score (TR 0-6)	1.0 (0.7), 0.0-3.2	2.3 (1.2), 0.7-5.1	<0.001
Low interest profile score (TR 0-6)	1.6 (0.7), 0.4-3.1	2.8 (0.7), 1.6-4.0	<0.001
Concern profile score (TR 0-6)	0.0 (0.1), 0.0-0.4	0.2 (0.3), 0.0-1.4	0.035
# Sensory profile items ≥4 (TR 0-10)	1.3 (1.3), 0.0-5.0	4.0 (2.3), 1.0-8.0	<0.001
# Low interest profile items ≥4 (TR 0-10)	1.7 (1.6), 0.0-5.0	4.9 (2.1), 1.0-8.0	<0.001
# Concern profile items ≥4 (TR 0-10)	0.0 (0.2), 0.0-1.0	0.1 (0.5), 0.0-2.0	0.281
Sensory profile score ≥0.6	30 (76.9%)	23 (100.0%)	0.020
Low interest profile score ≥1.1	31 (79.5%)	23 (100.0%)	0.021
Neurodevelopmental problems			
ESSENCE-Q score (TR 0-24)	3.4 (3.0), 0.0-13.0	5.9 (4.9), 1.0-17.0	0.026
ESSENCE-Q score ≥5	11 (28.2%)	10 (43.5%)	0.220
Failed language screen at 2.5 years	5 (13.5%)	9 (39.1%)	0.023
Diagnosed or suspected autism	----[4]	6 (26.1%)	----
Diagnosed or suspected ADHD	----[4]	5 (21.7%)	----
Diagnosed intellectual disability	----[4]	0 (0.0%)	----

[1] Categorical variables: n (%), Pearson's Chi-squared test (all expected cell counts ≥5) or Fisher's exact test (any expected cell count <5). Continuous variables: M (SD), Min-Max; Wilcoxon rank sum test. [2] Adult BMI. [3] By definition: meeting criterion A0 and at least one of criteria A1-A4 was required for ARFID dx. [4] Not reported as we did not obtain sufficient information for all children in this group.
ARFID: avoidant restrictive food intake disorder; PARDI: Pica, ARFID, and Rumination Disorder Interview; TR: Theoretical range.

Table S1. ARFID–Brief Screener v2: Items, response options, and matching to DSM-5 criteria

#	DSM-5 Criterion	Item	Response options
1	A0 - Avoidance or restriction of food intake	Do you think your child has or has had problems with eating characterized by avoidance or restriction of foods (i.e., that your child eats only a small range of foods or very little overall)?	No, never Yes, now Yes, earlier *If yes:* Started (age): ___ Stopped (age): ___
2		Has any health professional (at preschool/school, child health services, or other health care) said that your child has problems with avoidant or restrictive eating?	
Skipping rule: Do not continue if you replied "No, never" to both question 1 and 2.			
3	A1 - Significant weight loss (or failure to grow/gain weight)	Have your child's eating habits led to your child losing weight, not gaining weight, or not growing taller as they should?	No, never Yes, now Yes, earlier *If yes:* Started (age): ___ Stopped (age): ___
4	A2 - Significant nutritional deficiency	Has any health professional said that your child has nutritional deficiencies due to their eating habits (e.g., vitamin or iron deficiency)?	
5	A3 - Dependence on enteral feeding or oral nutritional supplements	Has your child been prescribed dietary supplements containing vitamins and/or minerals to address nutritional deficiencies?	
6		Has your child required high-calorie supplements (e.g., nutritional drinks) to be able to maintain or gain weight?	
7		After the age of 6 months, has your child required tube feeding (food or fluid via a tube in the nose or into the stomach) to maintain proper nutritional status?	
8	A4 - Marked interference with psychosocial functioning	Do your child's eating habits negatively affect their functioning almost daily (e.g., in preschool/school, activities with family/friends)?	
9	Sensory aversion profile	Does your child often avoid eating foods with certain smell, taste, appearance, temperature, or consistency/texture (e.g., crispy or soft)?	
10	Lack of interest profile	Does your child often avoid eating foods because they are worried about e.g., choking, vomiting/being sick, tummy aches, diarrhea, or an allergic reaction?	
11	Concern about aversive consequences profile	Does your child often eat too little because of low interest in eating and/or low appetite?	
---	C - Eating disturbance not attributable to weight/shape concerns	***---- Not applied due to young age of the children in this study ----*** *Only if your child is 6 years or older:* Has your child ever restricted their eating because they wanted to lose weight or because they were afraid of gaining weight?	
12	D – Eating disturbance not attributable to concurrent medical condition	***---- Assessed but excluded from diagnostic algorithm[1] ----*** Do you suspect or know that your child's eating problems are primarily due to a medical condition or a mental disorder?	No Yes *If yes*, which one?

DSM-5 Criterion B (eating disturbance not due to lack of available food or a culturally sanctioned practice) is not included in the ARFID–Brief Screener.
[1] Of children meeting the DSM-5 Criterion A (i.e., A0 + at least one of A1–A4), n=3 parents indicated that the child's eating problems were primarily due to a medical condition or a mental disorder. The indicated conditions were constipation, autism, and prematurity; however, none of these conditions exclude a diagnosis of ARFID.

Table S2: Sample characteristics by screening group.

Characteristic	Overall N = 645[1]	(1) Screen-positive for current ARFID N = 42[1]	(2) Screen-positive for previous ARFID N = 25[1]	(3) Screen-negative with current eating problems N = 111[1]	(4) Screen-negative with previous eating problems N = 25[1]	(5) Screen-negative with no history of eating problems N = 442[1]	p-value[1]
Sex							0.999
Female	319 (49.5%)	21 (50.0%)	13 (52.0%)	55 (49.5%)	12 (48.0%)	218 (49.3%)	
Male	326 (50.5%)	21 (50.0%)	12 (48.0%)	56 (50.5%)	13 (52.0%)	224 (50.7%)	
Age at screen (months)	38.0 (9.0), 20.4-59.1	39.2 (9.6), 24.4-51.4	36.9 (8.6), 28.4-49.6	38.0 (9.0), 28.4-51.3	34.8 (8.0), 29.3-49.6	38.2 (9.1), 20.4-59.1	0.828
Routine check-up							0.288
2.5 years	371 (57.5%)	21 (50.0%)	16 (64.0%)	64 (57.7%)	19 (76.0%)	251 (56.8%)	
4 years	274 (42.5%)	21 (50.0%)	9 (36.0%)	47 (42.3%)	6 (24.0%)	191 (43.2%)	
Current BMI	16.4 (1.5), 12.7-24.4	15.3 (1.4), 12.7-18.8	15.8 (1.0), 13.9-17.8	16.3 (1.3), 13.6-20.0	16.9 (2.0), 14.2-24.4	16.5 (1.4), 13.4-22.1	<0.001
Respondent							0.941
Mother	538 (83.8%)	36 (87.8%)	22 (88.0%)	92 (82.9%)	22 (88.0%)	366 (83.2%)	
Father	93 (14.5%)	4 (9.8%)	3 (12.0%)	16 (14.4%)	3 (12.0%)	67 (15.2%)	
Mother & Father	11 (1.7%)	1 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (1.6%)	
Mother born in Sweden	521 (80.8%)	27 (64.3%)	19 (76.0%)	98 (88.3%)	18 (72.0%)	359 (81.2%)	0.011
Father born in Sweden	511 (79.8%)	27 (64.3%)	17 (70.8%)	94 (84.7%)	13 (52.0%)	360 (82.2%)	<0.001
Mother's education[2]							0.305
Less than compulsory school (<9y)	11 (1.7%)	1 (2.4%)	1 (4.0%)	3 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (1.4%)	
Compulsory school (9y)	32 (5.0%)	3 (7.1%)	1 (4.0%)	6 (5.5%)	2 (8.0%)	20 (4.6%)	
High school (12y)	184 (28.7%)	16 (38.1%)	7 (28.0%)	39 (35.5%)	11 (44.0%)	111 (25.3%)	
Further education (13-14y)	145 (22.6%)	9 (21.4%)	8 (32.0%)	24 (21.8%)	2 (8.0%)	102 (23.2%)	
University/college degree (15-17y)	269 (42.0%)	13 (31.0%)	8 (32.0%)	38 (34.5%)	10 (40.0%)	200 (45.6%)	
Father's education[2]							0.094
Less than compulsory school (<9y)	14 (2.2%)	2 (4.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (2.5%)	
Compulsory school (9y)	45 (7.1%)	5 (11.9%)	3 (12.5%)	6 (5.7%)	2 (8.0%)	29 (6.7%)	
High school (12y)	286 (45.4%)	14 (33.3%)	14 (58.3%)	64 (61.0%)	12 (48.0%)	182 (41.9%)	
Further education (13-14y)	111 (17.6%)	10 (23.8%)	1 (4.2%)	12 (11.4%)	4 (16.0%)	84 (19.4%)	
University/college degree (15-17y)	174 (27.6%)	11 (26.2%)	6 (25.0%)	22 (21.0%)	7 (28.0%)	128 (29.5%)	
A0 criterion (parent)							<0.001
Yes, currently	158 (24.5%)	41 (100.0%)	10 (40.0%)	107 (96.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Yes, earlier	38 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	13 (52.0%)	2 (1.8%)	23 (92.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
No, never	448 (69.6%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.0%)	2 (1.8%)	2 (8.0%)	442 (100.0%)	
A0 criterion (health professional)							<0.001
Yes, currently	87 (13.6%)	31 (75.6%)	4 (16.0%)	52 (48.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Yes, earlier	23 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (44.0%)	5 (4.6%)	7 (28.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
No, never	531 (82.8%)	10 (24.4%)	10 (40.0%)	51 (47.2%)	18 (72.0%)	442 (100.0%)	
Sensory avoidance[3]							<0.001
Yes, currently	101 (24.7%)	26 (61.9%)	8 (34.8%)	52 (48.1%)	2 (8.0%)		
Yes, earlier	11 (2.7%)	1 (2.4%)	4 (17.4%)	2 (1.9%)	3 (12.0%)		
No, never	297 (72.6%)	15 (35.7%)	11 (47.8%)	54 (50.0%)	20 (80.0%)		

Characteristic	Overall N = 645[1]	(1) Screen-positive for current ARFID N = 42[1]	(2) Screen-positive for previous ARFID N = 25[1]	(3) Screen-negative with current eating problems N = 111[1]	(4) Screen-negative with previous eating problems N = 25[1]	(5) Screen-negative with no history of eating problems N = 442[1]	p-value[1]
Lack of interest[3]							<0.001
Yes, currently	120 (29.3%)	37 (88.1%)	11 (45.8%)	63 (58.3%)	1 (4.0%)		
Yes, earlier	17 (4.1%)	2 (4.8%)	6 (25.0%)	2 (1.9%)	5 (20.0%)		
No, never	273 (66.6%)	3 (7.1%)	7 (29.2%)	43 (39.8%)	19 (76.0%)		
Concern about aversive consequences[3]							<0.001
Yes, currently	9 (2.2%)	4 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)		
Yes, earlier	7 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.7%)	3 (2.7%)	2 (8.0%)		
No, never	393 (96.1%)	36 (90.0%)	21 (91.3%)	103 (93.6%)	23 (92.0%)		

[1] Categorical variables: n (%); Pearson's Chi-squared test. Continuous variables: M (SD), Min-Max; Wilcoxon rank sum test. [2] “y” indicates total number of total school years. [3] Parents of screen-negative children with no history of eating problems (screening group 5) did not respond to this question due to the skipping rule of the ARFID-Brief Screener.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.26.24314270; this version posted September 28, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S3. Neurodevelopmental problems measured by ESSENCE-Q separately by symptom in children with versus without ARFID diagnosis (dx) in the PARDI

Characteristic	**No ARFID dx in PARDI** N = 39	**ARFID dx in PARDI** N = 23[1]	**p-value**[2]
General development			0.862
No	34 (87.2%)	18 (81.8%)	
Maybe/a little	2 (5.1%)	2 (9.1%)	
Yes	3 (7.7%)	2 (9.1%)	
Motor development/milestones			>0.999
No	38 (97.4%)	21 (95.5%)	
Maybe/a little	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Yes	1 (2.6%)	1 (4.5%)	
Sensory reactions (e.g. touch, sound, light, smell, taste, heat, cold, pain)			0.039
No	37 (94.9%)	16 (72.7%)	
Maybe/a little	1 (2.6%)	3 (13.6%)	
Yes	1 (2.6%)	3 (13.6%)	
Communication/language/babble			0.543
No	31 (79.5%)	16 (72.7%)	
Maybe/a little	5 (12.8%)	2 (9.1%)	
Yes	3 (7.7%)	4 (18.2%)	
Activity (overactivity/passivity) or impulsivity			0.150
No	31 (79.5%)	14 (63.6%)	
Maybe/a little	6 (15.4%)	3 (13.6%)	
Yes	2 (5.1%)	5 (22.7%)	
Attention/concentration/"listening"			0.254
No	30 (76.9%)	14 (60.9%)	
Maybe/a little	7 (17.9%)	5 (21.7%)	
Yes	2 (5.1%)	4 (17.4%)	
Social interaction/interest in other children			0.315
No	34 (87.2%)	17 (77.3%)	
Maybe/a little	4 (10.3%)	2 (9.1%)	
Yes	1 (2.6%)	3 (13.6%)	
Behavior (e.g. repetitive, routine insistence)			0.245
No	32 (82.1%)	15 (68.2%)	
Maybe/a little	6 (15.4%)	4 (18.2%)	
Yes	1 (2.6%)	3 (13.6%)	
Mood (depressed, elated/manic, extreme irritability, crying spells)			0.084
No	31 (79.5%)	12 (54.5%)	
Maybe/a little	6 (15.4%)	8 (36.4%)	
Yes	2 (5.1%)	2 (9.1%)	
Sleep			0.666
No	32 (82.1%)	17 (77.3%)	
Maybe/a little	6 (15.4%)	3 (13.6%)	
Yes	1 (2.6%)	2 (9.1%)	
Feeding			<0.001
No	2 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	
Maybe/a little	21 (53.8%)	2 (8.7%)	
Yes	16 (41.0%)	21 (91.3%)	
"Funny spells"/absences			>0.999
No	36 (92.3%)	21 (95.5%)	
Maybe/a little	2 (5.1%)	1 (4.5%)	
Yes	1 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	

[1] One child had missing values on all ESSENCE--Q variables except on *Attention/concentration/"listening"* (Maybe/a little) and *Feeding* (Yes). [2] All variables: n (%), Pearson's Chi-squared test (all expected cell counts ≥5) or Fisher's exact test (any expected cell count <5).