

1 **Alcohol use and cognitive functioning in young adults: improving causal inference**

2

3 Liam Mahedy^{1,2,3} (Ph.D.), Steph Suddell^{1,2,3} (MSc), Caroline Skirrow^{1,4}, (Ph.D.), Gwen S.

4 Fernandes⁵ (Ph.D.), Matt Field⁶ (Ph.D.), Jon Heron⁵ (Ph.D.), Matthew Hickman⁵ (Ph.D.),

5 Robyn Wootton^{1,2,3} (Ph.D.), Marcus R. Munafò^{1,2,3} (Ph.D.)

6

7 **Affiliations**

8 ¹School of Psychological Science, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

9 ²MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

10 ³National Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centre at the University

11 Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

12 ⁴Cambridge Cognition, Cambridge, UK.

13 ⁵Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

14 ⁶Department of Psychology, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.

15

16 All authors meet authorship criteria.

17

18 **Corresponding author:** Liam Mahedy, School of Psychological Science, University of Bristol,

19 12a Priory Road, Bristol, UK, BS8 1TU.

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

21

22 **Running head:** Alcohol and cognition in young adults

23 **Word count:** 3,653 (excluding Abstract, Figures, Tables and References)

24 **Conflict of interest:** CS is employed by Cambridge Cognition Ltd. MRM is co-director of
25 Jericoe Ltd, which produces software for the assessment and modification of emotion
26 recognition. LM, RW, SS, MF, JH, & MH report no conflicts of interest.

27 **Abstract**

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

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

35 **Setting:** South West England.

36 **Participants:** The observational study comprised of 3,155 adolescents and their parents
37 (fully adjusted models) from ALSPAC. Genetic instruments for alcohol use were based on
38 almost 1,000,000 individuals from GSCAN. Genetic instruments for the cognitive outcomes
39 were based on 2,500 individuals from ALSPAC.

40 **Measurements:** Binge drinking was assessed at approximately 16, 17, 18, 21, and 23 years.
41 Cognitive functioning comprised working memory, response inhibition, and emotion
42 recognition assessed at 24 years of age. 99-independent genome-wide significant SNPs
43 associated with 'number of drinks per week' was used as the genetic instrument for alcohol
44 consumption. Potential confounders were included in the observational analyses.

45 **Findings:** Four binge drinking classes were identified: 'low-risk' (41%), 'early-onset monthly'
46 (19%), 'adult frequent' (23%), and 'early-onset frequent' (17%). We found insufficient
47 evidence to support an association between early-onset frequent binge drinking and
48 cognitive functioning: working memory ($b=0.09$, 95%CI=-0.10 to 0.28), response inhibition
49 ($b=0.70$, 95%CI=-10.55 to 11.95), and emotion recognition ($b=0.01$, 95%CI=-0.01 to 0.02)
50 compared to low-risk drinkers. Two-sample MR analyses similarly provided little evidence

51 that alcohol use is associated with deficits in working memory using the inverse variance
52 weight ($b=0.29$, 95%CI=-0.42 to 0.99), response inhibition ($b=-0.32$, 95%CI=-1.04 to 0.39),
53 and emotion recognition ($b=0.03$, 95%CI=-0.55 to 0.61).

54 **Conclusions:** Binge drinking in adolescence and early adulthood may not be causally related
55 to working memory, response inhibition, and emotion recognition in youths.

56

57 INTRODUCTION

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

64 There is a wealth of evidence from animal (8,9), neuroimaging (10–12), twin (13,14),
65 and cognitive neuroscience (15,16) studies suggesting that adolescent binge drinking is
66 negatively associated with cognitive functioning. However, the direction of this association
67 remains unclear as many of these results are based on evidence from small cross-sectional
68 studies. Studies that have examined this association using prospective data have largely
69 revealed mixed findings. For example, some studies have found that alcohol use preceded
70 deficits in domains of cognitive functioning (17–20), while other studies have provided
71 support for the opposite direction (21–23). One possible way to overcome reverse causation
72 is to use Mendelian randomisation (24). This approach uses genetic variants to proxy for an
73 exposure in an instrumental variable analysis to estimate the causal effect on the outcome
74 (25). One previous study examining the association between alcohol use and cognition in
75 mid- to late-adulthood using observational and MR approaches (26), found that having
76 consumed ‘any versus no’ alcohol was associated with better immediate recall, delayed
77 recall, verbal fluency, and processing speed in the observational study, however these
78 findings were not supported by the MR analyses.

79 In an effort to strengthen the evidence we used a triangulation approach with
80 observational and genetic epidemiological methods to better understand the causal

81 relationships between drinking patterns and cognitive functioning in young adults using
82 data from Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). The aims were to
83 investigate (1) whether patterns of binge drinking (assessed between 16 to 23 years) were
84 associated with working memory, response inhibition, and emotion recognition assessed at
85 age 24, and (2) whether alcohol use was associated with cognitive functioning using two-
86 sample Mendelian randomisation (MR) (27). MR can reduce bias from residual confounding
87 and reverse causation by using genetic variants that are known to be associated with the
88 exposure (25). We expected to find that more frequent binge drinking would be associated
89 with deficient cognitive functioning, and that this association would be supported by the MR
90 analyses.

91

92 **METHODS**

93 *Design*

94 Longitudinal latent class analysis was used to derive heterogenous patterns of binge
95 drinking from ages 16 to 23 years. Linear regression was used to examine the relationship
96 between patterns of binge drinking and subsequent cognitive functioning. The young person
97 provided self-reported information on binge drinking and cognitive functioning. The clear
98 temporal ordering of exposure, confounders and outcome helps to rule out the possibility of
99 reverse causality. Two-sample MR tested evidence for the causal relationship between
100 alcohol use and cognitive functioning.

101 **Observational analyses**

102 *Participants and Procedure*

103 We used data from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC),
104 an ongoing population-based study that contains a wide range of phenotypic and

105 environmental measures, genetic information and linkage to health and administrative
106 records. A fully searchable data dictionary is available on the study's website
107 <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/>. Approval for the study was
108 obtained from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the Local Research Ethics
109 Committees. Informed consent for the use of data collected via questionnaires and clinics
110 was obtained from participants following recommendations of the ALSPAC Ethics and Law
111 Committee at the time. Consent for biological samples has been collected in accordance
112 with the Human Tissue Act (2004). All pregnant women residing in the former Avon Health
113 Authority in the south-west of England and had an estimated date of delivery between 1
114 April 1991 and December 1992 were eligible for the study (Phase I consisted of N=14,541).
115 Of the 13,988 offspring alive at one year, a small number of participants have withdrawn
116 fully from the study (n=41), leaving an eligible sample of 13,947. Of these, 9,299 offspring
117 were invited to attend the 24-year clinic assessment. Detailed information about ALSPAC is
118 available online www.bris.ac.uk/alspac and in the cohort profiles (28–30). A detailed
119 overview of our study population, including attrition at the different measurement
120 occasions is presented in Supplementary Material Figure S1.

121 **Measures**

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

123 *Exposure: Binge drinking*

124 Information on binge drinking was collected on five occasions via a questionnaire (Q)
125 or during attendance at a study clinic (C). Mean ages at response were: 16y 7m (Q), 17y 9m
126 (C), 18y 6m (Q) 20y 11m (Q), and 22y 11m (Q) using the following question reflecting
127 drinking over the past year “How often do you have six or more drinks on one occasion?”.
128 One drink was specified as ½ pint (568 ml) average strength beer/lager, one glass of wine, or

129 one single measure (25ml) of spirits. Responses at each time point were used to derive a
130 repeated 3 level ordinal variable with categories “Never/Occasional” (comprising of “Never”
131 and “Less than monthly”), “Monthly” and “Weekly”. Daily or almost daily was collapsed into
132 the “Weekly” group.

133 *Outcome variables*

134 At 24 years of age ($M=24.0$ years; $SD=9.8$ months) participants attended a clinic-
135 based assessment which included computerised cognitive assessments as part of a broader
136 assessment battery of mental and physical health and behaviour. Data collection for the
137 online questionnaires was collected and managed by REDcap electronic data capture tools
138 (31,32).

139 *Working memory*

140 The N -back task (2-back condition) was used to assess working memory. The N -back
141 task (33) is widely used to measure working memory (17,34,35). A measure
142 of discriminability (d') was chosen as the primary outcome measure given it is an overall
143 performance estimate. Of the participants assessed with cognitive tasks at age 24 ($n=3,312$),
144 $n=182$ did not provide any data on the task; $n=70$ were omitted due to negative d' scores
145 and/or not responding to over 50% of the trials, leaving a sample of $n=3,242$.

146 *Response inhibition*

147 The Stop Signal Task (36) was used to assess response inhibition – the ability to
148 prevent an ongoing motor response. The task consisted of 256 trials, which included a 4:1
149 ratio of trials without stop signals to trials with stop signals. Mean response times were
150 calculated. An estimate of *stop signal reaction time* (SSRT) was calculated and used as the
151 primary outcome as it is a reliable measure of inhibitory control, with shorter SSRT's
152 indicating faster inhibition. SSRT data were available for $n=3,201$ participants.

153 *Emotion recognition*

154 Emotion recognition was assessed using a six alternative forced choice (6AFC)
155 emotion recognition task (37) comprising of 96 trials (16 for each emotion) which measures
156 the ability to identify emotions in facial expressions. In each trial, participants were
157 presented with a face displaying one of six emotions: anger, disgust, fear, happiness,
158 sadness, or surprise. An overall measure of ER (the number of facial emotions accurately
159 identified) was used as the primary outcome. ER data were available for $n=3,368$
160 participants. Further information on all three cognitive tasks is presented in Supplementary
161 material.

162 *Potential confounders*

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

172 *Statistical methods*

173 *Observational analyses*

174 The observational analyses were conducted in two stages. First, longitudinal latent
175 class analysis was used to derive trajectories of binge drinking for individuals having at least
176 one measure of binge drinking ($n=6,353$). Starting with a single latent class, additional

177 classes were added until model fit was optimised. See supplementary material for a
178 description of model fit. Analyses were carried out using Mplus 8.1 (38).

179 Class membership was then related to covariates using the three-step method using
180 the Bolck-Croon-Hagenaars (BCH) (39) method. The first stage estimated the latent class
181 measurement model and saves the BCH weights. While, the second stage involved using
182 these weights which reflect the measurement error of the latent class variable. Linear
183 regression was used to examine the association between the continuous distal outcomes
184 and latent class membership controlling for the confounding variables. Results are reported
185 as unstandardised beta coefficients and 95% confidence intervals.

186 *Missing data*

187 Missing data was dealt with in three steps. Of those invited to the age 24-year clinic
188 ($n=9,299$), 6,353 (68%) participants provided self-report information on binge drinking on at
189 least one timepoint between 16 and 23 years. Of these, $n=3,755$ (59%) had available
190 information on all covariates. Next, multiple imputation was based on 3,155 (46%)
191 participants who had information on at least one of the cognitive outcomes. The imputation
192 model (based on 100 datasets) contained performance on all of the cognitive tasks, all
193 measures of binge drinking, and potential confounding variables, as well as a number of
194 auxiliary variables known to be related to missingness (e.g., substance use in early
195 adolescence, parental financial difficulties, and other SES variables). Finally, inverse
196 probability weighting was used where estimates of prevalence and associations were
197 weighted to account for probabilities of non-response to attending the clinic. See Table S1
198 for a detailed description of attrition.

199 *Genetic analyses*

200 Two-sample MR was used to test the hypothesised causal effect of alcohol use on
201 cognitive functioning. The two-sample MR approach requires summary level data from two
202 GWAS, enabling SNP-exposure and SNP-outcome effects to be derived from different data
203 sources. As the genetic instrument for alcohol consumption we used the 99 conditionally
204 independent genome-wide significant SNPs associated with ‘number of drinks per week’,
205 identified by the GWAS & Sequencing Consortium of Alcohol and Nicotine use (GSCAN
206 <https://gscan.sph.umich.edu/>) based on a sample of $n=941,280$. 87 of these SNPs were
207 available in ALSPAC. As outcomes, we used GWAS conducted in ALSPAC for each of our
208 three primary cognitive measures: i) working memory assessed using d' ($n=2,471$); ii)
209 response inhibition assessed using SSRT ($n=2,446$); and iii) emotion recognition assessed
210 using total number of correctly recognised emotions ($n=2,560$). Further information is
211 provided in the Supplementary material (Figures S4-S9). The main strength of using
212 summary data from large GWAS consortia in two-sample MR is the increased statistical
213 power. Analyses were performed using the TwoSampleMR R package, part of MR-Base (40).

214

215 **RESULTS**

216 *Observational analyses*

217 *Patterns of binge drinking*

218 The prevalence of both monthly and weekly binge drinking increased across time
219 apart from a slight decrease at age 23 years (Table S2). There was good agreement that a
220 four-class solution was adequate in explaining the heterogeneity in binge drinking based on
221 increasing Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) (41) and sample size adjusted Bayesian
222 Information Criterion (SSABIC) (42) values in the five-class model and an LRT value of
223 $p=0.05$. See Table S3 in the Supplementary Material for a comparison of model fit indices.

224 The four-class solution (Figure 1) comprised patterns of binge drinking that were labelled as
225 'low-risk' (47.1%), 'early-onset monthly' (19.0%), 'adult frequent' (18.7%), and 'early-onset
226 frequent' (19.0%). See Table S4 in the Supplementary Material for class validation. See Table
227 S5 in the Supplementary Material for a detailed description of confounding factors
228 associated with binge drinking class membership.

229 [Figure 1]

230 *Working memory – 2-back task*

231 Table 1 presents unadjusted and adjusted associations between patterns of binge
232 drinking from 16 to 23 years and working memory at age 24. There was little evidence to
233 suggest an association between patterns of binge drinking and working memory
234 performance in the fully adjusted models ('early-onset monthly': $b=0.54$, 95%CI=-1.92 to
235 0.82; 'adult frequent': $b=0.03$, 95%CI=-0.80 to 0.86; 'early-onset frequent': $b=-0.42$, 95%CI=-
236 1.24 to 0.41). Furthermore, there was little evidence to suggest that patterns of binge
237 drinking were associated with the secondary outcomes (i.e., number of hits and false
238 alarms) (Table S6).

239 [Table 1]

240 *Response inhibition - stop signal task*

241 Table 2 presents unadjusted and adjusted associations between patterns of binge
242 drinking and an overall measure of response inhibition. There was little evidence to suggest
243 an association between patterns of binge drinking and ability to inhibit responses in the fully
244 adjusted models ('early-onset monthly': $b=-3.9$, 95%CI=-109.3 to 101.5; 'adult frequent':
245 $b=15.9$, 95%CI=-38.2 to 69.9; 'early-onset frequent': $b=31.9$, 95%CI=-25.3 to 89.2).
246 Furthermore, there was little evidence to suggest that patterns of binge drinking were

247 associated with any of the secondary outcomes (i.e., Go reaction time, Go accuracy, and
248 Stop accuracy) (Table S7).

249 [Table 2]

250 *Emotion recognition – 6AFC task*

251 Table 3 presents unadjusted and adjusted associations between patterns of binge
252 drinking and number of correctly identified emotions. There was little evidence to suggest
253 an association between patterns of binge drinking and emotion recognition in the fully
254 adjusted models ('early-onset monthly': $b=0.01$, 95%CI=-0.12 to 0.14; 'adult frequent':
255 $b=0.04$, 95%CI=-0.04 to 0.13; 'early-onset frequent': $b=0.02$, 95%CI=-0.07 to 0.10).
256 Furthermore, there was little evidence to suggest that patterns of binge drinking were
257 associated with any of the secondary outcomes (i.e., anger, disgust, fear, happy, sad, and
258 surprise) (Table S8).

259 [Table 3]

260 *Sensitivity analyses*

261 Models using complete cases were included to assess the impact of missing data (Table S9).
262 A latent growth model of the five repeated measures of binge drinking was conducted to
263 examine the association with working memory, response inhibition, and emotion
264 recognition while controlling for potential confounding variables ($n=3,155$) (Figure S3 and
265 Table S10).

266 *Genetic analyses*

267 *Mendelian randomisation*

268 The two-sample MR method provides little evidence to suggest that alcohol use
269 (SNPs associated with number of drinks per week) is a causal risk factor for deficits in
270 cognitive functioning (Table 4). Focusing on the IVW estimate as the primary measure, SNPs

271 associated with the number of alcoholic drinks per week were not associated with d' on the
272 working memory task ($b=0.285$ 95% CI=-0.42 to 0.99; $p=0.43$); SSRT on the response
273 inhibition task ($b=-0.321$ 95%CI=-1.04 to 0.39; $p=0.38$); or total hits in the emotion
274 recognition task ($b=0.028$ 95% CI=-0.55 to 0.61; $p=0.93$). Sensitivity analyses did not alter
275 the main findings.

276 [Table 4]

277 **DISCUSSION**

278 We found insufficient evidence to suggest an association between binge drinking
279 between the ages of 16 and 23 and cognitive deficits at age 24 using a combination of
280 observational and genetic approaches. In the observational analyses, four patterns of binge
281 drinking across adolescence and early adulthood were identified. These patterns were not
282 associated with later measures of cognitive functioning in either the unadjusted or adjusted
283 models. In the genetic analyses, there was no evidence to suggest that number of drinks
284 consumed per week was a causal risk factor for deficits in cognitive functioning in the
285 ALSPAC sample.

286 *Comparison with previous studies*

287 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to assess the relationship
288 between alcohol use and cognitive functioning in adolescence and young adulthood using a
289 combination of observational and genetic epidemiological approaches. Unlike the studies
290 that have demonstrated a prospective association between binge drinking and cognitive
291 functioning in adolescence e.g. (17–20), we found little evidence in support of this
292 association. The contrast in findings could be due to a number of possibilities. First, our
293 study used a large population sample incorporating data from over 3,000 individuals
294 spanning maternal pregnancy to 24 years of age. Previous studies (19,20) used functional

295 magnetic resonance imaging based on youths at high-risk for substance use disorders ($n=40$
296 for both studies), while the study by Peeters and colleagues (18) used a sample at high-risk
297 for externalising problems ($n=374$ at baseline). Second, this study assessed cognitive
298 functioning in early adulthood, a time when cognitions are thought to reach maturity (2–5),
299 in comparison to all four studies who assessed cognitive functioning up to 19 years of age.
300 Examining peak levels of cognitive functioning helps to reduce the possibility that cognitive
301 functioning is influencing earlier alcohol use (i.e., reverse causation). Third, as alcohol use
302 behaviours typically change over time (43), repeated measures of binge drinking were used
303 in this study to capture heterogenous patterns across this sensitive period in comparison to
304 our previous study which assessed alcohol use on one occasion (17). Finally, most of the
305 previous studies (18–20) assessed cognitive functioning using different measures to the
306 more widely used measures in this study (i.e., *N*-back task, Stop signal task, and 6AFC task).

307 Our findings support and extend those of Boelema and colleagues (44) who found
308 insufficient evidence to suggest that alcohol use prospectively affected maturation of
309 cognitive functions in a large prospective study of Dutch adolescents (45). First, Boelema
310 and colleagues examined cognitive functioning across adolescence, while we were able to
311 examine peak levels of cognitive functioning. Second, assessing binge drinking in young
312 adulthood allowed us to capture heterogenous patterns during the sensitive period (i.e.,
313 going to University or in full-time paid employment). Finally, WM performance was
314 measured in reaction times only, as opposed to the more comprehensive approach used in
315 our study (i.e., number of hits, false alarms, and d').

316 There are a number of differences with the findings from Kumari and colleagues
317 (26). First, the observational study examines weekly alcohol consumption (and was
318 dichotomised into 'any versus none' per week), compared to the repeated measures

319 approach used in this study. Second, different cognitive outcome measures were used.
320 Third, alcohol and cognition were assessed in mid-late adulthood (mean age across six
321 studies ranged from 55 to 66 years) compared to adolescence/ young adulthood in this
322 study. The MR analyses was based on a single SNP (rs1229984) as opposed to 87 SNPs in
323 this study. The main disadvantage to using single SNPs is that statistical power may be low
324 and an inability to separate horizontal from vertical pleiotropy (46).

325 *Limitations*

326 There are a number of limitations to this study. First, the ALSPAC cohort suffers from
327 attrition which reduces study power and also is higher among the socially disadvantaged
328 (47) (Table S1). We attempted to minimise the impact of attrition using sensitivity analyses.
329 Missingness was related to having information binge drinking, potential confounders and
330 cognitive information. However, the pattern of results remained the same in the complete
331 case (Table S9) and imputed analyses, suggesting that the pattern of missing data did not
332 lead to biased effect estimates. It is possible that both the observational and two-sample
333 MR analyses are underpowered. For example, poor entropy (a measure of class separation)
334 in the observational analyses could indicate poor misclassification in the latent classes
335 resulting in dilution of effect estimates. Small sample size in the cognitive functioning GWAS
336 is likely to be underpowered in the two-sample MR analyses. Second, binge drinking was
337 assessed using one-item from the AUDIT, however these assessments covered five
338 occasions over 7 years. Third, including yearly binge drinking assessments would have
339 helped class formation, however given the pattern of results, it is plausible that they would
340 not change the pattern of results. Fourth, although it is possible to either under- or over-
341 estimate drinking behaviour using self-reported data, participants completed questionnaires
342 individually and were assured of their anonymity. Fifth, although there is some debate in

343 the literature surrounding the construct validity of performance on the *N*-back task as an
344 indicator of working memory ability, it has been argued that using *N*-back performance
345 indices from a signal-detection framework (i.e. *d'*) may reveal clearer insights about its
346 validity as a measure of working memory performance (48–50). Sixth, different measures of
347 alcohol use for the observational and MR analyses were used. Along with deriving latent
348 classes of binge drinking, we used the largest GWAS consortia (GSCAN) which has identified
349 87 genetic instruments for ‘number of alcohol drinks per week’ which is a continuous
350 measure. To our knowledge it is not currently possible to use a nominal exposure (as was
351 used in the observational analyses) and consequently the effect sizes are not directly
352 comparable.

353 Seventh, as we examined one potential causal pathway, it is possible that the
354 association could work in the opposite direction, that is, impairments in cognitive
355 functioning may precede (and increase the risk of developing) alcohol problems (18,23). We
356 were however able to include a number of measures to maximise the robustness of our
357 findings: (i) ascertaining the time order of exposures and outcomes; (ii) controlling for
358 premorbid working memory function and brain insults prior to the onset of alcohol use; and
359 (iii) a number of relevant confounders were included to help reduce the possibility of
360 residual confounding. It is possible that a common risk factor is influencing both binge
361 drinking and deficits in cognition, however the two-sample MR analyses helps to protect
362 against this possibility by minimising bias from reverse causation and residual confounding.
363 Eighth, genetic variants were based on number of drinks per week, whereas the
364 observational analyses used frequency of binge drinking. Although not directly comparable,
365 there was evidence of a dose response relationship between binge drinking patterns and

366 the AUDIT-C measure, which taps into quantity and frequency (see Supplementary
367 material).

368 Finally, the main limitation of two-sample MR is that the quality of the pooled results
369 in the GWAS consortia is dependent on the individual studies. Another limitation is that the
370 same sample may contribute to both GWAS (i.e., GWAS for exposure and outcome) which
371 was the case in the current study as ALSPAC was in both the exposure and outcome. This
372 will bias the MR estimate towards the observed estimate. However, as the MR found no
373 clear evidence for an effect, this suggests it was not biased by overlapping samples.

374

375 *Implications and Conclusions*

376 In order to rule out the possibility of deficient cognitive functioning preceding binge
377 drinking in adolescence, future research should use an equally robust approach to examine
378 the alternate hypothesis. We found insufficient evidence to suggest an association between
379 binge drinking between the ages of 16 and 23 and cognitive deficits at age 24 using a
380 combination of observational and genetic approaches, although both approaches are likely
381 to be underpowered. Future studies should use larger observational samples and meta-
382 analyses of related cognitive measures in GWAS to help to increase power.

383

384 **Acknowledgements:** The work was undertaken with the support of the MRC and Alcohol
385 Research UK (grant number MR/L022206/1). We acknowledge also support from The Centre
386 for the Development and Evaluation of Complex Interventions for Public Health
387 Improvement (DECIPHer); a UKCRC Public Health Research Centre of Excellence (joint
388 funding (grant number MR/KO232331/1) from the British Heart Foundation, Cancer
389 Research UK, Economic and Social Research Council, Medical Research Council, the Welsh

390 Government and the Wellcome Trust, under the auspices of the UK Clinical Research
391 Collaboration); and the NIHR School of Public Health Research. Support was also provided
392 by the UK Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of
393 Bristol (MM_UU_00011/7). LM, RW, SS, and MRM are members of the UK Centre for
394 Tobacco and Alcohol Studies, a UKCRC Public Health Research Centre of Excellence. LM,
395 REW, SS, and MRM are supported by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at the University
396 Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Bristol. The views expressed in
397 this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National
398 Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care. GWAS data were
399 generated by Sample Logistics and Genotyping Facilities at Wellcome Sanger Institute and
400 LabCorp (Laboratory Corporation of America) using support from 23andMe. The UK Medical
401 Research Council and Wellcome (Grant ref: 102215/2/13/2) and the University of Bristol
402 provide core support for ALSPAC. This publication is the work of the authors and LM and
403 MRM will serve as guarantors for the contents of this paper. A comprehensive list of grants
404 funding is available on the website
405 (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf>). We
406 are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their
407 help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer
408 and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers,
409 receptionists and nurses. This publication is the work of the authors who will serve as
410 guarantors for the contents of this paper.

411

412 REFERENCES

- 413 1. De Bellis MD, Clark DB, Beers SR, Soloff PH, Boring AM, Hall J, et al. Hippocampal
414 volume in adolescent-onset alcohol use disorders. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2000;157(5):737–
415 44.
- 416 2. Fry AF, Hale S. Relationships among processing speed, working memory, and fluid
417 intelligence in children. *Biol Psychol*. 2000;54(1–3):1–34.
- 418 3. Kramer AF, de Sather JCMG, Cassavaugh ND. Development of attentional and
419 oculomotor control. *Dev Psychol*. 2005;41(5):760–72.
- 420 4. Davidson MC, Amso D, Anderson LC, Diamond A. Development of cognitive control
421 and executive functions from 4 to 13 years: evidence from manipulations of memory,
422 inhibition, and task switching. *Neuropsychologia*. 2006;44(11):2037–78.
- 423 5. Thomas LA, De Bellis MD, Graham R, LaBar KS. Development of emotional facial
424 recognition in late childhood and adolescence. *Dev Sci*. 2007;10(5):547–58.
- 425 6. Sowell ER, Delis D, Stiles J, Jernigan TL. Improved memory functioning and frontal
426 lobe maturation between childhood and adolescence: a structural MRI study. *J Int
427 Neuropsychol Soc*. 2001;7(3):312–22.
- 428 7. Sowell ER, Thompson PM, Holmes CJ, Jernigan TL, Toga AW. In vivo evidence for post-
429 adolescent brain maturation in frontal and striatal regions. *Nat Neurosci*. 1999;2:859.
- 430 8. White AM, Ghia AJ, Levin ED, Swartzwelder HS. Binge pattern ethanol exposure in
431 adolescent and adult rats: differential impact on subsequent responsiveness to
432 ethanol. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2000;24(8):1251–6.
- 433 9. Risher M-L, Fleming RL, Boutros N, Semenova S, Wilson WA, Levin ED, et al. Long-
434 term effects of chronic intermittent ethanol exposure in adolescent and adult rats:
435 radial-arm maze performance and operant food reinforced responding. *PLoS One*.

- 436 2013;8(5):e62940–e62940.
- 437 10. Crews F, He J, Hodge C. Adolescent cortical development: a critical period of
438 vulnerability for addiction. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav.* 2007;86(2):189–99.
- 439 11. Chambers RA, Taylor JR, Potenza MN. Developmental neurocircuitry of motivation in
440 adolescence: a critical period of addiction vulnerability. *Am J Psychiatry.*
441 2003;160(6):1041–52.
- 442 12. Squeglia LM, Schweinsburg AD, Pulido C, Tapert SF. Adolescent binge drinking linked
443 to abnormal spatial working memory brain activation: differential gender effects.
444 *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 2011;35(10):1831–41.
- 445 13. Wilson S, Malone SM, Thomas KM, Iacono WG. Adolescent drinking and brain
446 morphometry: A co-twin control analysis. *Dev Cogn Neurosci.* 2015;16:130–8.
- 447 14. Malone SM, Luciana M, Wilson S, Sparks JC, Hunt RH, Thomas KM, et al. Adolescent
448 drinking and motivated decision-making: a cotwin-control investigation with
449 monozygotic twins. *Behav Genet.* 2014;44(4):407–18.
- 450 15. Parada M, Corral M, Mota N, Crego A, Rodriguez Holguin S, Cadaveira F. Executive
451 functioning and alcohol binge drinking in university students. *Addict Behav.*
452 2012;37(2):167–72.
- 453 16. Gullo MJ, Loxton NJ, Price T, Voisey J, Young RM, Connor JP. A laboratory model of
454 impulsivity and alcohol use in late adolescence. *Behav Res Ther.* 2017;97:52–63.
- 455 17. Mahedy L, Field M, Gage S, Hammerton G, Heron J, Hickman M, et al. Alcohol use in
456 adolescence and later working memory: Findings from a large population-based birth
457 cohort. *Alcohol Alcohol.* 2018;53:251–8.
- 458 18. Peeters M, Monshouwer K, Janssen T, Wiers RW, Vollebergh WAM. Working memory
459 and alcohol use in at-risk adolescents: a 2-year follow-up. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.*

- 460 2014;38(4):1176–83.
- 461 19. Squeglia LM, Pulido C, Wetherill RR, Jacobus J, Brown GG, Tapert SF. Brain response
462 to working memory over three years of adolescence: influence of initiating heavy
463 drinking. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2012;73(5):749–60.
- 464 20. Wetherill RR, Squeglia LM, Yang TT, Tapert SF. A longitudinal examination of
465 adolescent response inhibition: neural differences before and after the initiation of
466 heavy drinking. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2013;230(4):663–71.
- 467 21. Peeters M, Janssen T, Monshouwer K, Boendermaker W, Pronk T, Wiers R, et al.
468 Weaknesses in executive functioning predict the initiating of adolescents' alcohol use.
469 *Dev Cogn Neurosci*. 2015;16:139–46.
- 470 22. Squeglia LM, Jacobus J, Nguyen-Louie TT, Tapert SF. Inhibition during early
471 adolescence predicts alcohol and marijuana use by late adolescence.
472 *Neuropsychology*. 2014;28(5):782–90.
- 473 23. Fernie G, Peeters M, Gullo MJ, Christiansen P, Cole JC, Sumnall H, et al. Multiple
474 behavioural impulsivity tasks predict prospective alcohol involvement in adolescents.
475 *Addiction*. 2013;108(11):1916–23.
- 476 24. Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. "Mendelian randomization": can genetic epidemiology
477 contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *Int J Epidemiol*.
478 2003;32(1):1–22.
- 479 25. Lawlor DA, Harbord RM, Sterne JAC, Timpson N, Davey Smith G. Mendelian
480 randomization: using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in
481 epidemiology. *Stat Med*. 2008;27(8):1133–63.
- 482 26. Kumari M, Holmes M V, Dale CE, Hubacek JA, Palmer TM, Pikhart H, et al. Alcohol
483 consumption and cognitive performance: a Mendelian randomization study.

- 484 Addiction. 2014/07/01. 2014;109(9):1462–71.
- 485 27. Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, Li Y, Brazel DM, Chen F, et al. Association studies of up to
486 1.2 million individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and
487 alcohol use. *Nat Genet.* 2019;51(2):237–44.
- 488 28. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, et al. Cohort Profile:
489 the 'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of
490 Parents and Children. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2013;42(1):111–27.
- 491 29. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, Boyd A, Golding J, Davey Smith G, et al.
492 Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers
493 cohort. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2013;42(1):97–110.
- 494 30. Northstone K, Lewcock M, Groom A, Boyd A, Macleod J, Timpson N, et al. The Avon
495 Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC): an update on the enrolled
496 sample of index children in 2019. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2019;4:51.
- 497 31. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic
498 data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for
499 providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform.*
500 2009;42(2):377–81.
- 501 32. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, Neal LO, et al. The REDCap
502 consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J*
503 *Biomed Inform.* 2019;95(5):103208.
- 504 33. Kirchner WK. Age differences in short-term retention of rapidly changing information.
505 *J Exp Psychol.* 1958;55(4):352–8.
- 506 34. Wardle MC, de Wit H, Penton-Voak I, Lewis G, Munafò MR. Lack of association
507 between COMT and working memory in a population-based cohort of healthy young

- 508 adults. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2013;38(7):1253–63.
- 509 35. Rossi R, Zammit S, Button KS, Munafò MR, Lewis G, David AS. Psychotic experiences
510 and working memory: a population-based study using signal-detection analysis. *PLoS*
511 *One*. 2016;11(4):e0153148–e0153148.
- 512 36. Logan GD, Cowan WB, Davis KA. On the ability to inhibit simple and choice reaction
513 time responses: a model and a method. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform*.
514 1984;10(2):276–91.
- 515 37. Penton-Voak IS, Bate H, Lewis G, Munafo MR. Effects of emotion perception training
516 on mood in undergraduate students: randomised controlled trial. *Br J Psychiatry*.
517 2012;201(1):71–2.
- 518 38. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. *User's Guide*. 7th ed. Muthén LK, Muthén BO, editors. Los
519 Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén; 2016.
- 520 39. Bolck A, Croon M, Hagenaars J. Estimating latent structure models with categorical
521 variables: one-step versus three-step estimators. *Polit Anal*. 2004;12(1):3–27.
- 522 40. Hemani G, Zheng J, Elsworth B, Wade KH, Haberland V, Baird D, et al. The MR-Base
523 platform supports systematic causal inference across the human phenome. *Elife*.
524 2018 May;7.
- 525 41. Schwarz G. Estimating the dimension of a model. *Ann Stat*. 1978;6:461–4.
- 526 42. Sclove L. Application of model-selection criteria to some problems in multivariate
527 analysis. *Psychometrika*. 1987;52:333–43.
- 528 43. Faden VB. Trends in initiation of alcohol use in the United States 1975 to 2003.
529 *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2006;30(6):1011–22.
- 530 44. Boelema SR, Harakeh Z, Van Zandvoort MJE, Reijneveld SA, Verhulst FC, Ormel J, et al.
531 Adolescent heavy drinking does not affect maturation of basic executive functioning:

- 532 Longitudinal findings from the TRAILS study. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(10):1–15.
- 533 45. Ormel J, Oldehinkel AJ, Sijtsma J, van Oort F, Raven D, Veenstra R, et al. The
534 TRacking Adolescents' Individual Lives Survey (TRAILS): design, current status, and
535 selected findings. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2012;51(10):1020–36.
- 536 46. Hemani G, Bowden J, Davey Smith G. Evaluating the potential role of pleiotropy in
537 Mendelian randomization studies. *Hum Mol Genet*. 2018;27(R2):R195–208.
- 538 47. Wolke D, Waylen A, Samara M, Steer C, Goodman R, Ford T, et al. Selective drop-out
539 in longitudinal studies and non-biased prediction of behaviour disorders. *Br J*
540 *Psychiatry*. 2009;195(3):249–56.
- 541 48. Kane MJ, Conway ARA, Miura TK, Colflesh GJH. Working memory, attention control,
542 and the N-back task: a question of construct validity. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn*.
543 2007;33(3):615–22.
- 544 49. Meule A. Reporting and interpreting working memory performance in n-back tasks.
545 *Front Psychol*. 2017;8:352.
- 546 50. Haatveit BC, Sundet K, Hugdahl K, Ueland T, Melle I, Andreassen OA. The validity of d
547 prime as a working memory index: results from the “Bergen n-back task”. *J Clin Exp*
548 *Neuropsychol*. 2010;32(8):871–80.
- 549







Figure 1. Distribution of binge drinking response across latent classes at each timepoint ($n=6,353$). Class proportions based on estimated posterior probability¹

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

	Low risk	Early-onset monthly	Adult frequent	Early-onset frequent	
$n=3,155$ for all models	Reference group	b (95% CI)	b (95% CI)	b (95% CI)	Wald (df) p value
Model 1					
Working memory d'	-	-0.07 (-0.26, 0.12)	0.24 (0.12, 0.36)	0.15 (0.03, 0.28)	20.29 (3) $p<0.001$
Model 2					
Working memory d'	-	-0.54 (-1.55, 0.47)	-0.01 (-0.65, 0.37)	-0.28 (-0.93, 0.37)	1.93 (3) $p=0.59$
Model 3					
Working memory d'	-	-0.46 (-1.176, 0.85)	0.03 (-0.80, 0.86)	-0.43 (-1.25, 0.40)	1.68 (3) $p=0.64$
Model 4: fully adjusted					
Working memory d'	-	-0.54 (-1.92, 0.82)	0.03 (-0.80, 0.86)	-0.42 (-1.24, 0.41)	1.78 (3) $p=0.62$

Note. Model 1: unadjusted; Model 2 adjusted for sex, tenure, income, social status, housing tenure, maternal education, and maternal smoking in pregnancy; Model 3: further adjusted for working memory at age ~11 years and HI: head injury/ unconsciousness up to age 11 years; Model 4: further adjusted for tobacco and cannabis use up to age 16.5 years.

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

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

	Low risk	Early-onset monthly	Adult frequent	Early-onset frequent	
<i>n</i> =3,155 for all models	Reference group	<i>b</i> (95% CI)	<i>b</i> (95% CI)	<i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
Model 1					
Stop signal reaction time	-	11.5 (-0.9, 23.8)	-8.7 (-16.8, -0.6)	-5.9 (14.0, 2.1)	10.74 (3) <i>p</i> =0.01
Model 2					
Stop signal reaction time	-	35.7 (-33.4, 104.8)	-12.3 (-54.9, 30.3)	12.0 (-31.3, 55.2)	2.13 (3) <i>p</i> =0.55
Model 3					
Stop signal reaction time	-	5.6 (95.3, 106.4)	15.7 (-38.3, 69.7)	32.6 (-24.6, 89.8)	1.39 (3) <i>p</i> =0.71
Model 4: fully adjusted					
Stop signal reaction time	-	-3.9 (-109.3, 101.5)	15.9 (-38.2, 69.9)	31.9 (-25.3, 89.2)	1.35 (3) <i>p</i> =0.72

Note. Model 1: unadjusted; Model 2 adjusted for sex, tenure, income, social status, housing tenure, maternal education, and maternal smoking in pregnancy; Model 3: further adjusted for working memory at age ~11 years and HI: head injury/ unconsciousness up to age 11 years; Model 4: further adjusted for tobacco and cannabis use up to age 16.5years.

Table 3. Patterns of binge drinking from 16 to 23 and emotion recognition at age 24 (higher scores reflect better performance)

	Low risk	Early-onset monthly	Adult frequent	Early-onset frequent	
<i>n</i> =3,155 for all models	Reference group	<i>b</i> (95% CI)	<i>b</i> (95% CI)	<i>b</i> (95% CI)	Wald (df) <i>p</i> value
Model 1					
Total hits	-	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.02 (0.01, 0.03)	0.01 (-0.00, 0.02)	14.85 (3) <i>p</i> =0.002
Model 2					
Total hits	-	-0.01 (-0.11, 0.09)	0.02 (-0.05, 0.08)	0.01 (-0.05, 0.07)	0.32 (3) <i>p</i> =0.96
Model 3					
Total hits	-	0.00 (-0.13, 0.13)	0.04 (-0.04, 0.13)	0.02 (-0.07, 0.10)	1.04 (3) <i>p</i> =0.79
Model 4: fully adjusted					
Total hits	-	0.01 (-0.12, 0.14)	0.04 (-0.04, 0.13)	0.02 (-0.07, 0.10)	1.07 (3) <i>p</i> =0.78

Note. Model 1: unadjusted; Model 2 adjusted for sex, tenure, income, social status, housing tenure, maternal education, and maternal smoking in pregnancy; Model 3: further adjusted for working memory at age ~11 years and HI: head injury/ unconsciousness up to age 11 years; Model 4: further adjusted for tobacco and cannabis use up to age 16.5years.

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

Exposure	Outcome	Method	N SNPs	Beta (95% CI)	P-value
Drinks per week	Working memory	Inverse-Variance Weighted	87	0.285 (-0.42, 0.99)	0.43
		MR Egger (SIMEX)	87	-0.473 (-1.70, 0.74)	0.45
		Weighted Median	87	0.408 (-0.50, 1.32)	0.38
		Weighted Mode	87	0.315 (-1.45, 2.08)	0.32
Drinks per week	Response inhibition	Inverse-Variance Weighted	87	-0.321 (-1.04, 0.39)	0.38
		MR Egger (SIMEX)	87	-1.213 (-2.23, 2.20)	0.29
		Weighted Median	87	-0.556 (-1.55, 0.43)	0.27
		Weighted Mode	87	-0.689 (-2.49, 1.13)	0.46
Drinks per week	Emotion recognition	Inverse-Variance Weighted	87	0.028 (-0.55, 0.61)	0.93
		MR Egger (SIMEX)	87	0.445 (-1.14, 2.03)	0.58
		Weighted Median	87	-0.157 (-1.01, 0.69)	0.72
		Weighted Mode	87	-0.180 (-1.78, 1.42)	0.82

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