

1 **Participation Questionnaire for Preschoolers with Autism Spectrum Disorder: Item**

2 **Development**

3 Takuto Nakamura^{a*}, Sakumi Koyama^b, Hirofumi Nagayama^a, and Satoshi

4 Sasada^c

5 *^aFaculty of Health and Social Services, School of Rehabilitation, Kanagawa University of Human*

6 *Services, Yokosuka, Japan*

7 *^bChild Development Support Office, Smile-Kids, Nerima, Japan*

8 *^cGraduate School of Health and Social Services, Kanagawa University of Human Services, Yokosuka,*

9 *Japan*

10 *Corresponding author:

11 Takuto Nakamura

12 Kanagawa University of Human Services,

13 1-10-1 Heiseicho, Yokosuka, Kanagawa, Japan 238-8522

14 E-mail: nakamura-y49@kuhs.ac.jp

15

16

17 **Word Count: 5300**

18

19

20

21 **Participation Questionnaire for Preschoolers with Autism Spectrum Disorder: Item**

22 **Development**

23 Occupational therapists need to comprehensively assess participation of children
24 with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) in daily activities and evaluate the
25 effectiveness of relevant interventions. Several participation measurement tools
26 have been developed for children with ASD, but these tools require expert
27 involvement, which is a barrier to large-scale surveys. To address these concerns,
28 a caregiver-administered questionnaire—the Participation Questionnaire for
29 Preschoolers (PQP)—was developed. However, this tool could be improved due
30 to its narrow age range of 48–72 months and because the item development
31 process does not reflect the perspectives of children and caregivers. Therefore,
32 we expanded the PQP’s target age range to 36–83 months and developed new
33 items that reflect the perspectives of professionals and caregivers. Interviews
34 were conducted with eight experts in supporting children with ASD and 11
35 caregivers of children with ASD. The interviews were transcribed, and a content
36 analysis was performed. The number of questions was reduced from 51 to 36,
37 and the order of items was changed for clarity. Two of the eight sub-domains
38 were removed to clarify the conceptual difference between activity and
39 participation. The updated version of the PQP has two unique features: (1) it can
40 be administered without expert involvement, and (2) it includes items specific to
41 the challenges faced by children with ASD. Future development of the scale and
42 validation of its measurement properties are needed.

43

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Autism spectrum disorder (ASD) is a neurodevelopmental disorder characterized by
47 challenges related to social interaction, communication, and repetitive behaviors and interests
48 [1]. Typically, ASD is evident early in an individual's development, particularly in childhood,
49 and can considerably impact later life. Therefore, support in early childhood is vital, and
50 significant financial resources are invested in high-income countries to manage ASD [2].

51 "Participation" is a construct defined in the International Classification of Functioning,
52 Disability, and Health as "involvement in life situations" [3]. This construct, which implies
53 involvement in academics, family roles, interactions with friends, and community activities,
54 is an important goal for occupational therapists [4]. However, the disability characteristics of
55 ASD create limitations to this participation [5]. Prior research suggests that children with
56 ASD have limited participation in many domains compared to typically developing children,
57 and that this limitation is more prominent in ASD than in other disorders [6, 7].

58 Occupational therapists have examined the use of standardized methods to assess the
59 participation of children with ASD [8]. Many of the earliest participation measurement tools
60 were generic tools not limited to a specific disability or disorder. These tools have helped to
61 characterize participation across disability status and type and build a knowledge base for
62 participation-focused occupational therapy practice. However, in recent years, there has been

63 a rapid expansion in the development of disability-specific participation measurement tools
64 that are highly useful in clinical settings and aptly reflect the effects of interventions. For
65 example, tools such as the "Activities Scale for Kids performance (ASKp) [9]" for measuring
66 participation in children with musculoskeletal disorders, and "Pediatric Measure of
67 Participation short forms [10]" for children with spinal cord injuries, have been developed
68 and utilized for various disabilities. This trend emphasizes the need to develop
69 disability-specific participation measurement tools for children with ASD [8].

70 The oldest existing disability-specific participation measurement tool for children
71 with ASD is the Matrix for Assessment of Activities and Participation [11]. This tool can be
72 used by professionals to comprehensively measure the activities and participation of children
73 with ASD aged 3–6 years. The Structured Preschool Participation Observation for Children
74 with ASD (SPO-ASD) can specifically measure participation in non-inclusive educational
75 settings [12]. The SPO-ASD is a valid and reliable tool designed for professionals to conduct
76 detailed assessments of ASD features in children aged 4-6 years. Additionally, the Picture My
77 Participation-Chinese version is a valid tool that can be used for children with ASD [13]. This
78 tool is advantageous because it allows children to self-report their participation through a
79 photo-based interview and can be used by children with ASD aged 5–9 years.

80 However, the use of these measurement tools necessitates trained experts to conduct
81 interviews or observations. These requirements pose challenges not only for clinical
82 application [14] but also for conducting large-scale surveys.

83 Given the constraints of these previously developed tools, the Participation
84 Questionnaire for Preschoolers (PQP) was developed [15]. The PQP, developed through
85 interviews with caregivers and professionals, is a participation measurement tool specifically
86 designed for children with ASD. It is a caregiver-administered questionnaire comprising 54
87 items that comprehensively measure participation and can be answered without professional
88 involvement. The development of a simple, standardized measurement tool such as the PQP
89 can help clinicians easily screen for and monitor changes in participation. Furthermore, the
90 questionnaire can serve as a basis for building evidence in support of participation of children
91 with ASD in large-scale surveys.

92 However, development of the PQP items is ongoing. Furthermore, the target age range
93 is limited to 48–72 months. Considering that ASD is often detected at approximately three
94 years of age in high-income countries [2], the PQP's current target age range may not satisfy
95 the needs of actual clinical practice and research. There is also a growing demand for new
96 tools to assess and validate changes in participation and the effectiveness of interventions for
97 children with ASD. Therefore, this study aims to expand the PQP's target age range and
98 develop new items adaptable to children of diverse age groups.

99 **Materials and methods**

100 We used a qualitative methodology to develop the questionnaire items. To ensure that the
101 constructs captured important indicators related to the participation of children with ASD, the
102 item development steps of the COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health
103 Measurement Instruments (COSMIN) methodology for assessing the content validity of
104 patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs)-user manual were used as a reference [16].
105 Three main steps were followed to develop the questionnaire. First, we determined the basic
106 design of the questionnaire, including the constructs to be measured, the target population,
107 and the response options. This study followed the PQP design used in previous studies [15],
108 except for the target age group. Next, content experts (described below) reviewed the 54
109 items of the PQP [15] and participated in interviews to assess content validity.
110 Semi-structured interviews were conducted to collect the perspectives of caregivers of
111 children with ASD. Additionally, cognitive interviews were conducted with caregivers to
112 judge whether the items were interpreted as the developers intended. The institutional review
113 board of the first author's university approved the study, and all participants provided
114 informed consent. This study was conducted between February and October 2021. It was,
115 however, not prospectively registered in any public open access database.

116 ***Validation by experts***

117 ***Questionnaire design***

118 The PQP is based on the International Classification of Functioning (ICF), a comprehensive
119 framework developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) [3] to assess health and
120 disability [15]. The PQP was developed for professionals to assess the participation of children
121 with ASD in real-life situations and provide targeted interventions. A reflective model is
122 adopted in the PQP, and a diverse range of indicators is established to capture the overall
123 picture of “participation.” The preliminary PQP items were developed in Japanese and
124 included eight tentative sub-areas based on the International Classification of Functioning,
125 Children, and Youth (ICF-CY) codes related to activity and participation. These sub-domains
126 are communication; mobility; self-care; domestic life; interpersonal interactions and
127 relationships; engagement in play; education; and community, social, and civic life [3]. To
128 evaluate participation in these eight domains, the PQP included both the dimensions of
129 performance and capacity, as defined by the ICF. Furthermore, to facilitate a more
130 comprehensive discussion of participation dimensions during interviews, the initial items
131 incorporated elements such as a child’s enjoyment, frequency of engagement, degree of
132 involvement, and parental aspirations, based on findings from literature reviews [17, 18, 19].
133 This approach was intended to ensure that each item reflects various aspects of participation,
134 ultimately contributing to a comprehensive representation of participation as a whole.

135 Interviews were conducted with experts with at least five years of experience working
136 with children with ASD to validate the questionnaire content. We gathered feedback from

137 four occupational therapists, three researchers in occupational therapy theory, one
138 “participation” researcher, one physician, one speech and hearing therapist, one clinical
139 psychologist, one certified social worker, one childcare worker, and one physical therapist.
140 All participants had clinical experience in Japan. Based on their input, a 51-item draft of the
141 questionnaire was developed (Table 1). Response options were set on a 5-point scale: “agree”
142 (5 points), “somewhat agree” (4 points), “undecided” (3 points), “somewhat disagree” (2
143 points), and “disagree” (1 point). The total score was calculated by summing the scores for
144 each item. The target population for the PQP is preschool-aged ASD children with an
145 intelligence quotient (IQ) of 50 or higher who have no comorbidities other than
146 neurodevelopmental disorders [20]. Although the PQP’s target age range was 48–72 months,
147 in this study, the items were modified to verify the content validity when the target age range
148 was expanded to 36–83 months.

149 *Participants*

150 Eight participants were included in the first phase of this study: three “participation”
151 researchers, one occupational therapist, one speech–language–hearing therapist, one clinical
152 psychologist, one certified social worker, and one childcare worker. The inclusion criteria for
153 selecting the participation researchers were that they had published peer-reviewed articles
154 that included the word “participation” in the ICF. Regarding the other professionals, selection
155 was based on them having had at least five years of experience working with children with

156 ASD in their practice. Using a convenience sampling method, participants were approached
157 by e-mail or telephone and informed in advance of the study's content, purpose, and
158 significance. Of the participants, a total of four were working at universities or other
159 educational/research institutions, one of whom was also working at a clinic, and three were
160 working at child development support facilities or centers, which are typical early support
161 services in Japan. No participant refused to participate in the study. All participants were
162 native Japanese speakers practicing in Japan. Details of participants are presented in Table 2.

163 *Data collection*

164 Individual semi-structured interviews were conducted with each participant using an online
165 conferencing tool. This format was chosen because there was concern that due to using an
166 online conferencing tool, it would not be possible to have smooth communication among
167 participants in interviews with multiple participants, such as focus group interviews. An
168 interview guide was used for the interviews, asking (1) what were the signs that ASD
169 children's participation was facilitated or limited, and (2) whether any items were
170 inappropriate or missing from the draft items developed. The first author (TN), a male
171 occupational therapist from a university rehabilitation department with experience in multiple
172 qualitative studies, conducted the interviews in Japanese. The second author (SK), a female
173 occupational therapist with experience in conducting multiple qualitative studies, was also

174 present in the interviews as an interview assistant. The interviews were recorded and

175 transcribed. The average duration of each interview was 93 minutes.

176 *Data analysis*

177 A qualitative content analysis was employed [21]. The analysis was conducted first, with

178 coding performed independently by the first and second authors. The unit of analysis was

179 defined as “mentions of item validity.” In this study, validity was defined as any of the

180 following, based on the COSMIN definition of quality guidelines for PROMs [16]:

181 (1) “Relevance” indicates the relevance of the construct being measured (participation),

182 the target population (young children with ASD), the context of use (support for

183 children with ASD), and the appropriateness of the response options and recall

184 period.

185 (2) “Comprehensiveness” indicates the coverage of important concepts for measuring

186 constructs (participation).

187 (3) “Comprehensibility” indicates that respondents have an adequate understanding of

188 the instructions, items, and response options, and that the items are adequately

189 represented.

190 After each interview, the first and second authors searched the transcripts

191 independently for statements regarding item validity. The statement context was checked to

192 determine whether the statement made a clear reference to the question items. For unclear or

193 ambiguous references, we used the context before and after the statement as a basis for
194 judgment. Next, we determined which item the statement referred to, and assigned an item
195 number to the statement. When a statement referred to more than one question item, multiple
196 codes were extracted from the statement. For example, if a statement referred to both Items 1
197 and 2, two codes corresponding to each item were extracted. Furthermore, statements that did
198 not refer to a specific item but were related to the questionnaire’s validity, such as those
199 suggesting a lack of items or a need to modify the instructions or questionnaire design, were
200 labeled with the code “other” and extracted. Each code was then deductively labeled for
201 relevance, comprehensiveness, or comprehensibility, based on the aforementioned definition
202 of validity. Finally, these codes were tied to the corresponding item number and participant. For
203 example, a reference to the comprehensibility of the 10th item in the first interview was labeled
204 “1-10-Comprehensibility;” two references to the missing item in the second interview were
205 labeled “2-Other 1-Comprehensiveness” and “2-Other 2-Comprehensiveness.”

206 After completing the coding, the first and second authors shared their analyses,
207 discussed any discrepancies, and finalized the codes. Following the coding decisions, the two
208 authors read the statements in the generated code; decided whether to modify, delete, or add
209 items (or directives or layouts); and created a draft of revised items. During this process, items
210 from existing scales were sometimes referenced [22, 23]. When new items were modified or

211 added, they were identified as either activity or participation codes with reference to the
212 ICF-CY. This item draft was used in the subsequent round of interviews.

213 After the interviews were completed, both the first and second authors inductively
214 categorized the codes. These categories grouped the reasons that modifications were deemed
215 necessary, as indicated in the responses. The analysis was conducted separately for codes
216 related to appropriateness and comprehensibility.

217 *Validation by caregivers*

218 *Questionnaire design*

219 The draft PQP items as modified in the first phase were used.

220 *Participants*

221 This study was conducted with participants who were caregivers of children with ASD.
222 Inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) Participants were caregivers of preschool children aged
223 36–83 months and with a diagnosis of ASD, (2) the children had no comorbid diagnoses other
224 than neurodevelopmental disorders in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental
225 Disorders, Fifth Edition, and (3) the children had an IQ of 50 or higher. During study
226 recruitment, the authors requested referrals from child development support centers and
227 medical institutions in Japan and approached participants by e-mail and telephone. All
228 participants provided oral and written informed consent. No one refused to participate.
229 Participants were selected to cover variables such as the child's sex, age in months, comorbid

230 diagnoses, IQ, region of residence, family structure, the caregiver’s sex, and employment
231 status. Specifically, we collected these variables based on reports from caregivers, and when
232 recruiting new participants, we continued to recruit participants in categories that had not yet
233 appeared in one or more variables. The final total number of participants was 11. Details of
234 the participants are presented in Table 3.

235 *Data collection*

236 Cognitive and semi-structured interviews were conducted using an online conferencing tool.
237 The interviews were conducted in Japanese by the first author (TN), who received two
238 months of training in cognitive interviewing. In the cognitive interviews, participants were
239 asked to use the “think-aloud method” in combination with the “verbal probing method” [24].
240 Specifically, the think-aloud method was used for each item in each section of the PQP: “First,
241 please describe your child’s condition;” “Next, please describe your feelings;” and “Finally,
242 please describe your child’s feelings.” If the first author (TN) felt that there was a need for
243 further questions, additional open-ended questions were asked (e.g., “You mentioned that it
244 was difficult to make a judgment, but what specifically was difficult for you?”). In addition, a
245 semi-structured interview was conducted after the cognitive interview. To ensure that the
246 items for understanding participation were covered and that no inappropriate items were
247 included, participants were asked (1) whether the items covered aspects important to the lives
248 of the participants’ children and their families; and (2) whether the drafted items were

249 irrelevant, inappropriate, or offensive to their daily lives. The second author (SK) was also
250 present during the interviews as an interview assistant. The interviews were recorded and
251 transcribed, and either the first or second author took notes for reference in the analysis. In
252 the analysis, participants who needed revisions for any item underwent a second interview to
253 determine if the issues were resolved by the modifications. Data collection was concluded
254 after the interviews with Participant 11, who followed three consecutive participants who did
255 not mention needing revisions, indicating that data saturation had been reached. The average
256 duration of each interview was 33 minutes.

257 *Data analysis*

258 The same analysis was performed as in Phase 1.

259 **Results**

260 *Content validation by experts*

261 A total of 120 changes were made to the proposed PQP questions, reducing the final number of
262 questions from 51 to 35. The changes comprised 80 modified questions, 28 deleted questions,
263 and 12 added questions. The sub-domain most frequently reported was “education,” (35 times;
264 29.2%), followed by “self-care” (23 times; 19.2%), “interpersonal interaction and relationships”
265 (15 times; 12.5%), “community, social and civic life” (14 times; 11.7%), “engagement in play”
266 (13 times; 10.8%), “domestic life” (8 times; 6.7%), “communication” (7 times; 5.8%), and
267 “mobility” (4 times; 3.3%). One modification (0.8%) was also made to the overall design of the

268 questionnaire. Table 2 shows the number of occurrences of the relevance, comprehensiveness,
269 and comprehensibility codes in each interview.

270 *Relevance*

271 There were 30 relevance codes, accounting for 25% of all codes. When the relevance codes
272 were inductively categorized according to their reasons, the most frequently mentioned code
273 was “clarifying the difference between activity and participation” (n = 17, 56.7%).

274 Approximately 82.4% of these codes were attributed to Participant 1 (a “participation”
275 researcher). It was ascertained that all questions within the communication and mobility
276 domains pertained more to activity than participation, leading to the deletion of these two
277 domains. Additionally, Participant 1 referenced “clarifying the difference between
278 environment and participation” (n = 5) 16.7% of times.

279 I think the sub-domain of communication often asks about skills, so, well, if you ask if
280 it’s about participation, I will say it’s not really. (Participant 1)

281 In addition, “the meaning of the question changes depending on the context” (n = 7)
282 was mentioned by Participants 2 (“participation” researcher) and 3 (speech–language–hearing
283 therapist), accounting for 23.3% of the total. Another code, which indicated items that
284 highlighted caregivers’ concerns, was identified: “raises concerns among caregivers.” Codes
285 for appropriateness appeared in 93.3% of the total responses from Participant 3, after which
286 only two codes appeared from Participant 7.

287 *Comprehensiveness*

288 There were 14 codes for comprehensiveness, accounting for 11.7% of all codes. Half of the
289 codes (n = 7) were situated within the education domain.

290 I think it's important for children of the same age to have opportunities; for example, to
291 get together in a group like during a music festival or a play or a Christmas party and
292 enjoy the atmosphere. Whether it's possible to share time and place ... I feel like this is
293 something important for participation. (Participant 5)

294 In response, a new item was added in the education domain: "Has opportunities to
295 enjoy reading with children of the same age" (later revised to "Enjoys class activities in
296 cooperation with children of the same age").

297 *Comprehensibility*

298 There were 76 comprehensibility codes, accounting for 63.3% of all codes. Comprehensibility
299 codes were inductively classified as "question structure is difficult to understand" (n = 41) for
300 46.1%, "topic is unclear" (n = 39) for 43.8%, "answer is difficult to determine" (n = 8) for 9.0%,
301 and "instructions are difficult to understand" (n = 1) for 1.1% (13 codes were overlapped into
302 two classifications). In particular, in the interview with Participant 2, it was suggested that the
303 items, which had been categorized into eight domains according to the ICF activity and
304 participation codes, be presented in the following three question formats: "answer the

305 following questions about your child,” “describe how you feel,” and “answer the question
306 about your child’s feelings.”

307 The subjects have been repeatedly “this child is” and “you are.” This item comprises
308 two types of questions: “A question to answer about the child as understood from the
309 mother’s perspective” and “A question for the mother to speculate from the child’s
310 perspective.” We must consider that changing the subject requires effort for people with
311 tendencies of neurodevelopmental disorders, and it could be burdensome for them to
312 answer. (Participant 2)

313 With this change, the items that had been arranged as eight domains were rearranged
314 into the three question formats described above.

315 *Content validation by caregivers*

316 A total of 49 changes were made to the PQP items, resulting in the final number of questions
317 changing from 35 to 36. There were 48 modifications, zero deletions, and one addition.

318 Interpersonal interaction and relationships were modified 20 times (40.8%); education, 13
319 times (26.5%); engagement in play, eight times (16.3%); community, social, and civic life, four
320 times (8.2%); self-care, two times (4.1%); and modifications regarding response options, two
321 times (4.1%). No modifications were made to “domestic life.” The number of occurrences of
322 the relevance, comprehensiveness, and comprehensibility codes in each interview is shown in
323 Table 3; and the revised items, after the interviews were completed, are shown in Table 4.

324 *Relevance*

325 No issues of relevance were reported in the interviews. All participants stated that the items
326 were relevant to the child, and the questions were not deemed sensitive for respondents to
327 answer.

328 *Comprehensiveness*

329 Only one code for comprehensiveness was reported, accounting for 2.1% of the total. A mother
330 of a child within the highest quartile for age in the study noted that there were few questions
331 about relationships with friends, commenting:

332 "I have no problem changing clothes and daily habits, and I am worried about what is
333 going on with their friends, so I thought it would be okay if I had some more questions
334 like that." (Participant 3)

335 A new item—"Has close friends (talks a lot, plays together a lot, etc.)"—was added in
336 response.

337 *Comprehensibility*

338 Regarding comprehensibility, there were 48 references to question ambiguity and misleading
339 item order, accounting for 98.0% of the total. The codes were inductively categorized as
340 follows: "topic is unclear" (41.7%, n = 20), "question is difficult to recall" (18.8%, n = 9),
341 "answer is difficult to determine" (16.7%, n = 8), "question structure is difficult to understand"
342 (8.3%, n = 4), and "others" (14.9%, n = 7). The "others" included the content of the instructions,

343 the order in which the items were presented, and the placement of the response options
344 (applicable options on the left and non-applicable options on the right). For example, although
345 Participant 6 talked about her child’s challenging behavior at mealtime in the semi-structured
346 interview, she answered “agree” to the item “family time seems to be fun.” However, when she
347 was probed by the interviewer about whether she rarely had fun during family time, she replied
348 as follows.

349 When he doesn’t get his way, there are quite a few times when he gets angry ... But the
350 joyful look on my child’s face is quite impressionable to me, so I ended up choosing
351 “agree” for this question. (Participant 6)

352 This item was judged to be a “question difficult to recall” and was revised to “always
353 appears to enjoy his time with his family.”

354 **Discussion**

355 *PQP item development and characteristics*

356 This study aimed to extend the age range targeted by the PQP and to develop new items
357 suitable for a broader spectrum of children. The newly developed PQP items offer three
358 primary advantages. First, they enable the comprehensive collection of participation data
359 through a questionnaire, which is essential. The PQP was validated for its relevance,
360 comprehensiveness, and comprehensibility based on interviews with eight experts and eleven
361 caregivers of children with ASD until data saturation was achieved. Looking forward, if the

362 development of this scale is completed and it allows for assessing comprehensive participation
363 without requiring trained professionals, it could greatly improve the feasibility of conducting
364 large-scale surveys. Additionally, this could establish a foundation for gathering evidence
365 about the participation of children with ASD.

366 Second, the newly developed items reflect the perspectives of both professionals and
367 caregivers, highlighting the key challenges faced by children with ASD, such as difficulties
368 performing activities of daily living and accessing specialized services [2]. Disability-specific
369 measurement tools may be better suited to capture the information required for intervention
370 and monitor intervention effectiveness than generic instruments [8, 25]. The PQP could,
371 therefore, be a useful tool for occupational therapists to assess and monitor the participation of
372 children with ASD during interventions.

373 Third, this tool facilitates the assessment of a wider age range of children with ASD
374 than the previous PQP items enabled. The need for early intervention for children with ASD
375 has been widely recognized, and intervention implemented from infancy is becoming more
376 common in high-income countries [2]. Therefore, the PQP's expanded age range increases its
377 accessibility for practical use. It could also contribute to the feasibility of research on the early
378 childhood participation of children with ASD, such as by enabling longer-term longitudinal
379 studies.

380 ***Limitations and future research directions***

381 The development of measurement tools requires item development, scale development,
382 and the verification of reliability and validity [26]. To make the PQP usable in practice and
383 research, these steps must be implemented in the future. Particularly, the selection of
384 questionnaire items will require item reduction analysis for scale development, and the
385 validation of content validity needs to be conducted separately after scale development.
386 COSMIN recommends validating content validity using qualitative research and also
387 recommends the use of quantitative approaches such as the Delphi method alongside the
388 qualitative methods as beneficial [16].

389 This study has some limitations. Between 2020 and 2021, when the data were collected,
390 many municipalities in Japan implemented travel restrictions owing to the COVID-19
391 pandemic [27]. This could have limited many people's diversity of events and travel-related
392 items. To address this issue, it may be useful to reexamine the content validity of the data by
393 comparing it with data collected during the non-pandemic period. In addition, the data
394 collected from caregivers included only participants who used child development support
395 services and medical institutions. Therefore, the participation status of children who did not use
396 these services may not have been adequately assessed. In future studies, it will be important to
397 assess the applicability of the PQP to children who do not use these services. This would enable
398 confirmation that the PQP adequately reflects the participation status of all children with ASD.
399 Finally, the content of the newly developed PQP items was validated only in the unique cultural

400 and institutional environment of Japan. Cross-cultural validation is required to use the PQP in
401 countries other than Japan.

402 **Conclusion**

403 This study expands the target age range of the PQP—a disability-specific participation
404 measurement tool for children with ASD—to 38–83 months and develops new items. The
405 updated version of the PQP has two unique features: (1) it provides a comprehensive
406 assessment of participation in a questionnaire format, and (2) it includes items specific to the
407 challenges faced by children with ASD.

408

409 **Acknowledgments:** The authors express their gratitude to medRxiv for hosting our initial
410 findings, available at <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.08.22.23294206v1>. We
411 also thank Erik and Satomi Phillips for their assistance with the English translation of the
412 items.

413 **Funding Details:** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the
414 public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

415 **Disclosure Statement:** The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest or financial
416 ties to disclose.

417 **Data Availability Statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available
418 upon reasonable request but are not publicly accessible due to privacy or confidentiality
419 concerns.

420 References

- 421 1. American Psychiatric Association. "Neurodevelopmental disorders" In *Diagnostic*
422 *and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (2022).
423 [https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787.x01_Neurodevelopmental Disord](https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787.x01_Neurodevelopmental_Disorders)
424 [ers](https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787.x01_Neurodevelopmental_Disorders)
- 425 2. Catherine Lord, Tony Charman, Alexandra Havdahl, Paul Carbone, Evdokia
426 Anagnostou, Brian Boyd, Themba Carr, Petrus J de Vries, Cheryl Dissanayake and
427 Gauri Divan, "The Lancet Commission on the future of care and clinical research in
428 autism." *Lancet* 399 No. 10321 (2022): 271–334,
429 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)01541-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01541-5).
- 430 3. World Health Organization. International classification of functioning, disability, and
431 health: Children and youth version: ICF-CY (World Health Organization, 2007)
- 432 4. Cheryl Boop, Susan M. Cahill, Charlotte Davis, Julie Dorsey, Varleisha Gibbs and
433 Brian Herr, "Occupational therapy practice framework: Domain and process fourth
434 edition," *American Journal of Occupational Therapy* 74 Suppl. 2 (2020): 1–85.
- 435 5. Sorayya Askari, Dana Anaby, Melanie Bergthorson, Annette Majnemer, Mayada
436 Elsabbagh and Lonnie Zwaigenbaum, "Participation of children and youth with
437 autism spectrum disorder: A scoping review," *Review Journal of Autism and*
438 *Developmental Disorders* 2 No. 1 (2015): 103–114,
439 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40489-014-0040-7>.
- 440 6. Patti LaVesser and Christine Berg, "Participation patterns in preschool children with
441 an autism spectrum disorder," *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health* 31 No. 1
442 (2011): 33–39, <https://doi.org/10.3928/15394492-20100823-01>.
- 443 7. Verónica Schiariti, Soheil Mahdi, and Sven Bölte, "International classification of
444 functioning, disability and health core sets for cerebral palsy, autism spectrum
445 disorder, and attention-deficit-hyperactivity disorder," *Developmental Medicine and*
446 *Child Neurology* 60 No. 9 (2018): 933–941, <https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.13922>.
- 447 8. Tamara Yee, Joyce Magill-Evans, Lonnie Zwaigenbaum, Lori-Ann R. Sacrey, Sorayya
448 Askari and Dana Anaby, "Participation measures for preschool children with autism
449 spectrum disorder: A scoping review," *Review Journal of Autism and Developmental*
450 *Disorders* 4 No. 2 (2017): 132–141, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40489-017-0102-8>
- 451 9. Costi, Stefania, Maria Cristina Filippi, Luca Braglia, Laura Beccani, Isabella Corradi,
452 Elena Bruzzi, Chiara Signorelli, and Elisa Pelosin. "Reliability and construct validity
453 of the activities scale for kids in Italian children with cerebral palsy." *Disability and*
454 *rehabilitation* 44, no. 21 (2022): 6445-6451.
455 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2021.1966519>
- 456 10. Mulcahey, M. J., Christina C. Thielen, Mary D. Slavin, Pengsheng Ni, and Alan M.

- 457 Jette. "Pediatric measure of participation short forms version 2.0: development and
458 evaluation." *Spinal Cord* 59, no. 11 (2021): 1146-1154.
459 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41393-021-00625-5>
- 460 11. Susana Castro and Ana Pinto, "Matrix for assessment of activities and participation:
461 Measuring functioning beyond diagnosis in young children with disabilities,"
462 *Developmental Neurorehabilitation* 18 No. 3 (2015): 177-189,
463 <https://doi.org/10.3109/17518423.2013.806963>.
- 464 12. Anat Golos, Sophi Chapani Itkin and Hadas Ben-Zur, "The structured preschool
465 participation observation (SPO) for children with ASD: Adaptation, initial
466 psychometric properties, and children's participation," *Physical and Occupational
467 Therapy in Pediatrics* 42 No. 2 (2022): 198-214,
468 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01942638.2021.1968096>.
- 469 13. Liya Li, Berit Møller Christensen, Marita Falkmer, Yue Zhao and Karina Huus,
470 "Content validity of the instrument 'Picture My Participation' for measuring
471 participation of children with and without autism spectrum disorder in mainland
472 China," *Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy* 30 No. 8 (2023): 1237-1247,
473 <https://doi.org/10.1080/11038128.2023.2220911>.
- 474 14. Kathleen N. Lohr and Bradley J. Zebrack, "Using patient-reported outcomes in
475 clinical practice: Challenges and opportunities," *Quality of Life Research* 18 No. 1
476 (2009): 99-107, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-008-9413-7>.
- 477 15. Takuto Nakamura, Sakumi Koyama, Hirofumi Nagayama and Satoshi Sasada,
478 "Development and content validation of a participation measurement questionnaire
479 for young children with autism spectrum disorder," *Japanese Journal of Occupational
480 Therapy Research* 25 No. 1 (2022): 7-14.
- 481 16. Caroline B Terwee, Cecilia AC Prinsen, Alessandro Chiarotto, Henrica CW de Vet,
482 Lex M Bouter, Jordi Alonso, Marjan J Westerman, Donald L Patrick and Lidwine B
483 Mokkink, *COSMIN methodology for assessing the content validity of PROMs-user
484 manual* (VU University Medical Center, 2018)
- 485 17. Gary M. Bedell, Mary A. Khetani, Martha A. Cousins, Wendy J. Coster, and Mary C.
486 Law, "Parent perspectives to inform development of measures of children's
487 participation and environment," *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 92
488 No. 5 (2011): 765-773, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2010.12.029>
- 489 18. Wendy Coster and Mary Alunkal Khetani, "Measuring participation of children with
490 disabilities: Issues and challenges," *Disability and Rehabilitation* 30 No. 8 (2008):
491 639-648, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280701400375>.
- 492 19. Christine Imms, Brooke Adair, Deb Keen, Anna Ullenhag, Peter Rosenbaum and Mats
493 Granlund, "'Participation': a systematic review of language, definitions, and
494 constructs used in intervention research with children with disabilities,"

- 495 *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology* 58 No. 1 (2016): 29–38,
496 <https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.12932>.
- 497 20. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental*
498 *disorders: DSM-5 (Vol. 5)* (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)
- 499 21. Klaus Krippendorff, *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (Sage
500 Publications, 2018).
- 501 22. Toyojiro Matsuishi, Miki Nagano, Yuko Araki, Yoshiyuki Tanaka, Mizue Iwasaki,
502 Yushiro Yamashita, Schinichiro Nagamitsu, Chiho Iizuka, Takashi Ohya, Kunihiko
503 Shibuya et al., “Scale properties of the Japanese version of the Strengths and
504 Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ): A study of infant and school children in community
505 samples,” *Brain and Development* 30 No. 6 (2008): 410–415,
506 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.braindev.2007.12.003>.
- 507 23. Sara S. Sparrow, David A. Balla, Domenic V. Cicchetti and Edgar A. Doll,
508 *Vineland-II: Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales;[VABS]; Survey Forms manual; a*
509 *revision of the Vineland Social Maturity Scale* (NCS Pearson, 2005)
- 510 24. Paul C. Beatty and Gordon B. Willis, “Research synthesis: The practice of cognitive
511 interviewing,” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 71 No. 2 (2007): 287–311,
512 <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfm006>.
- 513 25. R. Fitzpatrick, C. Davey, M. J. Buxton and D. R. Jones, “Evaluating patient-based
514 outcome measures for use in clinical trials.” *Health Technology Assessment* 2 No. 14
515 (1998): i–iv, 1–74. <https://doi.org/10.3310/hta2140>.
- 516 26. Lidwine Mookink, Cecilia Prinsen, Donald Patrick, Jordi Alonso, Lex Bouter, Henrica
517 de Vet and Caroline Terwee, “COSMIN methodology for systematic reviews of
518 patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs)”, 2018,
519 [https://cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_](https://cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018.pdf)
520 [version-1_feb-2018.pdf](https://cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018.pdf)
- 521 27. Maskari Machida, Itaru Nakamura, Takako Kojima, Reiko Saito, Tomoki Nakaya,
522 Tomoya Hanibuchi, Tomoko Takamiya, Yuko Odagiri, Noritoshi Fukushima, Hiroyuki
523 Kikuchi, et al., “Acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine in Japan during the COVID-19
524 pandemic.” *Vaccines* 9 No. 3 (2021): 210, <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9030210>.
- 525

526 **Tables**

527 Table 1. The Participation Questionnaire for Preschoolers: preliminary items and subdomains

■ The first question is about your child's self-care and health

1. The child tries to take care of himself/herself (dressing, eating, etc.)
 2. The child has difficulty completing his/her daily routine (becomes distracted while eating, starts something else while getting dressed, etc.)
 3. The child does not like to be well-groomed (is reluctant to wear certain clothing, wash hair, brush teeth, etc.)
 4. The child has a sound he/she does not like (vacuum cleaner noise, sibling crying, sirens, etc.)
 5. The child is easily fatigued
 6. You are worried about the child's diet
 7. You are worried about the child's defecation
 8. You are worried about the child's sleep
 9. You are having trouble teaching the child to take care of himself/herself (excretion, changing clothes, eating, etc.)
 10. You have a family member who will help you care for the child
 11. You have availed a service to take care of the child, which provides you with peace of mind (nursery school, babysitting, etc.)
-

12. You are having difficulty in getting the child to seek medical attention or treatment

■ The following questions are about your child's domestic life

13. The child tries to clean up (toys, drawing materials, etc.)

14. You are glad that the child is willing to help others (carries dishes, throws away garbage, etc.)

■ The next questions are about mobility

15. The child is capable of running smoothly and has no issues with changing speed and direction

16. You feel unsafe when walking outdoors with the child (e.g., he/she jumps out into the road)

17. You have difficulties when you are out with the child (he/she goes away on his/her own, does not try to walk by himself/herself, etc.)

18. You do not have access to necessary public transportation with the child (bus, train, plane, etc.)

■ The following questions are about play:

19. The child is able to spend time playing by himself/herself

20. The child has opportunities for active physical play

21. The child is able to have a good time with his/her friends

22. The child is able to participate in play with rules

23. The child has a safe place to play

24. You do not enjoy playing with the child

25. You do not have many places to have fun with the child (park, children's center, etc.)

■ The following questions are about education at home and in preschools and kindergartens:

26. The child obediently listens to adults

27. The child is not able to follow the teacher's instructions to complete the task

28. The child is active in physical activities (running, gymnastics, dancing, etc.)

29. The child is actively involved in creative activities (drawing, clay, crafts, etc.)

30. The child tries to use a tool that he/she has never used before (pencil, jump rope, cleaning supplies, etc.)

31. The child sometimes does not want to go to educational places (kindergarten, preschool, etc.)

32. You want to use medical and welfare services for children with disabilities, but you cannot

33. You are always anxious when you think about the child's future

■ The following questions are about recreational and cultural activities:

34. The child can enjoy outings with the family (eating out, amusement parks, etc.)

35. You have difficulty traveling with the child on overnight stays

36. You have difficulty taking the child to a family gathering (Buddhist memorial service, New Year's Day, etc.)

37. You do not have the financial means to enjoy holidays with the child

■ The following questions are about interpersonal relationships:

38. The child does something that others may find offensive

39. The child enjoys spending time with family

40. The child has many troubles with other children (friends, siblings, etc.)

41. The child has a particularly close friend

42. The child has adults, other than his parents, who appreciate his/her good qualities (grandparents, teachers, etc.)

43. The child has people in the community who are willing to be involved with him/her (e.g., mother's friends)

44. You sometimes do not enjoy spending time with the child

■ The last questions are about communication

45. The child reacts when a friend calls him/her

46. The child understands and acts on words and gestures of encouragement (continues activity, smiles, etc.)

47. The child helps others in need (offers a hand to a child who has fallen, picks up

something that has fallen, etc.)

48. The child knows his/her written name

49. The child can communicate refusals to the family (not wanting to go, not wanting to drink, etc.)

50. The child can answer in spoken words when asked

51. You can understand what the child is trying to say

528 Each item was written in Japanese and translated into English by three reviewers. One reviewer
529 was a native English-speaking staff member of the thesis editing company, one was a native
530 English-speaking American, and one was a native Japanese speaker who had lived in the USA
531 for more than 20 years.

532 Items 2–9, 12, 16–18, 24, 25, 27, 31–33, 35–38, 40, and 44 were reverse-scored.

Table 2. Demographics of the expert participants involved in content validation and the number of codes that appeared

| Participant | Sex | Profession | Practical experience | Facility | Relevance | Comprehensiveness | Comprehensibility |
|-------------|--------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Male | “Participation” researcher | None | Professional school | 19 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | Female | “Participation” researcher | 21-30 years | University/clinic | 5 | 4 | 29 |
| 3 | Female | Speech–language–hearing therapist | 5-10 years | Clinic/child development support center | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 4 | Female | Clinical psychologist | 11-20 years | Clinic/child development support center | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5 | Male | Certified social worker | 21-30 years | University | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 6 | Female | Childcare worker | 11-20 years | Child development support center | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 7 | Male | Occupational therapist | 11-20 years | University | 2 | 3 | 15 |
| 8 | Male | “Participation” researcher | 21-30 years | University | 0 | 1 | 10 |

Practical experience was defined as the time spent working with children with ASD. Among the “participation” researchers,

Participants 2 and 8 were researchers who also had experience supporting children with ASD. Participants 5 and 7 belonged to a research institute and had experience in ASD research. The other participants worked at medical institutions or welfare facilities related to supporting children with ASD.

Table 3. Demographics of caregivers involved in content validation

| Participant | Relationship | Child's sex | Child's age (months) | Comorbid diagnosis | IQ | Residential areas | Relevance (1st/2nd) | Comprehensiveness (1st/2nd) | Comprehensibility (1st/2nd) |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Mother | Female | 36-41 | NONE | SI | Big city A | 0/0 | 0/0 | 9/2 |
| 2 | Father | Male | 65-71 | NONE | SI | Big city A | 0/0 | 0/0 | 1/1 |
| 3 | Mother | Male | 65-71 | NONE | SI | Big city A | 0/0 | 1/0 | 3/0 |
| 4 | Mother | Male | 65-71 | NONE | BI | Big city B | 0/0 | 0/0 | 4/0 |
| 5 | Mother | Male | 54-59 | ADHD | SI | Town C | 0/0 | 0/0 | 2/0 |
| 6 | Mother | Male | 65-71 | NONE | ID | Big city D | 0/0 | 0/0 | 1/15 |
| 7 | Mother | Male | 54-59 | NONE | ID | Town E | 0/0 | 0/0 | 7/0 |
| 8 | Mother | Male | 48-53 | NONE | Sup | City F | 0/0 | 0/0 | 1/1 |
| 9 | Mother | Male | 60-65 | ID | ID | City G | 0/NA | 0/NA | 0/NA |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|--------|-------|------|----|------------|------|------|------|
| 10 | Mother | Male | 60-65 | DCD | SI | Big city H | 0/NA | 0/NA | 0/NA |
| 11 | Mother | Female | 70-77 | ADHD | ID | Town I | 0/NA | 0/NA | 0/NA |

ADHD, Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder; DCD, Developmental dyscoordination disorder; ID, Intellectual disability. The results of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children or the Tanaka-Binet Intelligence Scale are used for the intelligence quotient. However, as there is a high correlation between the scores of both intelligence tests and the Kyoto Scale of Psychological Development, the developmental quotient is regarded as the intelligence quotient only in the results of the Kyoto Scale of Psychological Development. On this basis, IQ 50-69 was classified as Intellectual Disability (ID), IQ 70-84 as Borderline intelligence (BI), IQ 85-115 as Standard intelligence (SI), and IQ 116 and above as Superior intelligence (Sup). IQ 116 and above are classified as Superior intelligence. Residential areas are classified into government-designated cities (hereafter referred to as “big city,” indicating municipalities with a population of over 500,000), other cities (hereafter referred to as “city,” indicating municipalities with a population between 50,000 and 500,000), and towns and villages (hereafter referred to as “town,” indicating municipalities with a population of under 50,000), based on the classification of local governments by Japan’s Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications. The same region of residence, including alphabetic characters, means that participants reside in the same municipality.

Participants 2 and 3 were fathers and mothers of the same child.

Table 4. Items after caregivers' content validation and the number of codes for each sub-domain

| ■ First, please answer the following questions about your child: | SC | DOM | IIR | EDU | EIP | CSC | COM | MOB |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Changes clothes by himself/herself | <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | | |
| 2. Finishes getting dressed | <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | | |
| 3. Helps around the home | | <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | |
| 4. Can play alone for more than 15 minutes | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 5. Engages in active physical play | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 6. Plays with friends | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 7. Participates in competitive activities (relay, <i>sugoroku</i> , etc.) | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | | |
| 8. Learns social skills with friends | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | | | |
| 9. Learns how to use school supplies (at home, kindergarten, etc.) | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | | | |
| 10. Enjoys class activities in cooperation with children of the same age | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | | | |

- 11. Has favorite lessons for learning
- 12. Has close friends (talks a lot, plays together a lot, etc.)
- 13. Fights with others of the same age (biting, hitting, etc.)
- 14. Always feels safe with friends
- 15. Has a teacher that he/she likes
- 16. Always has a teacher by his/her side to help develop strengths (kindergarten, lessons, medical care, etc.)
- 17. Has someone, other than his parents, who is always there when he/she needs help
- 18. Plenty of places to go out with family
- 19. Neighbors outside of the immediate family are always nice to him/her
- 20. Opportunities to participate in community gatherings (festivals, children's meetings, etc.)

■ Next, please describe how you feel

SC DOM IIR EDU EIP CSC COM MOB

- 21. Concerned about your child's diet

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|----|-----|-----|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 22. Concerned about your child's defecation | <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| 23. Concerned about your child's sleep | <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| 24. Concerned about changing your child's clothes | <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| 25. Playing with your child can be exhausting | | | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | |
| 26. Suffering from lack of specialized support for children with disabilities (lack of facilities, reluctance to go to facilities, etc.) | | | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | |
| 27. Difficulty in sending your child to preschool or kindergarten | | | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | |
| 28. Time at home with your child is always a pleasure | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | | | | | |
| 29. You can take your child on a trip that involves an overnight stay | | | | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> | |
| 30. You can take your child to a gathering of relatives | | | | | | | | | | <input type="radio"/> |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | | | | |
| ■ Finally, please answer the question about your child's feelings | | SC | DOM | IIR | EDU | EIP | CSC | COM | MOB | |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31. Reluctant to seek medical attention at a hospital | <input type="radio"/> | | | | | | | | | |

Comprehensibility

2 0 19 13 8 3 0 0 3

Each item was written in Japanese and translated into English by three reviewers. One reviewer was a native English-speaking staff member of the thesis editing company, one was a native English-speaking American, and one was a native Japanese speaker who had lived in the USA for more than 20 years.

Abbreviations: SC, Self-care; DOM, Domestic life; IIR, Interpersonal interactions and relationships; EDU, Education; EIP, Engagement in play; CSC, Community, social, and civic life; COM, Communication; MOB, Mobility; OTH, Others.

“☐” indicates the sub-domain to which the item corresponds.

The codes related to “Others” pertain to the change in directives and the change in the placement of items and responses. Items 13, 21–27, and 31 are reverse-scored.