



25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** The first stage of diagnosing autism spectrum disorders usually involves population  
27 screening to detect children at risk. The aim of this study was to develop cut-off points and assess  
28 diagnostic properties for the Polish version of the Communication and Symbolic Behavior Scales-  
29 Developmental Profile – Infant-Toddler Checklist for the possibility of using this questionnaire in  
30 population screening.

31 **Method:** The study was conducted among 602 children from the general population who had  
32 previously participated in the earlier phase of validation of the questionnaire for Polish conditions. The  
33 collected data were statistically processed to calculate the accuracy (i.e. sensitivity, specificity) of the  
34 questionnaire.

35 **Results:** In individual age groups, the sensitivity of the questionnaire varies from 0.667 to 0.750,  
36 specificity from 0.854 to 0.939, positive predictive value from 0.261 to 0.4 and negative predictive  
37 value - from 0.979 to 0.981.

38 **Conclusions:** These results indicate that the Polish version of the Communication and Symbolic  
39 Behavior Scales-Developmental Profile – Infant-Toddler Checklist can be used as an effective tool for  
40 ASD universal screening.

41 **Keywords:** autism spectrum disorder, diagnostic screening programs, primary health care, validation  
42 study, early diagnosis

## 43 Introduction

44 Autism spectrum disorders (ASD) are neurodevelopmental conditions of undetermined and  
45 complex etiology, most often manifested in early childhood, which affect the everyday activities of  
46 individuals and are characterized primarily by difficulties in the sphere of communication and  
47 interpersonal interactions as well as restricted interests or repetitive behaviors [1]. The prevalence of  
48 ASD is not clearly defined – the World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that ASD affects 1 in 160  
49 children worldwide [2]. More recent reports from a systematic review by Zeidan et al. estimate the  
50 worldwide prevalence of ASD as 1 in 100 children [3] at the same time indicating significant variability  
51 in prevalence depending on the country and research assumptions used in individual studies.  
52 According to the only official data from the Polish National Health Fund from 2012, the prevalence rate  
53 of ASD in individuals under the age of 18 in Poland is 3.4 cases per 10,000 children [4], but more  
54 accurate preliminary data from two Polish provinces estimate that ASD occurs in one in 286 children  
55 [5].

56 The first symptoms of ASD usually appear during early child development – prodromal  
57 symptoms may be visible as early as 6 months of age [6,7]. Later in development (from 14 months to 3  
58 years of age) communication and social behavioral symptoms become apparent [8]. It is also possible  
59 that development plateaus after a period when the age-appropriate milestones were achieved or that  
60 the skills acquired earlier are lost [9,10]. It is assumed that a reliable diagnosis of ASD in a child can  
61 be made as early as the 2nd–3rd year of age [11]. However, due to delays associated with the  
62 diagnostic process (or its omission), this diagnosis is made much later – in a world-wide 2019 meta-  
63 analysis, the average age of ASD diagnosis is 60.48 months (range 30.90-234.57) [12].

64 Early diagnosis of ASD enables the initiation of an early, age-adjusted therapy of  
65 developmental delays and difficulties. The younger the child, the better the results of therapy can be  
66 achieved in the area of communication and social interaction, cognitive abilities, speech development,  
67 or behavior appropriate to the situation, which improves the quality of life of people with ASD, reduces  
68 the risk of mental disorders, and significantly reduces the burden of ASD [13–16].

69 Considering this, the American Academy of Pediatrics recommends screening at 18 and 24  
70 months of age as part of primary care during well-child care visits [17]. It appears that the increasing  
71 availability of screening significantly lowered the age of ASD diagnosis in the US, with diagnosis

72 before the age of 4 made in 71% of children (2018) compared to 58% in 2014 [18,19]. On the other  
73 hand, a 2016 report from the US Preventive Services Task Force shows insufficient evidence to  
74 recommend universal ASD screening [20]. However, there is evidence suggesting that including  
75 screening tools in routine medical appointments may result in earlier and more accurate identification  
76 of children who need further help compared to relying solely on clinical impressions, which is  
77 particularly important when care providers are less experienced in diagnosing ASD [21]. Moreover, the  
78 use of public ASD screening may reduce social inequities in terms of the age of diagnosis and access  
79 to further therapeutic activities [22,23]. The conclusions of both reports indicate the need for further  
80 research on screening tools and their effectiveness, as well as on the effectiveness of further  
81 proceedings after screening [24].

82 Due to the lack of tools for early diagnosis of ASD available in Poland, the authors have  
83 prepared a linguistically and culturally adapted version of the Communication and Symbolic Behavior  
84 Scales-Developmental Profile – Infant-Toddler Checklist (CSBS-DP ITC) [25]. CSBS-DP ITC is one of  
85 the available tools created for the early detection of symptoms of autism spectrum disorders. It is a 24-  
86 item questionnaire for parents or caregivers. The included questions are arranged into three  
87 composites (social, speech, and symbolic composite) and seven development predictors (emotion and  
88 eye gaze, communication, gestures, sounds, words, understanding, and object use). CSBS-DP ITC  
89 can be used in universal ASD screening of children aged 6 to 24 months in a primary care setting [26].  
90 The research showed that the result obtained in the questionnaire could confidently predict the level of  
91 language development two years in advance and is an effective tool for the screening of children with  
92 special needs [25–27].

93 In order to conduct a validation study and disseminate knowledge about the research, the  
94 "Spojrzyć w oczy" (Pol. "Look into the eyes") project was established. The project aimed to determine  
95 the psychometric properties (e.g. validity and reliability, sensitivity and specificity) of the Polish version  
96 of the CSBS-DP ITC. The questionnaire was translated using the back translate method by three  
97 independent translators, and the questions included were adjusted to the phonetics of the Polish  
98 language and the speech development of Polish children. A detailed description of the preparation of  
99 the tool for Polish cultural conditions is included in the earlier publication on CSBS-DP ITC validation  
100 [28]. Data from the earlier stage of the project indicate a very good fit of the one-factor and three-factor  
101 models in confirmatory factor analysis. The total score of the Polish version of ITC demonstrated

102 satisfactory internal consistency, Cronbach's  $\alpha = .92$ , and McDonald's  $\omega = .92$ . The stability of the  
103 measurement was confirmed by performing interrater and test-retest reliability analysis, proving  
104 perfect and satisfactory level of stability, respectively.

105 This study aims to further evaluate the sensitivity and specificity of the Polish version of the  
106 CSBS-DP ITC, assess the cut-off points, as well as the predictive convergent validity with the Autism  
107 Spectrum Rating Scales (ASRS) questionnaire, used by psychologists for screening children with  
108 suspected ASD and those at risk of it. Approval from the Bioethics Committee of the Wroclaw Medical  
109 University was obtained to conduct the study (number KB – 641/2020). All procedures were performed  
110 in accordance with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments.

## 111 **Methods**

### 112 Procedure and Participants

113 The participants were children aged 30 months and their parents or caregivers who  
114 participated in the earlier phase of the project by correctly filling in the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire  
115 when children were between 6 and 24 months of age. The condition for inclusion was living in Poland,  
116 speaking Polish as one's primary language, and giving informed, written consent to participate in the  
117 study. Project recruitment began on October 25, 2020 using advertisements placed in collaborating  
118 health care facilities and on social media, and ended on February 18, 2021. During this period,  
119 parents completed the CSBS-DP ITC screening questionnaire. The research phase lasted from April  
120 28, 2021, to October 12, 2022 – until the last child included in the project turned thirty months of age.  
121 As some of the children (N = 34) were awaiting the final diagnosis, their parents were contacted by  
122 phone at a later date. By March 30, 2023, a final diagnosis was obtained in all of them, except one  
123 (due to diagnostic difficulties, it was not possible to unambiguously confirm the presence of autism  
124 spectrum disorders in that particular case). During and after the data collection, only MS and SW had  
125 the opportunity to identify individual study participants - this was to enable the provision of further  
126 psychological and pedagogical assistance and further diagnostics.

127 Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and difficulties in conducting such a study face-to-face in  
128 healthcare clinics, an electronic version of the questionnaire was prepared and made available on the  
129 project's website examining the properties of the tool. Initially, the parents completed the CSBS-DP  
130 ITC questionnaire along with a short record of the mother's and father's age and the child's

131 comorbidities (genetic, hearing and vision disorders, movement disorders, family history), birth weight,  
132 and the week of pregnancy in which the delivery took place. Then, upon a child's turning 30 months of  
133 age, the respective child's parents were contacted again and asked to fill in the ASRS questionnaire  
134 and a short follow-up interview, which included questions about the occurrence of symptoms that were  
135 concerning to the parents and further diagnostics.

136 In the case of suspicion of ASD in a child (understood as a result above ASRS cut-off point or  
137 any persistent concerns parents have about their child's development despite negative screening  
138 using the ASRS), the Autism Diagnosis Observation Schedule-2 (ADOS-2) test was performed to  
139 make it possible to determine with high probability the presence of autism spectrum disorders in  
140 children from the risk group. At each stage during the study, parents were offered the possibility of  
141 carrying out the ADOS-2 test at the research center in Cieszyn, Silesian Voivodeship. However, due to  
142 the distribution of the population throughout the country, the majority of them preferred performing  
143 further diagnostics near their place of residence.

144 Invitations to the follow-up were sent to all 1461 parents of children who were included in the  
145 first phase of the project. A total of 678 submissions were received back, 76 reports were excluded  
146 from the study – 48 of them because parents had not previously participated in CSBS-DP ITC  
147 screening, and in 11 cases siblings were assessed in the follow-up instead of the child who was  
148 screened, and another 17 were repeated submissions. When attempts were made to contact the other  
149 parents via e-mail or telephone (N = 849), as many as 722 of them admitted that they did not complete  
150 the further part of the study due to the lack of symptoms in their children and hence – lack of  
151 willingness to remain in the study. Finally, 602 children were enrolled in the study, whose parents had  
152 fully completed the ASRS questionnaire and follow-up interview, and who had participated in an earlier  
153 CSBS-DP ITC screening, which gives a return rate of 41.2%. The number of participants significantly  
154 exceeds the minimum sample size to have a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of 5% in  
155 the Polish population (the calculated minimum sample size was 139) (Schmidt et al., 2018). The mean  
156 age of the children was 30.21 months. The vast majority of questionnaire forms were filled in by the  
157 children's mothers (N = 601, 99.83%) – only one of them was filled in by a father. The individual  
158 phases of the project and the number of participants at each stage are collected in Figure 1. Sample  
159 characteristics of the study participants are presented in Table 1.

160 **Figure 1**

161 Chart showing the number of study participants at each stage of the Spojrzec w oczy project

162 Fig 1

163 **Note.** ASRS – Autism Spectrum Rating Scales, CSBS-DP ITC - Communication and Symbolic

164 Behavior Scales-Developmental Profile – Infant-Toddler Checklist , DD – developmental delay, LD –

165 language delay.

166 **Table 1**

167 *Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants*

Characteristic	Follow-up	
	<i>n</i>	%
Sex		
Female	248	41.20
Male	354	58.80
Preterm born		
>34 weeks	1	0.16
34-37 weeks	17	2.82
Medical conditions		
Serious genetic disorders	4	0.66
Serious health problems	24	3.99
Sight problems	5	0.83
Hearing problems	4	0.66
Muscle tone or other musculoskeletal system disorders	118	19.60
Physical rehabilitation in the past	240	39.86
ASD in closest family (first degree relatives)	7	1.16

## Place of residence

Village	140	23.25
Town inhabited by less than 20,000 people	54	8.97
City inhabited by 20,000-100,000 people	92	15.28
City inhabited by more than 100.000 people	316	52.49

---

168

## 169 **Evaluation Instruments**

### 170 *Autism Spectrum Rating Scales (ASRS)*

171 ASRS is a set of questionnaires, used as an auxiliary tool in the diagnostic process or a  
172 screening tool, consisting of full and abbreviated versions of tests for younger children (2–5 years) and  
173 older children and adolescents (6–18 years), both for parents and teachers [29]. The ASRS was  
174 developed in 2013 and its structure corresponds to the diagnostic criteria DSM-IV-TR and ICD-10. The  
175 Polish version was prepared in 2016 and is characterized by high reliability in the version for parents  
176 and has a confirmed discriminatory, convergent, and differential validity [30]. Additionally, the Polish  
177 version corresponds to DSM-5 diagnostic criteria. In the study, the short version for younger children  
178 was used, which contains 15 items that best differentiate between children diagnosed with ASD and  
179 the comparative group from the non-clinical population. The analysis of the discriminant function for  
180 raw scores revealed that the indicators of correct classification ranged from 88.2% to 91.4%.  
181 Cronbach's alpha for the ASRS version used in the study is 0.85. Sensitivity and specificity are 87.8%  
182 and 83.5%, respectively.

### 183 *Further Evaluation Instruments*

184 As ASRS is a Level 2 ASD diagnostic tool, parents were asked for additional information to  
185 determine the need for further diagnosis. In order to further evaluate children's development, a short  
186 structured interview (follow-up interview) was created. They were also asked if their child had received  
187 an ASD diagnosis from a psychiatrist (understood as disorders included in the ICD-10 (International  
188 Classification of Diseases 10th-revision) classification as F84.0, F84.1, or F84.5 or in the DSM-5 as  
189 autism spectrum disorder). They were also asked if their child had completed any of the available  
190 standardized diagnostic protocols available in Poland: Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised (ADI-R),



191 Psychoeducational Profile-3rd Edition-PL (PEP-3-PL), or Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule  
192 (ADOS) and what was the result of the conducted examination [31–33]. Information on the diagnostic  
193 provider's credentials and experience was collected when possible to avoid the possible impact of  
194 extraneous variables on the results. A positive response in terms of receiving a nosological diagnosis  
195 of ASD from a psychiatrist or a positive ADOS test result meant qualification to the group of children  
196 diagnosed with ASD. If the child received another diagnosis (e.g. language delay – LD), this was also  
197 recorded in the database used in the study..

## 198 Statistical Analysis

199 All the analyses presented in this manuscript were performed using Statistica 13 and R  
200 software. Due to the wide variation of results in individual age groups (resulting from rapid  
201 development in the age group analyzed) and the insufficient number of participants at a particular age  
202 in months, it was necessary to group the participants into age cohorts gathering children at least  
203 partially at a similar level of psychomotor development. Participants were divided into four groups  
204 based on the substages of Piaget's Sensorimotor Stage theory of cognitive development [34]. The first  
205 group included children aged from 6 to 8 months of age, the second group included children between  
206 9 and 12 months, the third group included children between 13 and 18 months, and the fourth group  
207 included children above 19 months.

208 Because more complex tools are also used during further diagnostics of children with  
209 suspicion of ASD, first it was checked whether there was any correlation between the results achieved  
210 by children in the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire and the shortened version of the ASRS (used as a  
211 Level 2 questionnaire) using the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient method. In addition, since the  
212 children were grouped into four age cohorts, it was checked whether there were any interactions for  
213 the model with the CSBS-DP ITC Total Score explained variable and the Total ASRS and age  
214 explanatory variables. The last aspect that was checked was the relationship between the variables of  
215 the child's age (in months) and the Total Score obtained in the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire. To verify  
216 the linearity, a normality analysis of the residuals of the linear model was performed using the  
217 Kolmogorov–Smirnov and Shapiro–Wilk tests. The tests showed no normality of the residuals in the  
218 model. For this reason, non-parametric methods were used for further analysis.

219 The discriminating ability of CSBS-DP ITC was examined to ensure that it was appropriate for  
220 each age cohort. This was achieved by conducting a receiver operating characteristics (ROC) analysis  
221 for all four age groups. The discriminating ability of the Polish Version of CSBS-DP ITC was  
222 determined by the Area Under the Curve (AUC) statistic. AUC values ranged from 0.5, representing a  
223 random chance efficacy, to 1.0, representing excellent performance in discriminating between the two  
224 conditions [35]. For each of the groups for which the ROC analysis was successful, potential cut-offs  
225 were determined to enable the tool to be used in practice as a clinical guide for further management.  
226 Two different methods were used to determine the cut-offs – the first was the cut-off point at which  
227 maximum sensitivity and specificity were determined using the Youden index, which represents the  
228 overall accuracy of the test [36,37]. Additionally, the minimizing expected costs method was used by  
229 including a “decision threshold” in constructing tangents because potentially classifying a child with  
230 ASD as a healthy individual carries a higher cost (in terms of delay in treatment) than the opposite  
231 mistake (Zweig & Campbell, 1993). We assumed that the weight of these errors (misclassification  
232 costs) increases with the age of the child (and therefore with the delay in diagnosis). It was further  
233 assumed that the costs of misclassification (for children falsely classified as healthy – false negative)  
234 would be measured as 1, 2, 3, and 5, for the respective groups as age increases; values were  
235 adopted arbitrarily.

236 Due to the unclear prevalence of ASD in the Polish population, three different probabilities were  
237 used to determine the cut-off points using the tangent method – random (0.5), declared by WHO for  
238 the world population (1:160) and the probability estimated from the study population (depending on the  
239 number of cases in a given cohort). Thus, a total of twelve ROC curves were created and analyzed,  
240 and the results of these analyses were used to establish the sensitivity and specificity in specific age  
241 groups.

## 242 **Results**

### 243 Correlation between Total scores of ASRS and CSBS-DP ITC

244 To assess predictive accuracy between the earlier CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire result and the  
245 later ASRS, Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient analysis was used. Since the Total Score  
246 achieved in the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire depends on the age of the examined child, it was

247 additionally checked whether the child’s age affects the strength of the relationship between Total  
 248 CSBS-DP ITC scores. Results are presented in Table 2 and Figures 2 and 3.

249 **Table 2**

250 *Spearman correlation values for the total scores obtained by children in the appropriate age groups in*  
 251 *the ASRS, CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire and age when the CSBS-DP ITC was completed (in months).*

Variables	Spearman’s r	t	p
I (6-8 months of age; N = 73)			
Total ASRS score & Total CSBS-DP ITC score	-0.118	-1.000	0.321
Total CSBS-DP ITC score & Age of child	<b>0.389</b>	<b>3.555</b>	<b>0.001</b>
II (9-12 months of age; N = 131)			
Total ASRS score & Total CSBS-DP ITC score	<b>-0.280</b>	<b>-3.315</b>	<b>0.001</b>
Total CSBS-DP ITC score & Age of child	<b>0.510</b>	<b>6.739</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
III (13-18 months of age; N = 242)			
Total ASRS score & Total CSBS-DP ITC score	<b>-0.364</b>	<b>-6.055</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Total CSBS-DP ITC score & Age of child	<b>0.412</b>	<b>7.013</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
IV (19-24 months of age; N = 156)			
Total ASRS score & Total CSBS-DP ITC score	<b>-0.431</b>	<b>-5.921</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Total CSBS-DP ITC score & Age of child	<b>0.160</b>	<b>2.009</b>	<b>0.046</b>

252

253 **Figure 2**

254 *Distribution of children’s Total scores in the CSBS-DP ITC and ASRS questionnaires by children’s*  
 255 *age.*

256 *Fig 2*

257 **Figure 3**

258 *Rank analysis of the distribution of children’s total scores achieved in the CSBS-DP ITC and ASRS*  
 259 *questionnaires in the accepted age groups.*

260 *Fig 3*

261 Statistically significant weak or moderate correlations are present between the total ASRS  
262 score and the total CSBS-DP ITC score in the three oldest age groups. It should be noted that in each  
263 age cohort, there are weak or moderate correlations between the child's age and the total score  
264 obtained in CSBS-DP ITC. It should be borne in mind that these two questionnaires have an opposite  
265 scale – in the CSBS-DP ITC, the higher the score, the lower the risk of ASD in the child, while for the  
266 ASRS the opposite is true, which is clearly visible in Figure 2. The older the children examined, the  
267 more pronounced the inverse relationships between the results achieved in the CSBS-DP ITC  
268 questionnaire and the ASRS. In order to better present this relationship, an analysis was performed for  
269 age groups using ranking (due to the previously mentioned lack of normal distribution of variables).  
270 The results are shown in Figure 3.

271 Sensitivity, specificity of the Polish version of CSBS-DP ITC

272 In order to determine the sensitivity, specificity and other measures of the classification test for  
273 the Polish version of the CSBS-DP ITC, this study used the Youden method of ROC analysis and the  
274 tangential method to minimize the potential costs associated with misclassification. Results of the  
275 analyses and ROC charts for individual age groups using the Youden method are provided in Figures  
276 4a-c and Table 3. Results using the tangential method with different probabilities of ASD occurrence  
277 (random, 1:160, and estimated from the sample) are provided in Table 4. For the group aged 9–12  
278 months, the cost of misclassification of a child with ASD as healthy (false negative) was set as equal  
279 to 2, in the group of 13–18 months – as equal to 3, in the group of 19–24 months – as 5.

280 Due to the small number of ASD cases in the first group (children aged 6 to 8 months), the  
281 ROC analysis in this subgroup could not be performed.

282 **Figure 4a-c**

283 ROC analysis charts in individual age groups using the Youden method.

284 Fig 4a

285 Fig 4b

286 Fig 4c

287 **Table 3**

288 *Values of sensitivity, specificity and other parameters for adopted, best matching cut-off points in given*  
 289 *age groups.*

Total result (Cut-off)	Sensitivity	Specificity	Youden index	Accuracy	PPV	NPV	FPR	FNR	LR(+)	LR (-)
<i>Group II (children aged 9-12 months; N = 131)</i>										
<i>AUC = 0.804; z = 3.664; p &lt; 0.001</i>										
19	0.375	0.911	0.286	0.878	0.214	0.957	0.089	0.625	4.193	0.686
20	0.500	0.894	0.394	0.870	0.235	0.965	0.106	0.500	4.731	0.559
<b>21</b>	<b>0.750</b>	<b>0.862</b>	<b>0.612</b>	<b>0.855</b>	<b>0.261</b>	<b>0.981</b>	<b>0.138</b>	<b>0.250</b>	<b>5.426</b>	<b>0.290</b>
22	0.750	0.821	0.571	0.817	0.214	0.981	0.179	0.250	4.193	0.304
23	0.750	0.780	0.530	0.779	0.182	0.980	0.220	0.250	3.417	0.320
<i>Group III (children aged 13-18 months; N = 242)</i>										
<i>AUC = 0.856; z = 6.941; p &lt; 0.001</i>										
34	0.625	0.898	0.523	0.880	0.303	0.971	0.102	0.375	6.141	0.417
35	0.688	0.872	0.559	0.860	0.275	0.975	0.128	0.313	5.358	0.359
<b>36</b>	<b>0.750</b>	<b>0.854</b>	<b>0.604</b>	<b>0.847</b>	<b>0.267</b>	<b>0.980</b>	<b>0.146</b>	<b>0.250</b>	<b>5.136</b>	<b>0.293</b>
37	0.750	0.823	0.573	0.818	0.231	0.979	0.177	0.250	4.238	0.304
38	0.750	0.757	0.507	0.756	0.179	0.977	0.243	0.250	3.082	0.330
<i>Group IV (children aged 19-24 months; N = 156)</i>										
<i>AUC = 0.782; z = 2.597; p &lt; 0.001</i>										
35	0.444	0.959	0.404	0.929	0.400	0.966	0.041	0.556	10.889	0.579
38	0.556	0.959	0.515	0.936	0.455	0.972	0.041	0.444	13.611	0.463
<b>39</b>	<b>0.667</b>	<b>0.939</b>	<b>0.605</b>	<b>0.923</b>	<b>0.400</b>	<b>0.979</b>	<b>0.061</b>	<b>0.333</b>	<b>10.889</b>	<b>0.355</b>
40	0.667	0.925	0.592	0.910	0.353	0.978	0.075	0.333	8.909	0.360
41	0.667	0.918	0.585	0.904	0.333	0.978	0.082	0.333	8.167	0.363

290 **Note.** Bold values correspond to the cut-off value that has the best predictive parameters according to  
 291 the ROC analysis using the Youden method. Sensitivity – true positive rate; specificity – true negative

292 rate; PPV – positive predictive value (precision); NPV – negative predictive value; FPR – false positive  
293 rate (fall-out rate); FNR – false negative rate (miss rate); LR(+) – positive likelihood ratio; LR(-) –  
294 negative likelihood ratio.

295 **Table 4**

296 *Values of sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, positive and negative values for estimated cut-offs using*  
297 *analysis with minimizing expected costs using different presumed prevalences of ASD in Polish*  
298 *population.*

Presumed prevalence	Estimated cut-off	Sensitivity	Specificity	Accuracy	PPV	NPV
<i>Group II (children aged 9-12 months; N = 131)</i>						
<i>Assumed misclassification cost = 2</i>						
0.5 (random)	21	0.750	0.862	0.855	0.261	0.981
1:160	12	0.125	1.000	0.947	1.000	0.946
estimated from the sample	14	0.250	0.984	0.939	0.500	0.953
<i>Group III (children aged 13-18 months; N = 242)</i>						
<i>Assumed misclassification cost = 3</i>						
0.5 (random)	44	1.000	0.376	0.417	0.102	1.000
1:160	18	0.188	1.000	0.946	1.000	0.946
estimated from the sample	30	0.563	0.951	0.926	0.450	0.968
<i>Group IV (children aged 19-24 months; N = 156)</i>						
<i>Assumed misclassification cost = 5</i>						
0.5 (random)	54	1.000	0.109	0.160	0.064	1.000
1:160	30	0.111	0.993	0.942	0.500	0.948
estimated from the sample	39	0.667	0.939	0.923	0.400	0.979

299

300 The highest sensitivity and specificity values were achieved using the Youden method and  
301 cut-offs did not change depending on the assumed probability of ASD occurrence. In the case of using  
302 the tangential method, the adopted cut-offs significantly differed depending on the assumed probability  
303 of ASD occurrence in the Polish population and they were usually characterized by lower accuracy or

304 a significant disproportion between sensitivity and specificity in favor of one of these parameters.  
305 Moreover, adopting cut-offs determined using this method may be too volatile (e.g., 30 or 54 points in  
306 group 19–24 months of age), which is also probably due to the small number of cases of children  
307 diagnosed with ASD in the sample.

308

309           Among all performed ROC analyses, the area under the curve (AUC) index ranged from  
310 0.782 to 0.856, which is a value allowing for the classification ability for the CSBS-DP ITC to be  
311 considered as at least above moderate. Among children in the age group of 9–12 months, a cut-off of  
312 21 points was adopted, allowing for a sensitivity of 0.750 and a specificity of 0.862 with a Youden  
313 index of 0.612; in the age group of 13–18 months, a cut-off of 36 points was adopted, giving a  
314 sensitivity of 0.750 and a specificity of 0.854 with a Youden index of 0.604, and in the group of 19–24  
315 months – a cut-off of 39 points, giving a sensitivity of 0.667 and specificity of 0.939 with a Youden  
316 index of 0.605.

317           Due to the size of the groups, analyzes of the CSBS-DP ITC subscales (Social, Speech,  
318 Symbolic components) using ROC curves did not allow for clear cut-off points for children. For this  
319 reason, if it is necessary to use subscales to determine a child's risk, we suggest using the method  
320 used in the original version of the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire (i.e. 1.25 SD below the mean score in  
321 the study population). Raw results and cut-off thresholds for this method were described in a previous  
322 publication on the Polish version of CSBS-DP ITC [28].

323

324

## 325 **Discussion**

326           The aim of this study was to determine the final psychometric values of the Polish version of  
327 the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire as part of the nationwide project. The questionnaire enables testing  
328 children for developmental disorders from the age of 6 months, which is a distinctive feature of this  
329 study - previous studies on other diagnostic tools e.g. Modified-Checklist for Autism in Toddlers  
330 (Revised) (M-CHAT-R/F), Brief Infant Toddler Social Emotional Assessment (BITSEA), First Year  
331 Inventory (FYI) or Quantitative Checklist for Autism in Toddlers (Q-CHAT) were focused on older  
332 children [38–41]. In addition to the CSBS-DP ITC, the only screening questionnaire designed to be  
333 completed by parents (rather than trained observers) for children aged 6 months and older is the

334 Canadian-validated APSI [42]. Therefore, this study may provide evidence for the purposefulness of  
335 screening for developmental disorders among the youngest children in the primary care setting.

336 Due to the dynamic development of children's skills in the studied period, it was necessary to  
337 take into account the age difference affecting the results achieved by children. In the original version  
338 of the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire, there are separate cut-off points for each individual month of age,  
339 however, they have been set as a point below 1.25 SD from the average result in the general  
340 population. Due to the lack of sufficient participants in the study with a confirmed diagnosis of ASD,  
341 only solution to this problem was to group children into appropriate larger age cohorts.

342 Data from the analysis of the statistical model indicate that the correlation between the child's  
343 age and the total score in the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire is also present in age subgroups, which  
344 means that children close to the age limit of the cohort may be classified differently by the  
345 questionnaire. The influence of age on the total score would probably be even stronger if it was  
346 examined without grouping children into cohorts, however, due to its significance, this effect cannot be  
347 ignored. Moreover, the analyses do not confirm the linearity of this impact – the introduction of a  
348 simple correction based on a linear relationship would involve the risk of error. Therefore, this is  
349 another reason why it was necessary to use previously developed theoretical constructs (in this case,  
350 Piaget's theory) to divide children into larger age groups. This, in turn, facilitated the conduct of  
351 analyses and the determination of threshold values according to the observed acquisition of particular  
352 abilities by children at the appropriate age. With the amount of data available, unfortunately, the only  
353 remaining solution is to take into account the correlation with age when interpreting the results and  
354 leave a margin of distrust for the scale. This is of particular relevance when evaluating children on the  
355 verge of age ranges. In case of doubt, as suggested by the authors of the original version, in the  
356 current study it is also recommended to check the child's development in the next three months.

357 Due to the small number of cases with ASD in the age group of 6–8 months, it was not  
358 possible to determine the parameters for the CSBS-DP ITC. Nevertheless, in the remaining three  
359 cohorts, the sensitivity and specificity values are at a satisfactory level (0.667–0.750 and 0.847–0.923,  
360 respectively), which, combined with a satisfactory AUC in each of the subgroups, demonstrates that  
361 the use of CSBS-DP ITC in the daily practice of healthcare professionals is justified. Another evidence  
362 of the usefulness of the tool is the presence of a moderately strong correlation between the CSBS-DP



363 ITC score and the subsequent ASRS score in the three older age groups; this effect could not be  
364 confirmed for the youngest age group, which may indicate that the use of the CSBS-DP ITC  
365 questionnaire before 9 months of age may not be prognostically accurate. To clarify this issue, it would  
366 be necessary to test the effectiveness of the CSBS-DP ITC in a larger sample in this age group.

367 It should be noted that the highest values of sensitivity and specificity were achieved using the  
368 Youden method, which is consistent with the assumptions of this method. This method assumes the  
369 probability of ASD occurrence as 50%, although the probability of ASD could not be unequivocally  
370 estimated in the population of children represented by the study sample in the current study. In a  
371 situation where the probabilities reported by the WHO were adopted for the analyses, the tangent  
372 method gives non-intuitive results and is far too volatile in classifying children into particular risk  
373 groups. Usage of cut-off points determined using this method would lead to a situation where the  
374 majority of examined children would be referred for further diagnostics. This, in turn, would lead to an  
375 increase in unnecessary costs for diagnosis, an increase in the psychological burden for families  
376 caused by a potentially unfavorable diagnosis in a child, and a reduction in the availability of  
377 specialists in the field of early diagnosis and intervention (because they would have to take care of a  
378 larger group of children who would not require this type of assistance). A measurable indicator of the  
379 lack of indications for the use of cut-offs determined by the tangent method with minimizing expected  
380 costs is a significant decrease in the sensitivity of the questionnaire visible in the ROC analyses.

381 A possible reason is that assuming the prevalence of ASD at 1:160 as reported by the WHO,  
382 we assume that the sample will be virtually random and will represent the population of all children. On  
383 the other hand, in individual subgroups of the data set, the empirical probabilities of ASD are even  
384 more than ten times higher. Based on a sample of 1,461 simple screening questionnaires, at least 35  
385 children were diagnosed with ASD, which gives a prevalence of ASD in the Polish population of 2.39%  
386 – considering that the majority of parents who did not participate in the follow-up with the use of ASRS  
387 and follow-up interview dropped out due to the lack of suspicion of any symptoms of developmental  
388 disorders in their children. This percentage is even higher if the study considers only children  
389 assessed using the ASRS and subsequent tests (e.g. ADOS) and it may be estimated as 5.81%.  
390 Compared to the preliminary data from two Polish regions (which indicate 32–38 cases of ASD per  
391 10,000 people), the prevalence of ASD in the group of respondents in the current study is markedly  
392 higher. The percentage of children diagnosed with ASD in whole project (2.39%) is therefore similar to

393 the most recent data for American children (1:64) [19]. However, it should be borne in mind that the  
394 selection of the method (due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the study was conducted online) may have  
395 resulted in some bias of the group – the questionnaire was filled in by willing parents, so parents  
396 observing the occurrence of any deficits in their children may account for a larger part of respondents  
397 than it actually could be the case in stationary primary care setting. Nevertheless, every effort was  
398 made to convince also parents who do not suspect any developmental disorders in their children to  
399 complete the questionnaire. It seems that these efforts were effective – 383 parents from 1461  
400 included in the study reported concerns about their child’s development, which constitutes 25.7% of all  
401 participants. This is perfectly in line with the data from a study conducted at the C.S. Mott Children’s  
402 Hospital, Michigan, US, where it was shown that a quarter of parents also report suspected  
403 developmental disorders in their children [43]. Similar conclusions can be drawn from studies in the  
404 Netherlands, where even up to 50% of parents reported minor concerns about their children’s  
405 development [44]. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the data from the current study indicate that despite  
406 the potential bias of the group, there is still a large proportion of undiagnosed individuals in the general  
407 population who could benefit from appropriate diagnosis and treatment.

408 Differences between the prevalence of ASD estimated and reported by other sources also  
409 have their resonance in the analyses presented in this study – an attempt to estimate cut-offs using  
410 the cost reduction method unfortunately turned out to be unreliable due to significant differences  
411 depending on the assumed probability of ASD occurrence in the examined individual. Taking all this  
412 into account, the authors finally used the sample probability estimated with the Youden method, which  
413 turned out to be robust to the uncertainty of probability. In addition, cut-offs estimated in this way seem  
414 to be close to the values reported in other CSBS-DP ITC adaptations, especially the American original  
415 version [26].

416 In order to reduce the rate of false positive results, it may be effective to include an  
417 observational study as a follow-up measure immediately after a positive result. The authors of the  
418 original version of the CSBS-DP created additional, further tools that aim to increase the sensitivity  
419 and specificity of the ITC questionnaire (i.e. Behavior Sample, where a pre-trained HCP assesses the  
420 child’s development, or Caregiver Questionnaire, where the child’s development is assessed by e.g. a  
421 caregiver in a nursery or nanny) [45]. Numerous evidence has also been described that the inclusion  
422 of follow-up methods increases the sensitivity and specificity also in the case of other ASD screening

423 tools (e.g. M-CHAT R/F) [46]. In addition, the use of a Behavior Sample by HCPs immediately after an  
424 ITC assessment could reduce the potential dropout and be used as an immediate validation strategy.  
425 The use of a follow-up method right after the questionnaire-based screening method could be all the  
426 more important because some of the families, even after obtaining a result of the screening tests  
427 suggesting the possibility of ASD in the child and indicating the need for further diagnostics, still do not  
428 feel concerned about the development of their child as a study performed in Flanders suggests [47].  
429 Major obstacles in trying to incorporate additional diagnostic methods in primary care settings are the  
430 excessive workload, insufficient time, and inadequate knowledge of HCPs about ASD [48–50].

431 Another issue worth mentioning is the possibility of using the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire to  
432 detect developmental disorders other than ASD, e.g. language development delay (LD), which were  
433 observed in 20 respondents in our study (3.32%), or to assess strengths or weaknesses in a child's  
434 developmental skills. Early detection of children with LD, especially those from high-risk groups, may  
435 benefit them in connection with the initiation of appropriate therapy, however, the effects of such  
436 therapy are less pronounced than in the case of ASD, as indicated by the results of the Danish SPELL  
437 longitudinal study conducted in the general population [51,52]. The presence of three main CSBS-DP  
438 ITC subscales concerning social skills, symbolic skills, and speech development indicates the child's  
439 potential resources and the most important deficits and may serve as a cue for early intervention  
440 therapists before further, more specialized diagnostics. However, the unequivocal use of this  
441 information in practice requires further research on the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire specifically in risk  
442 groups.

443 Nevertheless, the evidence from this study may contribute to the discussion regarding the  
444 inclusion of ASD screening during well-child care visits. So far, no fully validated questionnaire for the  
445 diagnosis of ASD in children under 2 years of age has existed in Poland; only one study on the  
446 reliability of the Q-CHAT questionnaire was published, without an attempt to estimate the cut-off in the  
447 Polish population or assess the sensitivity and specificity of the tool [53]. Taking into account the  
448 positive data from the current study on the CSBS-DP ITC properties, the use of this tool in everyday  
449 practice of HCPs would seem justified.

450 There are several limitations to this study. The first is the relatively small number of study  
451 participants whose development was monitored throughout the study. Although this number fully

452 meets the criteria of scientific research, a larger sample of respondents could provide better evidence  
453 of the usefulness of ASD screening in the Polish population and, at the same time, better estimate the  
454 prevalence of ASD in this age group in Poland. Another limitation is the method of electronic screening  
455 and the related self-selection of participants. It is believed to be one of the main factors for  
456 unrepresentativeness in studies conducted via online questionnaires. The attitudes of study  
457 participants may have influenced their decision to take part in the survey, which is why parents who  
458 suspected any developmental disorders in their children were more willing to participate in the study  
459 [54]. However, as mentioned earlier in the discussion, the present authors made every effort to avoid  
460 self-selection bias and, given the percentage of parents with any concerns about their child's  
461 development compared to other inpatient studies, most likely the attempt to make it negligible have  
462 been successful.

463 Another possible limitation is the tracking of children's development using online and  
464 telephone methods. Due to remote contact with parents, the authors relied on answers in  
465 questionnaires, surveys, and medical documentation provided. Nevertheless, in order to qualify the  
466 examined child to the group of children diagnosed with ASD, it was required to present appropriate  
467 documents prepared by a qualified psychologist or psychiatrist. The last flaw of the study is the time of  
468 observation of children – with the endpoint set at 30 months of age, and the possibility of extending  
469 this time if the child is undergoing further diagnostics, has received a positive ASRS result or parents  
470 have further concerns about the child's development. At the same time, according to the DSM-V  
471 definition of ASD, the symptoms of autism spectrum disorders may become fully apparent also in later  
472 years of development. Despite providing psychological help to children who require it, some of them  
473 may develop symptoms later – when social demands exceed the limited capacities of the child [1,55].

## 474 **Conclusions**

475 The Polish version of the CSBS-DP ITC questionnaire is characterized by reasonably high  
476 values of sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy in children aged from 9 to 24 months and children's  
477 performance in the questionnaire may also be a predictor of outcomes in later examinations (i.e.  
478 ASRS). The conducted analyses indicate the potential usefulness of the Polish version of the CSBS-  
479 DP ITC questionnaire in the everyday practice of healthcare professionals for population screening for

480 ASD. Further research is essential to more accurately define cut-offs among children who are on the  
481 verge of the accepted age ranges and among the youngest population (aged 6–8 months).

#### 482 ***Credit Author Statement***

483 **Mateusz Sobieski:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Investigation, Resources,  
484 Data Curation, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review & Editing, Visualization, Supervision, Project  
485 Administration. **Anna Kopszak:** Methodology, Formal analysis, Visualization. **Sylwia Wrona:**  
486 Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing – Review & Editing. **Maria Magdalena**  
487 **Bujnowska-Fedak:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Investigation, Writing – Original  
488 Draft, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision.

#### 489 ***Acknowledgements***

490 The study was financed from the researchers' own funds and the internal funds of Wrocław  
491 Medical University - the project is financed from the scientific grant: "Aspects of preventive care,  
492 diagnosis and therapy of patients of different ages under the care of a family doctor, including e-  
493 health, telemedicine solutions, coordination and analysis of care effectiveness indicators"; Task  
494 SIMPLE number: SUB.C290.19.054.

495 The researchers would like to thank Róża Hajkuś and Kamila and Tomasz Chadaj for their  
496 help in recruiting study participants.

#### 497 ***Data Availability Statement***

498 The data presented in this study are openly available in FigShare at  
499 <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.24179685.v1>.

#### 500 ***Conflict of interest***

501 None of the authors of the manuscript declares a conflict of interest.

#### 502 ***Bibliography:***

- 503 1. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th  
504 Edition. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association Publishing; 2013.  
505 doi:10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596.744053
- 506 2. Elsabbagh M, Divan G, Koh YJ, Kim YS, Kauchali S, Marcín C, et al. Global Prevalence of

- 507 Autism and Other Pervasive Developmental Disorders. *Autism Res.* 2012;5: 160–179.  
508 doi:10.1002/aur.239
- 509 3. Zeidan J, Fombonne E, Scora J, Ibrahim A, Durkin MS, Saxena S, et al. Global prevalence of  
510 autism: A systematic review update. *Autism Res.* 2022;15: 778–790. doi:10.1002/AUR.2696
- 511 4. Piskorz-Ogórek K, Ogórek S, Cieślińska A, Kostyra E. Autism in Poland in comparison to other  
512 countries. *Polish Ann Med.* 2020;22: 35–40. doi:10.1016/J.POAMED.2015.03.010
- 513 5. Skonieczna-Żydecka K, Gorzkowska I, Pierzak-Sominka J, Adler G. The Prevalence of Autism  
514 Spectrum Disorders in West Pomeranian and Pomeranian Regions of Poland. *J Appl Res*  
515 *Intellect Disabil.* 2017;30: 283–289. doi:10.1111/jar.12238
- 516 6. Zwaigenbaum L, Bryson S, Garon N. Early identification of autism spectrum disorders.  
517 *Behavioural Brain Research.* *Behav Brain Res;* 2013. pp. 133–146.  
518 doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2013.04.004
- 519 7. Canu D, Van der Paelt S, Canal-Bedia R, Posada M, Vanvuchelen M, Roeyers H. Early non-  
520 social behavioural indicators of autism spectrum disorder (ASD) in siblings at elevated  
521 likelihood for ASD: a systematic review. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2021;30: 497–538.  
522 doi:10.1007/s00787-020-01487-7
- 523 8. Jones E J H, Gliga T, Bedford R, Charman T, Johnson M H. Developmental pathways to autism:  
524 A review of prospective studies of infants at risk. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2014;39: 1.  
525 doi:10.1016/J.NEUBIOREV.2013.12.001
- 526 9. Landa R J, Gross A L, Stuart E A, Faherty A. Developmental Trajectories in Children With and  
527 Without Autism Spectrum Disorders: The First 3 Years. *Child Dev.* 2013;84: 429–442.  
528 doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01870.x
- 529 10. Pearson N, Charman T, Happé F, Bolton P F, McEwen F S. Regression in autism spectrum  
530 disorder: Reconciling findings from retrospective and prospective research. *Autism Res.*  
531 2018;11: 1602–1620. doi:10.1002/aur.2035
- 532 11. Chawarska K, Klin A, Paul R, Volkmar F. Autism spectrum disorder in the second year: stability  
533 and change in syndrome expression. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry.* 2007;48: 128–138.

534 doi:10.1111/J.1469-7610.2006.01685.X

535 12. Hof M van 't, Tisseur C, Bercklear-Onnes I van, Nieuwenhuyzen A van, Daniels AM, Deen M,  
536 et al. Age at autism spectrum disorder diagnosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis from  
537 2012 to 2019: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362361320971107>. 2020;25: 862–873.

538 doi:10.1177/1362361320971107

539 13. Orinstein AJ, Helt M, Troyb E, Tyson KE, Barton ML, Eigsti IM, et al. Intervention for optimal  
540 outcome in children and adolescents with a history of Autism. *Journal of Developmental and*  
541 *Behavioral Pediatrics*. 2014. pp. 247–256. doi:10.1097/DBP.0000000000000037

542 14. MacDonald R, Parry-Cruwys D, Dupere S, Ahearn W. Assessing progress and outcome of  
543 early intensive behavioral intervention for toddlers with autism. *Res Dev Disabil*. 2014;35:  
544 3632–3644. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2014.08.036

545 15. Smith T, Klorman R, Mruzek DW. Predicting Outcome of Community-Based Early Intensive  
546 Behavioral Intervention for Children with Autism. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 2015;43: 1271–  
547 1282. doi:10.1007/s10802-015-0002-2

548 16. Lai MC, Kasseh C, Besney R, Bonato S, Hull L, Mandy W, et al. Prevalence of co-occurring  
549 mental health diagnoses in the autism population: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The*  
550 *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2019;6: 819–829. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(19)30289-5

551 17. Hyman SL, Levy SE, Myers SM. Identification, Evaluation, and Management of Children With  
552 Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Pediatrics*. 2020;145. doi:10.1542/peds.2019-3447

553 18. Shaw KA, Maenner MJ, Baio J, Washington A, Christensen DL, Wiggins LD, et al. Early  
554 identification of autism spectrum disorder among children aged 4 years - Early autism and  
555 developmental disabilities monitoring network, six sites, United States, 2016. *MMWR Surveill*  
556 *Summ*. 2020;69: 1–11. doi:10.15585/MMWR.SS6903A1

557 19. Maenner MJ, Shaw KA, Baio J, Washington A, Patrick M, DiRienzo M, et al. Prevalence of  
558 autism spectrum disorder among children aged 8 Years-Autism and developmental disabilities  
559 monitoring network, 11 Sites, United States, 2016. *MMWR Surveill Summ*. 2020;69: 1–12.  
560 doi:10.15585/MMWR.SS6904A1



- 561 20. Siu AL. Screening for autism spectrum disorder in young children US preventive services task  
562 force recommendation statement. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc.* 2016;315: 691–696.  
563 doi:10.1001/jama.2016.0018
- 564 21. Sheldrick RC, Merchant S, Perrin EC. Identification of developmental-behavioral problems in  
565 primary care: A systematic review. *Pediatrics.* 2011. pp. 356–363. doi:10.1542/peds.2010-3261
- 566 22. Fein D, Carter A, Bryson SE, Carver LJ, Charman T, Chawarska K, et al. Commentary on  
567 USPSTF Final Statement on Universal Screening for Autism. *J Dev Behav Pediatr.* 2016;37:  
568 573. doi:10.1097/DBP.0000000000000345
- 569 23. Coury DL. Babies, bathwater, and screening for autism spectrum disorder: Comments on the  
570 USPSTF recommendations for autism spectrum disorder screening. *J Dev Behav Pediatr.*  
571 2015;36: 661–663. doi:10.1097/DBP.0000000000000227
- 572 24. Mandell D, Mandy W. Should all young children be screened for autism spectrum disorder?:  
573 <http://dx.doi.org/101177/1362361315608323>. 2015;19: 895–896.  
574 doi:10.1177/1362361315608323
- 575 25. Wetherby AM, Allen L, Cleary J, Kublin K, Goldstein H. Validity and reliability of the  
576 communication and symbolic behavior scales developmental profile with very young children. *J*  
577 *Speech, Lang Hear Res.* 2002;45: 1202–1218. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2002/097)
- 578 26. Wetherby AM, Brosnan-Maddox S, Peace V, Newton L. Validation of the Infant-Toddler  
579 Checklist as a broadband screener for autism spectrum disorders from 9 to 24 months of age.  
580 *Autism.* 2008;12: 487–511. doi:10.1177/1362361308094501
- 581 27. Wetherby AM, Woods J, Allen L, Cleary J, Dickinson H, Lord C. Early indicators of autism  
582 spectrum disorders in the second year of life. *J Autism Dev Disord.* 2004;34: 473–493.  
583 doi:10.1007/s10803-004-2544-y
- 584 28. Sobieski M, Wrona S, Flakus M, Pierchała K, Sobieska A, Podgórska K, et al. Reliability and  
585 Theoretical Validity of the Polish Version of Communication and Symbolic Behavior Scales-  
586 Developmental Profile – Infant-Toddler Checklist. [cited 11 Feb 2024].  
587 doi:10.2139/SSRN.4573426





- 588 29. Goldstein S, Naglieri J. Autism Spectrum Rating Scales (ASRS) Technical Manual. New York:  
589 Multi-Health Systems; 2013.
- 590 30. Wrocławska-Warchala E, Wójcik R. ASRS Zestaw Kwestionariuszy do Diagnozy Spektrum  
591 Autyzmu. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa  
592 Psychologicznego; 2016.
- 593 31. Chojnicka I, Pisula E. Cross-Cultural Validation of the Polish Version of the ADI-R, Including  
594 New Algorithms for Toddlers and Young Preschoolers. *Child Psychiatry Hum Dev* 2019 504.  
595 2019;50: 591–604. doi:10.1007/S10578-018-00865-2
- 596 32. Chojnicka I, Pisula E. Adaptation and Validation of the ADOS-2, Polish Version. *Front Psychol.*  
597 2017;8. doi:10.3389/FPSYG.2017.01916
- 598 33. Pisula E. Profil Psychoedukacyjny, Wydanie 3, Wersja polska. Podręcznik diagnosty.  
599 Warszawa: EduProf; 2019.
- 600 34. Lourenço OM. Developmental stages, Piagetian stages in particular: A critical review. *New*  
601 *Ideas Psychol.* 2016;40: 123–137. doi:10.1016/J.NEWIDEAPSYCH.2015.08.002
- 602 35. Swets JA. Measuring the accuracy of diagnostic systems. *Science.* 1988;240: 1285–1293.  
603 doi:10.1126/SCIENCE.3287615
- 604 36. Florkowski CM. Sensitivity, Specificity, Receiver-Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curves and  
605 Likelihood Ratios: Communicating the Performance of Diagnostic Tests. *Clin Biochem Rev.*  
606 2008;29: S83. Available: /pmc/articles/PMC2556590/
- 607 37. Kumar R, Indrayan A. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve for medical researchers.  
608 *Indian Pediatr.* 2011;48: 277–287. doi:10.1007/S13312-011-0055-4
- 609 38. Briggs-Gowan MJ, Carter AS, Irwin JR, Wachtel K, Cicchetti D V. The Brief Infant-Toddler  
610 Social and Emotional Assessment: Screening for Social-Emotional Problems and Delays in  
611 Competence. *J Pediatr Psychol.* 2004;29: 143–155. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jsh017
- 612 39. Turner-Brown LM, Baranek GT, Reznick JS, Watson LR, Crais ER. The First Year Inventory: A  
613 longitudinal follow-up of 12-month-olds to 3 years of age. *Autism.* 2013;17: 527.  
614 doi:10.1177/1362361312439633

- 615 40. Kleinman JM, Robins DL, Ventola PE, Pandey J, Boorstein HC, Esser EL, et al. The modified  
616 checklist for autism in toddlers: A follow-up study investigating the early detection of autism  
617 spectrum disorders. *J Autism Dev Disord.* 2008;38: 827–839. doi:10.1007/s10803-007-0450-9
- 618 41. Allison C, Matthews FE, Ruta L, Pasco G, Soufer R, Brayne C, et al. Quantitative checklist for  
619 autism in toddlers (Q-CHAT). A population screening study with follow-up: The case for  
620 multiple time-point screening for autism. *BMJ Paediatr Open.* 2021;5: e000700.  
621 doi:10.1136/bmjpo-2020-000700
- 622 42. Sacrey LAR, Bryson S, Zwaigenbaum L, Brian J, Smith IM, Roberts W, et al. The Autism  
623 Parent Screen for Infants: Predicting risk of autism spectrum disorder based on parent-reported  
624 behavior observed at 6–24 months of age. *Autism.* 2018;22: 322–334.  
625 doi:10.1177/1362361316675120
- 626 43. Freed GL, Singer DC, Gebremariam A, Schultz SL, Clark SJ. Milestones: How parents  
627 understand child development. *CS Mott Child Hosp Natl Poll Child Heal.* 2021;38: 1–2.  
628 Available: <https://mottpoll.org/reports/milestones-how-parents-understand-child-development>.
- 629 44. Reijneveld SA, De Meer G, Wiefferink CH, Crone MR. Parents' concerns about children are  
630 highly prevalent but often not confirmed by child doctors and nurses. *BMC Public Health.*  
631 2008;8: 124. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-8-124
- 632 45. Eadie PA, Ukoumunne O, Skeat J, Prior MR, Bavin E, Bretherton L, et al. Assessing early  
633 communication behaviours: Structure and validity of the Communication and Symbolic  
634 Behaviour Scales-Developmental Profile (CSBS-DP) in 12-month-old infants. *Int J Lang  
635 Commun Disord.* 2010;45: 572–585. doi:10.3109/13682820903277944
- 636 46. Robins DL, Casagrande K, Barton M, Chen CMA, Dumont-Mathieu T, Fein D. Validation of the  
637 modified checklist for Autism in toddlers, revised with follow-up (M-CHAT-R/F). *Pediatrics.*  
638 2014;133: 37–45. doi:10.1542/PEDS.2013-1813
- 639 47. Dereu M, Warreyn P, Raymaekers R, Meirsschaut M, Pattyn G, Schietecatte I, et al. Screening  
640 for Autism Spectrum Disorders in Flemish Day-Care Centres with the Checklist for Early Signs  
641 of Developmental Disorders. *J Autism Dev Disord* 2010 4010. 2010;40: 1247–1258.  
642 doi:10.1007/S10803-010-0984-0


- 643 48. Al Maskari T, Melville C, Al Farsi Y, Wahid R, Willis D. Qualitative exploration of the barriers to,  
644 and facilitators of, screening children for autism spectrum disorder in Oman. *Early Child Dev*  
645 *Care*. 2020;190: 1762–1777. doi:10.1080/03004430.2018.1550084
- 646 49. Buckley C. Making your practice autism friendly. *InnovAIT Educ Inspir Gen Pract*. 2017;10:  
647 327–331. doi:10.1177/1755738017692002
- 648 50. McCormack G, Dillon AC, Healy O, Walsh C, Lydon S. Primary Care Physicians' Knowledge of  
649 Autism and Evidence-Based Interventions for Autism: A Systematic Review. *Review Journal of*  
650 *Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2020. pp. 226–241. doi:10.1007/s40489-019-00189-4
- 651 51. Bleses D, Højen A, Justice LM, Dale PS, Dybdal L, Piasta SB, et al. The Effectiveness of a  
652 Large-Scale Language and Preliteracy Intervention: The SPELL Randomized Controlled Trial  
653 in Denmark. *Child Dev*. 2018;89: e342–e363. doi:10.1111/CDEV.12859
- 654 52. Bleses D, Dale PS, Justice L, Højen A, Vind BD, Jiang H. Sustained effects of an early  
655 childhood language and literacy intervention through second grade: Longitudinal findings of the  
656 SPELL trial in Denmark. *PLoS One*. 2021;16. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0258287
- 657 53. Niedźwiecka A, Pisula E. Symptoms of Autism Spectrum Disorders Measured by the  
658 Qualitative Checklist for Autism in Toddlers in a Large Sample of Polish Toddlers. *Int J Environ*  
659 *Res Public Health*. 2022;19: 3072. doi:10.3390/ijerph19053072
- 660 54. Biele G, Gustavson K, Czajkowski NO, Nilsen RM, Reichborn-Kjennerud T, Magnus PM, et al.  
661 Bias from self selection and loss to follow-up in prospective cohort studies. *Eur J Epidemiol*.  
662 2019;34: 927–938. doi:10.1007/S10654-019-00550-1
- 663 55. Bacon EC, Courchesne E, Barnes CC, Cha D, Pence S, Schreibman L, et al. Rethinking the  
664 idea of late autism spectrum disorder onset. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2018;30: 553–569.  
665 doi:10.1017/S0954579417001067

666






Children aged 9-12 months  
ROC analysis using Youden's index  
 $\rho$  estimated from the sample  
Youden's Index = 0,61  
recommended cut-off: 21,00






Children aged 13-18 months  
ROC analysis using Youden's index  
 $\rho$  estimated from the sample  
Youden's Index = 0,60  
recommended cut-off: 36,00



Children aged 19-24 months  
ROC analysis using Youden's index  
 $\rho$  estimated from the sample  
Youden's Index = 0,61  
recommended cut-off: 39,00





## Phase 0 Recruitment

1732 parents who  
completed CSBS-DP ITC  
questionnaire

271 excluded due to:  
- 236 children younger than 6 or  
older than 24 months  
- 35 repeated submissions

## Phase 1 Screening

Children aged 6-24 months

1461 children  
enrolled in the study

849 parents reluctant  
to further examination  
- 722 due to lack of symptoms in children  
- 127 due to no contact possible

## Phase 2 Follow-up

After reaching 30 months

678 submissions from parents  
who completed ASRS questionnaire  
and follow up-interview

76 excluded due to:  
- 48 children did not participate  
in screening  
- 17 repeated submissions  
- in 11 cases siblings were assessed,  
not the examined child

602 children  
enrolled in the follow-up

48 screened positively using ASRS  
554 screened negatively using ASRS

65 children underwent further  
evaluation due to present symptoms

35 diagnosed with ASD  
20 diagnosed with LD  
10 assessed negative (without DD)