**Supplementary material** [Factors associated with participation over time in the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: a study using linked education and primary care data]

Table S1: Timings of questionnaires and clinics included in our analysis

Age (of child)	Mother-	Child-
9.42 weeks gostation	completed	completed
8-42 Weeks gestation		
12 weeks gestation		
18 weeks gestation		
32 weeks gestation	lVI Ch	
4 weeks	Ch	
8 weeks	lVI Ch	
8 months		
8 months	Ch	
19 months	Ch	
21 months		
21 months	Ch	
24 months	Ch	
22 months	М	
38 months	Ch	
42 months	Ch	
42 months		
47 months	Ch	
54 months	Ch	
57 months	М	
65 months	Ch	0
60 months	Ch	Q 0
72 months		Q
73 months	Ch	Q 0
77 months	Ch	Q
85 months		Q
		Q Cl
7.5 years	Ch	
97 months	М	Q 0
8 5 years		d Cl
103 <sup>1</sup> months	Ch	
110 months	M	0
115 months	Ch	0
9 5 years	CII	d Cl
122 months	М	0
10.5 years		а С
128 months	Ch	0
134 months	M	0
11.5 years		Cl
140 months	Ch	0
145 months	M	0
12.5 years		Cl
157 months	Ch	Q
13.5 years		Cl
166 months	Ch	Q
167 months		Q
169 months		Q
15.5 years		Cl
, 16.5 years	Ch	Q
17.5 years		Cl
18 years	М	Q
, 19.5 years	Ch	
20 years		Q

1. Two questionnaires about different topics were administered at the same time

#### 2. Linkage to GP records

As part of the Secure Anonymised Information Linkage (SAIL) project [1], the NHS Wales Information Service (NWIS) and the Health Informatics Research Unit (HIRU) at the University of Swansea have established a method through which individual level data from multiple sources can be linked and analysed in a secure setting, including data from primary care electronic patient records. The Project to Enhance ALSPAC through Record Linkage (PEARL), in collaboration with the SAIL team and working with GP software system providers, developed two methods to extract GP records (where permissions allowed):

- (i) Pilot extraction: In 2012 ALSPAC carried out a pilot extraction of GP records of an initial pilot sample of index participants. The extraction took place from assenting GP practices across England & Wales. The methods for this extraction have been described in a previous paper [2].
- (ii) Main extraction: The NHS South West Commissioning Support Unit (SWCSU) has developed a governance framework and data extraction mechanism which secured opt-in assent from GP practices for the extraction of records and their use for SWCSU approved purposes. Invitations to participate in this system were made to all practices in the Bristol, North Somerset, Somerset and South Gloucestershire (BNSSSG) clinical commissioning group. The extraction mechanism is provided by EMIS, which supplies software systems to the majority of practices in the BNSSSG area. ALSPAC gained approval from the SWCSU Security and Informatics Group to extract participants' GP records. SWCSU informed all participating practices about this agreement and gave them opportunity to opt-out.

For both the pilot study and the main extraction, the methods after extraction were identical. The extracted records were pseudonymised at source and securely transferred into a copy of the SAIL secure setting (known as a UK Secure eResearch Platform, or UKSeRP) using SAIL's "split file" method and adhered to NHS standards of encryption and security, as described previously [2].

#### 3. Variables derived from GP data

BMI: Read codes (the UK GP coding system) 22K.. (BMI), 229.. (O/E - height), and 22A.. (O/E - weight) were used to define BMI. The mean of all measurements after age 10 was used; where there was only one measurement, this was used.

Consultation rate age 15-19 years: As others have done [3], we defined consultations by excluding any Read codes relating to administration, hospitalisations and provision of services and by counting multiple GP interactions within 1 day as one consultation.

(Prescribed) drug count age 15-19 years: As in previous research [4, 5], we counted the number of different drugs received by each participant at each year of age to provide an overall measure of morbidity. Each unique drug name was counted only once – so that repeat prescriptions and different formulations or doses of the same drug were not counted. Smoking before age 18 years: Two recent studies have defined smoking status using Read codes [6, 7]. In the current study, we used a combined set of codes but omitted the codes 6791. (health education – smoking) as this appeared to result in a large number of false positives (for example, there were many occasions on which this was recorded alongside a code for never smoked). Similarly, if codes about smoking cessation advice (67H1., 67H6., 8CAL., and others) were recorded but the individual was concurrently recorded as having never smoked, then this instance was classified as not smoking. As in the study by Atkinson and colleagues [6], if a Read code required a value to be recorded (for example, number of cigarettes per day) then we only classified someone as a smoker according to this code if this value was non-missing and greater than zero. Using this definition, individuals were recorded - at one or more time points - as either a non-smoker, an ex-smoker or a smoker. From this we generated smoking status at age 18 years (ever smoked or never smoked).

## 4. Summary of missing data

( )	· · · · ·
Variable	Number (%) missing
Baseline variables	
Sex	0
Mother's age at index birth	0
Age at first pregnancy	829 (6%)
Smoked in pregnancy	819 (6%)
Smoked ever	922 (7%)
Marital status	890 (6%)
Mother's ethnicity	1648 (12%)
Mother's education	1560 (11%)
Duration of breastfeeding	1410 (10%)
Maternal antenatal depression score	1998 (14%)
Phone in home	901 (6%)
Car	941 (7%)
Housing tenure	950 (7%)
Number of rooms	1083 (8%)
Crowding index	1173 (8%)
Double glazing	1504 (11%)
Financial difficulties score	1889 (14%)
Family occupational social class	2472 (18%)
Education variables	
Key stage 4 attainment score	2558 (18%)
School absence in year 11	3151 (23%)
SEN status in year 11	3162 (23%)
Measures from GP data	Number (%) missing of 13
	972 [Number (%) missing
	among the n=10 811 with GP
	data beyond age 4 years]
Asthma before age 8	
Smoking before age 18	4988 (36%) [1827 (17%)]
Depression before age 18	5207 (37%) [2046 (19%)]
Mean BMI	7040 (50%) [3879 (36%)]
Consultation rate 15-19 years	5052 (36%) [1891 (17%)]
Prescription rate 15-19 years	5052 (36%) [1891 (17%)]

Table S1: Number (%) with missing data for each variable (n=13 972)

As stated in the paper, 9049 individuals (65% of the 13 972) had complete covariate data. As expected, these individuals had higher rates of participation compared to those with incomplete data (results in main text). There were 6984 individuals (50% of the original sample) with baseline covariates and linked education data. Those with linked education data in addition to baseline covariates did not differ from all those with complete baseline covariates with respect to participation (mean number of questionnaires completed/clinics attended: 32 for mothers, 19 for children among those with education data as well as baseline covariates). Finally, there were between 4280 and 6671 individuals with baseline

covariates and linked GP data for the child and mother participation analysis. The mean number of questionnaires completed by mothers in this group was 34; the mean (questionnaires completed and clinics attended) for children was 21.

## 5. Multiple imputation models

Table S2 shows which variables were included in the two imputation models and in what form. Note that two separate imputation models were needed because the linked ALSPAC – GP data is stored on a secure server at Swansea University and excludes any individuals who have explicitly dissented to linkage to their health data (i.e. not all 13 972 study participants are included in the linked ALSPAC-GP dataset). Further the imputation model for the GP data only included individuals with GP data at least beyond the age of 4 (so that at least one of the GP variables – consultation and prescription rates aged 0-4 – was non-missing). In the first imputation model (model 1), IQ was imputed from the cube of the attainment score and the attainment score from the cube root of IQ. These variables were included as linear terms when imputing other variables. This has been described previously [8]. A square root transformation was applied to percent absence prior to imputation and it was used in its transformed form throughout the analysis.

Table S2: Variables included in the imputation	n models (model 1: n=13 972; model 2: n=10 811)
--	---

			· · · · · ·		/
	Variable	Type of	Regression model /	Included in	Included in
		variable	method used to	imputation	imputation
			impute this variable	model 1 <sup>1</sup> ?	model 2 <sup>2</sup> ?
	Sex	Binary	N/A	✓	$\checkmark$
Mother's age at index birth		Numerical	N/A	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Age at first pregnancy	Categorical	Multinomial logistic	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Smoked in pregnancy	Binary	Logistic	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Smoked ever	Binary	Logistic	✓	$\checkmark$
	Marital status	Binary	Logistic	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Mother's ethnicity	Binary	Logistic	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Mother's education	Categorical	Multinomial logistic	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Duration of breastfeeding	Categorical	Multinomial logistic	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Antenatal depression score	Numerical	Predictive mean	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
			matching (PMM)		
	Phone in home	Binary	Logistic	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Car	Binary	Logistic	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Housing tenure	Categorical	Multinomial logistic	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Number of rooms	Numerical	PMM	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Crowding index	Categorical	Multinomial logistic	✓	$\checkmark$
	Double glazing	Binary	Logistic	✓	$\checkmark$
	Financial difficulties score	Numerical	PMM	✓	$\checkmark$
	Occupational social class	Binary	Logistic	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Key stage 4 attainment score <sup>3</sup>	Numerical	Linear regression	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	School absence in year 11 <sup>4</sup>	Numerical	Linear regression	$\checkmark$	Х
	SEN status in year 11	Categorical	Multinomial logistic	$\checkmark$	Х
	Asthma diagnosis before age 8	Binary	Logistic	Х	$\checkmark$
	Smoking before age 18	Binary	Logistic	Х	$\checkmark$
	Depression before age 18	Binary	Logistic	Х	$\checkmark$
	Mean BMI	Numerical	Linear regression	Х	$\checkmark$
	Consultation rate 15-19 years <sup>5</sup>	Numerical	Linear regression	Х	$\checkmark$
	Prescription rate 15-19 years <sup>5</sup>	Numerical	Linear regression	Х	$\checkmark$
	Attended age 3.5 examination	Binary	Logistic	Х	$\checkmark$
	Auxiliary variables				
	Child IQ at 8 years <sup>6</sup>	Numerical	Linear regression	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Consultation rate 0-4 years	Numerical	N/A	Х	$\checkmark$
	Consultation rate 5-9 years	Numerical	Linear regression	Х	$\checkmark$
	Consultation rate 10-14 years	Numerical	Linear regression	Х	$\checkmark$
	Consultation rate 20+ years	Numerical	Linear regression	Х	$\checkmark$
	Prescription rate 0-4 years	Numerical	N/A	Х	$\checkmark$
	Prescription rate 5-9 years	Numerical	Linear regression	Х	$\checkmark$
	Prescription rate 10-14 years	Numerical	Linear regression	Х	$\checkmark$
	Prescription rate 20+ years	Numerical	Linear regression	Х	$\checkmark$

1. Model 1 was used to impute baseline and school variables and the resulting imputed data used to analyse the association between the baseline and education variables and participation.

2. Model 2 was used to impute baseline and GP variables and the resulting imputed data used to analyse the association between GP variables and participation (adjusting for baseline covariates). This model included only individuals with at least some GP data from age 5 years.

3. Attainment cubed included when imputing IQ; as linear term otherwise.

4. Transformed: square root of absence used throughout.

5. Categorical variable used in the analysis: passively imputed from the continuous version.

6. Cube root of IQ included when imputing attainment; as linear term otherwise.

# 6. Results from the complete case analysis

		Child	p-	Mother	p-
		participation	value	participation	value
Covariate	Level	OR (95% CI)		OR (95% CI)	
Sex	Female vs male	1.87 (1.69, 2.08)	< 0.001	1.07 (0.95, 1.21)	0.2
Mother's	O level / lower	1.00		1.00	
education	A level	1.48 (1.30, 1.69)		1.66 (1.42, 1.94)	
	Degree/higher	1.76 (1.47, 2.09)	< 0.001	2.00 (1.63, 2.45)	<0.001
Parity	0	1.00		1.00	
	1	0.78 (0.67, 0.90)		0.76 (0.64, 0.90)	
	2+	0.58 (0.46, 0.72)	< 0.001	0.57 (0.44, 0.73)	<0.001
Mother's age (at	Per 1 year increase	1.08 (1.06, 1.10)	< 0.001	1.09 (1.07, 1.11)	<0.001
birth of index child)					
Mother's ethnicity	Non-white vs white	0.53 (0.36, 0.78)	0.001	0.29 (0.18, 0.44)	<0.001
Family social class	Manual vs non-	0.83 (0.72, 0.97)	0.02	0.72 (0.61, 0.85)	<0.001
	manual				
Age at first	<20	1.00		1.00	
pregnancy	20-24	1.39 (1.17, 1.65)		1.40 (1.15, 1.70)	
	25+	1.46 (1.21, 1.77)	< 0.001	1.72 (1.39, 2.14)	<0.001
Maternal smoking	Yes vs no (in	0.81 (0.69, 0.95)	0.008	0.78 (0.65, 0.93)	0.007
	pregnancy)				
	Yes vs no (ever)	0.78 (0.69, 0.88)	<0.001	0.82 (0.71, 0.95)	<0.001
Duration of	Never/<1 month	1.00		1.00	
breastfeeding	1 to <3 months	1.72 (1.45, 2.04)		1.68 (1.38, 2.03)	
	3 to <6 months	1.81 (1.55, 2.13)		1.74 (1.45, 2.09)	
	6 months+	2.24 (1.95, 2.57)	< 0.001	2.38 (2.03, 2.79)	<0.001
Married	Yes vs no	1.09 (0.94, 1.26)	0.3	1.11 (0.93, 1.31)	0.2
Housing tenure	Owned/mortgaged	1.00		1.00	
	Private rented	0.62 (0.48, 0.79)		0.57 (0.43, 0.75)	
	Council/HA/other	0.85 (0.70, 1.03)	<0.001	0.81 (0.65, 1.01)	<0.001
Number of rooms	Per 1 room increase	1.03 (0.98, 1.09)	0.3	1.01 (0.95, 1.08)	0.7
Phone in home	Yes vs no/incoming	0.69 (0.55, 0.87)	0.001	0.69 (0.54, 0.90)	0.005
	only				
Car use	No vs yes	0.69 (0.54, 0.87)	0.002	0.76 (0.59, 1.00)	0.05
Double glazing	None vs full/partial	0.88 (0.79, 0.98)	0.02	0.86 (0.76, 0.98)	0.02
Financial	Per 1 unit increase	0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	0.02	0.98 (0.96, 1.00)	0.02
difficulties					
Crowding index	≤0.5	1.00		1.00	
	>0.5 – 0.75	0.92 (0.79, 1.07)		0.83 (0.69, 0.99)	
	>0.75 – 1	0.82 (0.66, 1.02)		0.76 (0.59, 0.97)	
	>1	0.68 (0.49, 0.92)	ххх	0.57 (0.40, 0.82)	0.06
Depression score	Per 1 unit increase	0.99 (0.98, 1.00)	0.06	0.98 (0.97, 0.99)	0.003

Table S4: Odds ratios for participation among complete cases: education variables (n=6,984)

		Child	p-	Mother	p-
		participation	value	participation	value
Covariate	Level	OR (95% CI) <sup>1</sup>		OR (95% CI) <sup>1</sup>	
Attainment score	for 10 point increase	1.06 (1.05, 1.07)	<0.001	1.05 (1.04, 1.06)	<0.001
SEN status	None	1.00		1.00	
	School action	0.80 (0.67, 0.96)		0.94 (0.76, 1.17)	
	Statement	0.56 (0.38, 0.83)	0.003	0.85 (0.54, 1.35)	0.7
School absence	For 1 point increase	0.88 (0.84, 0.92)	<0.001	0.87 (0.82, 0.91)	<0.001
	in square root of %				
	absence				

1. Mutually adjusted and adjusted for baseline Error! Reference source not found. factors.

		Child	p-	Mother	p-
		participation	value	participation	value
Covariate		OR (95% CI) <sup>1</sup>		OR (95% CI) <sup>1</sup>	
Asthma diagnosis	Yes vs no	6.05 (4.39, 8.32)	< 0.001	5.91 (3.99, 8.75)	<0.001
by age 8 <sup>2a</sup>					
Smoking record	Yes vs no	0.63 (0.53, 0.76)	< 0.001	0.68 (0.55, 0.84)	<0.001
by age 18 <sup>2b</sup>					
Depression	Yes vs no	0.71 (0.56, 0.90)	0.005	0.80 (0.60, 1.07)	0.1
before age 18 <sup>2c</sup>					
BMI <sup>2d</sup>	per 1kg/m	0.98 (0.96, 0.99)	0.001	0.97 (0.95, 0.99)	0.001
Consultation rate	≤1 per year	1.00		1.00	
age 15-19 <sup>2e</sup>	>1 – 4 per year	1.48 (1.26, 1.75)		1.23 (1.01, 1.50)	
	>4 per year	1.74 (1.45, 2.09)	< 0.001	1.25 (1.00, 1.56)	0.09
Prescription rate	≤1 per year	1.00		1.00	
age 15-19 <sup>2e</sup>	>1 – 4 per year	1.41 (1.23, 1.62)		1.19 (1.01, 1.40)	
	>4 per year	1.52 (1.25, 1.86)	<0.001	1.19 (0.94, 1.52)	0.1

Table S5: Odds ratios for participation among complete cases: GP-derived measures

1. Adjusted for baseline Error! Reference source not found. factors.

 a) n=6671 & 6652; b) n= 5527 & 5513; c) n=5413 & 5399; d) n=4290 & 4280; e) n=5477 & 5464 for child and mother participation, respectively.

# References

- 1. Ford, D.V., et al., *The SAIL Databank: building a national architecture for e-health research and evaluation.* BMC Health Serv Res, 2009. **9**: p. 157.
- 2. Cornish, R.P., et al., *Defining adolescent common mental disorders using electronic primary care data: a comparison with outcomes measured using the CIS-R.* BMJ Open, 2016. **6**(12).
- 3. Wang, Y., et al., *Do men consult less than women? An analysis of routinely collected UK general practice data.* BMJ Open, 2013. **3**(8).
- 4. Brilleman, S.L. and C. Salisbury, *Comparing measures of multimorbidity to predict outcomes in primary care: a cross sectional study.* Fam Pract, 2012.
- 5. Cornish, R.P., et al., *Socio-economic position and childhood multimorbidity: a study using linkage between the Avon Longitudinal study of parents and children and the general practice research database.* International Journal for Equity in Health, 2013. **12**(1): p. 66.
- 6. Atkinson, M.D., et al., *Development of an algorithm for determining smoking status and behaviour over the life course from UK electronic primary care records.* BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 2017. **17**(1): p. 2.

- 7. Mukherjee, M., et al., *Estimating the incidence, prevalence and true cost of asthma in the UK:* secondary analysis of national stand-alone and linked databases in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales—a study protocol. BMJ Open, 2014. **4**(11).
- 8. Cornish, R.P., et al., Using linked educational attainment data to reduce bias due to missing outcome data in estimates of the association between the duration of breastfeeding and IQ at 15 years. International Journal of Epidemiology, 2015. **44**(3): p. 937-945.