

European Journal of  
**Psychological  
Assessment**

**Editor-in-Chief**

Matthias Ziegler

**Associate Editors**

Martin Bäckström  
Gary N. Burns  
Laurence Claes  
Marjolein Fokkema  
David Gallardo-Pujol  
Samuel Greiff  
Christoph Kemper  
Stefan Krumm  
Lena Lämmle  
Carolyn MacCann  
René T. Proyer  
Sebastian Sauer  
Marit Sijbrandij

Official Organ of the European Association of Psychological Assessment

European Journal of

# Psychological Assessment

Your article has appeared in a journal published by Hogrefe Publishing. This e-offprint is provided exclusively for the personal use of the authors. It may not be posted on a personal or institutional website or to an institutional or disciplinary repository.

If you wish to post the article to your personal or institutional website or to archive it in an institutional or disciplinary repository, please use either a pre-print or a post-print of your manuscript in accordance with the publication release for your article and our “Online Rights for Journal Articles” ([www.hogrefe.com/journals](http://www.hogrefe.com/journals)).



# Challenges and Inequalities of Opportunities in European Psychiatry Research

## The Example of Psychodiagnostic Tool Availability in Research on Early Autism Identification

Sven Bölte,<sup>1,2</sup> Przemyslaw Tomalski,<sup>3</sup> Peter B. Marschik,<sup>1,4</sup> Steve Berggren,<sup>1,2</sup> Joakim Norberg,<sup>1</sup> Terje Falck-Ytter,<sup>1,5</sup> Olga Pokorska,<sup>3</sup> Emily J.H. Jones,<sup>6</sup> Tony Charman,<sup>7</sup> Herbert Roeyers,<sup>8</sup> Elzbieta Kostrzewa,<sup>1</sup> COST-ESSEA Action Members (BM1004 work groups)<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Women's and Children's Health, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

<sup>2</sup>KIND, Center for Psychiatry Research, Stockholm County Council, Sweden

<sup>3</sup>Neurocognitive Development Lab, Faculty of Psychology, University of Warsaw, Poland

<sup>4</sup>Institute of Physiology, Center for Physiological Medicine, Medical University of Graz, Austria

<sup>5</sup>Uppsala Child and Babylab, Department of Psychology, Uppsala University, Sweden

<sup>6</sup>Centre for Brain and Cognitive Development, Birkbeck College, University of London, UK

<sup>7</sup>Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, UK

<sup>8</sup>Department of Experimental Clinical and Health Psychology, Ghent University, Belgium

<sup>9</sup><http://www.cost-essea.com/>

**Abstract:** Europe is diverse in terms of economy, cultures, socio-demography, and languages. A crucial aspect of psychiatric research is the availability of standardized screening, diagnostic, and characterization instruments. We fine-mapped the accessibility of 14 clinical scales and cognitive tests for the assessment of early childhood Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD; e.g., ADOS, ADI-R, SCQ, SRS, CHAT, MESL) within 21 European countries. These tools are essential for internationally competitive early ASD detection research. We identified a considerable variation not only in the availability, but also psychometric standardization, and formal distribution of the instruments between the countries, privileging English speaking, high-income, and highly populated European countries. Absence of country-specific standardization was a problem across many countries, independent of income and size. Findings demonstrate, on a concrete level, the challenges in creating equal early ASD identification research opportunities in Europe, and the need for increased funding for instrument development and validation. We discuss the reasons, implications, and consequences of this inequity and ways of reducing it.

**Keywords:** assessment, neurodevelopmental disorders, mental health, tests, psychometrics

Europe is diverse in terms of cultures and languages, comprising 53 countries according to the WHO definition (including parts of geographical Asia), of which 28 are currently organized under the European Union (EU). Although many European countries are developed high-income countries, this should not camouflage the huge differences between high and less developed countries. For instance, following the World Bank's (worldbank.org) 2013/2014 classification of low- and middle-income (LAMI) countries, a noteworthy number of 17 European countries are still judged as low-middle (e.g., Albania, Georgia, Moldova,

Ukraine) or upper-middle income (e.g., Bulgaria, FYR Macedonia, Romania, Turkey), of which four are EU countries. Clinical and research psychiatry is equally diverse across Europe, with substantial variations even within countries due to federalism or regionalization (Evans-Lacko et al., 2014; Muijen, 2012). As for the worldwide situation, research output in Europe is dominated by the high-income countries (Muijen, 2012; Sumathipala, Siribaddana, & Patel, 2004).

Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) is a neurodevelopmental condition defined by overarching impairments in the areas of

reciprocal social communication and interaction, alongside a preference for repetitive, stereotyped activities, patterns of behaviors and interests (Bölte & Hallmayer, 2011). ASD has emerged a top priority health care issue in many countries (see, for instance, USA: “Combating Autism Act of 2006,” “Autism Treatment Acceleration ACT of 2009”; or UK: Autism Act UK, 2009) because of increasing rates of diagnoses (in high-income countries) around the globe (Elsabbagh et al., 2012), as well as high associated societal challenges and costs (Gustavsson et al., 2011) of educational and clinical care. In recent years, a growing interest in early detection of ASD has emerged, mostly driven by the insight that early identification is a prerequisite for early intervention, which itself may improve long-term outcomes for individuals with ASD (Dawson, 2008). Several methodologies have helped to investigate early detection and intervention in ASD, in particular screening studies and research on high-risk siblings (Bölte et al., 2013; Garcia-Primo et al., 2014; Ozonoff et al., 2011).

The availability of standardized diagnostic instruments is a crucial prerequisite for conducting high-quality early ASD detection research. Without evidence-based standardized phenotyping in psychiatry there is a risk of diagnostic bias and “garbage in, garbage out” research. Significant progress has been made over the past two decades in the development of reliable and valid phenotyping tools for ASD (Charman & Gotham, 2013). Many of these instruments are part of national or regional clinical guidelines for ASD in European countries (Arnglim et al., 2013; “Autism diagnosis in children and young people. Recognition, referral and diagnosis of children and young people on the autism spectrum”), while some are viewed as a “gold standard,” most notably the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule, Second Edition (Hus, Gotham, & Lord, 2012) combined with the Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised (Rutter, Le Couteur, & Lord, 2003). Publication of ASD research findings in leading ASD or general psychiatry journals can be challenging or even impossible without these tools. Nevertheless, their availability, validation, and standardization are limited to a small group of languages and cultures. The latter substantially limits international collaboration, and research opportunities for many countries, even in Europe, perhaps particularly for the LAMI countries among them.

The goal of this study was to inventory the accessibility and standardization of diagnostic instruments for early identification of autism across 21 European countries. Instruments were mapped that are currently required for internationally competitive early ASD identification research. With this work we aim to highlight potential challenges and (in-)equalities of science opportunities across

Europe in a concrete manner. The findings might be valuable to further raise awareness of research barriers in Europe and beyond, and to direct the focus of international public policy on these issues. This is particularly important not only for LAMI countries, but also for less populated countries and those with less commonly spoken languages.

## Methods

### Participants and Procedure

The study was carried out between November 2013 and April 2014. Twenty-one European countries involved in the COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology; [www.cost.eu](http://www.cost.eu)) action “Enhancing the Scientific Study of Early Autism” (ESSEA; for details see [www.cost-essea.com](http://www.cost-essea.com)) participated. COST-ESSEA is a network of over 60 scientists from 23 European countries, including three LAMI countries (Romania, FYR Macedonia, and Turkey), intending to develop capacity in early autism research across all action members. The principal investigators or research groups’ contact persons for each of the COST-ESSEA research network countries were surveyed. They were the official COST-ESSEA management committee representatives for their countries,<sup>1</sup> chosen by the chair, vice chair, and the four working group leaders of the action based when a country entered the network based on documented scientific experience and excellence in the area of early ASD assessment research. The countries were partly clustered for the study to form 16 language/cultural groups that in practice usually use the same versions of adapted diagnostic tools: Austria/Germany/Switzerland (German), Belgium/The Netherlands (Dutch), Czech Republic, Finland, France (including information on French-Canadian adaptations of tools), Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Israel, Macedonia, Poland, Portugal (including information on Brazilian adaptations of tools), Spain, Sweden/Norway (Scandinavia), Romania, and UK/Ireland (English; even US versions of instruments included here). Excel spreadsheet inventories containing items about the availability and standardization of language/culturally adapted versions of diagnostic instruments often used in leading research on early ASD identification were generated. They included four items: (1) Existence of domestic (language) versions of the instruments. (2) Domestic psychometric data (norms, reliability, validity) published. (3) Copyright for the instrument. (4) Published studies, on each of the 14 scales/tests (see Section “Inventoried Instruments” below). The spreadsheets were sent via e-mail to the

<sup>1</sup> See: [https://e-services.cost.eu/w3/index.php?id=1627&action\\_number=BM1004](https://e-services.cost.eu/w3/index.php?id=1627&action_number=BM1004)

**Table 1.** Total number of assessment tools (out of 14 examined in this review) available in each of the 16 language/cultural groups

Region	Availability	Standardization	Formal distribution
UK, Ireland	14	9 (1)*	14
Scandinavia	14	5	13
Belgium, The Netherlands	14	7	12
Israel	13	0	11
Portugal	13	0	8
France	12	3	11
Finland	12	0	11
Germany, Austria, Switzerland	11	8	11
Italy	11	3	9
Spain	11	4	11
Poland	9	1	8
Iceland	8	1	8
Romania	6	0	6
Hungary	6	0	5
Macedonia	5	1	3
Czech Republic	4	0	2

Notes. Availability = total number of assessment tools for which a language version exists; Standardization = how many of those language-specific versions have country-specific psychometrics; Formal distribution = number of psychological assessment tools which are formally distributed (by a publisher or the authors of the method) per language/cultural group.

\*Number of assessment tools with UK, Ireland standardization (other value includes USA specific normalizations).

principal investigators or research groups' contact persons and returned electronically. The returned material was analyzed, missing or inconsistent data was added or corrected by the authors based on own knowledge, searches in existing databases (e.g., PubMed, PsycINFO), correspondence with publishers as well as the original authors of the mapped diagnostic tools, and summarized to form an overview on the availability of the clinical scales and psychological tests across the 16 language/cultural groups. Finally, the overview was sent to the informants for approval. Before submission (December 2014) of this article some information was updated to include the most recent developments.

The selection of early ASD diagnostic instruments was based on a research protocol developed within "European Autism Interventions – A Multicentre Study for Developing New Medications" (EU-AIMS; [www.eu-aims.eu](http://www.eu-aims.eu)). Herein, and using Delphi method, leading European laboratories of ASD research have agreed on a common protocol of 14 clinical scales and psychological tests currently deemed the most adequate ones for research on early ASD detection, owing to their scientific quality, as well as scientific and clinical usage from an international perspective. An overview of this shared protocol is available online ([www.eurosibs.eu](http://www.eurosibs.eu)), and the strategic concepts of EU-AIMS in terms of assessments and patient characterization are described elsewhere in detail (Ashwood, Buitelaar, Murphy,

Spooren, & Charman, 2014). The instruments are briefly introduced in the following section.

## Inventoried Instruments

### ASD-Specific Scales

The Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule, Second Edition (ADOS-2) is a play and interview-based observation scale administered by experienced and specifically trained clinicians operationalizing DSM-IV/DSM-5 criteria for ASD in an empirically derived diagnostic algorithm. Different modules of the instrument are applied depending on the individual's age and expressive language level. Module T (for toddlers; no speech to single phrases, age 12–30 months) and module 1 (no speech to single phrases, > 31 months of age to school age) are most relevant to early ASD assessment research.

The Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised (ADI-R) is an investigator-based structured diagnostic caregiver interview, also operationalizing DSM-IV/DSM-5 criteria for ASD in a diagnostic algorithm. It can be used for individuals with suspected ASD of any age, although it is preferably used for children and adolescents. Recently, specific ADI-R diagnostic algorithms for toddlers and preschoolers have been published (Kim, Thurm, Shumway, & Lord, 2013). The combined use of the ADI-R and ADOS is often viewed as the first choice of diagnosing ASD in research and practice. This is true even for early ASD assessments (Zander, Sturm, & Bölte, 2015).

The Social Communication Questionnaire (SCQ) is a parent-report clinical ASD screener derived from the ADI-R. There are two versions: the "current" and the "lifetime" version.

The Social Responsiveness Scale (SRS) is a parent or teacher report questionnaire of autism traits for children aged 4–18 years. The preschool version of the SRS (SRS-P) covers the age range of 3–4 years.

The Development and Well-Being Assessment (DAWBA) is a group of interviews, questionnaires, and rating scales to enable ICD-10/DSM-IV psychiatric diagnoses on 5–17 year olds; DAWBA results can be inserted into a computer program algorithm that generates probabilities for a range of psychiatric disorders, including ASD. The provisional computer-generated diagnoses are then reviewed by an expert clinician.

The Quantitative (Q)-CHAT and the Modified (M)-CHAT/-Revised are early parent-report ASD screeners for young children aged between 16/18 and 24/30 months of age.

The Repetitive Behavior Scale (RBS) is a questionnaire that captures the breadth of stereotypic behaviors in individuals of any age with ASD on five dimensions, namely ritualistic/sameness behavior, stereotypic behavior,

**Table 2.** Availability of each of the assessment tools per language/culture group

	Availability	Standardization	Formal distribution
<i>ADOS</i>	16	3	14
<i>ADI-R</i>	15	4	13
CBCL	15	3	14
<i>CHAT</i>	14	3	12
SCQ	14	2	13
CDI	13	7	13
<i>DAWBA</i>	13	1	13
VABS	12	4	11
IBQ-R	12	3	12
ECBQ-R	11	0	11
SRS	11	3	8
ITSP	9	1	5
<i>RBS-R</i>	4	0	1
MSEL	4	0	3

Notes. ASD-specific scales are marked in italics. Availability = number of language/culture groups for which a given method is available; Standardization = in how many of the assessed language/culture groups the diagnostic instrument has been specifically standardized; Formal distribution = in how many of the assessed language/culture groups the diagnostic instrument is formally distributed (by a publisher or the authors of the method).

ADOS = Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule, ADI-R = Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised, CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist, CHAT = Modified Checklist for Autism in Toddlers, SCQ = Social Communication Questionnaire, CDI = MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory, DAWBA = Development and Well-Being Assessment, VABS = Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales, IBQ-R = Infant Behavior Questionnaire - Revised, ECBQ-R = Early Childhood Behavior Questionnaire, SRS = Social Responsiveness Scale, ITSP = Infant-Toddler Sensory Profile, RBS-R = Repetitive Behavior Scale - Revised, MSEL = Mullen Scales of Early Learning.

self-injurious behavior, compulsive behavior, and restricted interests. For comprehensive references see Electronic Supplementary Materials 1 and 3.

### Non ASD-Specific Psychological Tests and Clinical Scales

The MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory (CDI) is a parent/caregiver report tool for assessing language and communication development in infants and children. In most versions, it comes in two scales, an infant (8–16 months) and a toddler scale (16–30 months), capturing comprehension, word production and aspects of symbolic and communicative gesture, word production and the early grammar. Short screening version exists for English and Spanish and several other languages.

The Mullen Scales of Early Learning is a clinician administered child development test to measure gross and fine motor, visual reception, and expressive and receptive language from birth to 68 months of age.

The Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales (VABS) is a parent/caregiver report measure (administered as either a questionnaire or a clinical interview) of adaptive function

in everyday life regarding social, communicative, daily living, and motor skills (up to 6 years) from birth onwards.

The Infant-Toddler Sensory Profile (ITSP) is a parent/caregiver questionnaire on sensory processing patterns in infants (0–6 months) and toddlers (7–36 months), quantifying five domains: auditory, visual, tactile, vestibular, and oral sensory processing.

The Infant Behavior Questionnaire-Revised (IBQ-R) is a parent rated measure of infant temperament (3–12 months) on 14 subscales (e.g., activity level, distress to limitations, fear, smiling/laughter, cuddliness). Short and very short versions exist.

The Early Childhood Behavior Questionnaire (ECBQ) serves the same purpose as the IBQ-R, but in young children aged 18 and 36 months. It assesses 18 dimensions of temperament (e.g., attentional focus, cuddliness, discomfort, frustration, impulsivity, shyness).

The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) 1½–5 is an assessment of general problem behaviors in preschool children. The information is obtained from parents or teachers using items on eight syndrome scales (emotionally reactive; anxious/depressed; somatic complaints; withdrawn; sleep problems, attention problems; rule-breaking behavior; aggressive behavior). For comprehensive references see Electronic Supplementary Materials 2 and 3.

## Results

A detailed description of adaptations available for each of the reviewed scales or tests per country/linguistic region is provided in the supplementary tables and references (Electronic Supplementary Materials 1–3): ADOS in Supplementary Table 1, ADI-R in Supplementary Table 2, SCQ in Supplementary Table 3, SRS in Supplementary Table 4, DAWBA in Supplementary Table 5, Q-CHAT and M-CHAT/-R in Supplementary Table 6, RBS-R in Supplementary Table 7, CDI in Supplementary Table 8, Mullen Scales of Early Learning in Supplementary Table 9, VABS in Supplementary Table 10, ITSP in Supplementary Table 11, IBQ-R in Supplementary Table 12, ECBQ in Supplementary Table 13, and CBCL 1½–5 in Supplementary Table 14.

A substantial variation was identified in the availability of diagnostic instruments for different countries, cultures, or languages (Table 1), with only three regions (UK/Ireland, Scandinavia, and Belgium/The Netherlands) having access to sufficiently usable forms of all of the 14 diagnostic instruments. Additionally, clinicians and researchers from Israel and Portugal have access to 13 out of 14 proposed diagnostic instruments. For four of the surveyed countries (Romania, Hungary, FYR Macedonia, and Czech Republic) less than half of the instruments have been translated or adapted.

Not surprisingly, the number of instruments being available per country from a commercial publisher or directly from the authors of the respective tool in an organized fashion (e.g., download from a website) (here called “formal distribution”) also varied for different languages and countries/regions. In addition, although many of the available diagnostic tools are also distributed formally, in most cases, the number of available tools is higher than the number of tools distributed formally. The exceptions are UK/Ireland, German speaking countries (Germany, Austria, and Switzerland), Spain, Iceland, and Romania in which all available tools are even distributed formally.

Generally, many of the available (and published) diagnostic instruments have not been specifically standardized for the different European languages and countries/regions (Table 1). Even in the regions with high availability of diagnostic instruments, country/language specific reliability and validity properties or norms/cut-offs are sparse (e.g., in France, Italy, Spain) or missing (e.g., in Israel, Portugal, Finland). German and English speaking countries are exceptions from this observation, even though in the UK and Ireland for some tools there is a high reliance on generalizability of studies from the USA. If one assumes generalizability across English speaking countries, the USA, UK, and Ireland are characterized by the highest number of available, formally distributed as well as normalized methods. Dutch speaking countries as well as Scandinavian countries are other examples of regions with relatively high availability of some usable forms of the diagnostic instruments, which are mostly formally distributed. Country/language-specific normalization is, however, less common in case of these regions. Scientists and clinicians from German speaking countries can formally access 11 of the proposed diagnostic instruments, for which two thirds have a culture/language-specific standardization. In the case of other regions, even if translated diagnostic instruments are (formally or informally) available, specific standardizations are lacking. Clinicians and scientists from Czech Republic have the most limited access to diagnostic tools for early ASD assessment. Only 4 out of 14 tools have been translated to Czech, out of which two are formally available but no language-specific data has been collected.

Table 2 shows the availability of each of the early ASD diagnostic instruments within the totality of European languages/cultural regions. The only widely available tool across Europe is the ADOS/ADOS-2, which is accessible across all the examined language/culture regions. The ADI-R, CBCL, M-CHAT/Q-CHAT, and SCQ are available in the majority of regions. Nevertheless, there are not very many publications on these relatively well accessible methods originating in Europe (see Electronic Supplementary Materials 1-3). Two instruments are particularly infrequently available in Europe: The Mullen Scales of Early

Learning and the RBS-R (both available in four languages/culture regions). Among the formally distributed tools available in different language versions from commercial publishers are the ADOS-2 and ADI-R. The process of getting both of these published is protracted and takes several years. Instruments formally distributed by their authors are the DAWBA, M-CHAT, and MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory. Instruments with poor distribution are the ITSP, RBS-R, and Mullen Scales of Early Learning. Region/language specific standardizations are scarce or missing for many of the early ASD diagnostic instruments. This holds true even for tools with greater availability. The CDI can be partially considered an exception because it is available in 13 out of 16 examined regions and it has specific norms for seven of the countries.

## Discussion

Psychiatric research is based on reliable phenotyping, predominantly ensured by psychodiagnostic tools including first choice diagnostic instruments (“gold standard”) to determine psychiatric status, general psychopathology, or psychological characteristics (e.g., neuropsychological functions, IQ). Nevertheless, many of these scales and tests are only available in a limited number of languages, and have been normalized and validated for an even smaller number of cultural backgrounds. This study examined the (in-)equalities of research prerequisites across Europe regarding the access to diagnostic instruments enabling internationally competitive research on early ASD identification. Our study suggests that the middle-income countries are disadvantaged in Europe. The two included middle-income European countries (Romania, FYR Macedonia) had limited access to diagnostic scales compared to high-income European countries. In addition, limited access to certain instruments was identified in other east European countries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland) as well as Iceland, a country with a small population and its own language. However, even in these countries the access to a smaller selection of ASD-specific scales, such as the ADOS-2, ADI-R, SCQ, or M-CHAT/Q-CHAT or instruments used frequently in international research and practice to evaluate general psychopathology (CBCL), was satisfactory. These scales are either formally distributed by commercial publishers or freely and systematically made available by the authors. A further, less recognized issue in this context is the level of availability of each instrument to clinicians as well as the availability of adequate clinical and research training. In many countries where certain tools are not formally distributed, they have been adapted for research purposes only. This means that each administration is subject to license

fees paid directly to the copyright holder and in result the instrument is not available for clinical practice. Thus tool availability is further impounded by the need to negotiate license agreements with the publisher of the original version, while the publisher often sets a number of limitations on the use of data collected with this instrument. This is a particularly sensitive issue in the face of increasing demands for free access to research data put forward by public research funding bodies. As the purpose of this mapping was to examine if European countries can adhere to internationally competitive research protocols ([www.eu-aims.eu](http://www.eu-aims.eu); [www.eurosibs.eu](http://www.eurosibs.eu)), not the usage of ASD diagnostics in European clinical practice, we did not examine frequencies of usage of the various instruments in relation to either commercial or free distribution. We are therefore unable to evaluate which of the two is generally more beneficial for accessibility and usage. The latter is surely a limitation of the current study and deserves more attention in future research. It is of paramount interest to the EU-AIMS project mentioned earlier, and strategies and actions to solve related obstacles in Europe have been recently described (Ashwood et al., 2014). Still, as commercially distributed instruments are associated with costs for purchase, which are often high for LAMI countries, and entail stricter rules for copyright and terms of usage, free access is probably more advisable to reduce inequalities of research prerequisites concerning instrument access. However, even free access might not solve other challenges for LAMI countries, such as limited access to (expensive) training to ensure quality control of administration, scoring, and interpretation, like currently required for the ADOS-2 and ADI-R.

Strikingly, we found that for all European languages/cultural regions, no matter high or middle income, small or large population, and rare or frequently spoken language, there was a substantial deficiency of adequate language/cultural standardization. The only language for which standardization was sufficient across instruments was English (UK/Ireland), but only when assuming high intercultural validity between these countries and USA. Most scales originate from the USA, and generalizability of psychometric properties and norms to high-income European countries is often assumed. However, several studies, for instance those from Germany or Sweden on the ADOS-2, ADI-R, or SRS, show that this is only partially true (Bölte & Poustka, 2004; Bölte, Poustka, & Constantino, 2008; Zander et al., 2015). The latter demonstrates the need for increased cross-cultural research in the field of psychometric evaluation, an extremely and continuously underfunded area of science. This is unfortunate, as a large part of psychiatric research of all kind is based on reliable phenotyping, predominantly ensured by psychodiagnostic tools.

Reasons for international research imbalances in terms of tool availability and other aspects are multifaceted.

Proximal causes include the fact that the amount of research conducted in LAMI countries is comparably small and more likely to be of lower scientific quality than in high-income countries (Alem & Kebede, 2003). There are extremely few research skilled psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and other mental health professionals, and those who are, mostly work clinically, with a strong need to focus on health care services. Researchers face difficult circumstances in LAMI countries, owing to social, political, and economic situations that do not or cannot prioritize psychiatry research, leading to a lack of funding, poor equipment, and inadequate education. Moreover, a low level of scientific culture with no research and publication tradition hampers research (Jablensky, 1999). Our study also points out research disadvantages in developed countries with small populations and rarely spoken languages (e.g., Iceland). This is an obvious challenge, but it has rarely been discussed previously in the literature.

The underrepresentation of certain countries, especially LAMI countries in psychiatry research, is both ethically and scientifically challenging. Ethically, The World Mental Health report has pointed out the immense burden of psychiatric problems and disability that are associated with mental disorders in LAMI countries (Desjarlais, 1996), and the research gap also reflects the well-known 10/90 global divide: less than 10% of the world's research resources are earmarked for more than 90% of the health problems (Global Forum for Health Research, 2000). Scientifically, it is reasonable to support the use of the research capacities and findings from LAMI countries. Their inclusion might reduce research and publication bias, by providing a lot broader perspective on mental health and possibly new significant insights into basic and applied psychiatry. To a lesser degree this might even be true for developed countries, with small populations or rarely spoken languages.

To increase underrepresented countries, collaborative research between LAMI and more scientifically established countries is fruitful (Doku & Mallett, 2003). Several international collaborations have previously raised awareness for inequalities in psychological and psychiatric research prerequisites including the availability of scales to assess child development. For instance, The World Psychiatric Association (WPA) Task Force initiated activities aiming to support psychiatry journals (e.g., with PubMed indexation) in LAMI countries (de Jesus Mari et al., 2009), the Grand Challenges in Global Mental Health initiative by the US National Institute of Mental Health has identified research priorities to impact on mental health internationally (Collins et al., 2011), The WHO-launched collaborative longitudinal study of schizophrenia (Padma, 2014) and the Grand Challenges in Global Mental Health initiatives (Collins et al., 2011) aim to disclose overseen obstacles



for international psychiatric research. In terms of diagnostic tool availability, The Etiology, Risk Factors, and Interactions of Enteric Infections and Malnutrition and the Consequences for Child Health and Development (MAL-ED) cohort study (Murray-Kolb et al., 2014). Across eight sites, in Bangladesh, Brazil, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, South Africa, and Tanzania, the Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development and a modified MacArthur Communicative Development Inventory were adapted. Herein, the authors explicitly point out the complexity and costs of worldwide psychodiagnostic tool harmonization, in order to raise awareness among funders for future research support in this area of science.

The current mapping study is the first to review lacking diagnostic scale availability in early assessment of childhood ASD for research purposes from a cross-national perspective. Initiatives such as COST-ESSEA, and outcomes from these initiatives, such as the present study, can help to generate awareness of research inequalities in ASD and other neurodevelopmental disorders. They might serve as a decision pad for policy makers and the international research community to overcome those inequalities. Future studies in the area should investigate the status quo of tool availability in ASD beyond Europe, also include scales for adolescent and adult ASD, and incorporate research prerequisites in relation clinical practice.

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the ESF COST Action BM1004 Enhancing the Scientific Study of Early Autism (ESSEA), the Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking under Grant Agreement Number 115300, resources of which are composed of financial contribution from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007 – 2013) and EFPIA companies' in-kind contribution, the Swedish Research Council (Nr. 523-2009-7054), and the Swedish Research Council, in partnership with FAS, FORMAS, and VINNOVA [Cross-disciplinary research programme concerning children's and young people's mental health; Grant Number 259 – 2012-24]; The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation [P12-0270:1], Jerringfonden, and the Polish National Science Centre (2012/07/B/HS6/01464).

We thank the members of the ESSEA COST Action WG1 and WG2 who contributed to this article: Evald Saemundsen, Sigridur Jonsdottir (Iceland); Anneli Kylliäinen, Irma Moilanen (Finland); Silvana Markovska-Simoska, Nada Pop-Jordanova (Macedonia); Petra Warreyn, Chantal Kemner, Iris Oosterling (Netherlands/Belgium); Catherine Barthelemy (France); Ricardo Canal Bedia (Spain); Helen Mcconachie, Jonathan Green (Ireland/UK); Nurit Yirmiya,

David Mankuta (Israel); Eric Zander (Sweden, Norway, Denmark); Guiomar Oliveira (Portugal); Fabio Apicella (Italy).

### Electronic Supplementary Material

The electronic supplementary material is available with the online version of the article at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000340>

ESM 1. Tables 1–7.

ASD-specific scales.

ESM 2. Tables 8–14.

Non ASD-specific psychological tests and clinical scales.

ESM 3. Reference list.

References to ESM 1 and 2.

### References

- Alem, A., & Kebede, D. (2003). Conducting psychiatric research in the developing world: Challenges and rewards. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 182, 185–187.
- Arngim, T., Brødsgaard, M., Christiansen, P. B., Dalsgaard, S., Geoffroy, M. B., Jacobsen, T. B., ... Warrer, T. (2013). *Retningslinjer for diagnostik og behandling af ADHD hos voksne* [Guidelines for diagnosis and treatment of ADHD]. Copenhagen: Dansk Psykiatrisk Selskab. [http://dpsnet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/2013-11-29\\_retningslinjer\\_adhd\\_ok.pdf](http://dpsnet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/2013-11-29_retningslinjer_adhd_ok.pdf)
- Ashwood, K. L., Buitelaar, J., Murphy, D., Spooren, W., & Charman, T. (2014). European clinical network: Autism spectrum disorder assessments and patient characterisation. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 24, 985–995. doi: 10.1007/s00787-014-0648-2
- Bölte, S., & Hallmayer, J. (2011). *Autism spectrum conditions: FAQs on autism, Asperger Syndrome, and atypical autism answered by international experts*. Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe Publishing.
- Bölte, S., Marschik, P. B., Falck-Ytter, T., Charman, T., Roeyers, H., & Elsabbagh, M. (2013). Infants at risk for autism: A European perspective on current status, challenges and opportunities. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 22, 341–348. doi: 10.1007/s00787-012-0368-4
- Bölte, S., & Poustka, F. (2004). Diagnostic Observation Scale for Autistic Disorders: Initial results of reliability and validity. *Zeitschrift für Kinder- und Jugendpsychiatrie und Psychotherapie*, 32, 45–50.
- Bölte, S., Poustka, F., & Constantino, J. N. (2008). Assessing autistic traits: Cross-cultural validation of the Social Responsiveness Scale (SRS). *Autism Research*, 1, 354–363. doi: 10.1002/aur.49
- Charman, T., & Gotham, K. (2013). Measurement Issues: Screening and diagnostic instruments for autism spectrum disorders – lessons from research and practice. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 18, 52–63. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-3588.2012.00664.x
- Collins, P. Y., Patel, V., Joestl, S. S., March, D., Insel, T. R., Daar, A. S., ... Fairburn, C. (2011). Grand challenges in global mental health. *Nature*, 475, 27–30.
- Dawson, G. (2008). Early behavioral intervention, brain plasticity, and the prevention of autism spectrum disorder. *Development and Psychopathology*, 20, 775–803. doi: 10.1017/S0954579408000370

- de Jesus Mari, J., Patel, V., Kieling, C., Anders, M., Jakovljevi, M., Lam, L. C., ... Herrman, H. (2009). The 5/95 Gap on the dissemination of mental health research: The World Psychiatric Association (WPA) task force report on project with editors of low and middle income (LAMI) countries. *African Journal of Psychiatry*, 12, 33–39.
- Desjarlais, R. (1996). *World mental health: Problems and priorities in low-income countries*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Doku, V. C., & Mallett, M. R. (2003). Collaborating with developing countries in psychiatric research. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 182, 188–189.
- Elsabbagh, M., Divan, G., Koh, Y. J., Kim, Y. S., Kauchali, S., Marcín, C., ... Fombonne, E. (2012). Global prevalence of autism and other pervasive developmental disorders. *Autism Research*, 5, 160–179. doi: 10.1002/aur.239
- Evans-Lacko, S., Courtin, E., Fiorillo, A., Knapp, M., Luciano, M., Park, A. L., ... Consortium, R. (2014). The state of the art in European research on reducing social exclusion and stigma related to mental health: A systematic mapping of the literature. *European Psychiatry*, 29, 381–389. doi: 10.1016/j.eurpsy.2014.02.007
- Garcia-Primo, P., Hellendoorn, A., Charman, T., Roeyers, H., Dereu, M., Roge, B., ... Canal-Bedia, R. (2014). Screening for autism spectrum disorders: State of the art in Europe. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 23, 1005–1021. doi: 10.1007/s00787-014-0555-6
- Global Forum for Health Research. (2000). *The 10/90 report on health research 2000*. Geneva, Switzerland: Author.
- Gustavsson, A., Svensson, M., Jacobi, F., Allgulander, C., Alonso, J., Beghi, E., ... Group, C. S. (2011). Cost of disorders of the brain in Europe 2010. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, 21, 718–779. doi: 10.1016/j.euroneuro.2011.08.008
- Hus, V., Gotham, K., & Lord, C. (2012). Standardizing ADOS domain scores: Separating severity of social affect and restricted and repetitive behaviors. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 44, 2400–2412. doi: 10.1007/s10803-012-1719-1
- Jablensky, A. (1999). Psychiatric epidemiology and the global public health agenda. *International Journal of Mental Health*, 28, 6–14.
- Kim, S. H., Thurm, A., Shumway, S., & Lord, C. (2013). Multisite study of new Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised (ADI-R) algorithms for toddlers and young preschoolers. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 43, 1527–1538. doi: 10.1007/s10803-012-1696-4
- Muijen, M. (2012). The state of psychiatry in Europe: Facing the challenges, developing consensus. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 24, 274–277. doi: 10.3109/09540261.2012.697264
- Murray-Kolb, L. E., Rasmussen, Z. A., Scharf, R. J., Rasheed, M. A., Svendsen, E., Seidman, J. C., ... Maphula, A. (2014). The MAL-ED cohort study: Methods and lessons learned when assessing early child development and caregiving mediators in infants and young children in 8 low-and middle-income countries. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 59(Suppl. 4), S261–S272.
- National Institute for Health and Health Care Excellence (NICE). (2011). *Autism in under 19s: Recognition, referral and diagnosis. Clinical guideline*. Retrieved from <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg128/resources/autism-in-under-19s-recognition-referral-and-diagnosis-35109456621253>
- Ozonoff, S., Young, G. S., Carter, A., Messinger, D., Yirmiya, N., Zwaigenbaum, L., ... Stone, W. L. (2011). Recurrence risk for autism spectrum disorders: A Baby Siblings Research Consortium study. *Pediatrics*, 128, e488–495. doi: 10.1542/peds.2010-2825
- Padma, T. V. (2014). Developing countries: The outcomes paradox. *Nature*, 508, S14–15. doi: 10.1038/508S14a
- Rutter, M., Le Couteur, A., & Lord, C. (2003). *Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised (ADI-R)*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.
- Sumathipala, A., Siribaddana, S., & Patel, V. (2004). Underrepresentation of developing countries in the research literature: Ethical issues arising from a survey of five leading medical journals. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 5, E5. doi: 10.1186/1472-6939-5-5
- Zander, E., Sturm, H., & Bölte, S. (2015). The added value of the combined use of the Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised and the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule: Diagnostic validity in a clinical Swedish sample of toddlers and young preschoolers. *Autism*, 19, 187–199. doi: 10.1177/1362361313516199

Received February 10, 2015

Revision received September 23, 2015

Accepted October 5, 2015

Published online August 3, 2016

#### Sven Bölte

Center of Neurodevelopmental Disorders (KIND)

Department of Women's and Children's Health

Neuropsychiatry Unit

Karolinska Institutet

11330 Stockholm

Sweden

Tel. +46 8 514-52701

E-mail sven.bolte@ki.se