

COST WG4 meeting minutes, 5/11/12, Ghent

Scientific presentations focusing on parent-child interaction measures:

- Jonathan Green: Social Interaction Measure for Parents and Infants (SIM-PI) (Wan et al., *RIDD* 2012, Wan et al *JCPP* in press).
- Helen McConachie: Coding parent-child interaction as an outcome measure of intervention.
- Petra Warreyn (ESR): Coding parent-child interaction: some coding schemes and future plans

The scientific presentations were followed by a group discussion. Important conclusions from this discussion are:

- There seems to be an important difference in coding the interaction of children with and without language. This difference is most evident around the age of 18 months. The relation between coding schemes that do and that do not include verbal communication are not straightforward.
- Parent-child interaction will also be recorded at the sites participating in the EU-AIMS sibling research. It may be an opportunity to propose a common coding scheme, perhaps combining both more detailed frequency counts and rating scales.
- An issue that is repeatedly raised (also in previous discussions) is the comparison between detailed frequency coding (using systems as Interact or the Observer) and more global rating scales. The detailed coding systems generate many data, but it is not easy to get the most relevant information out of it. Anett informed us of a paper by Adamson et al. *JADD*, 2012, that has compared both kinds of systems, concluding that rating scales are certainly useful.

Training school:

- We plan to organize a training school on parent-child interaction coding in 2013 (probably June or September, preference goes to June)
- We had a long discussion about whether we should actually train people in one or more coding schemes, and if so, which coding schemes this would be. Are there some of the coding schemes used by members in our group that seem to be ideal for spreading over other research groups? What does the European research community need, now and in the next few years?
- Given that the choice for a coding scheme depends on the goals of the study (sibling follow-up, measuring change in intervention studies, ...) and the age and verbal ability of the child (see above), we decided to try and give initial workshops on some of the most promising coding schemes, both global rating systems and more detailed coding. To be most transferrable, we would need rather simple coding schemes.
- In a few days' workshop, we can offer a thorough exposure to a system but not train attendees to competence and research reliability. This would take ongoing work, perhaps through STSMs (or distance training, but that requires a lot of time of the trainers, and problems of translation of speech in videos).
- Also, given that the ADOS-C is a promising instrument and that it will probably become the 'industry standard' in the coming years, we should perhaps try and take this opportunity to get European researchers familiar with and if possible trained in this coding scheme.
- Helen and Jonathan will further discuss the possibilities concerning the ADOS-C, the extent to which it has completed its development and there are data to support its responsiveness to change with the relevant people. It is noted that ADOS-C rates only the child's behavior, during toy play with the parent.

- Our preliminary schedule would be: a 4-day training school, with a first day devoted to more general issues in set-up and coding (separate lectures), 2 days of training in the ADOS-C, and 1 day where people choose to get an introduction in 1 of 3 other coding systems (SIM-PI, DCMA, Kasari/Kaale coding of joint engagement)
- The budget generally allows for about 4 trainers and 12 trainees.
- To be continued in follow-up phone conferences and the Bilbao meeting.

Joint meeting with WG3

- There is a suggestion, in analogy with WG1/2, to do a mapping exercise of ethical procedures and governance issues in relation to screening and intervention studies. Mayada kindly offered to help with that, if we decide that we want to do this exercise
- In contrast to WG1 and 2, as a group we do not have that many questions about how these studies are done in other countries and how they may be done. If we would do this exercise, it would be as a preparation for a joint study. However, if we would apply for a joint study, this would probably be with a EU funding source, and then usually there is a complete set of detailed regulations that every site has to follow. That would make it less relevant to make an inventory of what every country is doing.
- Therefore, we decided not to do this survey.

Scientific presentations

- Erica Salomone (ESR): European survey on treatment as usual. Erica presented the preliminary analyses of data from over 2000 respondents to the international service survey. The data are very interesting, and at some points surprising. One suggestion was to arrange results by age of diagnosis, as children recently diagnosed may have fewer services (or more). After final analyses, Erica will send round the presentation with results for every country; these will be discussed in individual e-mail exchanges. After that, we will schedule a phone conference to discuss the continuation of this work, where to publish, authorship, etc.
- Helen McConachie (work led by Iris Oosterling): Parent implemented early intervention: evidence based on pooled data from four European randomized controlled trials. Data synthesis is proceeding and application will be made for a STSM to do data analysis and drafting of a paper in early 2013.
- Judith Sinzig: Survey for Professionals concerning availability of services for young children with autism spectrum disorder: presentation and discussion of the survey draft. The content is now agreed, and Isabella Breuer from Bonn will be undertaking a STSM to work on surveying the COST ESSEA members to report on the situation in their country.

Miscellaneous

- IMFAR 2013: A scientific panel on early intervention has been submitted as planned.
- STSM's: we hope to have the call early 2013, there will be two calls in 2013. Preference will be given to a joint activity with specified product, instead of visiting labs.
- Telephone conferences: middle of January, middle March. Helen to set up Doodles for these dates with her administrator Jane Tilbrook.