# 1 Concurrent validity of an Estimator of Weekly Alcohol

# 2 Consumption (EWAC) based on the Extended AUDIT

3

# 4 Authors

- 5 Dutey-Magni, PF,<sup>1,4,\*</sup> Brown, J,<sup>2</sup> Holmes, J,<sup>3</sup> Sinclair, JMA<sup>4</sup>
- 6
- 7 1 Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, London, UK
- 8 2 Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, University College London, London, UK
- 9 3 School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
- 10 4 Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, London, UK
- 11

# 12 \* Corresponding author:

- 13 Peter F. Dutey-Magni
- 14 Institute of Health Informatics
- 15 University College London
- 16 222 Euston Road
- 17 London
- 18 NW1 2DA
- 19 UK
- 20 Telephone: (+44) 020 3108 6424
- 21 Email: <u>p.dutey-magni@ucl.ac.uk</u>
- 22

# 23 Running head

24 Estimator of Weekly Alcohol Consumption EWAC

# 25 Word count

26 Body: 3,468 words (3,500 maximum); Abstract: 330 words (330 max)

# 27 Competing interests

- JB has received unrestricted research funding to study smoking cessation from companies
   who manufacture smoking cessation medications. PD, JH and JMAS declare no competing
- 30 interests.

# 31 **Protocol registration**

- 32 Dutey-Magni, PF, Sinclair, JMA, Brown, J. 2018. 'Concurrent Validity of an Estimator of
- 33 Weekly Alcohol Consumption (EWAC) Based on the Extended AUDIT.' OSF. November 12.
- 34 doi:<u>10.17605/OSF.IO/7WE4M</u>.

#### 35 Abstract

36 Background and Aims: The 3-question Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT-37 C) is frequently used in healthcare for screening and brief advice about levels of alcohol 38 consumption. AUDIT-C scores (0-12) provide feedback as categories of risk rather than 39 estimates of actual alcohol intake, an important metric for behaviour change. The study 40 aimed to (a) develop a continuous metric from the Extended AUDIT-C expressed in United 41 Kingdom (UK) units (8g pure ethanol), offering equivalent accuracy, and providing a direct 42 estimator of weekly alcohol consumption (EWAC) and (b) evaluate the EWAC's bias and 43 error using the Graduated-Frequency (GF) questionnaire as a reference standard of alcohol 44 consumption.

45 **Design:** Cross-sectional diagnostic study based on a nationally-representative survey.

46 **Settings:** Community-dwelling households in England.

47 **Participants:** 22,404 household residents aged  $\geq$  16 years reporting drinking alcohol at 48 least occasionally.

49 **Measurements:** Computer-assisted personal interviews consisting of (a) AUDIT 50 questionnaire with extended response items (the 'Extended AUDIT') and (b) GF. Primary 51 outcomes were: mean deviation <1 UK unit (metric of bias); root mean squared deviation <2 52 UK units (metric of total error) between EWAC and GF. The secondary outcome was the 53 receiver operating characteristic area under the curve for predicting alcohol consumption in 54 excess of 14 and 35 UK units.

Findings: EWAC had a positive bias of 0.2 UK units [95% confidence interval: 0.08, 0.4] compared with GF. Deviations were skewed: while the mean error was ±11 UK units/week [9.5, 11.9], in half of participants the deviation between EWAC and GF was between 0 and ±2.1 UK units/week. EWAC predicted consumption in excess of 14 UK units/week with a significantly greater area under the curve (0.918 [0.914, 0.923]) than AUDIT-C (0.870 [0.864, 0.876]) or the full AUDIT (0.854 [0.847, 0.860]).

61 **Conclusions:** A new estimator of weekly alcohol consumption (EWAC), which uses 62 answers to the Extended Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (Extended AUDIT-C), 63 meets the targeted bias tolerance. It is superior in accuracy to AUDIT-C and the full AUDIT 64 when predicting consumption thresholds, making it a reliable complement to the Extended 65 AUDIT-C for health promotion interventions.

#### 66 Keywords

alcohol consumption; self report; alcohol use disorder; screening programs, diagnostic;preventive health services

#### 69 Introduction

70 Alcohol consumption is responsible for 5% of disability-adjusted life years [1]. This burden 71 extends far beyond the health burden of alcohol use disorders, as defined in the 72 International Statistical Classification of Diseases (ICD-10 F10.1/F10.2 [2]) or the Diagnostic 73 and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders [3]. Clinical guidelines aiming to prevent [4], treat 74 and reduce [5] harm from alcohol consumption recommend systematic screening for alcohol 75 consumption using validated clinical tools. However, conceptual differences (exemplified by 76 the diagnostic classifications above) remain in how best to diagnose, measure, and 77 communicate harm [6].

A global standard has emerged in the 10-item Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) [7]. The shorter 3-item AUDIT-C focusses on consumption, and has equivalent predictive capability [8]. AUDIT-C is easy to use, making it an attractive choice for alcohol screening and brief interventions in healthcare [9] and other settings [10]. AUDIT-C exhibits two characteristics:

Ceiling effect: AUDIT-C's maximum response options for alcohol consumption
 frequency and quantity are heavily right-censored (Table 1). This creates a ceiling
 effect making the AUDIT-C poorly responsive to change in individuals with a high
 baseline score (up to reductions of 30%; e.g. frequency of drinking down from 7 to 5
 days or quantity down from 16 to 11 drinks per day).

AUDIT score interpretation: The ordinal scores produced by the AUDIT-C (range: 0–
 12) and the full AUDIT (range: 0–40) are multidimensional measures of alcohol risk. To
 date, most brief intervention models involve dichotomising AUDIT scores, on the basis
 of complex diagnostic accuracy studies [11], at cut-offs that vary internationally [12]. In
 practice, this may contribute to healthcare professionals lacking confidence in

discussing alcohol risks and consumption [13–16], and needing to be trained to deliver feedback [13,14]. Evidence also suggests that patients' understanding of alcohol risks overlaps loss of control more than alcohol consumption [17,18]. In response, some academic models of alcohol care advocate the framing of brief interventions around the continuum of alcohol use [19] rather than thresholds, since these can trigger stigma related to loss of control [20].

99 The 'Extended AUDIT-C' addresses the first characteristic thanks to a greater range of 100 response options on quantity and frequency (Table 1). It has been used in the United 101 Kingdom (UK) as part of two trials [21,22] and one continuous household survey [23] to 102 measure characteristics of consumption that could not have been measured with the right-103 censored AUDIT-C.

104 The present study proposes to address the second of these characteristics. It aims to 105 develop and validate an Estimator of Weekly Alcohol Consumption (EWAC) computed from 106 the Extended AUDIT-C. While retaining the Extended AUDIT-C questionnaire's alcohol use 107 disorders diagnostic capabilities, the EWAC is intended to facilitate the delivery of screening 108 and brief interventions by converting Extended AUDIT-C responses into a continuous and 109 direct measure of alcohol consumption that does not require additional screening questions. 110 Measuring alcohol consumption is a crucial part of behaviour change techniques (self-111 monitoring, feedback on behaviour, social comparison) commonly employed in self- [10] and 112 clinician-administered [9,24] interventions, and is encouraged as a metric of the continuum 113 of alcohol use [19].

#### 114 Methods

#### 115 Participants

116 Data originate from baseline measures in waves 110-133 (November 2015–October 2017) 117 of the Alcohol Toolkit Study, a repeated cross-sectional survey of residents of private English 118 households aged  $\ge$  16 years. Each month, census output areas averaging 300 households

were selected by stratified random sampling. Interviewers travelled to their designated area
and approach households quota sampling [23]. Respondents participated in a computerassisted personal interview.

#### 122 Measures

123 Index measurements underpinning the EWAC were the three questions making up the
124 Extended AUDIT-C (supplementary information S2), in which participants described their
125 drinking *during the last 6 months*.

The reference standard used is the Alcohol Toolkit Study GF schedule (supplementary information S3), in which participants described how many times they consumed given quantities of alcohol *during the last 4 weeks* [25]. The GF schedule's main advantage lies in measuring occasional heavy consumption, which can constitute an important proportion of total consumption.

131 Other reference estimates were used, this time for aggregate comparisons. 2014 per-capita 132 alcohol retail sales [26] captured all alcohol produced/processed in or imported to England 133 for sale or consumption. We also used data from 6,606 household residents aged  $\geq$  18 134 years participating in the 2011 Health Survey for England [27]. Year 2011 was chosen in 135 deviation from the registered protocol [28]: on that particularly year, the recurring computer-136 assisted interviewer-led beverage-specific quantity-frequency questionnaire was 137 accompanied by a prospective 7-day diary [29]. The diary reference standard was deemed 138 more informative to an international audience, and offered a direct point of comparison with 139 past research [30-32].

#### 140 Estimating alcohol consumption (EWAC)

To estimate alcohol consumption from Extended AUDIT-C responses, we employ methods developed for quantity-frequency-variability instruments [33]. For every individual *i*, the EWAC is computed as the product of  $F_i$  and  $Q_i$  (AUDIT questions 1 and 2 respectively) adjusted with the frequency of intense drinking  $V_i$  (AUDIT-3):

$$EWAC_i = F_i Q_i + V_i k$$

145 where *b* denotes the average units of alcohol consumed in an intense drinking day. 146 Coefficients F, Q, V and b are unknown. In this study, two sets of candidate coefficients are 147 considered: 148 AUDIT response item interval midpoint (e.g. 2.5 for '2 to 3 times per week') 149 • coefficients estimated empirically from a sample of individuals with measurements of 150 Extended AUDIT-C and GF, using a hierarchical Bayesian response model with the 151 estimating equation  $GF_i = F_iQ_i + V_ib + e_i$ , where e denotes independently normally 152 distributed errors. We set parabola-shaped informative priors on coefficients F, Q, V. 153 Details on model fitting, convergence evaluation and prior tuning are reported in 154 supplementary information S1.

### 155 Analyses

The protocol was pre-registered [28]. Results are reported in UK alcohol units (8g or 10mL of pure alcohol). Analyses were conducted in R [34–36] and all computer scripts are available online [37].

Participants were included in the analysis if they completed both the Extended AUDIT and the GF questionnaires. Out of 40,832 participants, 14,408 (35%) reported 'never' consuming alcohol in AUDIT question 1 and were not asked any further AUDIT or GF questions. A further 175 (0.4%) did not have valid AUDIT-C answers. Finally, 3,876 participants (9%) who did not have a valid GF alcohol consumption record were excluded. These GF data were assumed to be missing at random conditionally on the Extended AUDIT-C responses after a sensitivity analysis (supplementary information S1).

166 Valid observations (*N*=22,373) were separated into two datasets:

The training dataset (*N*=6,642) consisted of a 30 percent subset of participants drawn
 using stratified random sampling, ensuing a balanced representation by sex, age,

169 ethnic group and AUDIT-C risk level. It was used to estimate coefficients underpinning

170 the EWAC (supplementary information S1).

The validation dataset consisted of the remaining participants (*N*=15,731) and was
 used to evaluate the EWAC's bias and precision. In subgroup validation analyses
 utilising additional variables (eg education, smoking status), a further 358/15,731
 observations (2.3%) assumed to be missing at random were excluded.

175 Overall bias and error

176 The agreement between the EWAC and the GF was quantified in the validation dataset:

177 • bias was estimated by the **mean deviation** to the reference standard  $MD = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (EWAC - GF)$ . We tested the hypothesis that the MD does not exceed 1 UK 179 unit using a two-sided *t*-test.

180 • precision was estimated by the deviation root mean squared  $RMSD = \sqrt{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (EWAC - GF)^2}$ , a measure of total error capturing both bias and 181 182 random deviation from the reference standard. For example, an RMSD of 2 signifies 183 that the EWAC is on average with  $\pm$  2 UK units of the reference standard. We tested the hypothesis that the RMSD does not exceed 2 UK units using a one-sided  $\chi^2$  test. 184

185 Two sets of candidate coefficients were considered (see 'Design' section). We only report186 findings for the candidate set producing the lowest bias and error.

187 Subgroup bias and error

188 Multivariate regression models tested whether the EWAC's bias and precision varied across189 population subgroups:

the simple deviation (EWAC – GF) was regressed in a linear model to test subgroup
 differences in MD

192 • the squared deviation  $(EWAC - GF)^2$  was regressed in a log-transformed linear model 193 to test subgroup differences in the geometric mean squared deviation. Model

coefficients were then back-transformed (square root of the exponential) into relative
 RMSD estimates; these are interpreted as the ratio of the subgroup RMSD to the
 reference RMSD, a ratio >1 indicating worse precision than in the reference category.

Both models (supplementary table S5.1) included the following predictors: sex by age group; ethnic group; highest educational qualification; religion; smoking status. Additional models (supplementary table S5.2) were fitted solely in respondents with an AUDIT-C score  $\geq$  5 or an AUDIT score  $\geq$  8, for whom additional characteristics were recorded during interview: favourite drink (beer; wine; spirits alone; mixed spirits; cider; other); and whether the respondent had attempted to restrict alcohol intake in the last 12 months.

# 203 Receiver Operating Characteristics

204 We tested the EWAC's superiority to the traditional AUDIT and AUDIT-C scores in predicting 205 consumption exceeding 14 or 35 UK units/week. These correspond to UK thresholds for 206 characterising alcohol use as 'increasing risk' (predicted by an AUDIT-C score of 5-7), and 207 'higher risk' (AUDIT-C score  $\geq$  8) which is above 35 units for women and 50 units for men 208 [38]. We tested the hypothesis that the EWAC has an identical receiver operating 209 characteristic full area under the curve (AUC) to the AUDIT-C and the full AUDIT scores 210 using nonparametric paired AUC tests [39]. AUDIT-C and AUDIT scores were calculated 211 from the Extended AUDIT by capping the contribution of each question to 4.

#### 212 Aggregate concurrent validity

213 We compared the empirical cumulative distributions of (1) the EWAC computed in the 214 Alcohol Toolkit Study; (2) the GF estimator in the Alcohol Toolkit Study; (3) the beverage-215 specific estimator in the 2011 Health Survey for England; (4) the prospective diary estimator in the 2011 Health Survey for England in adults aged  $\geq$  18 years. A  $\chi^2$  test of homogeneity 216 217 of distributions (1) and (3) was performed on contingency tables of 13 drinking consumption 218 intervals in UK units/week (]0,5]; ]5,10]; ...; ]30,35]; ]35,45]; ]45,55]; ]55,65]; ]65,75]; 219 [75,100]; [100,200]). We report the proportions of on-trade and off-trade alcohol sales [26] 220 accounted for by each method.

- 221 Poststratification survey weights adjusted for nonresponse bias in sources (1-3), and self-
- selection into prospective diary data collection in source (4).

223 Results

#### 224 Bias and precision

EWAC coefficients estimated empirically (supplementary information S1, S4) had smaller bias and error and were used for the remainder of the analysis. With those, the EWAC's Pearson's correlation with GF was estimated at r = 0.72 [0.71, 0.72] (Kendall's rank correlation  $\tau = 0.63$ ).

- The mean deviation (MD) was 0.2 alcohol units/week [95% CI: 0.08, 0.4]. This bias is smaller than the preregistered  $\pm$  1-unit bias tolerance (p = 1.000).
- The root mean squared deviation (RMSD), at 10.7 units/week [95% CI: 9.5, 11.9], was significantly greater than the pre-registered 2-unit total error tolerance (p < 0.001), suggesting that the EWAC falls on average 11 units away from the GF reference standard.

However, there was substantial variation in RMSD; in 50% of participants, the EWAC fell within  $\pm$  2.1 UK units of the GF weekly consumption estimate. RMSD was proportional to alcohol consumption, amounting to about 50% of the EWAC value (Table 2). Thus, an interval defined as the EWAC  $\pm$  50% (e.g. '2–6 units/week' for an EWAC of 4; '10–30 units/week' for an EWAC of 20) contained the reference standard for over half (58%) of individuals.

Plots of EWAC against GF (Figure 1) indicate a slight positive bias for consumptions up to 10-14 units/week, and a slight negative bias beyond. The EWAC only starts losing granularity above 70 units/week (99th percentile of its distribution), where it provides just 6 possible values (82; 83; 92; 93; 100; 125 units/week; see Figure 1(b)).

Extensive subgroup analyses are reported in supplementary material 5. A very modest proportion of variation in bias and precision (<5%) can be attributed to socio-demographic

variables under examination. This indicates a relative homogeneity in precision in bias, to
one exception. The EWAC appears to overestimate consumption by 1 to 2 UK units in
groups with the lowest average consumption: women, and Non-British White, Black, and
Other ethnic groups.

250 **Receiver Operating Characteristics** 

We examined the EWAC's ability to predict consumption exceeding 14 or 35 UK units/week. The full areas under the receiver operating characteristic curves (AUC, supplementary Figure S6) are presented along sensitivity and specificity at the best thresholds in Tables 3– 4.

**14 UK units/week (increasing-risk)**: EWAC increases the AUC by 5 percentage points compared to the AUDIT-C score (p < 0.001); and 7 percentage points compared to the full AUDIT score (p < 0.001). The cut-off maximising the sum of specificity and sensitivity on the EWAC is 10 units/week. The sensitivity at this threshold is identical to AUDIT-C, but specificity gains 13 percentage points. Using the nominal cut-off of 14 units/week on the EWAC raises specificity to 0.928, at the cost of a reduction in sensitivity to 0.687 (Table 3).

**35 units/week (higher-risk)**: EWAC provides small increases in AUC compared with the AUDIT-C score (p < 0.001) and the full AUDIT score (p < 0.001). The best cut-off for detecting consumption in excess of 35 units/week using the EWAC was 17 units/week (Table 4).

# 265 **Empirical distribution**

Table 5 estimates adult residents' total alcohol consumption in England using four different sources, and compares them with alcohol retail sales. The Health Survey for England exhibits the highest estimates and coverage of alcohol sales. EWAC amounts to 71% of the total consumption estimated by the Health Survey for England's prospective diary, and 48% of retail sales.

Figure 2 suggests that the EWAC, like the Alcohol Toolkit Study GF, estimates a greater prevalence of lower-risk ( $\leq$  14 units/week) and increasing-risk alcohol use than Health Survey for England. It shows a clear departure between the EWAC and the Health Survey for England's beverage specific questionnaire, as evidence by the homogeneity test ( $\chi_{12}^2$ = 914.8, *p* < 0.001).

#### 276 Discussion

# 277 Main findings

We developed a continuous Estimator of Weekly Alcohol Consumption (EWAC) using a 6month Extended AUDIT-C. When compared with a 4-week Graduated Frequency (GF) reference standard, we found EWAC overestimates alcohol consumption by 0.2 UK units [0.08, 0.4], well under the pre-registered ±1 UK unit bias tolerance. We also attempted to measure how precise the EWAC is: in 50% of participants, the EWAC falls up to 2 UK units away from the GF measure, and an interval built as EWAC ±50% contains the GF measures in 58% of participants.

EWAC is superior to both the AUDIT-C and the full AUDIT scores in predicting GF exceeding 14 units/week (AUC = 0.92) and 35 units/week (AUC = 0.93). This places the EWAC among the best-performing diagnostic tools examined in the most recent systematic review [11]. At the 14-unit threshold, an EWAC >= 10 cut-off has a sensitivity of 0.87, compared to a 0.75 for an AUDIT-C >= 6 cut-off, without losing specificity.

### 290 **Potential applications**

Being equivalent to the AUDIT-C in speed and international standardisation, the EWAC may be suitable for use in any clinical setting to support brief interventions and to feed back a reliable interval estimate of alcohol consumption (eg: '6–18 units/week' or '50–140g/week'). The EWAC is available as a web app at <a href="https://ewac.netlify.app">https://ewac.netlify.app</a> along with resources to facilitate implementation (R software package, spreadsheets). Assessment of alcohol consumption is not well embedded in clinical practice [40]. The EWAC calculator fills a gap in resources by transforming the answers from the Extended AUDIT-C into a direct estimate of an individual's weekly alcohol consumption. This is a more directly accessible metric which should facilitate behaviour change by empowering people to monitor and control their alcohol consumption with–or without–the involvement of healthcare professionals, and should be assessed in future evaluations.

302 Nutt, Rehm et al. [19,41] argued that alcohol-related harm is best prevented if individuals 303 know their consumption level, and health professionals in all settings can engage patients 304 effectively to manage risks with evidence-based interventions, in a similar way to other risk 305 factors for disease, for example blood pressure or cholesterol. Yet, knowledge of beverages' 306 alcohol content is generally poor [42], and a survey evaluating the 2016 change in UK 307 alcohol guidelines found that just 8% of the UK drinkers knew the new recommended limits 308 [43]. The EWAC can support interventions focused on recognising the alcohol 309 content/volume of drinks, and recommended low-risk limits.

In addition, the EWAC's dimensional rather than categorical format can be useful to position recipients of brief interventions on the continuum of alcohol use [20,44], which may reduce the stigma of loss of control associated with screening-based interventions [17,45]. It can act as a complement, rather than a substitute to the multidimensional quality of AUDIT-C or the full AUDIT.

315 The EWAC is particularly suitable for digital interventions and healthcare records given that it 316 enables its complex algorithm to be embedded in a way not possible with paper records. 317 EWAC is already compatible with medical records information models developed in the 318 Systematised Nomenclature of Medicine Clinical Terms (SNOMED CT, Alcohol intake 319 (observable entity) [46]) and by the English Royal College of Physicians [47]. Such 320 information can have secondary uses as a variable in other disease risk scores, or to 321 prospectively recording of long-term alcohol exposure, an important risk factor for a range of 322 medical conditions.

#### 323 Strengths and limitations

This paper is the first to (a) develop an EWAC using a well-accepted and validated multidimensional alcohol screening tool such as the AUDIT; and (b) quantify its bias and precision with respect to a continuous measure of alcohol consumption. One study [48] previously reported mean consumption by AUDIT-C score, but without quantifying bias or precision of such a measure. Others have evaluated the AUDIT-C's accuracy in estimating alcohol consumption, but exclusively in relation to predicting consumption in excess of predefined thresholds [11].

Our study provides strong confidence in the internal and external validity of findings in England on account of the large sample size and extensive range of subgroup analyses reported. Bias was mostly consistent across subgroups examined (age/sex, education, smoking status, religion), with one exception. EWAC overestimated alcohol consumption by 2-3 UK units/week in Black/Other ethnic groups. Variation in the sensitivity of AUDIT-C across ethnic groups has previously been noted in the US [49].

337 Repurposing a well-known tool such as the AUDIT-C has several advantages. It is already 338 translated in many languages and adapted to the varying standard drink sizes adopted 339 internationally [7]. The Extended AUDIT scores can be converted into traditional AUDIT 340 scores by capping items to 4, thereby offering a point of comparison with existing evidence. 341 The AUDIT's properties are also well understood in diverse contexts and modes of 342 administration, based on the last 30 years of international research. For instance, a previous 343 study which found the AUDIT-C to be responsive to changes of 70g/week [50] can suggest 344 that the EWAC's own responsiveness to change should be equivalent, if not greater than the 345 AUDIT-C's, given the Extended AUDIT-C's additional response items.

We note two main study limitations. First, a longstanding obstacle in alcohol research and treatment lies in the absence of undisputed 'gold standard' or biomarker for objectively determining alcohol consumption. Instead, a number of instruments measure self-reported consumption with varying validity and reliability over different durations. Comprehensive

reviews [<u>30–32,51–53</u>] indicate that yesterday recall and prospective diaries tend to record higher (and more accurate) alcohol consumption by minimising recall bias, followed by GF measures.

Therefore, the GF reference standard, as all self-reported measures, is imperfect. While this has no effect on our measure of bias (MD), this may introduce bias into our measure of precision (RMSD): by definition, the reference standard's own independent error will inflate the RMSD. In other words, it is likely that a proportion of the RMSD is attributable to error in the GF measures rather than the EWAC.

358 Despite this, previous research suggests the EWAC's agreement with GF (Pearson's 359 correlation coefficient r = 0.71 and Kendall's rank correlation  $\tau = 0.63$  in the present study) is 360 comparable to the agreement between GF and prospective diaries measured from past 361 studies( $r \sim 0.86-0.89$  [54,55];  $\tau = 0.41$  [51]).

362 Second, the EWAC's design does not escape all limitations of methods of screening or 363 categorising alcohol use disorders. The conceptualisation of alcohol use disorders is related 364 to, but does not exclusively depend upon the amount of alcohol consumed. Since Jellinek's 365 description of 'the disease concept of alcoholism' [56] there have been numerous attempts 366 to categorise the range of phenotypes characterising alcohol use disorders in the absence of 367 any biomarker to 'verify' the presence of a particular pathology. The EWAC, by limiting itself 368 to an estimation of alcohol consumption is transparent across a wide range of alcohol use 369 disorders but does not measure the other factors underpinning this complex and 370 heterogeneous condition [6,57].

In conclusion, the EWAC has the potential to support interventions focusing on recognising the alcohol content and volume of drinks. The EWAC's dimensional rather than categorical format may facilitate this while avoiding the stigma sometimes associated with clinical categorisations of alcohol use disorders.

#### 375 **Declarations**

#### 376 Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Medical Research Council [grant reference MR/P016960/1]. The Alcohol Toolkit Study data collection was funded primarily by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) School for Public Health Research [grant reference SPHR SWP ALC WP5] and Public Health Research Programme [grant reference 15/63/01]. The EWAC online calculator development was funded by the Wessex Academic Health Science Network. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health.

# 384 Ethics

385 This study was approved by the University of Southampton's Faculty of Medicine Ethics

- 386 Committee (ERGO 44682).
- 387 Consent for publication
- 388 Not applicable.

#### 390 **References**

- [1] Shield K, Manthey J, Rylett M, Probst C, Wettlaufer A, Parry CDH, et al. National, regional, and global burdens of disease from 2000 to 2016 attributable to alcohol use: a comparative risk assessment study. The Lancet Public Health 2020;5:e51–61. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(19)30231-2.
- 394 [2] World Health Organisation. ICD-10: International statistical classification of diseases and related health
   395 problems: Tenth revision. 2004.
- [3] American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. Washington, DC:
   American Psychiatric Association; 2013. doi:<u>10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596</u>.
- 398 [4] National Institute of Health and Care Excellence. Alcohol-use disorders: prevention. Public health guideline
   399 [PH24] 2010.
- 400 [5] National Institute of Health and Care Excellence. Alcohol-use disorders: diagnosis, assessment and 401 management of harmful drinking and alcohol dependence. Clinical guideline [CG115]. 2011.
- 402 [6] Saunders JB, Degenhardt L, Reed GM, Poznyak V. Alcohol Use Disorders in ICD-11: Past, Present, and 403 Future. Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research 2019;43:1617–31. doi:<u>10.1111/acer.14128</u>.
- 404 [7] Babor TF, Higgins-Biddle JC, Saunders JB, Monteiro MG. The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test.
   405 Guidelines for Use in Primary Care. Second Edition. Geneva: World Health Organisation, Department of Mental Health; Substance Dependence; 2001.
- 407 [8] Bush K. The AUDIT Alcohol Consumption Questions (AUDIT-C): An Effective Brief Screening Test for 408 Problem Drinking. Archives of Internal Medicine 1998;158:1789. doi:<u>10.1001/archinte.158.16.1789</u>.
- 409 [9] Kaner EF, Beyer FR, Muirhead C, Campbell F, Pienaar ED, Bertholet N, et al. Effectiveness of brief alcohol
   410 interventions in primary care populations. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2018.
   411 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD004148.pub4.
- 412 [10] Kaner EF, Beyer FR, Garnett C, Crane D, Brown J, Muirhead C, et al. Personalised digital interventions for 413 reducing hazardous and harmful alcohol consumption in community-dwelling populations. Cochrane 414 Database of Systematic Reviews 2017. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD011479.pub2.
- [11] Meneses-Gaya C de, Zuardi AW, Loureiro SR, Crippa JAS. Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test
   (AUDIT): An updated systematic review of psychometric properties. Psychology & Neuroscience
   2009;2:83–97. doi:10.3922/j.psns.2009.1.12.
- [12] Nadkarni A, Garber A, Costa S, Wood S, Kumar S, MacKinnon N, et al. Auditing the AUDIT: A systematic review of cut-off scores for the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) in low- and middle-income countries. Drug and Alcohol Dependence 2019;202:123–33. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2019.04.031.
  [13] Beich A, Gannik D, Malterud K. Screening and brief intervention for excessive alcohol use: Qualitative
- 422 [13] Beich A, Gannik D, Malterud K. Screening and brief intervention for excessive alcohol use: Qualitative
   423 interview study of the experiences of general practitioners. BMJ 2002;325:870–0.
   424 doi:10.1136/bmj.325.7369.870.
- [14] Johnson M, Jackson R, Guillaume L, Meier P, Goyder E. Barriers and facilitators to implementing screening and brief intervention for alcohol misuse: a systematic review of qualitative evidence. Journal of Public Health (Oxford, England) 2011;33:412–21. doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdq095.
- 428 [15] Hutchings D, Cassidy P, Dallolio E, Pearson P, Heather N, Kaner E. Implementing screening and brief
   429 alcohol interventions in primary care: Views from both sides of the consultation. Primary Health Care
   430 Research and Development 2006;7:221–9. doi:10.1191/1463423606pc2920a.
- [16] McCormick KA, Cochran NE, Back AL, Merrill JO, Williams EC, Bradley KA. How Primary Care Providers
   Talk to Patients About Alcohol. Journal of General Internal Medicine 2006:060721075157048. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00490.x.
- [17] Khadjesari Z, Stevenson F, Toner P, Linke S, Milward J, Murray E. 'I'm not a real boozer': A qualitative study of primary care patients' views on drinking and its consequences. Journal of Public Health (Oxford, England) 2018:1–7. doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdy067.
- [18] O'Donnell Á, Hanratty B, Schulte B, Kaner E. Patients' experiences of alcohol screening and advice in primary care: A qualitative study. BMC Family Practice 2020;21:68. doi:<u>10.1186/s12875-020-01142-9</u>.
- [19] Nutt DJ, Rehm J. Doing it by numbers: A simple approach to reducing the harms of alcohol. Journal of
   Psychopharmacology 2014;28:3–7. doi:<u>10.1177/0269881113512038</u>.
- [20] Rehm J, Marmet S, Anderson P, Gual A, Kraus L, Nutt DJ, et al. Defining Substance Use Disorders: Do We
   Really Need More Than Heavy Use? Alcohol and Alcoholism 2013;48:633–40.
   doi:10.1093/alcalc/agt127.
- 444 [21] Kaner E, Bland M, Cassidy P, Coulton S, Dale V, Deluca P, et al. Effectiveness of screening and brief
   445 alcohol intervention in primary care (SIPS trial): pragmatic cluster randomised controlled trial. BMJ
   446 2013;346:e8501–1. doi:10.1136/bmj.e8501.
- [22] Crane D, Garnett C, Michie S, West R, Brown J. A smartphone app to reduce excessive alcohol consumption: Identifying the effectiveness of intervention components in a factorial randomised control trial. Scientific Reports 2018;8:4384. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-22420-8.
- [23] Beard E, Brown J, West R, Acton C, Brennan A, Drummond C, et al. Protocol for a national monthly survey
   of alcohol use in England with 6-month follow-up: 'The Alcohol Toolkit Study' Health behavior, health
   promotion and society. BMC Public Health 2015;15. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-1542-7.
- 453 [24] Michie S, Whittington C, Hamoudi Z, Zarnani F, Tober G, West R. Identification of behaviour change
   454 techniques to reduce excessive alcohol consumption. Addiction 2012;107:1431–40. doi:10.1111/j.1360-

455 456 457	0443.2012.03845.x. [25] Greenfield TK. Ways of measuring drinking patterns and the difference they make: experience with graduated frequencies. Journal of Substance Abuse 2000;12:33–49. doi: <u>10.1016/S0899-3289(00)00039-</u>
458 459 460	0. [26] Public Health England. Alcohol sales in England in 2014: Analysis to assess suitability for inclusion as an
460 461 462	<ul> <li>[27] NatCen Social Research, Royal Free and University College Medical School. Health Survey for England, 2011 [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], April 2013. SN: 7260. Colchester,</li> </ul>
463 464 465	<ul> <li>[28] Dutey-Magni P, Sinclair J, Brown J. Concurrent validity of an Estimator of Weekly Alcohol Consumption (EWAC) based on the Extended AUDIT 2018. doi:<u>10.17605/OSF.IO/7WE4M</u>.</li> </ul>
466 467 468	[29] Boniface S, Kneale J, Shelton N. Drinking pattern is more strongly associated with under-reporting of alcohol consumption than socio-demographic factors: evidence from a mixed-methods study. BMC Public Health 2014;14:1297. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-1297.
469 470 471	[30] Stockwell T, Donath S, Cooper-Stanbury M, Chikritzhs T, Catalano P, Mateo C. Under-reporting of alcohol consumption in household surveys: A comparison of quantity-frequency, graduated-frequency and recent recall. Addiction 2004;99:1024–33. doi:10.1111/j.1380-0443.2004.00815 x
472 473	<ul> <li>[31] Stockwell T, Zhao J, Macdonald S. Who under-reports their alcohol consumption in telephone surveys and by how much? An application of the 'yesterday method' in a national Canadian substance use survey.</li> </ul>
474 475 476	<ul> <li>[32] Stockwell T, Zhao J, Greenfield T, Li J, Livingston M, Meng Y. Estimating under- and over-reporting of drinking in national surveys of alcohol consumption: identification of consistent biases across four</li> </ul>
477 478 479	English-speaking countries. Addiction 2016;111:1203–13. doi: <u>10.1111/add.13373</u> . [33] Lemmens P, Tan ES, Knibbe R a. Measuring quantity and frequency of drinking in a general population survey: a comparison of five indices. Journal of Studies on Alcohol 1992;53:476–86.
480 481 482	doi: <u>10.15288/jsa.1992.53.476</u> . [34] R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing: 2017
483 484	<ul> <li>[35] Wickham H. Tidyverse: Easily install and load the 'tidyverse' 2017.</li> <li>[36] Stan Development Team. RStan: The R interface to Stan 2018.</li> </ul>
485 486 487	<ul> <li>[37] Dutey-Magni P. Concurrent validity of an Estimator of Weekly Alcohol Consumption (EWAC) based on the Extended AUDIT: Computer scripts 2021. doi: <u>10.5281/zenodo.4315023</u></li> <li>[38] Lavoie D. Alcohol identification and brief advice in England: A major plank in alcohol harm reduction policy.</li> </ul>
488 489 490	Drug and Alcohol Review 2010;29:608–11. doi: <u>10.1111/j.1465-3362.2010.00224.x</u> . [39] DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the Areas under Two or More Correlated Receiver Operating Characteristic Curves: A Nonparametric Approach. Biometrics 1988:44:837.
491 492 493	doi: <u>10.2307/2531595</u> . [40] Brown J, West R, Angus C, Beard E, Brennan A, Drummond C, et al. Comparison of brief interventions in primary care on smoking and excessive alcohol consumption: A population survey in angland British
494 495	Journal of General Practice 2016;66:e1–9. doi: <u>10.3399/bjgp16X683149</u> . [41] Rehm J, Anderson P, Manthey J, Shield KD, Struzzo P, Wojnar M, et al. Alcohol Use Disorders in Primary
496 497 498	<ul> <li>Health Care: What Do We Know and Where Do We Go? Alcohol and Alcoholism 2016;51:422–7. doi:<u>10.1093/alcalc/agv127</u>.</li> <li>[42] Mongan D, Long J. Standard drink measures throughout Europe; peoples' understanding of standard drinks.</li> </ul>
499 500 501	RARHA: Joint Actional on Reducing Alcohol Related Harm; 2015. [43] Rosenberg G, Bauld L, Hooper L, Buykx P, Holmes J, Vohra J. New national alcohol guidelines in the uk: Public awareness, understanding and behavioural intentions, Journal of Public Health 2018;40:549–56.
502 503	doi: <u>10.1093/pubmed/fdx126</u> . [44] Rehm J, Anderson P, Gual A, Kraus L, Marmet S, Nutt D, et al. The Tangible Common Denominator of Substance Use Disorders: A Poply to Commontarios to Pohm et al. (2013a). Alcohol and Alcoholism
505 506	2013;49:118–22. doi: <u>10.1093/alcalc/agt171</u> . [45] O'Donnell A, Abidi L, Brown J, Karlsson N, Nilsen P, Roback K, et al. Beliefs and attitudes about addressing
507 508 509	<ul> <li>doi:<u>10.1186/s12889-018-5275-2</u>.</li> <li>[46] UK Health and Social Care Information Centre. UK SNOMED CT Drug Extension, RF2: Full, Snapshot &amp;</li> </ul>
510 511 512	<ul> <li>Delta 2018.</li> <li>[47] Haroon S, Wooldridge D, Hoogewerf J, Mittal A, Bhala N, O'Donnell A, et al. Information standards for recording alcohol use in electronic health records: Project report 2018.</li> </ul>
513 514 515 516	[48] Rubinsky AD, Dawson DA, Williams EC, Kivlahan DR, Bradley KA. AUDIT-C Scores as a Scaled Marker of Mean Daily Drinking, Alcohol Use Disorder Severity, and Probability of Alcohol Dependence in a U.S. General Population Sample of Drinkers. Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research 2013;37:1380– 00. doi:10.1111/jcorr.12002
517 518 519	<ul> <li>[49] Frank D, DeBenedetti AF, Volk RJ, Williams EC, Kivlahan DR, Bradley KA. Effectiveness of the AUDIT-C as a Screening Test for Alcohol Misuse in Three Race/Ethnic Groups. Journal of General Internal Medicine 2008;23;781–7. doi:10.1007/s11606-008-0594-0</li> </ul>
520 521	[50] Bradley KA, McDonell MB, Bush K, Kivlahan DR, Diehr P, Fihn SD. The AUDIT Alcohol Consumption Questions: Reliability, Validity, and Responsiveness to Change in Older Male Primary Care Patients.

522	Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research 1998;22:1842-9. doi:10.1111/j.1530-	
523	0277.1998.tb03991.x.	
524	[51] Heeb J-L, Gmel G. Measuring alcohol consumption: A comparison of graduated frequency, quantity	
525	frequency, and weekly recall diary methods in a general population survey. Addictive Behaviors	
526	2005;30:403–13. doi: <u>10.1016/j.addbeh.2004.04.022</u> .	
527	[52] Livingston M, Callinan S. Underreporting in Alcohol Surveys: Whose Drinking Is Underestimated? Journal of	
528	Studies on Alcohol and Drugs 2015;76:158–64. doi: <u>10.15288/jsad.2015.76.158</u> .	
529	[53] Rehm J. Measuring Quantity, Frequency, and Volume of Drinking. Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental	
530	Research 1998;22:4s–14s. doi:10.1111/j.1530-0277.1998.tb04368.x.	
531	[54] Greenfield TK, Kerr WC, Bond J, Ye Y, Stockwell T. Improving Graduated Frequencies Alcohol Measures for	
532	Monitoring Consumption Patterns: Results from an Australian National Survey and a US Diary Validity	
533	Study. Contemporary Drug Problems 2009;36:705–33. doi:10.1177/009145090903600320.	
534	[55] Hilton ME. A comparison of a prospective diary and two summary recall techniques for recording alcohol	

535 consumption. British Journal of Addiction 1989;84:1085–92. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.1989.tb00792.x.

536 537 538 [56] Jellinek EM. The disease concept of alcoholism. New Haven: Hillhouse Press; 1960. doi:<u>10.1037/14090-000</u>.
 [57] Leggio L, Kenna GA, Fenton M, Bonenfant E, Swift RM. Typologies of Alcohol Dependence. From Jellinek to

Genetics and Beyond. Neuropsychology Review 2009;19:115–29. doi:10.1007/s11065-008-9080-z.

# 540 Figures and tables



541

542 **Figure 1.** Plots of EWAC against GF in (a) low/increasing risk respondents (n=15,008) and (b) all respondents (n=15,731)

544



Figure 2. Empirical cumulative distribution function of weekly alcohol consumption in
 England according to four alcohol schedules in residents aged 18 years and over

	Response items						
AUDIT-1: 'How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?'							
AUDIT-C	Never	Monthly or less	2 - 4 times per month	2 - 3 times per week	4+ times per week	-	_
Extended AUDIT-C	Never	Monthly or less	2 - 4 times per month	2 - 3 times per week	4-5 times per week	6+ times per week	-
[score]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[4]	_
AUDIT-2: 'How many units of alcohol do you drink on a typical day when you are drinking?'							
AUDIT-C	0 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 6	7 - 9	10+	_	-
Extended AUDIT-C	0 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 6	7 - 9	10-12	13-15	16+
[score]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[4]	[4]
AUDIT-3: 'How often have you had 6 or more units on a single occasion in the last year?'							
AUDIT-C							
Extended AUDIT-C	Never (	Monthly or less	Monthly Monthly or less	Weekly	Daily or almost daily	-	_
[score]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	_	_

# 548 Table 1. Comparison of AUDIT-C and Extended AUDIT-C

**Table 2.** Root Mean Squared Deviation (RMSD) between EWAC and GF schedule by alcohol consumption bracket (n = 15,731)

EWAC value (UK units/week)	n	RMSD [95% confidence interval]	Participants with GF contained in [EWAC×0.5; EWAC×1.5] interval (%)
[0,5)	6,927	3.1 [2.7–3.5]	3,375 (48.7)
[5,10)	3,589	10.0 [3.8–13.5]	2,127 (59.3)
[10,20)	3,363	12.4 [9.3–14.9]	2,330 (69.3)
[20,30)	1,010	15.5 [12.6–17.9]	736 (72.9)
[30,45)	495	19.4 [17.0–21.4]	342 (69.1)
[45,60)	142	27.4 [22.1–31.8]	101 (71.1)
[60,75)	113	25.7 [18.9–31.0]	95 (84.1)
[75,100)	66	40.2 [25.1–51.0]	48 (72.7)
[100,150)	26	77.0 [59.2–91.4]	13 (50.0)
All values	15,731	10.7 [9.4–11.9]	9,167 (58.3)

## 

# 

Table 3. Receiver operating characteristics of AUDIT-C score and EWAC for consumption >= 14 UK units or 112g/week (n = 15,731) 

Index test	Full Area Under the Curve	95% CI	Best threshold	Sensitivity	Specificity
AUDIT-C score	0.870	[0.864, 0.876]	5.5	0.753	0.811
Full AUDIT score	0.854	[0.847, 0.860]	5.5	0.792	0.751
EWAC	0.918	[0.914, 0.923]	9.8	0.873	0.813

Note: The best threshold refers the cut-off value that maximises the sum of sensitivity and specificity.

Table 4. Receiver operating characteristics of AUDIT-C score and EWAC for consumption >= 35 UK units or 280g/week (n = 15,731)

Index test	Full Area Under the Curve	95% CI	Best threshold	Sensitivity	Specificity
AUDIT-C score	0.912	[0.902, 0.922]	6.5	0.862	0.810
Full AUDIT score	0.900	[0.890, 0.910]	6.5	0.905	0.743
EWAC	0.934	[0.925, 0.943]	16.8	0.862	0.865

Note: The best threshold refers the cut-off value that maximises the sum of sensitivity and specificity.

Table 5. Summary statistics on alcohol consumption in England in residents aged 18 years and over (excluding abstainers) 

Study	<b>Mean</b> (UK units/week)	Median (UK units/week)	Variance	N	% of alcohol sold
HSE beverage-specific QF	14.0	7.3	474.6	6,545	72.6
HSE prospective diary	13.0	8.0	264.7	4,640	67.6
ATS GF	8.5	5.2	234.6	15,556	43.9
ATS EWAC	9.3	5.2	145.9	18,140	48.2
Retail sales	19.3	-	-	-	100.0