

# Functioning Assessment Short Test (FAST): Validity and Reliability in Adults With Autism Spectrum Disorder

Laura Gisbert Gustemps (✉ [lgisbert@vhebron.net](mailto:lgisbert@vhebron.net))

Hospital Vall d'Hebron: Vall d'Hebron Hospital Universitari <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8329-1717>

Jorge Lugo Marín

Hospital Vall d'Hebron: Vall d'Hebron Hospital Universitari

Imanol Setien Ramos

Hospital Vall d'Hebron: Vall d'Hebron Hospital Universitari

Gemma Español Martín

Hospital Vall d'Hebron: Vall d'hebron Hospital Universitari

Eduard Vieta

Hospital Clinic de Barcelona

Caterina Mar Bonnín

Hospital Clinic de Barcelona

Josep Antoni Ramos Quiroga

Hospital Vall d'Hebron: Vall d'Hebron Hospital Universitari

---

## Research

**Keywords:** Autism Spectrum Quotient, Adult, Functioning, Validity, Reliability, Factor Analysis

**Posted Date:** December 1st, 2020

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-114357/v1>

**License:** © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

# Abstract

**Background:** The assessment of functional impairment is crucial both for the diagnosis and the therapeutic approach to autism spectrum disorder (ASD). The purpose of the present study was to evaluate whether the FAST is a reliable and valid tool to assess functional impairment in adults with Level 1 ASD and to study the differences in psychosocial functioning between younger and older adults with ASD.

**Methods:** A case-control study was carried out in a sample of 150 participants, 71 adults with Level 1 ASD, and 79 adults without psychiatric history records.

**Results:** Results showed good psychometric properties in terms of validity and reliability. Cronbach's alpha for the total scale was .91 and the area under the curve was .98. The study also showed that adults with ASD present different profiles of functional impairment depending on their age: while younger patients present greater impairment in autonomy, older patients show more difficulties in interpersonal relationships

**Conclusions:** Our results support the use of the FAST in the evaluation of adaptive functioning in adults with Level 1 ASD.

## Background

Autism spectrum disorder (ASD) is a neurodevelopmental condition with a prevalence of up to 1 out of 54 children and it is characterized by early onset of social-communication difficulties and repetitive or stereotypical behaviors [1]. According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition Disorders (DSM-5) criteria, these symptoms cause "clinically significant impairment in social, occupational, and other fields of current functioning" [2].

The severity of ASD can vary greatly and is based on the degree to which social communication, insistence on the sameness of activities and surroundings, and repetitive patterns of behavior affect the daily functioning of the individual [2]. The term "spectrum" refers to the wide range of symptoms, skills, and levels of disability in functioning that can occur in people with ASD. Some children and adults with ASD are fully able to perform all activities of daily living while others require substantial support to perform basic activities [3].

On the other hand, one of the main therapeutic objectives for individuals with ASD is autonomy in adulthood [4]. Thus, a useful and easy-to-use tool for the assessment of the subject's functional state is urgently needed to guide the therapeutic effort to obtain the best results.

Therefore, the assessment of functional impairment is crucial both for the diagnosis and the therapeutic approach to ASD. The concept of psychosocial functioning is complex and it integrates different areas of a person's life, such as education, family, social life, working life, leisure and free time [5]. ASD has been

widely studied in children, but the quantity and quality of adult research is scarce [6, 7]. Valid, reliable, and sensitive outcome measures, which are fundamental for the development of an evidence-based for clinical effectiveness, are also lacking [8]. To date, the little existing evidence points to a poor psychosocial outcome for adults with ASD, even in the less severe group [4].

Also, the different stages of adulthood have been studied in relation to the trajectory of people with ASD in different areas of adaptive functioning [9, 10]. However, there have been conducted very few studies that have directly compared the different stages of adult life in the ASD population. Lever et al. [11] studied the prevalence of psychiatric disorders in young, middle and older adults, finding a higher level of psychopathology in young and middle-aged adults when compared to older adults. These differences throughout adult life can be reflected in different levels of functionality, being able to establish different trajectory profiles according to the adult stage.

Existing measures to assess the level of functioning, such as the World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule II (WHO-DAS II) [12], the SF-36 Health Survey (SF-36) [13], the Global Assessment of Functioning Scale [14] or the Independent Living Scales [15], present important limitations: they are long questionnaires, most of them do not assess all areas in a person's life, or they are not validated in adults with ASD. To assess functioning in ASD population, the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales, Second Edition (VABS-II) [16] and the Adaptive Behavior Assessment System, Second Edition (ABAS-II) [17] are also widely used. The VABS-II is the leading instrument for supporting the diagnosis of intellectual and developmental disabilities and the ABAS-II is a checklist of a broad range of skill areas related to development, behavior, and cognitive abilities. Although they are extensively used, they present some disadvantages, such as their length, making them difficult to apply routinely in a medical setting; moreover, they might not be reliable to assess functioning in people with ASD who do not present intellectual disability. Finally, to assess functioning in ASD and other neurodevelopmental disorders such as ADHD [18, 19], instruments without sufficient psychometric studies in these particular populations are being applied, such as Sheehan's Disability Scale (SDS) [20]. Although not having sufficient psychometric studies, these instruments are being used because of its easy application which makes them very useful in clinical settings.

According to this, efforts are needed to adapt the existing instruments and/or develop and evaluate new ones for assessing specific or related outcomes in adult individuals with ASD. There is a particular need for low cost, valid, and not time-consuming measures to facilitate research and use in daily routine follow-up visits. In this regard, the Functioning Assessment Short Test (FAST) [21] was developed for the clinical evaluation of functional impairment in patients suffering from mental disorders, evaluating different domains of functioning and it is very easy to apply (the administration only takes about 6 minutes long). The studied time frame refers to the last 15 days before assessment, and the test is a simple interview-administered instrument that requires very little time (6 min) to be applied. It comprises 24 items, which are divided into 6 specific areas of functioning: 1) Autonomy, referring to the patient's capacity to do things alone and make their own decisions; 2) Occupational functioning, which refers to the capacity to maintain a paid job, efficiency to perform tasks at work, working in the field in which the

patient was educated, and earning according to the level of the employment position; 3) Cognitive functioning is related to the ability to concentrate, perform simple mental calculations, solve problems, learn new information, and remember learned information; 4) Financial issues involve the capacity to manage finances and spend in a balanced way; 5) Interpersonal relationships refer to relations with friends and family, involvement in social activities, sexual relations, and the ability to defend ideas and opinions; 6) Leisure Time refers to the capacity to perform physical activities (sport, exercise) and the enjoyment of leisure activities. All items are rated on a 4-point scale, ranging from 0 (no difficulty) to 3 (severe difficulty). The global score is obtained by adding the scores of all the items. The higher the score, the greater the difficulties to function and greater impairment severity [21].

Results of previous studies using the FAST showed optimal validity and reliability properties in patients suffering from different mental health conditions. For instance, in patients with bipolar disorder, high internal consistency for the overall scale (Cronbach's alpha of .909) as well as for all its domains have been found [21]. In another study with patients with first psychotic episodes [22], an internal consistency level of .88 at baseline, .89 six months later, and .94 one year later have been reported. The FAST also showed good psychometric properties and could detect functional differences between patients with a diagnosis of schizophrenia and healthy subjects [23]. Finally, Rotger et al. [5] obtained good psychometric properties, in terms of reliability and validity, in the measure of the functional level of adults with ADHD. Hence, the purpose of the present study is to evaluate whether the FAST could be a reliable and valid tool to assess the functional outcome in adults with ASD in an outpatient clinical setting and to study the differences in psychosocial functioning between younger and older adults with ASD.

## Method

### Participants

A sample of participants with ASD was recruited from the monitored population within the Comprehensive Care Program for Autism Spectrum Disorder (PAITEA), from the Vall d'Hebron Hospital's Psychiatry Department. All participants were diagnosed using the Autism Diagnostic Observational Schedule-2 (24) by trained clinicians (L.GG and J.L.M). Inclusion criteria included: 1) being aged between 18 and 65 years; 2) diagnosis of ASD according to DSM-5 diagnostic criteria [2]. Respondents' language and cognitive barriers and ASD levels 2 and 3 were considered as exclusion criteria. The nonclinical control group (NC) was recruited by researchers at the Barcelona Clinic Hospital's Bipolar and Depressive Disorders Unit [24]. NC were selected if they were aged between 18 and 65 years, had no current or past psychiatric history, as determined by the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis I Disorders [25], and no first-degree relatives with a psychiatric disorder.

### Assessment

After informing the patients and obtaining their written consent, the investigator recorded demographic (age and gender) and clinical variables (psychiatric diagnosis history, if any) and administered the FAST

scale [21]. The FAST is an interviewer-administered instrument, designed to be used by a trained clinician. The evaluation time-window refers to the last two weeks.

Additionally, the Sheehan's Disability Scale (SDS) [20] was also administered. It is a three-item instrument widely used in clinical settings, which measures the severity of disability in three inter-related domains: work, family life/home responsibilities, and social/leisure activities. The SDS has shown good validity and reliability in Spanish clinical population [26].

## Statistical Analyses

To study the normality of the FAST variables, Shapiro–Wilk coefficient was applied. The results showed significant deviations from normality, precluding the use of parametric tests. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) was used to examine the internal consistency of the FAST items in each domain and the full scale. Cronbach's alpha measures were considered minimally acceptable if  $\alpha = .65$ , acceptable if  $\alpha = .7$ , and optimal if  $\alpha = .8$  [27]. Spearman's correlation coefficient were calculated to examine the correlations between the FAST and the SDS scores. To explore intergroup differences between ASD versus NC and between younger ASD adults (18–25 years) versus older ASD adults ( $= > 26$  years), nonparametric tests (Mann-Whitney Wilcoxon test) for each FAST domain were conducted. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with the original six-factor structure of the FAST was studied. When evaluating the fit of the CFA and stability models to the data, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and comparative fit index (CFI) were used. RMSEA values below .06 indicate a good fit to the data and CFI values close to .95 are acceptable [28]. The optimal cut-off point of the measure was analyzed by the area under the ROC curve (AUC). The AUC values were considered minimally acceptable when lower than .7, acceptable when between .7 and .8, optimal when between .8 and .9, and excellent when above .9 [29]. Data analyses were carried out with the statistical package IBM SPSS 19.0 and AMOS 26.0 for Windows. The alpha level was set at  $p < .05$

## Ethics

The study was approved by the Barcelona Universitari Vall d'Hebron Hospital's Ethics Committee and was carried out in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975 (the evaluation, support, and prevention unit). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

## Results

The total sample consisted of 150 participants: 71 adults with a diagnosis of ASD level 1 (43 male, 28 female), and 79 adults without psychiatric history records (51 female, 28 male). The mean age in the ASD group was 30.03 years ( $SD = 12$ , range 18–61), and 39.54 years ( $SD = 11$ , range 19–55) in the healthy control group ( $Z = -5.02$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The estimated time to complete the FAST was approximately 8 min. It facilitates quick responses as it is a simple instrument with few, straightforward, short questions.

## Internal consistency

Cronbach’s alpha showed excellent value for the FAST total score ( $\alpha = .97$ ) in the total sample of participants, and also for the ASD group ( $\alpha = .91$ ), whereas acceptable values were found for the NC group ( $\alpha = .76$ ). Table 1 shows internal consistency results for each FAST subscale.

Table 1  
Internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) for all FAST subscales and Total score.

	Total sample (n = 150)	ASD (n = 71)	HC (n = 79)
<b>FAST Total score (24 items)</b>	0.97	0.91	0.76
Autonomy (4 items)	0.92	0.85	0.02
Occupational functioning (5 items)	0.91	0.80	0.91
Cognitive functioning (5 items)	0.90	0.82	0.42
Financial issues (2 items)	0.95	0.93	0.88
Interpersonal relationships (6 items)	0.94	0.82	0.54
Leisure (2 items)	0.56	0.48	0.18

## Convergent validity

Spearman’s correlations analysis were conducted to study convergence between the FAST total score with the SDS scores. Results showed significant moderate correlations with each of three SDS domains: Work ( $r = .54, p < .001$ ), Social Life ( $r = .27, p = .02$ ), and Family Life ( $r = .31, p = .01$ ). FAST Occupational Functioning also showed a moderate correlation with SDS Work domain ( $r = .61, p < .001$ ); FAST Interpersonal Relationships correlated with the SDS Social domain ( $r = .46, p < .001$ ); and the FAST Family Life item (Item 20) correlated with the SDS Family Life domain ( $r = .68; p < .001$ ).

## Intergroup mean differences

Table 2 shows the results of the intergroup mean differences analysis. The ASD group showed significantly higher scores in the FAST total score ( $Z = -10.23, p < 0.001$ ), and in all the subscales when compared to NC participants. When compared by age, younger ASD adults showed significantly lower scores in the FAST Autonomy subscale ( $Z = -2.31, p = .02$ ), whereas older ASD adults showed significantly lower scores in the FAST Interpersonal Relationships subscale ( $Z = -2.27, p = .02$ ). No significant differences in the FAST total score were found between age groups (Table 3).

Table 2  
Intergroup mean differences (sd) between ASD and NC participants.

	ASD (n = 71)	NC (n = 79)	U Mann-Whitney (Z)
<b>FAST Total score</b>	40 (13.55)	4.24 (4.63)	-10.23*
Autonomy	6.08 (3.4)	0.27 (0.63)	-10.27*
Occupational functioning	8.59 (3.84)	0.85 (2.56)	-9.57*
Cognitive functioning	7.62 (3.58)	1.11 (1.27)	-9.75*
Financial issues	2.83 (2.14)	0.2 (.81)	-8.5*
Interpersonal relationships	11.77 (4.4)	1.11 (1.58)	-10.25*
Leisure	3.08 (1.51)	0.7 (1.1)	-8.35*
<i>*p &lt; .05</i>			

Table 3  
Intergroup mean differences (sd) between ASD younger vs. older adults

	ASD younger adults (n = 40)	ASD older adults (n = 31)	U Mann-Whitney (Z)
<b>FAST Total score</b>	39.33 (12.12)	40.84 (15.36)	- .87
Autonomy	6.93 (3.21)	5 (3.39)	-2.31*
Occupational functioning	8.3 (3.23)	8.97 (4.54)	-1.22
Cognitive functioning	7.23 (2.90)	8.13 (4.3)	- .84
Financial issues	3.03 (2.06)	2.58 (2.26)	- .90
Interpersonal relationships	10.9 (4.24)	12.9 (4.41)	-2.25*
Leisure	2.95 (1.34)	3.26 (1.71)	- .93
<i>*p &lt; .05</i>			

## Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The study of the internal structure of the FAST determined a poor model fit to the original six-factor structure (Fig. 1). The RMSEA value was .104, (90% CI [.94, .11];  $p = .00$ ), which is below the acceptable threshold, whereas the CFI value was .90, indicating poor model fit.

## ROC curve

We analyzed the scale's discriminant capacity between ASD and NC using the diagnostic performance ROC curve. The AUC was .98, 95% CI [0.96, 1] which, being close to 1, indicates excellent discriminant capacity. The result of the cut-off analysis indicates that a total FAST score above 12 obtains the best balance between sensitivity (96%) and specificity (94%). Positive and negative predictive values were .96 and .94, respectively. Figure 2 shows the ROC curve for the FAST total score comparing the ASD and NC groups.

## Discussion

The main goal of this study was to analyze the psychometric properties of the FAST scale for the first time in ASD population using a sample of patients with ASD and non-clinical individuals. Results showed good psychometric properties in terms of validity and reliability. Cronbach's alpha for the total scale was .91 and the area under the curve was .98. Moreover the ASD group showed significantly higher scores in the FAST total score ( $Z = -10.23, p < 0.001$ ), and in all the subscales when compared to NC participants.

A good functional outcome of people with autism is the main objective for professionals, families, and the individuals themselves, but there is no agreement about the instrument to measure it in adults with ASD [30]. At present, there are some limitations to evaluate functioning in autistic people due to methodological issues, particularly related to the wide heterogeneity in the cohorts studied and the variability in the measures used, which have led to inconsistent and sometimes contradictory research findings [4]. Thus more research is needed in this field.

Regarding the psychometric properties of the FAST scale, promising results were found in terms of validity and reliability, very similar to those obtained in bipolar disorder [21], schizophrenia [22], first psychotic episodes [23], and ADHD [5], supporting its use in the evaluation of adaptive functioning in adults with ASD level 1. Moreover, the FAST is a short and easily applied interview, making it very practical in healthcare settings. The instrument has been translated to English and validated in different languages, including French [31], Portuguese [32], and Italian [33], among others. The main finding of the present study is that the FAST is a valid and reliable instrument to assess functional impairment in adults with ASD.

The analysis of the FAST's internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha showed good consistency between the different responses and, therefore, between the scale's items. An excellent alpha index of .91 was found for the ASD group, while an acceptable value, .76, was found for the NC group. This may be because the NC is more heterogeneous than the ASD group, thus providing different functioning profiles and, therefore, a lower consistency between items.

Concerning concurrent validity, modest positive correlations between the FAST total score and scores in each of the three SDS domains were observed. Similar results were obtained in a previous validation of the FAST for ADHD population [5], where the SDS was also used to examine convergent validity. In both cases, the modest correlation obtained could be related to the low similarity between the two measures in the number of items (the SDS with only 3 items and the FAST with 24). In any case, when directly

comparing specific social- and family-related items with SDS subareas, higher convergence values were found.

Furthermore, we analyzed the scale's discriminant capacity between patients and controls using the diagnostic performance or ROC curve. The AUC was .98 which, being very close to 1, indicates an excellent discriminant capacity. These results are in line with those obtained in previous studies regarding bipolar [21] and ADHD populations [5]. The study of the scale's discriminant capacity also indicates that a score above 12 achieves the best balance between sensitivity (96%) and specificity (94%). Factor analysis showed poor model fit to the six-factor model proposed in the original validation [21]. This may be due to a small sample size. All items showed strong correlations with high factor loadings, except for Items 8 (*Charge according to your position*) and 24 (*Having a hobby*). Further studies should reconsider the original six-factor model when using the FAST in ASD population.

In accordance with previous studies [4, 34], our results indicate poorer functional outcomes for adult people with ASD compared to NC. Most studies of adults with ASD suggest that prognosis, as assessed by objective measures of social outcome (e.g., independence, employment, social relationships), is poor [4]. Considering the age group differences, the younger people showed more difficulties in the autonomy domain. This may be explained by the fact that the sample of younger adults still lived with their parents, compromising their possibilities of developing the self-care necessary skills, as their relatives compensate for their difficulties, which leads to these younger ASD adults' low motivation to perform these tasks by themselves. On the other hand, older ASD adults show poorer interpersonal relationships, which might be due to constant pressure to "fit in" with the demands of a society that fails to understand their needs or difficulties [35]. Their inability to meet these demands may lead to stress and anxiety and progressive isolation [36]. The older they get, the more social contacts center around special interests and skills, rather than involving close, spontaneous friendships [37].

## Limitations

The findings of this study should be interpreted with caution, considering two main limitations that have been identified. First, given that patients and controls were not matched by gender, the number of males in the ASD group is much higher than in the NC group. This is due to a higher prevalence of ASD in male population [38]. Further studies should address gender differences in the adaptive functioning of adults with ASD levels. Second, the FAST might not be appropriate for ASD patients of Levels 2 and 3 due to the content of the items examined. Future research could be performed to adapt some items depending on the person's severity level and thus making the FAST more suitable for all of the ASD spectrum. Among others, items like support needs, communication skills, and cognitive and behavioral difficulties could be taken into account.

## Conclusions

Despite the limitations, these preliminary results point out that the FAST scale presents adequate psychometric properties in terms of validity and reliability, suggesting that it could be an adequate tool to measure of the functioning in adults with ASD level 1. It shows a strong discriminant capacity between ASD and nonclinical subjects. Due to its characteristics, the scale is a feasible measure in healthcare settings, at least to assess patients with ASD level 1. The study also showed that adults with ASD present different profiles of functional impairment depending on their age: while younger patients present greater impairment in autonomy, older patients show more difficulties in interpersonal relationships

## Declarations

**Ethical approval and Informed consent:** Ethics approval was obtained from Hospital Universitari Vall d'Hebron Ethics Committee of Research and Medication.

**Consent for publication:** Not applicable.

**Availability of data and materials:** The datasets used and analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

### **Conflict of interests:**

The author L. Gisbert received travel awards for taking part in psychiatric meetings from Shire in the last 3 years.

Dr. E. Vieta has received grants and served as consultant, advisor or CME speaker for the following entities (unrelated to the present work): AB-Biotics, Abbott, Allergan, Angelini, Dainippon Sumitomo Pharma, Ferrer, Gedeon Richter, Janssen, Lundbeck, Otsuka, Sage, Sanofi-Aventis, and Takeda.

Dr. JA. Ramos-Quiroga was on the speakers' bureau and/or acted as consultant for Eli-Lilly, Janssen-Cilag, Novartis, Shire, Takeda, Bial, Shionogui, Lundbeck, Almirall, Braingaze, Sincrolab, Medice and Rubió in the last 5 years. He also received travel awards (air tickets + hotel) for taking part in psychiatric meetings from Janssen-Cilag, Rubió, Shire, Takeda, Shionogui, Bial, Medice and Eli-Lilly. The Department of Psychiatry chaired by him received unrestricted educational and research support from the following companies in the last 5 years: Eli-Lilly, Lundbeck, Janssen-Cilag, Actelion, Shire, Ferrer, Oryzon, Roche, Psious, and Rubió.

The authors JLM, ISR, GEM and CMB declare no conflict of interest.

**Funding :** This study was supported in part by Pla estratègic de recerca i innovació en salut (PERIS) 2016-2020 (SLT006/17/00287) and Instituto de Salud Carlos III (PI18/01788).

### **Authors' contributions:**

LGG, JLM and ISR: conceived and designed the study, collected and analysed the data and wrote the manuscript.

GEM: collected data and reviewed the manuscript.

CMB and EV reviewed the manuscript.

JARQ: supervised the project and reviewed the manuscript

All authors discussed the results and contributed to the final manuscript.

**Acknowledgments:** We thank the staff of the Comprehensive Care Programme of ASD (PAITEA) of the Department of Psychiatry of the Vall d’Hebron Hospital (Barcelona) as well as the staff of the Barcelona Clinic Hospital of the Bipolar Disorder Program. We also thank the participants of the study for their kind cooperation and Virginia Navascués for her diligent proofreading of this paper.

## References

1. Maenner MJ, Shaw KA, Baio J. Prevalence of autism spectrum disorder among children aged 8 years –autism and developmental disabilities monitoring network, 11 sites, United States, 2016. *MMWR Surveill Summ.* 2020;69(4):1.
2. American Psychiatric Association. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. 5th ed. Washington: American Psychiatric Association; 2013. In: Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. 2013. p. 5th ed.
3. Lord C, Elsabbagh M, Baird G, Veenstra-Vanderweele J. Autism spectrum disorder. *Lancet* [Internet]. 2018;392(10146):508–20. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31129-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31129-2).
4. Howlin P, Magiati I. Autism spectrum disorder: Outcomes in adulthood. *Curr Opin Psychiatry.* 2017;30(2):69–76.
5. Rotger S, Richarte V, Nogueira M, Corrales M, Bosch R, Vidal R, et al. Functioning Assessment Short Test (FAST): validity and reliability in adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci.* 2014;264(8):719–27.
6. Simonoff E, Kent R, Stringer D, Lord C, Briskman J, Lukito S, et al. Trajectories in symptoms of autism and cognitive ability in autism from childhood to adult life: Findings from a longitudinal epidemiological cohort. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2019.
7. Stringer D, Kent R, Briskman J, Lukito S, Charman T, Baird G, et al. Trajectories of emotional and behavioral problems from childhood to early adult life. *Autism.* 2020;1362361320908972.
8. Mason D, McConachie H, Garland D, Petrou A, Rodgers J, Parr JR. Predictors of quality of life for autistic adults. *Autism Res.* 2018;11(8):1138–47.
9. Roestorf A, Bowler DM, Deserno MK, Howlin P, Klinger L, McConachie H, et al. “Older Adults with ASD: The Consequences of Aging.” Insights from a series of special interest group meetings held at the International Society for Autism Research 2016–2017. *Res Autism Spectr Disord.* 2019;63:3–12.
10. Hand BN, Angell AM, Harris L, Carpenter LA. Prevalence of physical and mental health conditions in Medicare-enrolled, autistic older adults. *Autism.* 2020;24(3):755–64.

11. Lever AG, Geurts HM. Psychiatric Co-occurring Symptoms and Disorders in Young, Middle-Aged, and Older Adults with Autism Spectrum Disorder. *J Autism Dev Disord* [Internet]. 2016 Jun 9 [cited 2019 Jun 17];46(6):1916–30. Available from:<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26861713>
12. Organization WH. WHO psychiatric disability assessment schedule (WHO. World Health Organization; 1988.
13. Ware Jr JE, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36): I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care*. 1992;473–83.
14. Diagnostic D. statistical manual of mental disorders. (1995). Washingt DC, Am Psychiatr Assoc.
15. Loeb PA. Independent Living Scales (ILS) stimulus booklet. Psychological Corporation; 1996.
16. Sparrow SS, Cicchetti D V, Balla DA, Doll EA. Vineland adaptive behavior scales: Survey forms manual. American Guidance Service; 2005.
17. Harrison PL, Oakland T. ABAS II [kit]: Adaptive Behavior Assessment System. Psychological Corporation; 2003.
18. Gisbert L, Richarte V, Corrales M, Ibáñez P, Bosch R, Casas M, et al. The Impact of Emotional Lability Symptoms During Childhood in Adults With ADHD. *J Atten Disord*. 2018;22(6):581–90.
19. Pahnke J, Hirvikoski T, Bjureberg J, Bölte S, Jokinen J, Bohman B, et al. Acceptance and commitment therapy for autistic adults: An open pilot study in a psychiatric outpatient context. *J Context Behav Sci* [Internet]. 2019;13(November 2018):34–41. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2019.04.002>.
20. Sheehan D V, Harnett-Sheehan K, Raj BA. The measurement of disability. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol* [Internet]. 1996 Jun [cited 2016 Aug 29];11:89–95. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8923116>.
21. Rosa AR, Sánchez-Moreno J, Martínez-Aran A, Salamero M, Torrent C, Reinares M, et al. Validity and reliability of the Functioning Assessment Short Test (FAST) in bipolar disorder. *Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Heal*. 2007;3(1):5.
22. González-Ortega I, Rosa A, Alberich S, Barbeito S, Vega P, Echeburúa E, et al. Validation and use of the functioning assessment short test in first psychotic episodes. *J Nerv Ment Dis*. 2010;198(11):836–40.
23. Zortéa K, da Silva Magalhães PV, Rosa AR, de Lucena DF, Guimarães LR, Petter Francesconi LP, et al. Concurrent Validity and Reliability of the Brazilian Version of the Functioning Assessment Short Test in Patients with Schizophrenia. *Value Heal Reg Issues*. 2012;1(2):244–7.
24. Lord C, Rutter M, DiLavore PC, Risi S, Gotham K, Bishop SL. ADOS. Autism diagnostic Obs Sched Manual Los Angeles WPS. 1999.
25. Vieta E. Pros and cons of specialised care in bipolar disorder: An international perspective. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2013;202(3):170–1.
26. First M, Spitzer R, Gibbon M, Williams JBW. Entrevista clínica estructurada para los trastornos del eje I del DSM-IV: SCID-I. Versión Clínica Ed Masson Barcelona. 1999;

27. Luciano J V, Bertsch J, Salvador-Carulla L, Tomás JM, Fernández A, Pinto-Meza A, et al. Factor structure, internal consistency and construct validity of the Sheehan Disability Scale in a Spanish primary care sample. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2010;16(5):895–901.
28. Nunnally JC. *Psychometric theory 3E*. Tata McGraw-hill education; 1994.
29. Hu L, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct Equ Model a Multidiscip J*. 1999;6(1):1–55.
30. Hosmer Jr DW, Lemeshow S, Sturdivant RX. *Applied logistic regression*. Vol. 398. John Wiley & Sons; 2013.
31. Poon KK, Sidhu DJK. Adults with autism spectrum disorders: A review of outcomes, social attainment, and interventions. *Curr Opin Psychiatry*. 2017;30(2):77–84.
32. Claire D, Raust A, Fouques D, Barbato A, Etain B, Henry C. Validation of the French version of the functioning assessment short test (FAST) in patients with bipolar disorder. A study from the french bipolar expert centers network. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2012;28:e62–3.
33. Cacilhas AA, Magalhães PV da S, Ceresér KM, Walz JC, Weyne F, Rosa AR, et al. Validity of a short functioning test (FAST) in Brazilian outpatients with bipolar disorder. *Value Heal J Int Soc Pharmacoeconomics Outcomes Res*. 2009 Jun;12(4):624–7.
34. Moro MF, Colom F, Floris F, Pintus E, Pintus M, Contini F, et al. Validity and reliability of the Italian version of the Functioning Assessment Short Test (FAST) in bipolar disorder. *Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Heal CP EMH*. 2012;8:67.
35. Moss P, Mandy W, Howlin P. Child and adult factors related to quality of life in adults with autism. *J Autism Dev Disord*. 2017;47(6):1830–7.
36. Mazurek MO. Loneliness, friendship, and well-being in adults with autism spectrum disorders. *Autism*. 2014;18(3):223–32.
37. Hedley D, Uljarevic M, Wilmot M, Richdale A, Dissanayake C. Understanding depression and thoughts of self-harm in autism: A potential mechanism involving loneliness. *Res Autism Spectr Disord*. 2018 Feb;46:1–7.
38. Stacey T-L, Froude EH, Trollor J, Foley K-R. Leisure participation and satisfaction in autistic adults and neurotypical adults. *Autism*. 2019;23(4):993–1004.
39. Loomes R, Hull L, Mandy WPL. What Is the Male-to-Female Ratio in Autism Spectrum Disorder? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2017;56(6):466–74. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2017.03.013>.

## Figures




Figure 1

Factor structure of the FAST, including factor correlation and factor loadings (N=150; all subjects)






Figure 1

Factor structure of the FAST, including factor correlation and factor loadings (N=150; all subjects)



**Figure 2**

Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves illustrating the ability of the total FAST scale to identify any ASD cases at alternative cut-off points. N=150 (ASD vs NC).



**Figure 2**

Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves illustrating the ability of the total FAST scale to identify any ASD cases at alternative cut-off points. N=150 (ASD vs NC).