



HAL
open science

Identifying Language and Cognitive Profiles in Children With ASD via a Cluster Analysis Exploration: Implications for the New ICD-11

Silvia Silleresi, Philippe Prévost, Racha Zebib, Frédérique Bonnet-Brilhault, Donatello Conte, Laurice Tuller

► To cite this version:

Silvia Silleresi, Philippe Prévost, Racha Zebib, Frédérique Bonnet-Brilhault, Donatello Conte, et al.. Identifying Language and Cognitive Profiles in Children With ASD via a Cluster Analysis Exploration: Implications for the New ICD-11. *Autism Research*, 2020, <10.1002/aur.2268>. <hal-02880841>

HAL Id: hal-02880841

<https://hal.science/hal-02880841v1>

Submitted on 2 Jul 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

1 **Title:** Identifying language and cognitive profiles in children with ASD via a cluster analysis
2 exploration: implications for the new ICD-11

3
4 **Running title:** Language and cognitive profiles in children with ASD
5

6 **Authors:** Silvia Silleresi, Philippe Prévost, Racha Zebib, Frédérique Bonnet-Brilhault, Donatello
7 Conte & Laurice Tuller
8

9 **Authors affiliations:**

10 Silvia Silleresi

11 UMR 1253, Imagery and Brain (iBrain), Université de Tours, Inserm, Tours, France
12 Department of Psychology, University of Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy
13

14 Philippe Prévost,

15 UMR 1253, Imagery and Brain (iBrain), Université de Tours, Inserm, Tours, France
16

17 Racha Zebib,

18 UMR 1253, Imagery and Brain (iBrain), Université de Tours, Inserm, Tours, France
19

20 Frédérique Bonnet-Brilhault

21 UMR 1253, Imagery and Brain (iBrain), Université de Tours, Inserm, Tours, France
22

23 Donatello Conte

24 Laboratoire d'Informatique Fondamentale et Appliquée de Tours (LIFAT – EA 6300),
25 Tours, France
26

27 Laurice Tuller

28 UMR 1253, Imagery and Brain (iBrain), Université de Tours, Inserm, Tours, France
29

30
31 **Authors' addresses:**

32 S. Silleresi, P. Prévost, L. Tuller, R. Zebib & F. Bonnet-Brilhault:

33 UMR 1253, Imagery and Brain (iBrain), Université de Tours, Inserm, Tours, France

34 2 Boulevard Tonnellé

35 Centre de Pédiopsychiatrie, CHRU de Tours

36 Equipe Fonctional Neuropsychiatrie, UMR 1253, Imagery and Brain Unit

37 37044 Tours Cedex 09, France
38

39 S. Silleresi

40 Department of Psychology, University of Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

41 1, Piazza dell'Ateneo Nuovo

42 Dipartimento di Psicologia, Università di Milano Bicocca
43

1 20126, Milano, Italy

2

3 D. Conte:

4 Laboratoire d'Informatique Fondamentale et Appliquée de Tours (LIFAT – EA 6300), Tours,
5 France

6 64 avenue Jean Portalis,

7 Département Informatique de l'Ecole Polytechnique de Tours

8 37200, Tours, France

9

10

11 **The e-mail address of the corresponding author:**

12 Corresponding author: Silvia Silleresi

13 e-mail: silvia.silleresi@gmail.com

1 **Acknowledgments:**

2 This research was supported by a grant from the Region Centre (Doctoral Grant awarded to Silvia
3 Silleresi) and by the Neurofunctional Psychiatric Team at University of Tours. We would like to
4 thank all the children and the families that took part in the study, the staff of the Child Psychiatry
5 Department of Tours University Teaching hospital and our linguist colleagues, in particular Sandrine
6 Ferré.

7

8

9 **Conflict of interest**

10 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

1 **Abstract (241 words)**
2
3

4 The new version of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) mentions the existence of four
5 different profiles in the verbal part of the Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), describing them as
6 combinations of either spared or impaired functional language and intellectual abilities. The aim of the
7 present study was to put ASD heterogeneity to the forefront by exploring whether clear profiles related
8 to language and intellectual abilities emerge when investigation is extended to the entire spectrum,
9 focusing on verbal children. Our study proposed a systematic investigation of both language
10 (specifically, structural language abilities) and intellectual abilities (specifically, nonverbal cognitive
11 abilities) in fifty-one 6- to 12-year-old verbal children with ASD based on explicitly motivated
12 measures. For structural language abilities sentence repetition and nonword repetition tasks were
13 selected; for nonverbal cognitive abilities we chose Raven's Progressive Matrices, as well as Matrix
14 Reasoning and Block Design from the Wechsler Scales. An integrative approach based on cluster
15 analyses revealed five distinct profiles. Among these five profiles, all four logically possible
16 combinations of structural language and nonverbal abilities mentioned in the ICD-11 were detected.
17 Three profiles emerged among children with normal language abilities and two emerged among
18 language impaired children. Crucially, the existence of discrepant profiles of abilities suggests that
19 children with ASD can display impaired language in presence of spared nonverbal intelligence or
20 spared language in the presence of impaired nonverbal intelligence, reinforcing the hypothesis of the
21 existence of a separate language module in the brain.

22
23
24 **Lay summary**
25

26 The present work put ASD heterogeneity to the forefront by exploring whether clear profiles
27 related to language and cognitive abilities emerge when investigation is extended to the entire

1 spectrum (focusing on verbal children). The use of explicitly motivated measures of both
2 language and cognitive abilities and of an unsupervised machine learning approach, the cluster
3 analysis, (1) confirmed the existence of all four logically possible profiles evoked in the new ICD-
4 11, (2) evoked the existence of (at least) a fifth profile of language/cognitive abilities and (3)
5 reinforced the hypothesis of a language module in the brain.

6
7
8

9 **Keywords:** ASD, profiles, ICD-11, nonverbal cognitive abilities, structural language, cluster
10 analysis

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 **Identifying language and cognitive profiles in children with ASD via a cluster analysis**
2 **exploration: implications for the new ICD-11**

3
4
5 A diagnosis of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) includes specification of any accompanying
6 language and/or intellectual impairment (APA 2013). To date, few studies have taken up the
7 question of the nature of linguistic/cognitive profiles in verbal children with ASD by explicitly
8 exploring the interaction between language (dis)ability and intellectual (dis)ability and their
9 logically possible combinations (Geurts & Embrechts, 2008; Rapin et al., 2009; Tager-Flusberg,
10 2006; a.o.). The most recent attempt to identify and define these profiles is represented by the
11 release of new diagnostic subcategories for ASD in the World Health Organization’s International
12 Classification of Diseases ICD-11 (WHO, 2018) (Table 1).

13 **[Table 1]**

14
15 As reported in Table 1, the ICD-11 describes four different profiles, which combine either spared or
16 impaired *functional language* and *intellectual abilities*. Functional language impairment is specified
17 as “a marked impairment in spoken or signed language relative to the individual’s age, with the
18 individual not able to use more than single words or simple phrases for instrumental purposes, such
19 as to express personal needs and desires” and a deficit in intellectual abilities as “a performance
20 below the average range on intellectual, conceptual, and practical domains of cognitive
21 development” (WHO, 2018). Although these definitions provide general indications, they do not
22 specify which particular domains of functional language and cognitive development should be
23 evaluated or which measure(s) should be used for assessing linguistic and intellectual abilities.

24 In the literature on language in ASD three of the profiles reported in the ICD-11 have been
25 robustly attested: the two “homogeneous” profiles, autism with normal language (ASD-LN) and
26 normal IQ, and autism with impaired language (ASD-LI) and impaired IQ, and one of the

1 “discrepant” profiles, ASD-LI with normal IQ, which has been compared to the profile that defines
2 children with Developmental Language Disorder (DLD) (Williams et al., 2008). The existence of
3 the fourth “discrepant” profile, ASD-LN with impaired IQ, has been evoked, but, as far as we
4 know, it has been attested in very few studies (Joseph et al., 2002; Kjelgaard & Tager-Flusberg,
5 2001; Silleresi et al., 2018; Tuller et al., 2017). Assuming the probable existence of these four
6 profiles, we pursued the idea of crossing the abilities mentioned in the ICD-11, proposing both an
7 interpretation of the definitions of linguistic and intellectual impairment and the use of specific
8 tools for their measurement.

9 Establishing the nature of linguistic and intellectual abilities in children with ASD is not an
10 easy task, in part because phenotypical realizations of these abilities are characterized by notable
11 heterogeneity. Concerning language abilities, besides universal difficulties with pragmatics (Boucher,
12 2003; Tager-Flusberg, 1981), many individuals with ASD also show deficits in structural aspects of
13 language, notably phonology and morphosyntax (Boucher, 2012; Eigsti et al., 2011; Wittke et al.,
14 2017). Studies on verbal children with autism have reported that roughly half of these children
15 manifest mixed expressive/receptive structural language impairment (a group sometimes referred to
16 as ASD-LI or ALI), while the rest present normal language abilities (ASD-LN or ALN) (Loucas et
17 al., 2008; Tager-Flusberg, 2006). Whatever the definition of *functional language* in the ICD-11 may
18 entail, in order to “use single words and/or simple phrases for instrumental purposes” an individual
19 needs to be able to produce syllables (phonological abilities) and syntactic constructions
20 (morphosyntactic abilities). For these reasons we propose to interpret “impaired functional language”
21 as a deficit in structural language abilities, where "structural" refers to sound structure (phonology)
22 and word/sentence structure (morphosyntax).

23 How can structural language abilities be evaluated in ASD? Regarding phonological abilities,
24 several studies have claimed that Nonword Repetition (NWR) tasks are reliable indicators of

1 phonological impairment in children with ASD, even in the absence of low performance on other
2 phonological tasks, such as word repetition or articulation tasks (e.g., Kjelgaard & Tager-Flusberg,
3 2001). Most studies which have investigated phonological abilities in ASD have employed
4 phonological short-term memory NWR tasks based on items of increasing number of CV syllables
5 (Botting & Conti-Ramsden, 2003; Riches et al., 2011; Tager-Flusberg, 2015). As a result, we cannot
6 be sure whether the low performance reported in these studies was due to a short-term memory deficit
7 or to structural phonological impairment. More recently, NWR tasks have been constructed around the
8 notion of phonological complexity by manipulating several aspects of syllable structure, such as
9 consonant clusters (Gallon et al. 2007, Ferré et al. 2012). These tasks limit the effect of phonological
10 short-term memory by including nonwords not exceeding 3-4 syllables in length. In the few studies on
11 ASD that have used such tasks (Kjelgaard & Tager-Flusberg, 2001; Harper-Hill et al., 2013), low
12 performance was reported for some children, who appear thus to have a phonological deficit. In this
13 study we decided to employ a NWR having items varying in degree of phonological complexity, yet
14 restricted in syllable length: the Language Impairment Testing in a Multilingual Setting (LITMUS)-
15 NWR-French (Ferré & dos Santos, 2015) (see material and procedure section).

16 Regarding morphosyntactic abilities, impairment in ASD has been attested across numerous
17 languages both via the use of standardized tests such as the Clinical Evaluation of Language
18 Fundamentals - CELF (Lloyd et al., 2006 ; Ellis Weismer et al., 2017) and experimental tasks targeting
19 specific constructions such as grammatical tense marking (English: Modyanova et al. 2017; Roberts et
20 al. 2004; Mandarin: Zhou et al., 2015), pronominal clitics (French: Durrleman & Delage 2016; Prévost
21 et al., 2018; English: Perovic et al., 2013), relative clauses (English: Riches et al. 2010; Hebrew:
22 Sukenink & Friedmann, 2018), *wh*-questions (French: Prévost et al. 2017), and passives (French:
23 Durrleman et al. 2017; Greek: Terzi et al., 2014; Persian: Gavarrò et al., 2014). Nonetheless, it has
24 been claimed that neither standardized tests nor experimental tasks may be sufficient to isolate the

1 source of impairment in children with ASD (Wittke et al., 2017 a.o.). Measures drawn from
2 standardized tests rarely enable detailed analysis of specific morphosyntactic structures, and often
3 involve multiple aspects of several different language domains, preventing distinct evaluation of these
4 abilities (Prévost et al., 2017; Tuller et al., 2017; Wittke et al., 2017). Moreover, in experimental tasks
5 which do target specific aspects of morphosyntax as well as in standardized language tasks, it is not
6 always possible to tease apart language difficulties due to structural language impairment and those
7 related to problems with pragmatics, as the two are so densely intertwined. In particular, children with
8 ASD have been found to produce large numbers of unexpected errors which are distinct from those
9 found in other children (both TD and language impaired) and which can be related to difficulties
10 performing the task: not integrating language and visual stimuli, persevering a particular answer
11 pattern, etc. (see, for example, Prévost et al., 2018; Roberts et al., 2014). Such tasks thus may ultimately
12 obscure our understanding of the difficulties that children may have with structural aspects of language,
13 including fundamental similarities with DLD.

14 In contrast, it has been argued that Sentence Repetition (SR) should minimize the potential
15 effects of both pragmatics, as the items are presented devoid of any conversational context and the
16 instructions are very simple (Polišenská et al. 2015; Silleresi et al. 2018), and lexical knowledge, as
17 vocabulary can be carefully controlled. It is important to note that SR is not a task eliciting mere
18 verbatim echoing of the stimulus: if adequately modeled in order to minimize the effect of short term
19 memory and to include an adequate degree of syntactic complexity, it can evaluate the effects of
20 different types of long-term linguistic knowledge on immediate recall (Lombardi & Potter, 1992).
21 There is currently consensus that SR provides reliable information about children's language abilities
22 in clinical assessment, yielding high levels of sensitivity and specificity for individuals with structural
23 language impairment (DLD) across a large number of languages (Conti-Ramsden et al., 2001;
24 Marinis et al., 2017 a.o.). SR has also been used for the detection of language impairment in children

1 with ASD (Botting and Conti-Ramsden 2003; Harper-Hill et al. 2013; Riches et al. 2010, a.o.).
2 However, the specific SR tasks employed in these studies were highly memory based (involving
3 extremely long sentences) and/or they lacked a variety of complex constructions. For the present
4 study, we used an SR task targeting specific morphosyntactic structures of varying computational
5 complexity: the LITMUS-SR-French (Prevost, Zebib, & Tuller, 2012). This task was designed to
6 focus on specific constructions known to be difficult for children with language impairment, while
7 also reducing the potential influence of memory effects (see material and procedure section).

8 Regarding intellectual abilities, current large-scale epidemiological studies have reported a
9 mean rate of intellectually impaired children with ASD of 31% (IQ < 70), while the rest show normal
10 intellectual abilities, including 25% of children in the borderline range (71-85) and 44% with average
11 or above average IQ (> 85) (CDC 2018). The intellectual abilities of children with ASD are often
12 classified through Full Scale IQ (FSIQ) scores. However, these scores have been reported to be hard
13 to interpret because of the great heterogeneity of autistic abilities across intellectual domains
14 (nonverbal, verbal, working memory, speed processing) (Mayes & Calhoun, 2008). There is
15 evidence, in fact, that children with autism tend to display a relative, and sometimes absolute
16 weakness (when compared to TD age-peers) on tasks evaluating attention, motor abilities, processing
17 speed and verbal abilities, especially those tasks that entail measures of social and practical
18 understanding and/or pragmatic-communicative skills. This is found on the various subtests of most,
19 if not all, intelligence test batteries (Mackintosh & Mackintosh, 2011; Mottron, 2004). On the other
20 hand, nonverbal (NV) reasoning has been demonstrated to be a relative strength of autistic
21 individuals, especially on tasks based on abstract perception and visuo-spatial abilities (Barbeau et
22 al., 2013; Mottron et al., 2006).

23 Moreover, most of the tests used for evaluating intellectual abilities involve direct use of
24 language capacities both for comprehending the task instructions and producing verbalised responses.

1 Since we were seeking to detect profiles of language and intellectual abilities in children with ASD,
2 we aimed at selecting cognitive scores which are as nonverbal as possible, just as we sought to use
3 language measures capable of measuring as specifically as possible structural language abilities.
4 Besides being good indicators of intellectual abilities in children with ASD (Nader et al., 2016), NV
5 tests typically minimize the need for task instructions, experience-specific abilities, and other abilities
6 which may be important for performing the task (e.g., fine motor or speech skills), focusing on
7 abstract perception and fluid reasoning abilities. For these reasons we will interpret “impaired
8 intellectual abilities” as a deficit in nonverbal intellectual abilities.

9 How can NV intellectual abilities be evaluated in ASD? If we consider the two main
10 instruments used to evaluate human intelligence, Raven’s Progressive Matrices (RPM) (Raven,
11 1998), in research, and Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) (Wechsler, 2003), in clinical
12 practice, there is evidence that RPM better evaluate intellectual abilities of individuals with ASD
13 across the spectrum than on WISC FSIQ scores (Dawson et al. 2007; Hayashi et al. 2008; Nader et
14 al., 2016). Regarding the internal structure of the Wechsler Scale, it has been showed the Perceptual
15 Reasoning Index (PRI) of WISC-IV highlights the enhanced spatial perception and abstract reasoning
16 abilities of individuals with ASD in comparison to both FSIQ and the other indices and subtests of
17 the Wechsler scale, including the Verbal Comprehension Index (Barbeau et al. 2013). Yet, even
18 within the PRI, some studies have reported a further peak of abilities on the Matrix Reasoning and the
19 Block Design subtests compared to the Picture Concepts subtest (Nader et al. 2015; Oliveras-Rentas
20 et al. 2012). This may be due to the fact that children with ASD display their strengths more
21 consistently on visuospatial tasks (Block Design) and on fluid reasoning tests (Matrix Reasoning),
22 while they experience more difficulties when the task relies on language abilities (Picture Concepts)
23 (Houskeeper, 2011). Picture Concepts, in fact, strongly relies on language since children are asked to
24 verbalize their answers and provide sematic category motivation. We thus decided to use RPM, Block

1 Design and Matrix Reasoning of the WISC-IV to evaluate the intellectual (NV) abilities of children
2 of ASD in our study, but not Picture Concepts.

3 Finally, are there other factors that may be related to either impaired language or impaired
4 intellectual abilities in ASD? Current results in the literature have yet to reveal a complete picture.
5 Notably, it remains to be seen whether generalized measures of severity of autism symptoms can
6 predict performance on language and/or intellectual measures in ASD. Some studies have found
7 significant correlations between autism severity and both language abilities and intellectual abilities
8 (Gotham et al. 2009; Luyster et al. 2008; Tek et al., 2014), in contrast to others (Charman et al.
9 2011; Loucas et al., 2008).

10 The aim of the present study was to take a direct look at ASD heterogeneity by
11 investigating whether clear profiles related to language and intellectual abilities like the ones
12 described in the ICD-11 emerge when investigation is extended to the entire (verbal) spectrum. In
13 order to explore this question, we considered possible links between structural language and NV
14 abilities, as measured by specific repetition tasks for characterizing language capacities (LITMUS-
15 SR-French and LITMUS-NWR-French) and specific NV tasks (RPM, Block Design and Matrix
16 Reasoning) for characterizing intellectual abilities of children with ASD. We explored structural
17 language and nonverbal abilities by using an integrative machine learning approach, cluster analysis,
18 in order to see whether identifiable phenotypical profiles emerged.

19 We asked the following research questions: 1) when the measures selected for language and
20 intellectual abilities are applied to a population sample from the entire spectrum, do clear profiles
21 emerge? 2) Do these profiles resemble those presented in the new ICD-11 classification? For
22 researchers, answers to these questions would provide fundamental information that could facilitate
23 pinpointing the different phenotypes of autism; for clinicians, it would increase the possibility of
24 developing treatments tailored to the specific needs of individuals, based on particular patterns of

1 strengths and impairment.

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Methods

Participants

10 Fifty-one verbal children with ASD aged 6-12 years old ($M = 8;11$, $SD = 1;7$), two girls and forty-
11 nine boys, were recruited from the Autism Centre at the Regional University Teaching Hospital in
12 Tours (France). Fourteen of these children were bilingual (home exposure from birth to at least one
13 language other than French), reflecting the reality of the ASD population in France. All participants
14 met the criteria for a DSM-5/ICD-11 clinical diagnosis of ASD, confirmed by the Autism
15 Diagnostic Observation Schedule, ADOS (Lord et al., 2003), and/or the Child Autism Rating Scale,
16 CARS (Schopler et al., 2010) and the Evaluation of Autistic Behaviors, ECA-R (Lelord &
17 Barthélémy, 2003). For this study, the ADOS calibrated severity score, the ECA-R and the CARS
18 global score were used as measures of autism severity. The main characteristics of our population
19 are presented in Table 2.

[Table 2]

21 For all children the only inclusionary criterion was the production of utterances of at least three
22 words, to ensure that language tests could be administrated; no exclusionary criterion was applied
23 for intellectual ability. Information on the bilingual children's language exposure and use was
24 collected via the Parents of Bilingual Children Questionnaire (Tuller, 2015). Of the 14 bilinguals,
25 10 were French-dominant and 4 were balanced bilinguals; these children's other languages were
26 either Arabic (5), Farsi (2), English (2), Kurmanji, Lingala, Russian, Turkish or Vietnamese. Since
27 the bilingual children did not differ from the other children with ASD, for any measure of language
28 (SR: $t(50) = 1.04$, $p = .304$; NWR: $t(50) = 0.52$, $p = .605$), cognitive ability (RPM: $t(50) = 0.62$, $p =$

1 .540; Block Design: $t(42) = 0.28, p = .783$; Matrix Reasoning: $t(42) = 1.13, p = .276$), or autism
2 severity (ADOS: $t(50) = -0.08, p = .930$; CARS: $t(50) = -0.90, p = .380$; ECA-R: $t(50) = -1.13, p =$
3 $.228$), all children were grouped together. We note, in particular, that poor vocabulary skills, which
4 could be expected to impact on SR performance, were as frequent among the monolingual
5 participants (15/37 had composite vocabulary scores below -1.25) as among the bilingual
6 participants (6/14), and the two groups did not differ on this measure ($t(50) = 0.24, p = .754$). The
7 study received approval from the Ethical Committee for Non- Interventional Research (CERNI) of
8 Tours-Poitiers (France). Informed consent was obtained for all individual participants included in
9 the study.

10
11
12 *Materials and procedure*
13
14
15

16 Language abilities were evaluated via the LITMUS-NWR-French and the LITMUS-SR-French
17 (henceforth NWR and SR respectively). The design of the NWR task was conceived to
18 concentrate on those complex phonological structures that have been identified as the source of
19 errors in children with impaired phonology: syllable complexity, with more complex syllables
20 including consonant clusters or consonants in syllable-final position (dos Santos & Ferré, 2018).
21 The stimuli were controlled for word-likeness and, in contrast to many other NWR tasks, did not
22 exceed three syllables in length, in order to minimize memory effects. The 50 nonwords of the
23 task included simple consonant–vowel (CV) syllables, syllables with initial and median consonant
24 clusters (CCV) and syllables with a final consonant (CVC#).

25 SR manipulated syntactic computational complexity, measured in terms of the nature and
26 number of operations needed for the derivation of a syntactic construction. It was based on the
27 fact that children with DLD show deficits in certain structure-dependent relationships, such as

1 tense-marking (Franck et al., 2004) and long-distance dependencies necessitating movement (*wh*-
2 questions and relative clauses), and in embedded clauses (Delage et al., 2008; Guasti &
3 Cardinaletti, 2003; Hamann, 2006; Jakubowitz & Tuller, 2008; a.o.). The task contained five
4 sentence structures (monoclausal sentences in the present tense, monoclausal sentences in the past
5 tense, object *wh*-questions, sentence containing an argument clause, sentence containing a relative
6 clause) each divided into two substructures, one less complex and the other more complex,
7 consisting of three sentences each (for a total of 30 sentences). The structures were controlled for
8 number of words and syllables in order to minimize working memory effects. For a detailed
9 description of both NWR and SR tasks see de Almeida et al., 2017.

10 These two repetition tasks have been shown to be good indicators of impairment, in both
11 monolingual and bilingual populations, accurately distinguishing between DLD and TD (de
12 Almeida et al., 2017; Tuller et al., 2018; a.o.). Drawing from these findings, we hypothesised that
13 these tools should also identify language impairment in monolingual and bilingual children with
14 ASD. Based on the results in Tuller et al.'s (2018) study the repetition cut-off rate for impairment
15 for monolingual children was established at 77% correct repetition for NWR (specificity, 83%,
16 and sensitivity, 88%) and 78% for SR (specificity, 92%, and sensitivity, 93%) and for bilingual
17 children at 77% for NWR (sensitivity 85% and specificity 74%) and at 75% for SR (sensitivity
18 81% and specificity 72%).

19 Children's nonverbal cognitive level was estimated through RPM and, when available, Block
20 Design and Matrix Reasoning of the WISC-IV. Out of the 51 children included in our protocol, 43
21 had been administrated the WISC-IV battery. The eight remaining children had NV scores from
22 another cognitive evaluation, the Echelles Différentielles d'Efficiace Intellectuelle-Révisée, EDEI-
23 R (Perron-Borelli, 1996). The relevant indices derived from EDEI-R have been shown to be consistent
24 with RPM scores as well as with indices of the WISC (Jumel, 2014). A research assistant

1 administrated the coloured RPM test. Block Design, Matrix Reasoning subtests (WISC-IV) and NV
2 index (EDEI-R) had been administrated by hospital psychologists. The gap between administration
3 of the psychometric subtests and the RPM, always in that order, was less than twelve months ($M =$
4 2.72 , $SD = 8.9$) for each participant.

5 Each participant was tested individually in a quiet room, in two or more sessions ($M =$
6 2.01 ; $SD = 0.4$) whose duration varied from ten to thirty minutes depending on the child's level
7 of attention and participation. Each session was audio-recorded for transcription and coding.

8 9 10 *Data analysis* 11 12

13
14 Due to the limited number of participants a Principle Component Analysis (PCA) was first
15 conducted on all factors that could contribute to variability in our dataset. This allowed us to detect
16 which variables accounted the most for data variability and to eliminate parameters that could create
17 confounding effects. A cluster analysis was then conducted on the data selected from the PCA. Our
18 aim in using this technique was to limit as much as possible all a priori suppositions on the number
19 and nature of subtyping present in our sample (cfr. Lombardo et al., 2019), since this was our
20 research question. The cluster analysis was run through a *hard clustering method (K-means*
21 *clustering)* whereby each data point either belongs to a cluster completely or not. All statistical
22 analyses were conducted with the R-studio version 1.1.423.

23 Both the PCA and cluster analysis were run exclusively on the 43 children who had
24 WISC-IV scores. The results of the other eight children were analysed a posteriori by matching
25 their profiles to those detected by the cluster analysis.

26
27
28

Results

Reducing the number of factors in describing language and nonverbal ability profiles

In order to alleviate confounding effects of intercorrelations among the different parameters, the data were projected along orthogonal Principal Components. The PCA analysis included measures of structural language (SR and NWR) and nonverbal abilities (RPM, Block Design and Matrix Reasoning), and autism severity scores (ADOS severity score and CARS and ECA-R global scores). Data were scaled for normalization purposes due to the presence of different kinds of measures (Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2010). The PCA revealed two components, which together accounted for 60.7% of the data variability (Fig. 1). Table 3 describes the variables' contribution to each component.

[Figure 1]

[Table 3]

Results suggested that a combination of both structural language and NVIQ measures accounted for the identification of Component 1 (44.4%). All measures of structural language and NV abilities contributed significantly to the first dimension, except for Block Design. Component 2 (16.3%) relied exclusively on nonverbal measures (Block Design and Matrix Reasoning). Autism severity scores were only marginally involved in explaining the variability of the dataset, justifying their exclusion from further analyses.

Cluster analyses

The PCA analysis showed that the measures most highly involved in explaining our dataset were a combination of both structural language and NVIQ abilities. A K-means clustering method was

1 adopted in order to investigate whether clear profiles would emerge from the intersection of these
2 abilities. Moreover, a function, independent of the K-means algorithm, determines the optimal
3 number of clusters using different methods, *Sums of squares*, *Average silhouette* and *Gap statistics*
4 (Kassambara, 2017). The clustering variables for nonverbal measures and language measures
5 motivated above by the PCA analyses were RPM, Block Design, Matrix Reasoning, SR and NWR.
6 We decided to focus separately on morphosyntactic/NV profiles and on phonological/NV profiles
7 because some children showed discrepant performance on the two language tasks.

8 The optimal number of clusters was automatically estimated to be *five* for both
9 morphosyntactic/NV profiles and phonological/NV profiles. Crucially, all three methods (the
10 *Sums of squares*, the *Gap statistics* and the *Average silhouette*) returned the same result. We
11 therefore ran the K-means algorithm with $k = 5$ for both morphosyntactic/NV and
12 phonological/NV cluster analyses. The result was the distributions represented in Figures 2 (SR
13 and NVIQ abilities) and 3 (NWR and NVIQ abilities).

14 **[Figure 2]**

15

16 **[Figure 3]**

17

18 Each of the five profiles, for phonological and morphosyntactic abilities, included both monolingual
19 and bilingual children, suggesting that the bilingual children with ASD in our sample displayed the
20 same profiles as their monolingual peers. We note that the very same cluster analyses performed over
21 the 37 monolingual children with ASD (and thus excluding the 14 bilingual children) gave rise to the
22 exact same five clusters (Silleresi, 2018).

23 The characteristics of the centroid (mean, SD) of each cluster allowed us to identify and
24 tentatively label the five clusters as shown in Table 4.

25 **[Table 4]**

26

27 Three profiles showed "homogenous" abilities on both structural language and NV measures:

1 cluster 1 displayed low scores on both SR/NWR and NVIQ tasks and was thus labelled ASD-LI
2 with low NVIQ abilities; clusters 4 and 5 showed normal scores on SR/NWR and average and high
3 scores, respectively, on NVIQ tasks, hence the labels ASD-LN with average NVIQ abilities
4 (cluster 4) and ASD-LN with high NVIQ abilities (cluster 5). Two profiles showed
5 "heterogeneous" abilities displaying either impaired language abilities in presence of average
6 NVIQ scores, ASD-LI with average NVIQ, or spared language abilities in presence of impaired
7 NVIQ, ASD-LN with low NVIQ. In short, all four logically possible structural language / NV
8 abilities combinations were detected. In addition, a fifth profile, the ASD-LN with average NVIQ,
9 emerged.

10
11

12 *Children assessed with the EDEI-R psychometric test*

13
14

15 The eight children that were assessed via EDEI-R were not part of the cluster analysis. However, their
16 scores for SR, NWR and RPM and their NV score of EDEI-R, allowed us to incorporate them into the
17 clusters identified above (see Table 5). NV abilities of these eight children were considered to be
18 impaired when performance was below the threshold on both RPM and the NV index of the EDEI-R,
19 and to be unimpaired when performance was within norms on at least one test.

20 **[Table 5]**

21

22 Once these children were included, we calculated the prevalence of each cluster for both
23 structural language abilities (see Table 6). As a corollary result we note that the prevalence of the
24 five profiles was not exactly the same for morphosyntactic and phonological abilities.

25 **[Table 6]**

26

27

28

Discussion

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

In this study of structural language/nonverbal ability profiles in children with ASD, we placed heterogeneity in the centre of our investigation by extending work on language in autism to the entire spectrum, thus including verbal children with all levels of intellectual abilities. We applied domain specific measures of structural language (SR and NWR) and NVIQ (RPM, Matrix Reasoning and Block Design) to a group of 51 children with ASD, both monolingual and bilingual, aged 6 to 12, in order to see whether clear profiles, like the ones mentioned in the ICD-11, would emerge via a statistical approach based on PCA and cluster analyses.

Three main results emerged from our study. The PCA analysis suggested that severity of autism symptoms did not play a pivotal role in discriminating subtypes of ability profiles in children with ASD. This result appears to be in line with the transition from the DSM-IV and ICD-10 to the DSM-V and ICD-11, respectively, which is based on the idea of a *spectrum*, rather than discrete types of autism.

The cluster analysis suggested the existence of five profiles in both monolingual and bilingual children with ASD: three homogeneous profiles and two profiles displaying discrepant abilities. Among these five profiles, all four logically possible structural language / NV abilities combinations were detected. These results are in line with the findings reported in Joseph et al. (2002), Kjelgaard & Tager-Flusberg (2001); Silleresi et al. (2018) and Tuller et al. (2017). What is typically called *normal NVIQ* ended up being split into two clusters, *average level of NVIQ* and a *high level of NVIQ*, resulting into five profiles instead of the four originally expected. Among these five profiles, three emerged among LN children and two emerged among LI children, suggesting that it is inadequate to simply divide children into two groups on the basis of their language abilities (ASD-LI or ASD-LN). We note that the three LN-NVIQ profiles raise the question of the absence of three corresponding LI

1 profiles, and in particular why no LI-High NVIQ profile was attested. The extreme paucity of
2 relevant data in the literature makes it very difficult to conclude whether this could be the result of a
3 so-called Matthew effect (Stanovich, 2009). Likewise, the relatively low number of children in the
4 LN-Low NVIQ profile clearly deserves further investigation.

5 Our conclusion that all logically possible profiles are found (both homogenous and
6 heterogeneous), in both monolingual and bilingual children, constitutes an invitation to explore these
7 profiles and what may or may not be underlying them. Just how bilingualism impacts on which
8 profile a given child will belong to is an extremely interesting question, and one that deserves a study
9 in its own right. Our study has served only to show that bilingual children “end up” in each of the
10 profiles; this means, notably, that a bilingual language environment for a child with autism, whether
11 or not ID is present, does not preclude normal structural language functioning (see Gonzales-Barrero
12 & Nadig, 2018).

13 The next step in our enquiry will be to investigate the issue of the phenotypical similarities
14 between ASD-LI and DLD and between ASD-LN and TD, by comparing the performance in the five
15 profiles of morphosyntactic abilities and the five profiles of phonological abilities with the
16 performance of children with DLD and TD children. This will involve an analysis of the performance
17 for each sentence type and each syllabic structure manipulated by the two repetition tasks, including
18 error analysis, which will also determine whether the resulting phenotypical groups of children with
19 ASD found in the present study correspond to different degrees of impairment (in phonology and/or
20 syntax).

21
22 *Implications for the ICD-11*

23
24 We believe that the findings of this study illustrate rather clearly that progress in understanding

1 language profiles in ASD is dependent on investigation of children across the spectrum and use of
2 robust structural language and NV measures. Our study confirmed the existence of the four
3 language profiles mentioned in the ICD-11 (ASD-LN with high NVIQ, ASD-LN with low NVIQ,
4 ASD-LI with average NVIQ and ASD-LI with low NVIQ). The existence of all four logically
5 possible profiles clearly indicates that the subcategories of the ICD-11 are a reality in the autism
6 spectrum. First, the existence of, five profiles, with ASD-LN with normal NVIQ being split
7 between average NVIQ and high NVIQ, suggests that maybe the four profiles introduced in the
8 ICD-11 are not the only ones present in the autism spectrum. Second, the difference in prevalence
9 between morphosyntactic and phonological ability profiles suggests that these two domains should
10 be considered independently in the description of language ability profiles in the autism spectrum.
11 This would entail both a clearer definition of “functional language” and a specification of possible
12 discrepant structural language abilities in children with ASD. Third, the definition of “intellectual
13 impairment” should be refined by specifying which domain of cognitive abilities should be
14 considered most adapted to picture cognitive profiles in relation to language abilities.

15
16
17
18
19
20

Cognition and language: what is the relation in ASD?

21 From the vantage point of the existence of a language module in the human mind/brain, which thus
22 could in principle be selectively spared, our results receive a natural interpretation. The existence of
23 a double dissociation, such as the one found in the ASD-LI with average NVIQ profile and the ASD-
24 LN with low NVIQ profile, indicates that children with autism can indeed display impaired language
25 abilities in presence of spared nonverbal intelligence or spared language abilities in the presence of
26 impaired nonverbal intelligence, a profile reminiscent of that found in Williams Syndrome (Mervis
27 & Velleman 2011) and also in the language Savant *Christopher* (Smith & Tsimpli 1995). Specifically,

1 concerning the existence of the ASD-LN with low NVIQ profile in both monolingual and bilingual
2 children, our results support the few studies that have reported its existence in the literature (Joseph
3 et al., 2002; Kjelgaard & Tager-Flusberg, 2001; Silleresi et al., 2018; Smith & Tsimpli 1995; Tuller
4 et al., 2017) For many years, the assumption that low cognitive abilities necessarily entail low
5 language abilities has been taken for granted. However, these results, along with the existence of
6 profiles like those found in DLD and Williams Syndrome, reinforce the idea that language may
7 constitute an independent module in the brain, even though this module clearly interfaces with other
8 modules and central systems (see Chomsky, 1980; Fodor, 1985; Smith & Tsimpli, 1995).
9 Furthermore, the fact that the ICD-11 classification makes explicit reference to the existence of two
10 distinct profiles in nonverbal (or minimally verbal) children with ASD, one without intellectual
11 impairment and one with intellectual impairment, seems to further corroborate the existence of a
12 dissociation between language and cognitive (NV) abilities in this population.

13 Additional research is needed to test the replicability of the current findings and to address the
14 following limitations. The number of participants in the current study was limited; a larger population
15 sample, and in particular a larger sample of children with low NVIQ and of children with LI, should
16 make it possible to better address the question of the number and relative prevalence of the profiles.
17 Regarding the identification of profiles of abilities in ASD, we think that several pieces are still
18 missing from the puzzle. Our work has proposed a step forward into identifying structural language /
19 NV ability profiles in children with autism, but other factors which we were unable to investigate in
20 this study, should be taken into consideration in future analyses, such as executive functions and the
21 peaks and valleys of abilities which underlie performance on a wider array of NVIQ subtests. Finally,
22 additional research is needed to investigate how profiles of language and intellectual abilities evolve
23 from a longitudinal perspective (cfr. the idea of chronogeneity introduced by Georgiades et al., 2017).

24

1
2 **N of words:** 5434

1 **References**

- 2
- 3 APA. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.)*. Washington DC.
- 4 Barbeau, E. B., Soulières, I., Dawson, M., Zeffiro, T. A., & Mottron, L. (2013). The level and nature
5 of autistic intelligence III: Inspection time. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 122*(1), 295–
6 301. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029984>
- 7 Botting, N., & Conti-Ramsden, G. (2003). Autism, primary pragmatic difficulties, and specific
8 language impairment: Can we distinguish them using psycholinguistic markers?
9 *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology, 45*(8), 515–524.
- 10 Boucher, J. (2003). Language development in autism. *International Journal of Pediatric*
11 *Otorhinolaryngology, 67*, S159–S163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2003.08.016>
- 12 Boucher, J. (2012). Research Review: Structural language in autistic spectrum disorder -
13 characteristics and causes: Structural language in ASD. *Journal of Child Psychology and*
14 *Psychiatry, 53*(3), 219–233. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2011.02508>.
- 15 Buuren, S. van, & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. (2010). mice: Multivariate imputation by chained
16 equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software, 1*–68.
- 17 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2014). *Prevalence of Autism Spectrum Disorder*
18 *Among Children Aged 8 Years — Autism and Developmental Disabilities Monitoring*
19 *Network, 11 Sites, United States, 2010* (Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report No. 63 (2);
20 pp. 1–21). Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).
- 21 Charman, T., Pickles, A., Simonoff, E., Chandler, S., Loucas, T., & Baird, G. (2011). IQ in children
22 with autism spectrum disorders: data from the Special Needs and Autism Project (SNAP).
23 *Psychological Medicine, 41*(03), 619–627. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291710000991>
- 24 Chomsky, N. (1980). *Rules and Representations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- 25 Conti-Ramsden, G., Botting, N., & Faragher, B. (2001). Psycholinguistic Markers for Speci@c
26 Language Impairment (SLI). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 42*(6), 741–748.
- 27 Courchesne, V., Nader, A.-M., Girard, D., Bouchard, V., Danis, É., & Soulières, I. (2016). Le profil
28 cognitif au service des apprentissages: optimiser le potentiel des enfants sur le spectre de
29 l'autisme. *Revue québécoise de psychologie, 37*(2), 141. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1040041ar>
- 30 Dawson, M., Soulières, I., Ann Gernsbacher, M., & Mottron, L. (2007). The level and nature of
31 autistic intelligence. *Psychological Science, 18*(8), 657–662.
- 32 de Almeida, L., Ferré, S., Morin, E., Prévost, P., dos Santos, C., Tuller, L., ... Barthez, M.-A. (2017).

- 1 Identification of bilingual children with Specific Language Impairment in France. *Linguistic*
2 *Approaches to Bilingualism*, 7(3–4), 331–358. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.15019.alm>
- 3 Delage, H., Monjauze, C., Hamann, C., & Tuller, L. (2008). Relative Clauses in Atypical Acquisition
4 of French. *Language Acquisition and Development: Proceedings of GALA*, 166–176.
- 5 dos Santos, C., & Ferré, S. (2018). A Nonword Repetition Task to Assess Bilingual Children’s
6 Phonology. *Language Acquisition*, 25(1), 58–71.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489223.2016.1243692>
- 8 Durrleman, S., & Delage, H. (2016). Autism Spectrum Disorder and Specific Language Impairment:
9 Overlaps in Syntactic Profiles. *Language Acquisition*, 23(4), 361–386.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489223.2016.1179741>
- 11 Durrleman, S., Delage, H., Prévost, P., & Tuller, L. (2017). The comprehension of passives in Autism
12 Spectrum Disorder. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, 2(1), 88.
13 <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.205>
- 14 Eigsti, I.-M., de Marchena, A. B., Schuh, J. M., & Kelley, E. (2011). Language acquisition in autism
15 spectrum disorders: A developmental review. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 5(2),
16 681–691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2010.09.001>
- 17 Ellis Weismer, S., Davidson, M. M., Gangopadhyay, I., Sindberg, H., Roebuck, H., & Kaushanskaya,
18 M. (2017). The role of nonverbal working memory in morphosyntactic processing by children
19 with specific language impairment and autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of*
20 *Neurodevelopmental Disorders*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s11689-017-9209-6>
- 21 Ferré, S., Tuller, L., Sizaret, E., & Barthez, M.-A. (2012). Acquiring and avoiding phonological
22 complexity in SLI vs. typical development of French: The case of consonant clusters. In P.
23 Hoole, L. Bombien, M. Pouplier, C. Mooshammer, & B. Kühnert (Eds.), *Consonant Clusters*
24 *and Structural Complexity*. Berlin, Boston: DE GRUYTER.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614510772.285>
- 26 Ferré, S., & dos Santos, C. (2015). *The LITMUS-NWR-French*. Université de Tours.
- 27 Fodor, J. A. (1985). Precis of the modularity of mind. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 8(1), 1–5.
- 28 Franck, J., Cronel-Ohayon, S., Chillier, L., Frauenfelder, U. H., Hamann, C., Rizzi, L., & Zesiger, P.
29 (2004). Normal and pathological development of subject–verb agreement in speech
30 production: a study on French children. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 17(2–3), 147–180.
31 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0911-6044\(03\)00057-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0911-6044(03)00057-5)
- 32 Gallon, N., Harris, J. & Van der Lely, H. (2007) Non-word repetition: an investigation of

- 1 phonological complexity in children with Grammatical SLI. *Clinical linguistics & phonetics*,
2 21(6), 435-455.
- 3 Gavarró, A., & Heshmati, Y. (2014). An investigation on the comprehension of Persian passives in
4 typical development and autism. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 13, 79.
5 <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/catjl.151>
- 6 Georgiades, S., Bishop, S. L., & Frazier, T. (2017). Editorial Perspective: Longitudinal research in
7 autism - introducing the concept of ‘chronogeneity.’ *Journal of Child Psychology and*
8 *Psychiatry*, 58(5), 634–636. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12690>
- 9 Geurts, H. M., & Embrechts, M. (2008). Language Profiles in ASD, SLI, and ADHD. *Journal of*
10 *Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 38(10), 1931–1943. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-008-0587-1)
11 008-0587-1
- 12 Gonzalez-Barrero, A. M., & Nadig, A. (2018). Bilingual children with autism spectrum disorders:
13 The impact of amount of language exposure on vocabulary and morphological skills at school
14 age. *Autism Research*, 11(12), 1667-1678.
- 15 Gotham, K., Pickles, A., & Lord, C. (2009). Standardizing ADOS Scores for a Measure of Severity in
16 Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 39(5), 693–
17 705. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-008-0674-3>
- 18 Guasti, M. T., & Cardinaletti, A. (2003). Relative clause formation in Romance child production.
19 *Probus*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.2003.005>
- 20 Hamann, C. (2006). Speculations About Early Syntax: The Production of Wh-questions by Normally
21 Developing French Children and French Children with SLI. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*,
22 5(1), 143. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/catjl.82>
- 23 Harper-Hill, K., Copland, D., & Arnott, W. (2013). Do spoken nonword and sentence repetition tasks
24 discriminate language impairment in children with an ASD? *Research in Autism Spectrum*
25 *Disorders*, 7(2), 265–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2012.08.015>
- 26 Hayashi, M., Kato, M., Igarashi, K., & Kashima, H. (2008). Superior fluid intelligence in children
27 with Asperger’s disorder. *Brain and Cognition*, 66(3), 306–310.
28 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2007.09.008>
- 29 Houskeeper, J. L. (2011). *WISC-IV Matrix Reasoning and Picture Concepts Subtests: Does the Use*
30 *of Verbal Mediation Confound Measurement of Fluid Reasoning?* Pacific University
- 31 Jakubowitz, C., & Tuller, L. (2008). Specific language impairment in French. In D. Ayoun (Ed.),
32 *Language Learning & Language Teaching* (Vol. 21, pp. 97–133).

1 <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.21.08jak>

2 Joseph, R. M., Tager-Flusberg, H., & Lord, C. (2002). Cognitive profiles and social-communicative
3 functioning in children with autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Child Psychology and*
4 *Psychiatry*, 43(6), 807–821.

5 Kassambara, A. (2017). *Practical guide to cluster analysis in R: Unsupervised machine learning*
6 (STHDA, Vol. 1).

7 Kjelgaard, M. M., & Tager-Flusberg, H. (2001). An investigation of language impairment in autism:
8 Implications for genetic subgroups. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 16(2–3), 287–308.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690960042000058>

10 Lelord, G., & Barthélémy, C. (2003). *Echelle d'évaluation des comportements autistiques, ECAR.*
11 ECAN.

12 Lombardo, M. V., Lai, M.-C., & Baron-Cohen, S. (2019). Big data approaches to decomposing
13 heterogeneity across the autism spectrum. *Molecular Psychiatry*.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-018-0321-0>

15 Lord, C., Rutter, M., DiLavore, P. S., & Risi, S. (2003). *Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule:*
16 *ADOS*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.

17 Loucas, T., Charman, T., Pickles, A., Simonoff, E., Chandler, S., Meldrum, D., & Baird, G. (2008).
18 Autistic symptomatology and language ability in autism spectrum disorder and specific
19 language impairment. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49(11), 1184–1192.

20 Luyster, R. J., Kadlec, M. B., Carter, A., & Tager-Flusberg, H. (2008). Language Assessment and
21 Development in Toddlers with Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Journal of Autism and*
22 *Developmental Disorders*, 38(8), 1426–1438. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-007-0510-1>

23 Mackintosh, N., & Mackintosh, K. J. (2011). *IQ and human intelligence* (Oxford University Press).
24 Oxford.

25 Marinis, T., Armon-Lotem, S., & Pontikas, G. (2017). Language impairment in bilingual children:
26 State of the art 2017. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 7(3–4), 265–276.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.00001.mar>

28 Mayes, S. D., & Calhoun, S. L. (2008). WISC-IV and WIAT-II Profiles in Children With High-
29 Functioning Autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 38(3), 428–439.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-007-0410-4>

31 Mervis, C. B., & Velleman, S. L. (2011). Children With Williams Syndrome: Language, Cognitive,
32 and Behavioral Characteristics and Their Implications for Intervention. *Perspectives on*

- 1 *Language Learning and Education*, 18(3), 98. <https://doi.org/10.1044/lle18.3.98>
- 2 Modyanova, N., Perovic, A., & Wexler, K. (2017). Grammar Is Differentially Impaired in Subgroups
3 of Autism Spectrum Disorders: Evidence from an Investigation of Tense Marking and
4 Morphosyntax. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00320>
- 5 Mottron, L. (2004). Matching strategies in cognitive research with individuals with high-functioning
6 autism: Current practices, instrument biases, and recommendations. *Journal of Autism and*
7 *Developmental Disorders*, 34(1), 19–27.
- 8 Mottron, L., Dawson, M., Soulières, I., Hubert, B., & Burack, J. (2006). Enhanced Perceptual
9 Functioning in Autism: An Update, and Eight Principles of Autistic Perception. *Journal of*
10 *Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36(1), 27–43. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-005-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-005-0040-7)
11 0040-7
- 12 Nader, A.-M., Jelenic, P., & Soulières, I. (2015). Discrepancy between WISC-III and WISC-IV
13 Cognitive Profile in Autism Spectrum: What Does It Reveal about Autistic Cognition? *PLOS*
14 *ONE*, 10(12), e0144645. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0144645>
- 15 Nader, A.-M., Courchesne, V., Dawson, M., & Soulières, I. (2016). Does WISC-IV Underestimate the
16 Intelligence of Autistic Children? *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 46(5),
17 1582–1589. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-014-2270-z>
- 18 Oliveras-Rentas, R. E., Kenworthy, L., Roberson, R. B., Martin, A., & Wallace, G. L. (2012). WISC-
19 IV Profile in High-Functioning Autism Spectrum Disorders: Impaired Processing Speed is
20 Associated with Increased Autism Communication Symptoms and Decreased Adaptive
21 Communication Abilities. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 42(5), 655–664.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-011-1289-7>
- 23 Perovic, A., Modyanova, N., & Wexler, K. (2013). Comprehension of reflexive and personal
24 pronouns in children with autism: A syntactic or pragmatic deficit? *Applied Psycholinguistics*,
25 34(04), 813–835. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716412000033>
- 26 Polišenská, K., Chiat, S., & Roy, P. (2015). Sentence repetition: what does the task measure?:
27 Sentence repetition: what does the task measure? *International Journal of Language &*
28 *Communication Disorders*, 50(1), 106–118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12126>
- 29 Prévost, P., Tuller, L., Barthez, M. A., Malvy, J., & Bonnet-Brilhault, F. (2017). Production and
30 comprehension of French wh-questions by children with autism spectrum disorder: A
31 comparative study with specific language impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 38(05),

- 1 1095–1131. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716417000078>
- 2 Prévost, P., Tuller, L., Zebib, R., Barthez, M. A., Malvy, J., & Bonnet-Brilhault, F. (2018). Pragmatic
3 versus structural difficulties in the production of pronominal clitics in French-speaking children
4 with autism spectrum disorder. *Autism & Developmental Language Impairments*, 3,
5 239694151879964. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2396941518799643>
- 6 Prevost, P., Zebib, R., & Tuller, L. (2012). *The LITMUS-SR-French*. Université de Tours.
- 7 Rapin, I., Dunn, M. A., Allen, D. A., Stevens, M. C., & Fein, D. (2009). Subtypes of Language
8 Disorders in School-Age Children With Autism. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 34(1), 66–
9 84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87565640802564648>
- 10 Raven, J. (1998). *Raven's progressive matrices*. Oxford: OUP.
- 11 Riches, N. G., Loucas, T., Baird, G., Charman, T., & Simonoff, E. (2010). Sentence repetition in
12 adolescents with specific language impairments and autism: An investigation of complex
13 syntax. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 45(1), 47–60.
14 <https://doi.org/10.3109/13682820802647676>
- 15 Riches, N. G., Loucas, T., Baird, G., Charman, T., & Simonoff, E. (2011). Non-word repetition in
16 adolescents with Specific Language Impairment and Autism plus Language Impairments: A
17 qualitative analysis. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 44(1), 23–36.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2010.06.003>
- 19 Roberts, J. A., Rice, M. L., & Tager-Flusberg, H. (2004). Tense marking in children with autism.
20 *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 25(3), 429–448.
- 21 Schopler, E., Reichler, R. J., & Renner, B. R. (2002). *The Childhood Autism Rating Scale (CARS)*.
22 Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.
- 23 Smith, N., & Tsimpli, I. M. (1995). *The Mind of a Savant: Language, Learning and Modularity*.
24 Oxford, UK and Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- 25 Silleresi, S. (2018). Structural language and nonverbal ability profiles in monolingual and bilingual
26 children with ASD. Université de Tours.
- 27 Silleresi, S., Tuller, L., Delage, H., Durrleman, S., Bonnet-Brilhault, F., Malvy, J., & Prevost, P.
28 (2018). Sentence repetition and language impairment in French-speaking children with ASD.
29 In A. Gavarro (eds.) *Language Acquisition and Language Disorders*. pp. 235–258.
30 Amsterdam: John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- 31 Stanovich, K. E. (2009). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in
32 the acquisition of literacy. *Journal of education*, 189(1-2), 23-55.

- 1 Sukenik, N., & Friedmann, N. (2018). ASD Is Not DLI: Individuals With Autism and Individuals
2 With Syntactic DLI Show Similar Performance Level in Syntactic Tasks, but Different Error
3 Patterns. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00279>
- 4 Tager-Flusberg, H. (1981). On the nature of linguistic functioning in early infantile autism. *Journal of*
5 *Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 11(1), 45–56.
- 6 Tager-Flusberg, H. (2006). Defining language phenotypes in autism. *Clinical Neuroscience*
7 *Research*, 6(3–4), 219–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnr.2006.06.007>
- 8 Tager-Flusberg, H. (2015). Defining language impairments in a subgroup of children with autism
9 spectrum disorder. *Science China Life Sciences*, 58(10), 1044–1052.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11427-012-4297-8>
- 11 Tek, S., Mesite, L., Fein, D., & Naigles, L. (2014). Longitudinal Analyses of Expressive Language
12 Development Reveal Two Distinct Language Profiles Among Young Children with Autism
13 Spectrum Disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 44(1), 75–89.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-013-1853-4>
- 15 Terzi, A., Marinis, T., Kotsopoulou, A., & Francis, K. (2014). Grammatical abilities of Greek-
16 speaking children with autism. *Language Acquisition*, 21(1), 4–44.
- 17 Tuller, L. (2015). Clinical use of parental questionnaires in multilingual contexts. In S. Armon-
18 Lotem, J. de Jong, N. Meir (Eds.) *Multilingual Matters. Methods for assessing multilingual*
19 *children: Disentangling bilingualism from Language Impairment*. pp. 301–330. Bristol.
- 20 Tuller, L., Ferré, S., Prévost, P., Barthez, M.-A., Malvy, J., & Bonnet-Brilhault, F. (2017). The effect
21 of computational complexity on the acquisition of French by children with ASD. In Naigles,
22 Letitia R. (Ed). *Innovative investigations of language in autism spectrum disorder* (pp. 115–
23 140). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association; Berlin, Germany: Walter de
24 Gruyter GmbH.
- 25 Tuller, L., Hamann, C., Chilla, S., Ferré, S., Morin, E., Prevost, P., ... Zebib, R. (2018). Identifying
26 language impairment in bilingual children in France and in Germany: Language impairment
27 in bilingual children. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 53(4),
28 888–904. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12397>
- 29 Wechsler, D. (2003). Wechsler intelligence scale for children–Fourth Edition (WISC-IV). *San*
30 *Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation*.
- 31 WHO. (2018). ICD-11. Retrieved from <https://icd.who.int>
- 32 Williams, D., Botting, N., & Boucher, J. (2008). Language in autism and specific language

1 impairment: Where are the links? *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(6), 944–963.

2 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013743>

3 Wittke, K., Mastergeorge, A. M., Ozonoff, S., Rogers, S. J., & Naigles, L. R. (2017). Grammatical
4 Language Impairment in Autism Spectrum Disorder: Exploring Language Phenotypes
5 Beyond Standardized Testing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8.

6 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00532>

7 Zebib, R., Tuller, L., Prévost, P., & Morin, E. (2013). Formal Language Impairment in French-
8 speaking children with ASD: a comparative ASD/SLI study. *Advances in Language*
9 *Acquisition*. Presented at the GALA, Newcastle.

10 Zhou, P., Crain, S., Gao, L., Tang, Y., & Jia, M. (2015). The Use of Grammatical Morphemes by
11 Mandarin-Speaking Children with High Functioning Autism. *Journal of Autism and*
12 *Developmental Disorders*, 45(5), 1428–1436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-014-2304-6>

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

1 **Tables**

2 **Table 1.** Classification codes and description for the ICD-11 ASD subcategories

3

	Codes	Description
Verbal children with ASD	6A02.0	Autism spectrum disorder without disorder of intellectual development/functioning and with mild or no impairment in functional language
	6A02.1	Autism spectrum disorder with disorder of intellectual development/functioning and with mild or no impairment in functional language
	6A02.2	Autism spectrum disorder without disorder of intellectual development/functioning and with impaired functional language
	6A02.3	Autism spectrum disorder with disorder of intellectual development/functioning and with impaired functional language

4

5

1 **Table 2.** Participant characteristics - mean (SD) and minimum/maximum values

	Mean (SD)	Range
Age (y;m)	8 ;11 (1.7)	6;3 – 12;0
<i>Severity of autism (calibrated scores for ADOS and global scores for CARS and ECA-R)</i>		
CARS	27.5 (4.4)	19.5 – 38.5
ADOS severity score	5.89 (2.2)	2 – 10
ECA-R global score	25.8 (17.8)	2 – 68
<i>NVIQ abilities (standard scores)[†]</i>		
RPM	92.3 (15.3)	69 – 125
Block Design (PRI of WISC-IV) [‡]	95.6 (18.9)	55 – 125
Matrix Reasoning (PRI of WISC-IV) [‡]	92.5 (17)	60 – 120
<i>Language abilities [§]</i>		
NWR (% correct repetition)	79 (19)	0 – 100
SR (% correct repetition)	63 (31)	0 – 100

2 [†] The cut-off for NVIQ measures is 80 standard score.

3 [‡] The scores for Block Design and Matrix Reasoning were collected for 43/51 children.

4 [§] The repetition cut-off rate for monolingual children was established at 77% for SR and at 77% for
 5 NWR; for bilingual children at 75% for SR and at 77% for NWR. These rates correspond to high
 6 level of diagnostic accuracy for language impairment (Tuller et al., 2018).

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1 **Table 3.** Variables contributing to principle components – correlation and *p*-values for Component 1
 2 and Component 2 (the significance threshold after post-hoc correction – Bonferroni was $p = < .006$).
 3

Component 1 (44.4%)	Correlation	<i>p</i>-value
SR	.819	< .001
RPM	.820	< .001
NWR	.802	< .001
Matrix Reasoning	.798	< .001
Block Design	.286	.223
ADOS	-.335	.056
CARS	-.217	.224
ECAR	-.304	.085
Component 2 (16.3%)	Correlation	<i>p</i>-value
Block Design	.764	< .001
Matrix Reasoning	.621	< .001
RPM	.303	.076
NWR	.404	.022
SR	.227	.198
CARS	.478	.010
ECAR	.335	.056
ADOS	-.034	.847

4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16

1 **Table 4.** The main characteristics (mean, SD), name and prevalence of the five profiles for both
 2 morphosyntactic/NV abilities and phonological/NV abilities

	SR (%)	RPM (standard score)	Block Design (standard score)	Matrix Reasoning (standard score)	Morphosyntactic/ NVIQ ability profiles
Cluster 1 (<i>n</i> = 5)	38 (24)	74 (4)	64 (8)	66 (5)	ASD-LI with low NVIQ
Cluster 2 (<i>n</i> = 5)	83 (10)	79 (9)	73 (8)	83 (7)	ASD-LN with low NVIQ
Cluster 3 (<i>n</i> = 11)	28 (17)	87 (14)	102 (10)	92 (15)	ASD-LI with average NVIQ
Cluster 4 (<i>n</i> = 11)	88 (9)	92 (8)	101 (12)	95 (15)	ASD-LN with average NVIQ
Cluster 5 (<i>n</i> = 11)	90 (14)	111 (9)	106 (11)	108 (5)	ASD-LN with high NVIQ
	NWR (%)	RPM (standard score)	Block Design (standard score)	Matrix Reasoning (standard score)	Phonological NVIQ ability profiles
Cluster 1 (<i>n</i> = 4)	71 (24)	73 (4)	68 (12)	70 (5)	ASD-LI with low NVIQ
Cluster 2 (<i>n</i> = 5)	91 (6)	79 (8)	69 (8)	78 (13)	ASD-LN with low NVIQ
Cluster 3 (<i>n</i> = 9)	65 (13)	86 (9)	104 (9)	95 (11)	ASD-LI with average NVIQ
Cluster 4 (<i>n</i> = 14)	90 (5)	92 (8)	100 (12)	93 (17)	ASD-LN with average NVIQ
Cluster 5 (<i>n</i> = 11)	91 (5)	111 (9)	106 (11)	108 (5)	ASD-LN with high NVIQ

34 Note :

35 Scores below the thresholds are in bold

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Table 5. Individual scores of the 8 children evaluated via the EDEI-R psychometric test

Child code	SR (%)	NWR (%)	RPM (standard score)	NV score EDEI-R (standard score)	Morsyn/NV profile	Phono/NV profile
SIM	40	62	114	104	ASD-LI with average NVIQ	ASD-LI with average NVIQ
KEV	33	28	78	97	ASD-LI with average NVIQ	ASD-LI with average NVIQ
EVA	33	38	95	80	ASD-LI with average NVIQ	ASD-LI with average NVIQ
ROS	90	96	90	95	ASD-LN with average NVIQ	ASD-LN with average NVIQ
RIV Bilingual	30	72	103	103	ASD-LI with average NVIQ	ASD-LI with average NVIQ
MIM Bilingual	0	0	78	79	ASD-LI with low NVIQ	ASD-LI with low NVIQ
LCU Bilingual	70	78	110	104	ASD-LI with average NVIQ	ASD-LN with average NVIQ
YVA Bilingual	50	74	69	30	ASD-LI with low NVIQ	ASD-LI with low NVIQ

Note : Scores below the thresholds are in bold

1
2
3
4
5

Table 6. Prevalence of the five profiles for both morphosyntactic/NV abilities and phonological/NV abilities

	Morphosyntactic/NV abilities	Phonological/NV abilities
ASD-LI with low NVIQ	14%	11%
ASD-LN with low NVIQ	10%	10%
ASD-LI with average NVIQ	33%	25.5%
ASD-LN with average NVIQ	23.5%	31%
ASD-LN with high NVIQ	21.5%	21.5%

6
7

1 **Figure Legends**

2 **Figure 1.** The PCA including all the parameters. The contribution bar highlights the weight (%) of
3 each variable in explaining the variability in the data set. The left and bottom axes are showing
4 normalized principal component scores.

5
6 **Figure 2.** Cluster analysis (K-means) for morphosyntactic/NV ability profiles on the measures of SR,
7 Block Design, Matrix Reasoning and RPM. Children with bilingual exposure are indicated with (BI).

8
9 **Figure 3.** Cluster analysis (K-means) for phonological/NV ability profiles on the measures of NWR,
10 Block Design, Matrix Reasoning and RPM. Children with bilingual exposure are indicated with (BI).

11

12

13





