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In summary, we have shown that the CHAT instrument, administered by public health nurses at the 18−month developmental
followed−up with more specific instruments.

The use of the CHAT within the broader context of developmental infant screening deserves further consideration. For
example Honda and Shimizo have higher test performance but it has not been comprehensively evaluated in a general population sample.

The gold standard for diagnosis of autism was not applied to the entire sample. The CHAT instrument has been
employed in data collection. This is a 14 item interviewer−administered instrument divided into
two groups: (10) screening and (4) diagnostic. The CHAT represents a significant strength of the study. However the relatively small sample size is a significant
limitation. Although a good response rate for first−time screening was achieved (79%), the sample was small for the
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and simple instrument for PHNs to use. Given the evidence that early diagnosis improves prognosis in autism there is a clear need for further work addressing the use of the CHAT instrument in routine developmental assessment in Ireland.
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