

### Supplementary Material

#### PRAS-ASD as a Continuous Dependent Variable - Linear Regression Results

Table 4. Linear Regression of EDI Reactivity and SRS-2 Total Score onto PRAS-ASD Total Score

Linear Predictors (n=1045)	B	Beta	t
Age	-.33	-.08	3.02**
Gender	1.05	-.03	1.17
Race	.83	.02	.62
Ethnicity	.87	.02	.72
Intellectual Disability***	-3.30	-.12	-4.50***
SRS-2‡ Total Score	.21	.21	7.13***
EDI§ Reactivity Short Form theta score***	7.10	.45	15.42***
		<i>F</i> Change	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Overall Model</b>		<b>63.87</b>	<b>.30</b>

Key: † Emotion Dysregulation Inventory; ‡ Social Responsiveness Scale-2; \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

#### The Role of Intellectual Disability (ID)

Exploratory analyses examined whether findings differed in ID and non-ID subgroups separately.

There was no difference on mean PRAS-ASD scores ( $t(1042) = 0.52, p = .60$ ) between youth with and without ID. However, youth with parent-reported ID had slightly lower mean EDI Reactivity scores ( $M = -0.35, SD = 0.85$ ) than those without ID ( $M = -0.21, SD = .85; t(1043) = -2.62, p = .009$ ).

The results predicting PRAS-ASD clinical cut-off groups (above/below 45) from the SRS-2 Total Score and EDI Reactivity, controlling for age, gender, race, and ethnicity separately for ID and no-ID groups both showed that higher EDI Reactivity was a significant predictor of elevated anxiety. However, SRS-2 Total Score was only significantly associated with elevated PRAS-ASD in the non-ID subgroup.

In sum, the non-ID subgroup had associations with ER impairment and ASD symptoms in predicting PRAS-ASD anxiety; the ID subgroup showed associations with ER, not ASD symptoms, in the prediction of anxiety as measured on the PRAS-ASD. These results are consistent with prior research suggesting that youth with ASD and average IQ are at increased risk for anxiety disorders compared to those with ID (Lecavalier et al., 2019). Whether lower levels of parent-reported anxiety are due to the

possibility that youth with ID are less able to use words to convey their emotional state is unclear (Lerner et al., 2017)

Table 5. Logistic Regression with ID and no-ID subgroups onto PRAS-ASD Clinical Cut-off Groups (Above/Below)

Logistic Predictors (n= 1107)	<i>ID subgroup</i>				Non-ID subgroup			
	B	Wald $\chi^2$	Odds Ratio	95% CI	B	Wald $\chi^2$	Odds Ratio	95% CI
Age	-.06	1.18	.95	.86-1.05	.03	.24	1.03	.92-1.15
Gender	.61	2.85	1.84	.91-3.74	-.18	.15	.83	.33-2.12
Race	-1.27	2.55	.28	.06-1.34	.84	1.23	2.32	.53-10.19
Ethnicity	-.93	4.00*	.39	.16-.98	-.85	2.19	.43	.14-1.32
SRS-2 ‡	.02	2.43	1.02	.99-1.05	.04	5.06*	1.04	1.01-1.07
Total Score								
EDI †	1.18	27.77***	3.26	2.10-5.10	1.36	25.20***	3.88	2.29-6.59
Reactivity Short Form theta score								

Key: † Emotion Dysregulation Inventory; ‡ Social Responsiveness Scale-2; \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001