Revised version of manuscript is in press at *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*

Accepted 5/19/2021

Empathy and Anxiety in Young Girls with Fragile X Syndrome

Jonas G. Miller¹, Kristi L. Bartholomay¹, Cindy H. Lee¹, Jennifer L. Bruno¹, Amy A. Lightbody¹, and Allan L. Reiss^{1,2,3}

¹Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305
USA

²Department of Radiology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305 USA

³Department of Pediatrics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305 USA

Acknowledgements: This research was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (R01MH050047-20 and T32MH019908), the Lynda and Scott Canel Fund for Fragile X Research, the Fragile X Registry and Database Clinic Compensation, the Jesse Hough Fund for Pediatric Autism Research, Rocky Foundation Program Support for Childhood Depression, the Marcia Brucker Lever and Ewart Gladstone Sinclair Fund, and the National Fragile X Foundation. This publication was supported by cooperative agreements #U01DD000231, #U19DD000753 and #U01DD001189, funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Department of Health and Human Services. We thank the families who participated in this study. A version of this paper was presented at the 17th National Fragile X Foundation International Fragile X Conference.

Corresponding author: Jonas G. Miller, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences,
Stanford University, 401 Quarry Road, Stanford, CA 94304. Email: jgmiller@stanford.edu.

Phone: 510-717-0412

Conflicts of Interest: None

Abstract

We measured parent-reported empathy and self-reported anxiety in young girls with fragile X syndrome (FXS) and in an age-, sex-, adaptive behavior-, autism-, and IQ-matched comparison group. Girls with FXS received higher parent-reported scores on cognitive and affective empathy but also self-reported more severe anxiety symptoms, particularly separation anxiety and phobia symptoms, than girls in the comparison group. Girls with FXS who received higher cognitive empathy scores, however, appeared buffered against risk for separation anxiety and phobia symptoms. Girls with FXS experience elevated empathy and anxiety relative to their developmentally-matched peers. Furthermore, higher cognitive empathy in girls with FXS may confer resilience against specific forms of anxiety that are commonly observed in FXS.

Keywords: adolescence, anxiety, childhood, empathy, females, Fragile X Syndrome

Empathy and Anxiety in Young Girls with Fragile X Syndrome

Fragile X syndrome (FXS) is a genetic condition characterized by interpersonal and emotional difficulties, including face and gaze aversion, social avoidance and withdrawal, and a wide range of other anxiety symptoms and phobias (Bruno et al. 2014; Cordeiro et al. 2011; Freund et al. 1993; Hall et al. 2009). Although FXS is associated with elevated levels of anxiety across various contexts and social situations, it does not appear to be characterized by deficient social motivation (Crawford et al. 2020). In addition, there are complex and inconsistent findings regarding the nature and development of social-cognitive impairments in FXS (Cornish et al. 2005; Losh et al. 2012; M. M. Mazzocco et al. 1994). For example, Cornish and colleagues (2005) found that children with FXS have impairments in social cognition that are comparable to those observed in children with other learning disorders. In contrast, Losh and colleagues (2012) found that children with FXS and autism, but not FXS only, performed worse than typically developing children on social cognitive tasks. Currently, it is unclear whether FXS is associated with deficits in specific social-emotional and social-cognitive skills, such as perceiving, sharing, and comprehending others' internal states.

Empathy, a multifaceted construct that encompasses these skills (Miller et al. 2016; Zaki et al. 2012), is comprised of both affective and cognitive processes. Affective empathy is the vicarious sharing of the emotions of others, whereas cognitive empathy is the ability to infer others' mental states (Hastings et al. 2014; Shamay-Tsoory 2010). Atypical or impaired empathy has been observed in a number of neurodevelopmental disorders (Demurie et al. 2011; Maoz et al. 2019), but autism spectrum disorders (ASD) have likely received the most attention from investigators interested in empathy. It is widely hypothesized that deficient cognitive empathy, but not affective empathy, is a central feature of ASD (Demurie et al. 2011; Deschamps et al.

2014; Dziobek et al. 2008; Golan and Baron-Cohen 2006), and that this deficit emerges in childhood (Yirmiya et al. 1998). These findings may have implications for empathy in FXS given that children with FXS often present with ASD symptoms, although more often in boys than in girls (Bailey et al. 2008). Furthermore, studies of FXS often use assessments such as the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS) (Lord et al. 1989) to measure social behaviors that are closely related to empathy. Unlike idiopathic ASD, however, FXS has a well-defined genetic basis and thus provides a unique model for exploring gene-behavior associations underlying affective and cognitive empathy. Despite the advantages of FXS as a disease model, the considerable interest in empathy in ASD, and overlap between ASD and FXS symptoms, relatively little FXS research has targeted and differentiated affective and cognitive empathy. Contrary to previous findings on cognitive empathy in ASD, Wishart and colleagues (2007) did not find evidence for deficient emotion recognition in children with FXS, and there are inconsistent findings regarding whether theory of mind – the ability to attribute mental states to other people – is impaired in FXS (Cornish et al. 2005; Losh et al. 2012). To our knowledge, prior studies have not considered whether affective empathy (e.g., sharing others' emotions) is affected in FXS. To assess empathy in developmental studies, researchers commonly use parent-report measures of children's behaviors reflecting dispositional affective and cognitive empathy (Dadds et al. 2009; Decety et al. 2018; Deschamps et al. 2014), but these measures have not been widely administered to children with FXS.

FXS presents a variable clinical phenotype, particularly in females who may be partially protected from the mutation via X-inactivation (Garber et al. 2008). However, the factors that moderate symptom severity in girls with FXS are unclear. Non-FXS research suggests that empathy could have implications for mental health. For example, one body of research suggests

that increased affective empathy can serve as a risk factor for increased internalizing symptoms in individuals who are prone to physiological states of hyperarousal (Tone and Tully 2014). Physiological hyperarousal has been observed in FXS (Hall et al. 2009; Klusek et al. 2015), but prior studies have not considered whether increased empathy in FXS may indicate risk for increased anxiety. Conversely, social anxiety has been associated with decreased affective empathy for positive emotions (Morrison et al. 2016) and decreased cognitive empathy (Hezel and McNally 2014), suggesting that some forms of empathy may be protective against anxiety. To date, studies have not considered whether empathy represents risk or resilience in FXS.

Much of the research on social functioning and anxiety in FXS has focused on males, likely because FXS occurs more frequently and presents more severe cognitive and behavioral problems in males than in females (Bartholomay et al. 2019). Nevertheless, females with FXS are at increased risk for anxiety, avoidance, depression, and social difficulties (Bailey et al. 2008; Cordeiro et al. 2011; Freund et al., 1993). Females in the general population also tend to be at greater risk for developing internalizing symptoms (McLaughlin and King 2015), and tend to have higher levels of empathy (Zahn-Waxler and Van Hulle 2012), than males. Sex differences in empathy and psychopathology may be linked, leading investigators to posit that empathy may hold particular clinical significance for anxiety in young girls (Zahn-Waxler and Van Hulle 2012). Studying young girls with FXS, who have a specific genetic risk factor associated with increased anxiety and social dysfunction, offers an important model for advancing our understanding of the relations among gene function, risk for anxiety, and empathy.

Previous studies of FXS have assessed anxiety using clinical interviews or questionnaires with parents and teachers as informants due to concerns about the accuracy of self-report in affected individuals (Wadell et al. 2013). Girls with FXS, however, present milder cognitive

deficits relative to males and thus may be more capable of providing meaningful insight into their own symptoms. Indeed, a small but growing number of studies have administered self-report measures in samples of children with neurodevelopmental disorders, including ASD and Turner Syndrome (Kaat and Lecavalier 2015; McCauley et al. 1995; Schiltz et al. 2017), but self-report measures remain underutilized in FXS research (Lesniak-Karpiak et al. 2003).

Here, we examined whether girls with FXS and their developmentally matched peers differed in their parent-reported empathy and self-reported anxiety symptoms. Our first analysis tested whether girls with FXS received different cognitive and affective empathy scores than girls in an age- and IQ-matched comparison group. Our second analysis tested whether girls with FXS differed from our comparison group on self-reported anxiety. Consistent with prior studies using parent-report assessments and clinical interviews (Bailey et al. 2008; Cordeiro et al. 2011; Freund et al. 1993), we expected girls with FXS to self-report more severe anxiety symptoms. Our final set of analyses explored whether cognitive and affective empathy moderated the associations between FXS group status and different types of anxiety symptoms.

Methods

Participants and Procedure

Participants were part of an ongoing longitudinal study of the mechanisms underlying anxiety, avoidance, and arousal in girls with FXS. The current analyses included a sample of child and adolescent girls (ages 6.03-16.31 years) with FXS (n=43) and a comparison group of girls without FXS (n=32). The groups were matched for age, verbal IQ (Differential Abilities Scale, verbal abilities (Elliott et al., 2018), and adaptive behavior and functional skills (Communication, Daily Living Skills, and Socialization as assessed by the Vineland-2 Adaptive Behavior Scales; Sparrow et al. 2005) (see Table 1 for descriptive statistics). Participants in the

FXS group were recruited from North America through FXS communities such as the National Fragile X Foundation, the Fragile X Clinical and Research Consortium, and the Fragile X Online Registry With Accessible Research Database. All participants in the FXS group were diagnosed by a genetic test as having more than 200 CGG repeats in the fragile X mental retardation 1 (FMR1) gene. Participants in the comparison group were recruited to (group) match girls in the FXS group for verbal IQ. These participants were recruited from local school districts, regional centers, parent organizations, academic and clinical centers, a website announcement at our university, and social media sites targeting northern and southern California. Consent was obtained from parents of all participants. Assent was also obtained from participants depending on child age and level of functioning. The study protocol was approved by the institutional review board of our university.

Empathy

Parents reported on child empathy using the Griffith Empathy Measure (Dadds et al., 2008). The affective empathy subscale includes 9 items assessing children's tendency to share the feelings of others (e.g., "my child becomes sad when other children are sad"). The cognitive empathy subscale includes 6 items assessing children's ability to engage in perspective-taking (e.g., "My child can't understand why other people get upset"). Parents rated items on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree). To make scores comparable to previous research with typically developing children (Dadds et al. 2008), we recoded items to range from -4 to 4 and summed items within each subscale to form indices of affective ($\alpha = .71$) and cognitive empathy ($\alpha = .75$).

Anxiety

Participants self-reported on their anxiety symptoms using the Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children (MASC; March et al. 1997). The MASC includes subscales to assess different kinds of anxiety symptoms, including separation anxiety/phobias (e.g., “I get scared when my parents go away”, $\alpha=.63$), social anxiety (e.g., “I’m afraid that other kids will make fun of me”, $\alpha=.80$), obsessions and compulsions (e.g., “I have to check things several times or more”, $\alpha=.81$), physical symptoms (e.g., “I get shaky or jittery”, $\alpha=.76$), harm avoidance (e.g., “I usually ask permission to do things”, $\alpha = .58$), and generalized anxiety disorder (e.g., “I feel restless and on edge”, $\alpha=.69$). The MASC is designed as a self-report measure, but an administrator was always present to facilitate understanding of the questions for younger and lower functioning children as needed. For all participants, the administrator read the first few questions aloud before evaluating whether the individual child could complete the rest of the items by themselves. Participants rated items on a 4-point scale ranging from 0 (never true about me) to 3 (often true about me). Items were summed within each subscale.

Of the 75 participants who provided data on empathy, MASC data were missing for 15 participants either due to children’s age (i.e., younger than 7 years old) or failing to provide useable data during the interview (e.g., child did not understand questions or was unable to provide responses). Thus, analyses including MASC data were based on a sample of 60 participants ($n=35$ for FXS group and $n=25$ for comparison group). Within these analyses, both groups were still matched on age ($t(58)=0.80$, $p=.425$), verbal IQ ($t(58)=1.78$, $p=.080$), and Vineland-2 Adaptive Behavior Scales (all $t(58)<1.18$, all $ps>.243$). Participants who were missing MASC data were younger (mean difference=2.49 years, $t(73)=3.50$, $p=.001$) and had lower daily living skills scores (mean difference=8.25, $t(73)=2.27$, $p=.026$) than participants with

complete data. Participants who did and did not provide MASC data did not significantly differ on other study variables (all $ps > .080$).

Autism

We used the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule, Second Edition (ADOS-2; Lord et al. 2012) to assess autistic behaviors. The ADOS-2 is a semi-structured interview in which a trained researcher or clinician engages children in activities meant to elicit symptoms of autism. We used the ADOS-2 algorithm to compute behavioral scores on social affect, restricted and repetitive behaviors, and an overall total score. The total score was used to determine whether participants were “non-spectrum” or if they reached diagnostic cut-offs for a classification of either “autism” or “autism spectrum”.

Statistical Analyses

First, we conducted one-way multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) tests to examine whether there were group differences in overall empathy and anxiety scores across subscales. We conducted one-way ANOVAs as planned follow-up tests to examine whether girls with FXS and girls in the comparison group differed in specific aspects of empathy and/or anxiety as assessed by individual subscales. Second, we conducted a multiple analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) test to examine whether empathy moderated the association between group status and anxiety scores across MASC subscales (Baron and Kenny 1986). This analysis included group status, affective empathy, cognitive empathy, the interaction between affective empathy and group status, and the interaction between cognitive empathy and group status, as predictors of anxiety symptoms. We conducted planned follow-up regression analyses to test empathy by group status interaction effects on specific types of anxiety. Significant interactions were probed by

examining the association between group status and anxiety separately at 1 SD above and below the mean of empathy (affective or cognitive) .

Results

Group comparisons on verbal IQ, adaptive behaviors, autism behaviors, empathy, and anxiety are presented in Table 1. In the total sample, 26 girls met ADOS-2 based criteria for autism (12 girls in the comparison group and 14 girls in the FXS group) and 6 met criteria for autism spectrum (2 girls in the comparison group and 4 girls in the FXS group). Girls with and without FXS did not differ in ADOS-2 based autism diagnoses ($\chi^2[2]=0.35, p=.838$).

TABLE 1 HERE

Group differences in empathy and anxiety are presented visually in Figure 1. The MANOVA test of empathy showed a statistically significant main effect of group status, $F(2, 72)=6.55, p=.002$, partial $\eta^2 = .15$. Follow-up tests showed that girls with FXS received higher scores on affective empathy, $F(1, 72)=7.65, p=.007$, partial $\eta^2 = .10$, and cognitive empathy, $F(1, 72)=6.54, p=.013$, partial $\eta^2 = .08$, compared to girls in the comparison group (see Figure 1). Prior research using the Griffith Empathy Measure with typically developing girls found that age was positively associated with cognitive empathy scores (Dadd et al. 2008). We did not find that age was associated with empathy scores in the total sample (both $p>.273$) or in the separate testing groups (all $ps>.291$).

The MANOVA test of anxiety also showed a statistically significant main effect of group status, $F(6, 53)=2.39, p=.041$, partial $\eta^2 = .21$. That is, there was a pattern of results differentiating girls with FXS and girls in the comparison group on the MASC anxiety subscales. Follow-up tests showed that girls with FXS reported more severe separation anxiety/phobia symptoms than girls in the comparison group, $F(1, 58)=4.29, p=.043$, partial $\eta^2 = .07$. The

observed differences between girls with FXS and girls in the comparison group on the other anxiety subscales did not reach statistical significance (all p s > .109).

*****FIGURE 1 HERE*****

The interactions between empathy and group status on overall anxiety were not significant (both p > .155). We conducted planned follow-up regression analyses to determine whether group status was differentially associated with specific kinds of anxiety symptoms at high and low levels of empathy. The interaction between group status and cognitive empathy in predicting separation anxiety/phobia symptoms was statistically significant (β = -.33, p = .011). At low levels of cognitive empathy, girls with FXS reported more severe separation anxiety/phobia symptoms than girls in the comparison group (β = .65, p < .001). Conversely, at high levels of cognitive empathy, group status was not associated with separation anxiety/phobia symptoms (β = -.02, p = .929). Figure 2 presents the interaction effect and shows that group differences in separation anxiety/phobia symptoms widen at low levels of cognitive empathy and narrow at high levels of cognitive empathy. Figure 2 also shows that cognitive empathy is negatively associated with separation anxiety/phobia symptoms in girls with FXS (β = -.40, p = .026), but is not associated with symptoms in girls in the comparison group (β = .37, p = .075).

*****FIGURE 2 HERE*****

The full regression model is presented in Table 2. The interaction between group status and affective empathy in predicting separation anxiety/phobia symptoms was in the opposite direction of the cognitive empathy by group status interaction effect, but did not reach statistical significance (β = .23, p = .080).

*****TABLE 2 HERE*****

Interaction effects between empathy and group status were not significant in regression models predicting other MASC subscales (all $ps > .147$)

Discussion

This study examined whether girls with FXS differed from a group of developmentally-matched girls on parent-reported cognitive and affective empathy and self-reported anxiety. Our results suggest that girls with FXS may experience elevated empathy and anxiety, particularly separation anxiety and phobias, relative to their developmentally-matched peers. Furthermore, our findings provide novel evidence that high cognitive empathy may confer resilience against separation anxiety and phobia symptoms in girls with FXS.

Our study is the first to assess parent-reported cognitive and affective empathy in a sample of young girls with FXS. Our finding that girls with FXS received higher cognitive empathy scores is consistent with previous task-based studies suggesting that FXS is not characterized by emotion recognition and theory of mind deficits comparable to those observed in other learning disorders (Losh et al. 2012; Wishart et al. 2007). In addition, this study is the first to suggest that affective empathy is intact in girls with FXS relative to developmentally-matched peers. Given that our study groups were matched on adaptive behaviors, autism behaviors, and autism diagnoses, higher empathy scores in girls with FXS was not likely due to group differences in general communication, social functioning, or autism. Taken together, empathy appears to be a relative strength rather than disability in girls with FXS. One implication of these findings is that although difficulties associated with FXS in girls are partially attributed to impaired social skills (Mazzocco et al. 1997), these difficulties may not be rooted specifically in understanding and resonating with other people's emotions. Overall, our use of parent reports of everyday behaviors hypothesized to reflect children's dispositional

empathy complements prior studies that assessed empathy and closely-related constructs in laboratory settings. Nevertheless, further research is needed to replicate our findings, particularly regarding affective empathy given the lack of prior FXS studies on this topic.

Consistent with prior studies of anxiety in FXS using parent-report measures and clinical interviews (Cordeiro et al. 2011; Lachiewicz 1992), we found that girls with FXS self-reported higher overall levels of anxiety compared to the comparison group on the MASC. However, when examining each anxiety dimension separately, only the separation anxiety/phobias dimension was statistically significantly higher in girls with FXS. Specific phobia and, to a lesser extent, separation anxiety, are common anxiety symptoms in females with FXS (Cordeiro et al. 2011). In this context, our results suggest that under certain conditions, some girls with FXS may be capable of providing meaningful information about their own experiences of anxiety. Our study adds to a small but growing literature that utilizes self-report measures in an attempt to better understand mental health symptoms in neurodevelopmental disorders (Kaat and Lecavalier 2015; McCauley et al. 1995; Schiltz et al. 2017). It is worth noting, however, that we excluded some participants from these analyses due to their age or them not demonstrating an understanding of, or not providing answers to, MASC questions; the participants who were excluded were younger and had lower scores on daily living skills than those who provided MASC data. Further research is necessary to validate and determine the longitudinal stability of self-report measures of anxiety like the MASC for young girls with FXS.

Elevated affective empathy may indicate risk for anxiety problems in certain developmental contexts (Gambin and Sharp 2016; Tone and Tully 2014; Zahn-Waxler and Van Hulle 2012). In our study, the interaction between affective empathy and group status predicting separation anxiety and phobia symptoms did not reach statistical significance. On the other hand,

the direction of the interaction effect suggested that at high, but not low, levels of affective empathy, FXS was associated with more severe separation anxiety and phobia symptoms. Heightened affective empathy may confer risk in girls with FXS, but this finding should be interpreted with caution given that the interaction effect was a statistical trend. A larger sample, or consideration of parent-report measures of anxiety symptoms, may be needed to detect the moderating effect of affective empathy on risk for anxiety. In contrast, increased cognitive empathy in girls with FXS appeared to be a protective factor. We found that at higher levels of cognitive empathy, girls with FXS were not at increased risk for separation anxiety/phobia symptoms. Conversely, the FXS-related risk for reporting elevated separation anxiety/phobia symptoms was amplified in girls who received lower cognitive empathy scores. Our interaction effect between cognitive empathy and group status fits with the perspective that there are meaningful individual differences and moderators of the clinical phenotype in girls with FXS. Cognitive empathy processes such as perspective-taking may involve adopting a distanced, evaluative approach to understanding other people's emotions (de Vignemont and Singer 2006; Decety and Lamm 2009). Thus, cognitive empathy processes may inherently regulate affective processes (Buffone et al. 2017; Miller et al. 2020), potentially including those implicated in anxiety problems. Our findings suggest that cognitive empathy could be a useful target for interventions aimed at attenuating anxiety in girls with FXS. Existing social cognition training programs for children with autism (Didehbani et al. 2016) could be considered as possible anxiety interventions for girls with FXS. It is unclear, however, why we found dispositional cognitive empathy to have implications specifically for separation anxiety/phobia symptoms in girls with FXS. One possible explanation is that increased cognitive empathy is a developmental adaptation that buffers against forms of anxiety that girls with FXS are most at risk for

experiencing. From a gene-behavior association perspective, diminished fragile x mental retardation protein (FMRP) in girls with FXS leads to disruptions in synaptic plasticity that likely contribute to anxiety (Spencer et al. 2005), but cognitive empathy in girls with FXS may indicate processes that counter this genetic risk. Further research that considers gene function, risk for anxiety, and empathy with other resilience factors could be a promising avenue for future FXS research.

This study had several limitations. First, empathy scores could have been biased by parental factors that differed across our FXS and comparison groups. As a related point, although the Griffith Empathy Measure is widely used, there has been recent debate over whether it provides valid differentiation of cognitive and affective empathy (Dadds 2019; Murphy 2017). Future research using experimental, observational, physiological, and multi-informant measures (Michalska et al. 2013; Miller 2018; Zhou et al. 2003) could complement our study findings and help further illuminate the nature of empathy in girls with FXS. Second, it is unclear whether our findings apply to young boys with FXS, who typically present a more severe clinical phenotype than girls. Thus, it remains possible that boys with FXS present deficits in cognitive and affective empathy, potentially as a result of reduced levels of FMRP. Third, future research should consider cognitive and affective empathy in girls with FXS compared to a typically developing control group. Fourth, given our cross-sectional and correlational study design, we cannot infer whether cognitive empathy plays a causal role in attenuating separation anxiety/phobia symptoms in girls with FXS. Finally, our sample size may have limited our ability to detect statistically significant differences between our FXS and comparison groups, particularly for interaction effects. Future studies with greater statistical power should be conducted to replicate our significant and null findings.

Despite these limitations, our study is important in providing the first evidence that girls with FXS may experience elevated empathy relative to girls with other developmental disorders. We administered a parent-report measure of empathy that is widely used in developmental psychology but had not previously been utilized in FXS research. We also administered a self-report measure of anxiety, and found that girls with FXS reported elevated anxiety, particularly separation anxiety/phobia symptoms. However, higher cognitive empathy in girls with FXS may confer resilience against this specific form of anxiety.

References

- Bailey, D. B., Raspa, M., Olmsted, M., & Holiday, D. B. (2008). Co-occurring conditions associated with FMR1 gene variations: Findings from a national parent survey. *American Journal of Medical Genetics. Part A*, 146A(16), 2060–2069.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajmg.a.32439>
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.51.6.1173>
- Bartholomay, K. L., Lee, C. H., Bruno, J. L., Lightbody, A. A., & Reiss, A. L. (2019). Closing the Gender Gap in Fragile X Syndrome: Review on Females with FXS and Preliminary Research Findings. *Brain Sciences*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci9010011>
- Bruno, J. L., Garrett, A. S., Quintin, E.-M., Mazaika, P. K., & Reiss, A. L. (2014). Aberrant face and gaze habituation in fragile x syndrome. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 171(10), 1099–1106. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.13111464>
- Buffone, A. E. K., Poulin, M., DeLury, S., Ministerio, L., Morrisson, C., & Scalco, M. (2017). Don't walk in her shoes! Different forms of perspective taking affect stress physiology. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 72, 161–168.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.04.001>
- Cordeiro, L., Ballinger, E., Hagerman, R., & Hessler, D. (2011). Clinical assessment of DSM-IV anxiety disorders in fragile X syndrome: Prevalence and characterization. *Journal of Neurodevelopmental Disorders*, 3(1), 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11689-010-9067-y>

- Cornish, K., Burack, J. A., Rahman, A., Munir, F., Russo, N., & Grant, C. (2005). Theory of mind deficits in children with fragile X syndrome. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 49(5), 372–378. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2005.00678.x>
- Crawford, H., Moss, J., Groves, L., Dowlen, R., Nelson, L., Reid, D., & Oliver, C. (2020). A Behavioural Assessment of Social Anxiety and Social Motivation in Fragile X, Cornelia de Lange and Rubinstein-Taybi Syndromes. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 50(1), 127–144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-019-04232-5>
- Dadds, M. R., Hawes, D. J., Frost, A. D. J., Vassallo, S., Bunn, P., Hunter, K., & Merz, S. (2009). Learning to 'talk the talk': The relationship of psychopathic traits to deficits in empathy across childhood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, 50(5), 599–606. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.02058.x>
- Dadds, M. R., Hunter, K., Hawes, D. J., Frost, A. D. J., Vassallo, S., Bunn, P., Merz, S., & Masry, Y. E. (2008). A measure of cognitive and affective empathy in children using parent ratings. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 39(2), 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-007-0075-4>
- de Vignemont, F., & Singer, T. (2006). The empathic brain: How, when and why? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10(10), 435–441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.08.008>
- Decety, J., & Lamm, C. (2009). Empathy versus personal distress: Recent evidence from social neuroscience. In *The social neuroscience of empathy* (pp. 199–213). MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262012973.003.0016>
- Decety, J., Meidenbauer, K. L., & Cowell, J. M. (2018). The development of cognitive empathy and concern in preschool children: A behavioral neuroscience investigation. *Developmental Science*, 21(3), e12570. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12570>

- Demurie, E., De Corel, M., & Roeyers, H. (2011). Empathic accuracy in adolescents with autism spectrum disorders and adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *RESEARCH IN AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDERS*, 5(1), 126–134.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2010.03.002>
- Deschamps, P. K. H., Been, M., & Matthys, W. (2014). Empathy and Empathy Induced Prosocial Behavior in 6- and 7-Year-Olds with Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 44(7), 1749–1758. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-014-2048-3>
- Didehbani, N., Allen, T., Kandalaft, M., Krawczyk, D., & Chapman, S. (2016). Virtual Reality Social Cognition Training for children with high functioning autism. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 62, 703–711. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.04.033>
- Dziobek, I., Rogers, K., Fleck, S., Bahnemann, M., Heekeren, H. R., Wolf, O. T., & Convit, A. (2008). Dissociation of Cognitive and Emotional Empathy in Adults with Asperger Syndrome Using the Multifaceted Empathy Test (MET). *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 38(3), 464–473. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-007-0486-x>
- Elliott, C. D., Salerno, J. D., Dumont, R., & Willis, J. O. (2018). The Differential Ability Scales—Second Edition. In *Contemporary intellectual assessment: Theories, tests, and issues*, 4th ed (pp. 360–382). The Guilford Press.
- Freund, L. S., Reiss, A. L., & Abrams, M. T. (1993). Psychiatric disorders associated with fragile X in the young female. *Pediatrics*, 91(2), 321–329.
- Gambin, M., & Sharp, C. (2016). The Differential Relations Between Empathy and Internalizing and Externalizing Symptoms in Inpatient Adolescents. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 47(6), 966–974. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-016-0625-8>

- Garber, K. B., Visootsak, J., & Warren, S. T. (2008). Fragile X syndrome. *European Journal of Human Genetics: EJHG*, 16(6), 666–672. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ejhg.2008.61>
- Golan, O., & Baron-Cohen, S. (2006). Systemizing empathy: Teaching adults with Asperger syndrome or high-functioning autism to recognize complex emotions using interactive multimedia. *Development and Psychopathology*, 18(2), 591–617. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579406060305>
- Hall, S. S., Lightbody, A. A., Huffman, L. C., Lazzeroni, L. C., & Reiss, A. L. (2009). Physiological Correlates of Social Avoidance Behavior in Children and Adolescents With Fragile X Syndrome. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 48(3), 320–329. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CHI.0b013e318195bd15>
- Hastings, P. D., Miller, J. G., Kahle, S., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (2014). The neurobiological bases of empathic concern for others. In *Handbook of moral development*, 2nd ed (pp. 411–434). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203581957.ch19>
- Hezel, D. M., & McNally, R. J. (2014). Theory of mind impairments in social anxiety disorder. *Behavior Therapy*, 45(4), 530–540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2014.02.010>
- Kaat, A. J., & Lecavalier, L. (2015). Reliability and validity of parent- and child-rated anxiety measures in autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 45(10), 3219–3231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-015-2481-y>
- Klusek, J., Roberts, J. E., & Losh, M. (2015). Cardiac Autonomic Regulation in Autism and Fragile X Syndrome: A Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(1), 141–175. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038237>

- Kraemer, H. C., & Blasey, C. M. (2004). Centring in regression analyses: A strategy to prevent errors in statistical inference. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 13(3), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.170>
- Lachiewicz, A. M. (1992). Abnormal behaviors of young girls with fragile X syndrome. *American Journal of Medical Genetics*, 43(1–2), 72–77. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajmg.1320430111>
- Lesniak-Karpiak, K., Mazzocco, M. M. M., & Ross, J. L. (2003). Behavioral assessment of social anxiety in females with Turner or fragile X syndrome. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 33(1), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1022230504787>
- Lord, C., Rutter, M., Goode, S., Heemsbergen, J., Jordan, H., Mawhood, L., & Schopler, E. (1989). Autism diagnostic observation schedule: A standardized observation of communicative and social behavior. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 19(2), 185–212. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02211841>
- Losh, M., Martin, G. E., Klusek, J., Hogan-Brown, A. L., & Sideris, J. (2012). Social Communication and Theory of Mind in Boys with Autism and Fragile X Syndrome. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00266>
- Maoz, H., Gvirts, H. Z., Sheffer, M., & Bloch, Y. (2019). Theory of Mind and Empathy in Children With ADHD. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 23(11), 1331–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054717710766>
- March, J. S., Parker, J. D., Sullivan, K., Stallings, P., & Conners, C. K. (1997). The Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children (MASC): Factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 36(4), 554–565. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-199704000-00019>

- Mazzocco, M. M. M., Kates, W. R., Baumgardner, T. L., Freund, L. S., & Reiss, A. L. (1997). Autistic Behaviors Among Girls with Fragile X Syndrome. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 27(4), 415–435. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025857422026>
- Mazzocco, M. M., Pennington, B. F., & Hagerman, R. J. (1994). Social cognition skills among females with fragile X. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 24(4), 473–485. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02172129>
- McCauley, E., Ross, J. L., Kushner, H., & Cutler, G. (1995). Self-esteem and behavior in girls with Turner syndrome. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics: JDBP*, 16(2), 82–88.
- McLaughlin, K. A., & King, K. (2015). Developmental Trajectories of Anxiety and Depression in Early Adolescence. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 43(2), 311–323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-014-9898-1>
- Michalska, K. J., Kinzler, K. D., & Decety, J. (2013). Age-related sex differences in explicit measures of empathy do not predict brain responses across childhood and adolescence. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 3, 22–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2012.08.001>
- Miller, J. G. (2018). Physiological mechanisms of prosociality. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 20, 50–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.08.018>
- Miller, J. G., Nuselovici, J. N., & Hastings, P. D. (2016). Nonrandom Acts of Kindness: Parasympathetic and Subjective Empathic Responses to Sadness Predict Children's Prosociality. *Child Development*, 87(6), 1679–1690. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12629>
- Miller, J. G., Xia, G., & Hastings, P. D. (2020). Right Temporoparietal Junction Involvement in Autonomic Responses to the Suffering of Others: A Preliminary Transcranial Magnetic

- Stimulation Study. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 14, 7.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2020.00007>
- Morrison, A. S., Mateen, M. A., Brozovich, F. A., Zaki, J., Goldin, P. R., Heimberg, R. G., & Gross, J. J. (2016). Empathy for positive and negative emotions in social anxiety disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 87, 232–242.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2016.10.005>
- Schiltz, H., McIntyre, N., Swain-Lerro, L., Zajic, M., & Mundy, P. (2017). The Stability of Self-Reported Anxiety in Youth with Autism Versus ADHD or Typical Development. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 47(12), 3756–3764.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-017-3184-3>
- Shamay-Tsoory, S. G. (2010). The Neural Bases for Empathy: *The Neuroscientist*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858410379268>
- Spencer, C. M., Alekseyenko, O., Serysheva, E., Yuva-Paylor, L. A., & Paylor, R. (2005). Altered anxiety-related and social behaviors in the Fmr1 knockout mouse model of fragile X syndrome. *Genes, Brain, and Behavior*, 4(7), 420–430.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1601-183X.2005.00123.x>
- Tone, E. B., & Tully, E. C. (2014). Empathy as a “Risky Strength”: A Multilevel Examination of Empathy and Risk for Internalizing Disorders. *Development and Psychopathology*, 26(4 0 2), 1547–1565. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579414001199>
- Wadell, P. M., Hagerman, R. J., & Hessel, D. R. (2013). Fragile X syndrome: Psychiatric manifestations, assessment and emerging therapies. *Current Psychiatry Reviews*, 9(1), 53–58. <https://doi.org/10.2174/157340013805289644>

- Wishart, J. G., Cebula, K. R., Willis, D. S., & Pitcairn, T. K. (2007). Understanding of facial expressions of emotion by children with intellectual disabilities of differing aetiology. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research: JIDR*, 51(Pt 7), 551–563.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2006.00947.x>
- Yirmiya, N., Erel, O., Shaked, M., & Solomonica-Levi, D. (1998). Meta-analyses comparing theory of mind abilities of individuals with autism, individuals with mental retardation, and normally developing individuals. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(3), 283–307.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.3.283>
- Zaki, J., Ochsner, K. N., & Ochsner, K. (2012). The neuroscience of empathy: Progress, pitfalls and promise. *Nature Neuroscience*, 15(5), 675–680. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3085>
- Zhou, Q., Valiente, C., & Eisenberg, N. (2003). Empathy and its measurement. In *Positive psychological assessment: A handbook of models and measures* (pp. 269–284). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10612-017>

Figure 1. Group differences in empathy and anxiety.

Note. FXS = Fragile-X Syndrome; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder; GEM = Griffith Empathy Measure; MASC = Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children. The black horizontal line inside of the box represents the median. The red dot represents the mean. Higher values reflect higher scores.

Figure 2. Interaction between group status and cognitive empathy in predicting separation anxiety/phobia symptoms.

Note. FXS = Fragile X Syndrome; GEM = Griffith Empathy Measure; MASC = Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

	Total Sample			FXS			Comparison			
	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	<i>p</i>
Age	10.51	2.65	6.03-16.31	10.58	2.86	6.03-16.31	10.43	2.37	6.50-15.21	.809
Verbal IQ	82.12	17.36	31-114	79.70	17.93	33-114	85.38	16.27	31-112	.163
DAS Communication	79.03	13.50	44-108	80.49	14.64	44-108	77.06	11.74	54-100	.280
DAS Daily Living Skills	82.93	12.96	57-118	84.60	12.09	65-108	80.69	13.93	57-118	.198
DAS Socialization	79.49	12.73	51-110	80.81	12.48	54-110	77.72	12.91	51-98	.301
GEM Affective Empathy	3.03	10.65	-25-24	5.84	9.21	-19-20	-0.75	11.41	-25-24	.007
GEM Cognitive Empathy	7.55	9.79	-18-23	9.95	8.08	-8-22	4.31	11.02	-18-23	.013
MASC Generalized	11.87	5.67	0-23	12.86	5.48	0-23	10.48	5.75	2-23	.110
Anxiety Disorder										
MASC Separation	10.88	5.34	1-23	12.06	5.57	2-23	9.24	4.61	1-16	.043
Anxiety/Phobias										
MASC Social Anxiety	11.22	6.14	2-26	11.86	6.14	2-26	10.32	6.15	2-26	.343

MASC Physical	10.85	6.39	0-31	11.66	6.39	0-31	9.72	6.34	0-24	.250
Symptoms										
MASC Harm Avoidance	15.78	4.10	3-23	15.51	4.35	3-23	16.16	3.77	8-23	.552
MASC	10.20	6.81	0-29	9.97	7.10	0-29	10.52	6.51	0-23	.761
Obsessions/Compulsions										
ADOS-2 Social Affect	5.91	4.64	0-19	6.58	4.70	1-19	5.00	4.49	0-16	.146
ADOS-2 Restricted and	1.01	1.32	0-5	1.02	1.42	0-5	1.00	1.19	0-4	.940
Repetitive Behaviors										
ADOS-2 Overall Total	6.92	5.30	0-21	7.60	5.37	1-21	6.00	5.15	0-17	.197

Note. ADOS-2=Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule, Second Edition; DAS=Differential Abilities Scale; GEM=Griffith Empathy Measure; MASC=Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children; FXS=Fragile X Syndrome. P-values correspond to independent sample t-tests comparing the FXS and comparison groups.

Table 2. Regression model predicting MASC Separation Anxiety/Phobias

	MASC Separation Anxiety/Phobias			
	B	SE	β	<i>p</i>
Intercept	10.84	0.67		<.001
Group status	3.38	1.36	.32	.016
Affective Empathy	0.05	0.06	.11	.431
Cognitive Empathy	-0.09	0.07	-.15	.242
Group x Affective Empathy	0.22	0.12	.23	.080
Group x Cognitive Empathy	-0.38	0.14	-.33	.011

Note. MASC=Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children. For Group status, the comparison group was coded as -0.5 and the FXS group was coded as 0.5 (Kraemer and Blasey, 2004).