



IFAU

Institute for Evaluation of Labour
Market and Education Policy

Sober mom, healthy baby?

Effects of brief alcohol interventions in Swedish maternity care

Erik Grönqvist
Anna Norén
Anna Sjögren
Helena Svaleryd

WORKING PAPER 2016:16

The Institute for Evaluation of Labour Market and Education Policy (IFAU) is a research institute under the Swedish Ministry of Employment, situated in Uppsala. IFAU's objective is to promote, support and carry out scientific evaluations. The assignment includes: the effects of labour market and educational policies, studies of the functioning of the labour market and the labour market effects of social insurance policies. IFAU shall also disseminate its results so that they become accessible to different interested parties in Sweden and abroad.

IFAU also provides funding for research projects within its areas of interest. The deadline for applications is October 1 each year. Since the researchers at IFAU are mainly economists, researchers from other disciplines are encouraged to apply for funding.

IFAU is run by a Director-General. The institute has a scientific council, consisting of a chairman, the Director-General and five other members. Among other things, the scientific council proposes a decision for the allocation of research grants. A reference group including representatives for employer organizations and trade unions, as well as the ministries and authorities concerned is also connected to the institute.

Postal address: P.O. Box 513, 751 20 Uppsala

Visiting address: Kyrkogårdsgatan 6, Uppsala

Phone: +46 18 471 70 70

Fax: +46 18 471 70 71

ifau@ifau.uu.se

www.ifau.se

Papers published in the Working Paper Series should, according to the IFAU policy, have been discussed at seminars held at IFAU and at least one other academic forum, and have been read by one external and one internal referee. They need not, however, have undergone the standard scrutiny for publication in a scientific journal. The purpose of the Working Paper Series is to provide a factual basis for public policy and the public policy discussion.

ISSN 1651-1166

Sober mom, healthy baby?

Effects of brief alcohol interventions in Swedish maternity care^a

by

Erik Grönqvist^b, Anna Norén^c, Anna Sjögren^d and Helena Svaleryd^e

September 19, 2016

Abstract

A large body of research documents the importance of early life conditions for the health and human capital formation of children. The detrimental effects of alcohol exposure in utero are well documented, and therefore identifying effective methods for preventing harmful maternal alcohol consumption is of great importance. We exploit the stepwise introduction of alcohol screening and brief interventions at Swedish antenatal clinics, to evaluate the causal effect of enhanced alcohol prevention on infant health using a difference-in-differences strategy. We find that the program improves infant health measured by prescription of pharmaceutical drugs and hospitalizations during the child's first year of life. The results suggest that effects are likely driven by changes in maternal behavior after the first trimester and seem to extend beyond the birth of the child.

Keywords: Alcohol prevention; Brief intervention; AUDIT; Antenatal care; Child health

JEL-codes: I12; I18

^a We are grateful for comments and suggestions from Caroline Hall, Kristiina Huttunen, Erica Lindahl, Kerstin Petersson, Stephanie von Hinke Kessler Scholder and participants at the Family and Education Workshop 2016, Puerto Rico, Workshop Health and the Labour Market 2016 at Aarhus university, Nordic Health Economic Study Group Meeting in Uppsala 2015, 10th Nordic Summer Institute in Labor Economics in Uppsala, SOLE meeting 2016 in Seattle and seminars at Stockholm School of Economics, Linnaeus University and Health Economic Forum at Uppsala University.

^b Institute for Evaluation of Labour Market and Education Policy, and Department of Economics, Uppsala University. erik.gronqvist@ifau.uu.se

^c Department of Economics, Uppsala University. anna.noren@nek.uu.se

^d Institute for Evaluation of Labour Market and Education Policy and UCLS, Uppsala University. anna.sjogren@ifau.uu.se

^e Department of Economics, UCLS and UCFS Uppsala University and Linnaeus University. helena.svaleryd@nek.uu.se

Table of contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Prenatal health and alcohol exposure	7
3	Antenatal care, screening and brief interventions	9
4	Empirical strategy.....	12
4.1	Expected effects of the program.....	15
5	Data	17
5.1	Study population and screening	17
5.2	Child health outcomes	19
5.3	Descriptive statistics.....	20
5.4	AUDIT scores, maternal characteristics, behaviors and child outcomes	21
6	Results	22
6.1	The effect of the program on child health	22
6.2	Which health conditions are affected?	24
6.3	Heterogenous effects	25
6.4	Sex differences	27
6.5	Socio-economic outcomes of parents.....	28
6.6	Robustness of results	29
7	Effects of the program on pregnant women's behavior using survey data	33
8	Conclusion.....	36
	References	39
	Appendix A	47
	Appendix B. AUDIT questionnaire.....	52

1 Introduction

Public interventions and recommendations concerning expecting women's alcohol consumption have long been part of national strategies to promote maternal and child health. This has been motivated by the insight that the fetus is not protected from harm in utero and by evidence of negative effects of alcohol exposure (McBride, 1961; Von Lenz and Knapp, 1962; Jones, Smith, Ulleland and Streissguth, 1973; Barker 1990).¹ Ambiguous findings regarding the effects of moderate alcohol consumption during pregnancy have however lead to a questioning of strict recommendations to completely abstain from alcohol (see for example Oster; 2013), and pregnant women do not always follow the recommendations. In spite of strict recommendations in Sweden, Göransson et al (2003) find that about 30 percent of pregnant women reported using alcohol regularly, in an anonymous survey. Barry et al (2009) report much lower figures for the US: 10-12 percent of pregnant women report drinking at all. Yet, this is of concern in view of a growing recent literature in economics showing that alcohol exposure in utero has causal adverse effects on health and human capital (see e.g. Wüst, 2010; Zhang, 2010; von Hinke et al., 2014; Nilsson, 2015); in particular since Wüst and von Hinke are able to demonstrate that the ambiguous impact on child health of maternal wine or moderate alcohol consumption disappear when selection effects are accounted for.

In a report of the US National Task Force on Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and Fetal Alcohol Effect it is concluded that research on the effectiveness of universal prevention interventions to reduce alcohol related pregnancies or fetal alcohol spectrum disorders is insufficient, though Screening and Brief interventions are mentioned as promising strategies (Barry et al, 2009). Hence, it is of great importance to identify effective methods for preventing harmful fetal alcohol exposure, and more generally to find interventions that improve child health. It is also important to understand how enhanced

¹ Prenatal exposure to alcohol is identified as an important *preventable* cause of mental retardation with large medical and social costs (Abel and Sokol, 1987; West and Blake, 2005). The insight that the fetus is not protected from harm in utero has gained recognition since the 1960s. The documentation of the severe side effects of Thalidomide in the 1960's (McBride, 1961; Von Lenz and Knapp, 1962) and of adverse effects of alcoholism in the early 1970's (Jones, Smith, Ulleland and Streissguth, 1973) was important for establishing the vulnerability of the fetus. These and other findings lead Barker (1990) to formulate the Fetal origins hypothesis, which is discussed at length in Almond and Currie (2011). There is now a large empirical literature documenting *effects* on health and human capital of fetal exposure to toxic substances (Chay and Greenstone 2003; Almond, Edlund and Palme, 2009; Currie, Niedell and Schneider, 2009; Currie, Greenstone and Moretti, 2011; Currie and Walker 2011; Black et al. 2013), maternal health shocks (Almond 2006), malnutrition (Lindeboom, Portrait and van der Berg 2010; Almond and Mazumder, 2011; Doblehammer, van der Berg and Lumey 2011;), maternal stress (Currie and Rossin-Slater, 2013; Lindo, 2011), economic conditions (van der Berg, Lindeboom and Portrait, 2006; van der Berg, Doblhammer and Christensen 2011), and alcohol (Wüst, 2010; Zhang, 2010; von Hinke et al., 2014; Nilsson, 2015).

preventive interventions against health hazards in utero affect health and early development of children. The contribution of this paper is to do just that.

We exploit regional time variation 2004-2009 in the introduction of the Swedish Risk Drinking project in antenatal care. This is a screening and brief intervention (BI) program for alcohol in Swedish antenatal clinics from 2004 to analyze the effects of enhanced alcohol prevention on child health and maternal behavior during the first years of life. The program consists of three parts: (i) screening for risky alcohol consumption in gestation week 8-12 using the Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test (AUDIT) instrument as a pedagogic tool to screen and inform about risks; (ii) using Motivational Interviewing (MI) techniques to modify behavior; and (iii) referral to treatment for those identified as needing more extensive treatment with access to specialist care.² The roll out of the program involved a major effort to train midwives in screening with AUDIT and in motivating behavioral change using MI-techniques; a training likely to have enhanced the midwives' ability to encourage health promoting behaviors also in domains other than alcohol.

By studying heterogeneities—by type of medication and diagnosis, by age and socioeconomic status of mothers, and by sex of the child as well as the impact on the sex-ratio at birth—as well as maternal smoking and breast feeding, our aim is to provide insights into the mechanisms through which screening and BI for alcohol in antenatal care can affect child health.

Interest in the effectiveness of universal alcohol prevention programs as an integral part of antenatal care, is motivated by a growing literature of well identified studies establishing a causal link between alcohol exposure in utero and negative birth outcomes (Wüst 2010 and Zhang 2010), school outcomes, educational attainment, labor market outcomes and a lower ratio of boys to girls (Nilsson, 2016) in observational data. While the negative effect of excess alcohol exposure, and binge drinking, has been widely accepted, the recent evidence puts a focus on likely negative effects also of low and moderate consumption (von Hinke et al. 2014). This recent evidence questions a large number of observational correlation studies suggesting that the risks of moderate consumption are ambiguous and depend on the nature of alcohol consumption (see meta studies by Polygenis et al. 1998; Abel and Hannigan, 1995).

² The literature also refers to this type of public health program as SBIRT: Screening, Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment, see eg Young (2014) et al for a review.

Interest in the effectiveness of this screening and BI program in antenatal care is also motivated by the large body of research on BI using MI. Such interventions are common and claimed to be effective in a number of areas of health: diabetes care, weight loss, smoking cessation, drug or alcohol addiction and in promoting reductions in risky behaviours (Rubak et al, 2004). However, in reviewing a large number of reviews, O'Donnell et al (2014) conclude that the evidence regarding interventions during pregnancy is yet rather weak.³ Moreover, studies of large scale BI-programs in primary care for general populations are rare and so is the evidence on effects of alcohol prevention on child health. To our knowledge this is the first attempt to evaluate the effects of a population wide nationally implemented screening and BI-program in maternity care on child health and maternal behavior.⁴

Due to timing constraints, not all antenatal clinics were able to introduce the program simultaneously (Socialstyrelsen, 2008). This resulted in a staggered introduction of the screening and MI across antenatal clinics in Sweden so that similar mothers giving birth in the years 2003-2009 faced different screening and alcohol prevention regimes depending on where they lived and when they were pregnant. This allows us to estimate the effects of the program with a difference-in-differences strategy. We use rich administrative data on prescription drugs and hospital care consumption (including detailed information on chemical classification and diagnosis) to construct measures of health, for the universe of first born children in Sweden during the implementation 2004-2009. In an additional analysis we use a similar strategy to estimate the effects on self-reported maternal behaviors and child health exploring survey data collected by the midwives covering 70 percent of births during the years 2003-2008.

We find that the program improves infant health, both as measured by pharmaceutical drugs and by inpatient care utilization during the first year of life. We also find evidence of reduced maternal smoking during pregnancy, and suggestive evidence of increased breastfeeding. In particular, we find that screening lowered the probability of children being prescribed a pharmaceutical drug during their first year of life by 8.4

³ A similar conclusion is drawn regarding other types of informational interventions to increase awareness of the risks of alcohol during pregnancy using various forms of media such as commercials, pamphlets etc (Crawford Williams et al 2015).

⁴ Nilsen et al 2012 analyze maternal self-reported (but anonymous) drinking habits pre-pregnancy and during pregnancy for mothers registered in antenatal care before and after the program was implemented in the municipality of Linköping. They find no significant differences in reported drinking habits but they do find improved perceptions of and a more positive attitude to the alcohol information received from the midwife.

percent, and lowered the probability of being admitted to hospital during their first year of life with 7.5 percent. We find that the health effects are mainly driven by reductions in prescriptions related to infections and by reductions in inpatient care due to injury and ‘avoidable’ conditions, which would not have required hospitalization if the child had access to timely and effective preventive or primary care (e.g. asthma, diarrhea and infections). We find no effects on conditions that could be connected to congenital malformations or perinatal condition and complications at birth that would be associated with heavy alcohol exposure in early gestation. Neither do we find an effect on the sex ratio at birth nor do we find differential health effects by sex of the child. This pattern of results is consistent with the program having no influence on hazardous alcohol consumption in early gestation, which is what to expect given that it is administered towards the end of the first trimester. Instead, the results are consistent with the interpretation that the screening and brief alcohol intervention reduced alcohol exposure later in the pregnancy, leading to improvement in children’s immune system. The effects on avoidable conditions and injuries, as well as effects on maternal smoking cessation also point to behavioral effects that extend beyond alcohol consumption and the duration of the pregnancy. Effects on smoking may partly be the result of the MI-training improving midwives general ability to support health promoting behaviors, not only behaviors related to alcohol. Smoking and alcohol consumption are however often complements as is found in Wüst (2010).

This paper is a contribution to the literature on the importance of in utero and early life conditions for child health by illustrating the importance of alcohol exposure and maternal behavior for child health. More specifically it is a contribution to the understanding for how policy interventions can impact child development. Our paper thus also contributes to the literature estimating effects of BI in general, and brief alcohol interventions in antenatal care in particular. Showing that the screening and BI-program in Swedish antenatal care improved child health and maternal behaviors when implemented within the context of universally available antenatal care is an important argument for supporting such policy initiatives. The socioeconomic profile of the results also suggests that alcohol prevention in antenatal care contributes to closing socioeconomic gaps at birth. A further contribution of this paper is to the wider

literatures on screening and information interventions, and alcohol prevention in particular (O'Donnell et al, 2013).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The following section reviews the literature on prenatal health and alcohol exposure. Section 3 summarizes antenatal care policies in Sweden and discusses the new screening and brief intervention program. In Section 4, we describe the empirical strategy and Section 5 describes the data. Finally, Section 6 reports the results from the main analysis and Section 7 reports the results using survey data. Section 8 concludes.

2 Prenatal health and alcohol exposure

A large body of research documents the detrimental effects of severe alcohol exposure in utero (Abel, 1984, Streissguth et al., 1994). The most severe diagnosis associated with fetal alcohol exposure is Fetal alcohol syndrome (FAS) which includes a combination of congenital anomalies combined with confirmed maternal alcohol consumption during pregnancy, with the main symptoms being growth deficiency (both pre- and postnatal), FAS-specific facial features, and central nervous system damage causing cognitive and functional disabilities. Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders (FASD) is a non-diagnostic term for permanent birth defects (Sokol, Delaney-Black and Nordstrom, 2003), and includes a broader spectrum of growth deficiency and cognitive and psychosocial impairments and disabilities caused by the mother's consumption of alcohol during pregnancy (Streissguth et al. 1996; Clarke and Gibbard, 2003; Riley and McGee, 2005). While effects on the physical development of organs and extremities may be more affected at the early stages of gestation, there are reasons to believe that the development of the central nervous system and the brain as well as fetal growth and birth weight are sensitive to alcohol exposure throughout the pregnancy (eg Guerri, 2002).

Although the link between heavy alcohol exposure and FAS is widely accepted, there are surprisingly few studies that can convincingly identify a causal relationship between alcohol consumption and child health in a general population of mothers.⁵ There are, however, a growing number of studies with well-identified causal effects utilizing sales restrictions to document the detrimental effects of maternal alcohol consumption on

⁵ See discussion in Nilsson (2015) for a discussion of the earlier mainly observational studies.

child outcomes at the population level (Zhang 2010, Fertig and Watson 2010, and Nilsson 2015).⁶ Zhang (2010) examines the relationship between drinking during pregnancy and infant birth outcomes utilizing changes in state-wide alcohol taxation. She finds that higher alcohol taxes reduce binge drinking among pregnant mothers and improves birth outcomes of children. This result is partly due to selection into motherhood, as unplanned pregnancies are more likely for women engaging in binge drinking.⁷ Similarly, Fertig and Watson (2010) find that changes in state minimum drinking age laws in the US have effects on infant health mainly by affecting the composition of families: alcohol availability by young adults is associated with more unplanned pregnancies, in particular among low SES parents. Composition effects are also found by Nilsson (2015) who studies a temporary (8.5 month) policy experiment of less restrictive sales rules for strong beer in two Swedish regions in the 1960's. The experiment increased the availability of alcoholic beer for youths in the age 18-21 which increased alcohol consumption, most likely in the form of binge drinking. Nilsson also finds detrimental long run effects from alcohol exposure in utero in terms of substantially lower earnings, wages, educational attainments, and cognitive and non-cognitive ability. The negative effects on earnings are found throughout the distribution but are largest below the median. The detrimental effects of increased alcohol availability are found to be strongest for fetuses exposed at early stages of the pregnancy, resulting in a higher than normal ratio of boys to girls and worse outcomes (educational attainment and earnings) for boys.⁸

These studies suggest that maternal alcohol consumption, in particular the alcohol consumption of young mothers, is influenced by increased access to alcohol and that this increased consumption is harmful for children. von Hinke et al (2014) instead use so called Mendelian randomization as a source of exogenous variation to identify effects of fetal alcohol exposure on the educational attainment of UK children.

⁶ Barreca and Page (2013) are however unable to find a significant effect.

⁷ The health of unplanned children is often worse since these children are more often born to lower SES mothers.

⁸ Effects on the sex-ratio, implying a lower ratio of boys to girls, are typically associated with negative shocks or presence of maternal stressors at the time of conception or during the first half of the pregnancy (Valente 2015). This effect is driven by selection at conception but also by spontaneous abortions and can be the result of different mechanisms with different implications for the sex difference in health of the children, conditional on live birth. Almond and Currie, 2011 find evidence of scarring, i.e. that differential survival would be the result of deteriorating maternal health during pregnancy resulting in a low sex-ratio and a sex gap in health at birth to the favour of girls. This is consistent with the findings of Nilsson 2015. Catalano et al 2008, however find evidence of so called culling, i.e. that the survival threshold of boys has shifted to the right such that surviving boys are in fact in better health.

Information on maternal genotypes of a particular gene, shown to influence alcohol metabolism and consumption, is used to instrument for alcohol use during pregnancy. Because carrying this variant of the gene affects alcohol consumption across individuals in the full population, they are able to study effects of low or moderate consumption in a representative population of mothers. The interesting feature with this study is that it shows that selection is the reason why OLS results indicate positive effects of wine consumption and moderate drinking throughout the pregnancy and negative effects of beer consumption and binge drinking. IV-estimates, instead are consistently negative suggesting that alcohol exposure is negative for educational attainment and that more alcohol, more binge drinking and longer exposure during the pregnancy is worse. Because the gene variant is likely to affect maternal alcohol consumption also after birth, it cannot be ruled out that both in utero and childhood exposure to maternal alcohol consumption matter for child outcomes.

In a study on Danish register data, Wüst (2010) instead uses a sibling fixed effect approach to study the effects of alcohol consumption on child outcomes. She finds that controlling for selection using siblings turns the insignificant association between alcohol consumption and birth outcomes into a significant negative effect. As in the study of UK mothers, this reflects that mothers are positively selected into alcohol consumption during pregnancy. She also finds a dose-response relationship such that more drinking causes more harm, rather than finding that the effects are driven only by excessive consumption.

3 Antenatal care, screening and brief interventions

Sweden has an extensive system of antenatal clinics, with an objective not only to strengthen parents in their parental role but also to detect and prevent poor health and offer support to mothers. The care received at the antenatal care clinics is free of charge and easily accessible. Health education is an important aspect of antenatal care and focuses mainly on lifestyle changes during pregnancy. Nearly 100 percent of all expecting mothers are enrolled in maternity care services delivered primarily through municipality-based public antenatal clinics (Socialstyrelsen, 2005); around 520 clinics in Sweden care for the about 100 000 pregnant women annually. During uncomplicated pregnancies, women typically have 6-10 prenatal visits to the antenatal clinic. The focus

of the first visit, which occurs around week 8-12 of the pregnancy, is primarily to make a physiological assessment and to provide information about pregnancy. An important aspect of health care during pregnancy is to identify risks and conditions—both medical and psychosocial—which can affect the pregnancy, the delivery, and the development of the fetus. By covering nearly all pregnant women in Sweden, the antenatal clinics have a strategic position in detecting and preventing prenatal alcohol exposure, and to provide support to women who experience difficulties to stop drinking alcohol during pregnancy.

In 2004 the Risk Drinking project was initiated in Swedish maternity care in response of a growing concern for changed alcohol consumption patterns following Sweden's entry to the EU. In particular, the alcohol consumption among women aged 28-38 increased during the late 1990's (Bergman and Källmén, 2003). Since consumption of alcohol during pregnancy is influenced by established habits, changed consumption patterns in general, may have consequences for women's attitudes towards alcohol during pregnancy (Göransson, 2004). The Risk Drinking project was a nationwide effort to implement a brief alcohol intervention as an integral part of routine care. The project was run and financed by the Swedish Public Health Agency and had a large impact on the antenatal clinics' alcohol preventive work by promoting the use of the AUDIT instrument to detect risky alcohol consumption (Socialstyrelsen, 2009); by introducing and providing training in MI as a tool for motivating reduced alcohol consumption; and by extra counselling and referral to specialists for mothers displaying a risky alcohol consumption pattern.⁹

AUDIT is a 10-item questionnaire, developed by WHO, covering three areas: consumption, addiction, and alcohol related damages (Babor et al., 2001)¹⁰. The AUDIT instrument was adapted for use in antenatal clinics by asking, not about present but rather, about pre-pregnancy alcohol behavior, and was promoted as a pedagogic tool to be used at the woman's first visit at the antenatal clinic around week 8-12 of the pregnancy. The AUDIT questionnaire is filled out by the midwife or by the mother and is used as a basis for talking about alcohol habits. During the interview the midwife informs about risks with alcohol during pregnancy with the explicit purpose of motivating behavioral change among those who display risky consumption patterns.

⁹ MI is developed in Miller 1983 and Miller and Rollnick, 1991

¹⁰ See Appendix B for the AUDIT questionnaire.

This involves a motivational discussion exploring habits and the mother's own positive and negative attitudes towards alcohol while maintaining an empathic, non-judgmental atmosphere. Based on the woman's own ambivalence towards alcohol, the role of the midwife is to strengthen the woman's own arguments against drinking by providing facts about the risks for the fetus. It is important that this is done in a compassionate way so as to avoid arguments and negative feelings that might evoke a defensive attitude.¹¹ One strength of the AUDIT protocol is its sensitivity and high specificity—compared to other screening instruments—in detecting risky consumption at different levels of alcohol use and problems (Saunders et al., 1993, Reinert and Allen, 2007). Another strength lies in its implementation which is focused on women's alcohol consumption prior to pregnancy.¹² Women are more likely to answer truthfully about pre-pregnancy consumption, and pre-pregnancy alcohol intake has been shown to be a good predictor of the alcohol consumption during pregnancy (Göransson et al., 2003).

The AUDIT protocol grades alcohol behavior on a 0-40 scale, where a higher score indicates more hazardous alcohol consumption. Originally the cut-point for identifying at-risk drinking behavior in the general population was set to 8. Studies later showed that the cut-point for women should be set lower and values of 5-6 or even as low as 3 has been suggested for identifying at-risk drinking among females (Reinert and Allen, 2007).¹³ If a woman scores a value of 6 or higher on AUDIT the midwife will immediately start a motivational BI with the aim of supporting modified behavior. The woman will also be invited for more frequent visits. If the midwife considers it necessary, or if the woman gets a very high AUDIT score, referral to other professions such as counselors, the social service, and/or an alcohol dependency clinic will also follow (Folkhälsoinstitutet 2014; Damström Thakker, 2011; Västra Götalandsregionen 2008). Importantly, the intervention is aimed at motivating and encouraging behavioral modification rather than coercion or merely providing health information.

¹¹ See eg Handmaker and Wilborne (2001).

¹² It is widely recognized that obtaining reliable self-reports of women's alcohol use during pregnancy is difficult because of stigma and because of uncertainty about what entails risky consumption (Gray and Henderson, 2006).

¹³ . Among those diagnosed as having hazardous or harmful alcohol use in a general population, 92% had an AUDIT score of 8 or more, and 94% of those with non-hazardous consumption had a score of less than 8 (Saunders et al., 1993). AUDIT scores in the range of 8-15 is found to represent a medium level of alcohol problems whereas scores of 16 and above represented a high level of alcohol problems. Since the effects of alcohol vary with average body weight and differences in metabolism, lowering the cut off for women with one point—i.e. to an AUDIT of 7—will increase sensitivity for this population groups (Babor et al., 2001).

During the roll out of the Risk Drinking project in antenatal care midwives were trained in using AUDIT as well as in MI technique. The training programs were organized by the coordinating midwives at the county level.¹⁴ Training involved a full day training program on the risks of alcohol consumption during pregnancy and how to use the AUDIT questionnaire in antenatal care. A further important part of the program was training in MI techniques. This part of the program involved 3-4 days of training and recurring visits by instructors at the antenatal clinics in order to follow up and support implementation of AUDIT and MI. A limited number of lecturers and instructors were involved in these training programs and hence time constraints implied that it took some time to train midwives in AUDIT and MI.¹⁵ As a result the program was gradually adopted by antenatal clinics, where the exact timing depended on accessibility and scheduling possibilities among both participating clinics and by lecturers and instructors. By 2010, 92 percent of the clinics had introduced AUDIT and MI (Socialstyrelsen, 2008).¹⁶

In an evaluation of the Risk Drinking project, the National Board of Public Health (Folkhälsoinstitutet, 2010) found that the fraction of midwives who thought they had good or very good knowledge about the risks of alcohol during pregnancy rose marginally between 2004 and 2009, from 94 to 99 percent. During the same period, the fraction midwives who judged their ability to identify at risk mothers as good or very good rose from 60 to 92 percent. In a survey of Stockholm midwives, midwives regarded MI-training, in particular, as very important in strengthening their ability to talk to mothers about alcohol (Damström Thakker, 2011).

4 Empirical strategy

To estimate the effects of a universal screening brief alcohol intervention program in antenatal care on infant health and maternal behavior, we use a difference-in-differences approach where we utilize the staggered implementation of AUDIT screening and MI across antenatal clinics within counties. Although antenatal clinics are municipality

¹⁴ Together with Heads of Obstetrics, coordinating midwives in the counties are in charge of developing, implementing and evaluating local practice in the area of antenatal care and reproductive health.

¹⁵ In Figure A1 in Appendix A we describe the gradual implementation of the AUDIT-MI-program.

¹⁶ For a detailed account of the training program and implementation see eg Nilsen et al 2011. Details about the implementation are also based on an interview with Kerstin Petersson, head administrator of the MHV-register and Coordinating midwife in Stockholm County, October 16, 2015.

based, health care in Sweden is organized at the county level: 290 municipalities are divided into 21 counties which are responsible for the provision of health care. For this reason there is some regional variation in the organization and practices across different counties, which may affect health care utilization (Socialstyrelsen, 2011), and hence the measures of health used in this study. We will therefore focus on within-county variation between municipalities in the timing of implementation to identify the effects of the program. Figure 1 illustrates how the gradual increase in the share of antenatal clinics implementing the program yields a substantial municipal variation within counties (except for the counties of Uppsala, Jönköping, Gotland, Blekinge, and Västmanland) in the years before 2010.¹⁷




Figure 1. Regional implementation of the program by year

Mothers are regarded as treated by the program if they—during the first four months of the pregnancy—live in a municipality where the antenatal clinics have implemented the

¹⁷ 33 municipalities are excluded from the analysis because the clinics within the municipality introduced the program in different years. The sample restrictions are discussed in Section 5.1.

program, and the control group is pregnant women in other parts of the county where the program has not yet been introduced. The empirical model is given by:

$$y_{ickt} = \alpha + \beta Treatment_{kt} + \gamma_k + \eta_{ct} + \theta bm_i + \mathbf{X}_i \lambda + \mathbf{K}_{kt} \lambda + \varepsilon_{ickt}, \quad (1)$$

where y_{ickt} is the outcome of child i in county c in municipality k , year t . With γ_k being a vector of municipal fixed effects, and η_{ct} a vector of county specific time effects, the variations between municipalities within a county identify the effect. $Treatment_{kt}$ is an indicator taking the value 1 if the mother belongs to a clinic which has implemented the screening and BI program and 0 otherwise. In order to control for seasonal patterns in infant health and drinking patterns we include an indicator for birth month, bm_i . \mathbf{X}_i is a vector of controls for predetermined family characteristics. There is a social gradient both in child health (Cutler et al., 2008 and Mörk et al., 2014) as well as in drinking and awareness of the detrimental effects of alcohol consumption during pregnancy (Bergman and Källmén, 2003). We therefore include the following characteristics as controls: mothers' and fathers' age; immigrant status and educational level of the mother; whether the parents live together in the year that the child was born; and sex of the child. We also include municipal unemployment level and municipal alcohol sales per capita in the regression to control for time-varying differences in municipal characteristics, \mathbf{K}_{kt} . The coefficient of interest is β , which is the estimate of the treatment effect. Standard errors are clustered at the municipal level.

The main identifying assumption is that the timing of implementation is unrelated to changes in infant health and maternal alcohol consumption in the municipality. And since the timing of implementation was determined by when midwives could be scheduled for training in AUDIT and MI, rather than motivated by alcohol consumption patterns we believe that the parallel trends assumption is fulfilled. The assumption is corroborated by a number robustness tests in section 6.6.

A potential threat to the identification comes from Swedish mothers being free to choose antenatal clinic. Mothers could potentially select into clinics based on their alcohol prevention practices: a woman with risky alcohol consumption could for example choose a clinic without screening if she is reluctant to reveal a potential abuse. In order to avoid this selection problem we restrict our attention to municipalities with

only one antenatal clinic or municipalities where all clinics implemented screening and BI at the same time. The problem of varying screening practices, and the scope for clinic choice, is more pronounced in larger cities with several clinics and in section 6.6 we present sensitivity analyses with regard to excluding these municipalities.

Another potential threat to the identification strategy is that mothers who were exposed to the program at the antenatal clinic may also have been exposed to new alcohol preventive strategies elsewhere, e.g. at child health clinics after the child was born. Although not as well documented, the implementation of the Risk Drinking project in child health clinics was not coordinated with the implementation effort at antenatal clinics. In fact, child health clinics initiated the Risk Drinking project later and at a slower pace than the antenatal care clinics. In 2006, the fraction of child health nurses who had received at least some training in prevention of risky alcohol consumption was 52 percent, substantially lower than the corresponding fraction of midwives which was 88 percent. In addition, the midwives typically had received more training. By 2009, two thirds of midwives and one third child health nurses had received at least three days of training (Folkhälsomyndigheten, 2010)

4.1 Expected effects of the program

In order to assess through which mechanisms a screening and brief alcohol intervention program for pregnant women affects infant health we analyze heterogeneities by different domains of infant health, by sex of the child and by socioeconomic status of the mother. The previous literature suggests that the type and timing of fetal alcohol exposure may give rise to different consequences. Exposure in early stages of gestation and heavy exposure through bingeing are likely to result in a skewed sex-ratio at birth (selectivity at conception and spontaneous abortion is more likely for boys) and potentially worse outcomes for boys (Valente, 2015)¹⁸. Long run, but moderate, exposure throughout the pregnancy, on the other hand, is more likely to have detrimental effects on the development of the central nervous system, the brain as well as fetal growth and birth weight (Guerri, 2002).

¹⁸ See Valente, 2015 for a thorough discussion of these mechanisms. Almond and Currie, 2011 find evidence of scarring, i.e. that differential survival would be the result of deteriorating maternal health during pregnancy resulting in a low boy-to-girl-ratio and a sex gap in health at birth to the favour of girls. This is consistent with the findings of Nilsson 2015. Catalano et al 2008, however find evidence of so called culling, i.e. that the survival threshold of boys has shifted to the right such that surviving boys are in fact in better health.

In order to capture effects of early and heavy alcohol exposure we specifically look at sex ratio at birth and gender heterogeneities in outcomes. Because the investigated screening and BI program takes place towards the end on the first trimester, we should not expect it to have any effects on alcohol exposure at the early stages of the pregnancy. Moreover, heavy abuse is likely to have been detected also before the introduction of the studied program. We therefore do not expect effects on sex ratios at birth or gender heterogeneities. To capture effects of fetal exposure throughout the pregnancy we instead study effects on *infections* which may be a consequence of increased sensitivity or reduced immune function related to birth weight and fetal growth (Gauthier, 2015). In addition, we study the most common diagnoses leading to hospitalization among infants, i.e. *perinatal diagnoses*, and *respiratory* conditions. Although these categories of diagnoses are more difficult to directly link to type of exposure they are more common among children with low birth weight.¹⁹

In order to capture post natal behavioral changes of the mother we look at *injuries* and a set of conditions which are considered as *avoidable* hospitalizations in the sense that appropriate care and nutrition are likely to reduce their incidence (Page et al. 2007).²⁰

The program was designed to better detect at risk mothers. It is well known that the nature of alcohol consumption varies by maternal characteristics: younger and less educated women are more likely to engage in weekend binge drinking, whereas older and more educated women are more likely to have a consumption pattern with small or moderate quantities of alcohol on a more regular or every day basis (Wüst, 2010 and von Hinke Kessler Scholder, 2014). Differential effects by maternal age and education may thus pick up heterogeneous impact of the program due to heterogeneities in risk of alcohol exposed pregnancies as well heterogeneous responses at given risk levels.

Although the program was focused on alcohol prevention, it is possible that other behaviors are affected. We therefore also study effects on smoking and breastfeeding,

¹⁹ When using hospital admissions as outcome we combine we combine respiratory diagnoses (which include both admissions for asthmatic problems, croup, RS-virus and throat infections) and admissions for eye and ear infections.

²⁰ These “avoidable” hospitalizations are admissions for certain acute illnesses and worsening chronic conditions that might not have required hospitalization if they had been managed through timely and effective utilization of primary care and through patient behavior. Note that all such hospitalizations cannot be avoided. Avoidable conditions fall into three categories: vaccine preventable, acute conditions, and chronic conditions; that, if managed well, should not require hospital admission. We use the definition for children suggested by the Public Health Information Development Unit in Australia (Page et al. 2007). Table A1 in Appendix A lists diagnoses groups and the ICD codes included as well as the ATC codes for the categories of drugs.

which could be a consequence of reduced alcohol consumption, since alcohol and cigarettes are often consumed together, while mothers may be reluctant to breastfeed when they have been drinking. However, breastfeeding and smoking effects could also be spill-overs of MI training to other areas of health promotion if the midwives' ability to successfully promote behavioral change is not limited to alcohol.

5 Data

In the main analyses we combine data from administrative registers—e.g. the Population register, the Hospital Discharge register and the Prescription Drug register—with antenatal clinic level survey data on the implementation of the program from the Maternity Health Care Register. We describe these data below. In auxiliary analyses we also make use of individual level survey data from the Maternity Health Care Register. We describe these data in section 7 in connection to the results.

5.1 Study population and screening

Our study population in the main analysis consists of all first-born children in Sweden born 2003-2009 and their parents. The population is identified through the population register held at Statistics Sweden. It covers all Swedish residents with information on year and month of birth, birth order and with a link to the biological parents. The analysis will focus only on first-time mothers since we want to avoid information given during earlier pregnancies to influence the results. Moreover, given the possibility that the program may affect the probability of having a second child, we avoid biases introduced by selection in second births by focusing on first borns. The sample is also restricted to include only children who are born in Sweden and whose mothers reside in Sweden, since we want to make sure that the mothers have been exposed to Swedish maternity care.

For each parent we retrieve information on socioeconomic background characteristics from Statistics Sweden based on administrative records and population censuses; specifically: educational attainment, annual labor income, age, and municipality of residence. The information on educational attainment is based on a 3-digit code, corresponding to the International Standard Classification of Education 1997. For earlier cohorts covered by this register, and for immigrants, information on educational attainment is obtained from census data, whereas the data for later cohorts come directly

from educational registers of high quality. The information on labor income stems from data that employers are mandated to report to the tax authorities for income tax declaration purposes. These data are matched with information on alcohol prevention practice at the municipal level using the municipality of residency of the mother.

Data on the alcohol prevention at each antenatal clinic was collected by the Maternity Health Care Register. The register is managed by the medical profession and was initiated in 1999 in order to improve the quality and to enable monitoring and evaluation of the maternal health care. The register is based on a local organization of participating antenatal clinics. Participation by these facilities is not mandatory, yet in 2008 compliance was 89 percent. Since the register was initiated from within the profession and is used to benchmark quality and compare procedures, there is an incentive for accurate and high quality of reporting. Every year participating clinics submit information on working practices and services provided. We use this data to determine whether clinics are using a structured tool for alcohol screening for the period 2003-2008. Structured screening was first introduced as a part of the studied program and using structured screening implies that they have adapted the AUDIT instrument, MI-techniques and standardized procedures for referral to treatment. There is explicit information about the implementation of AUDIT screening from 2005 and onwards. For 2003 and 2004, clinics instead report whether they used “structured working methods to detect women with risky alcohol consumption”. For 2004 this implies AUDIT since the Risk Drinking project initiated the implementation of the program in 2004 and no alternative, structured screening methods were in use.²¹ Information on working methods at the antenatal clinics is linked to municipalities through the postal code. Most municipalities have only one antenatal clinic: Out of the 274 municipalities represented in Maternity Health Care Register, 72 municipalities have multiple clinics. Among municipalities with multiple units, 29 municipalities have units that introduced the screening simultaneously. Since we lack exact information on which center a woman visits we exclude the 33 municipalities where centers implemented the program in

²¹ For 2003 it is more ambiguous whether clinics responding that that use “structured working methods to detect women with risky alcohol consumption” in fact are using AUDIT, but it should be noted (i) that only 2 percent of the clinics were using such methods in 2003 as can be seen in Figure A1 in Appendix A, and (ii) that these clinics do not change screening status over the period. Details about the implementation are based on an interview with Kerstin Petersson, head administrator of the MHV-register and Coordinating midwife in Stockholm County, October 16, 2015.

different years. In total, pregnant women from 231 out of Sweden's 290 municipalities are included in the analysis.

A mother is treated if she, when she was pregnant, lived in a municipality that had introduced structured screening. Since we have no information on the exact timing of the screening of women, we create a screening window consisting of the first four months of the pregnancy. Given that we do not have access to information about gestation weeks at birth, nor exact birth dates, we assume that all women are pregnant for 38 weeks, and that the child is born the first of each month. Since the first visit to the midwife usually occurs around week 8-12, screening is likely to fall within this four month window.

To determine if a pregnant woman is affected by the program in a specific year, we restrict timing of treatment so that the full screening window has to occur past the turn of the year in order to belong to a "new" screening year. For example, a child born in August a given year is assumed to be conceived in November. Although the screening window overlaps the turn of the year, the treatment status of this child is determined by the screening regime the year prior to birth. In practice, this implies that children born between October and December in a given year are treated according to the screening practice in the birth year, whereas children born between January and September are treated according to screening practice the year prior to the birth year. The reason for the restrictive definition is that it is unlikely that all clinics implement the program in January but rather some time later during the year. Therefore, we also exclude the year of introduction in the main specification of the analysis.

5.2 Child health outcomes

Our measures of child health are based on whether the child was admitted to hospital or was prescribed pharmaceutical drugs during the first (second) year of life. We create indicators for child health taking the value 1 if the child was admitted (over night) to hospital, respectively prescribed any drug, and 0 otherwise. Register information on all inpatient hospital episodes and on all prescribed pharmaceutical drugs purchased at pharmacies is available from the Swedish National Board for Health and Welfare. The hospital data includes detailed information on admission date and on primary and secondary diagnoses classified according to WHO's ICD10 classification system. Hospitals are obliged by law to report this data, and the information is typically entered

into the hospital administrative system at discharge. Similarly, the drug data includes detailed information date of prescriptions and the chemical classification of the drug according to WHO's ATC system.²² Pharmacies have strong incentives to report sales in order to get reimbursed from the public drug benefit. By using information from the ICD and ATC classification we define hospitalizations and drug prescriptions for different conditions and events of ill-health as described in Section 4.1 (see Table A1 in Appendix A for exact ICD10 and ATC codes).

Information from the Hospital Discharge register is available for the whole implementation period 2003-2009. Information on drug prescriptions is available only from 2005-2009.

5.3 Descriptive statistics

The first column of Table 1 displays summary statistics for the full population of first-born children during the period 2003-2009. As discussed above we restrict the sample due to i) uncertainty of the exact month the screening was implemented, ii) uncertainty of exposure to screening in municipalities where some centers screened and others did not and iii) access to information on drug prescriptions. The second column includes information on the sample used in the analysis when studying hospitalization and the last column displays information on the sample when studying drug prescriptions. As can be seen from the first column, 17.3 percent of all first-borns during the period 2003-2009 are admitted to hospital during their first year of life. In our studied population the incidence is somewhat higher suggesting that hospitalization is more common in the included municipalities. Comparing column 1 to columns 2 and 3 also shows that there are some differences in the characteristics of the population. The reason is that municipalities which are excluded due to multiple antenatal clinics with different screening practices are larger cities with a higher share of single mothers, mothers with a higher education and a larger share of immigrant mothers.

As can be seen in the last column, hospitalization is much less common than getting a drug prescribed during the first year of life, 18.7 percent of the children are admitted to hospital and 51.2 percent of the children get a drug prescribed. Over time the hospitalization rate of children has decreases somewhat whereas the share of children

²² The drug data only includes prescription drugs sold at pharmacies. Pharmaceutical drugs administered at hospitals or at primary care facilities are not covered.

getting drugs prescribed has been rather constant over the period (see Figure A2 and Figure A3 in Appendix A). It is worth noting that these two health measures may pick up different dimensions of health, in particular hospitalization reflects more severe or urgent health conditions. They may also pick up parental differences in health seeking behavior; if the parents refrain from seeking care in time the child may need hospital care for health problems which could have been resolved with a proper medication.

Table 1. Sample characteristics

	Full population (2003-2009)	Hospital sample (2003-2009)	Drug sample (2005-2009)
Hospitalized children per 1000	173.1 (378.3)	188.9 (391.4)	187.3 (390.2)
Children w drug prescript(%)			51.19 (49.99)
Mother's age	29.02 (5.054)	28.29 (5.043)	28.27 (5.082)
Father's age	31.96 (6.063)	31.41 (6.150)	31.42 (6.230)
Single mother(%)	12.60 (33.18)	10.34 (30.45)	10.28 (30.38)
University educ mother(%)	49.99 (50.00)	43.02 (49.51)	44.45 (49.69)
Income below p20(%)	37.99 (48.54)	41.24 (49.23)	42.64 (49.46)
Imigrant mother(%)	18.42 (38.77)	16.33 (36.96)	17.43 (37.93)
Municipal unemployment(%)	3.514 (1.104)	3.545 (1.185)	3.385 (1.196)
Observations	269819	108562	72690

5.4 AUDIT scores, maternal characteristics, behaviors and child outcomes

Before proceeding to the analysis we characterize how maternal characteristics, health behaviors and child health relate to AUDIT scores. Table 2 presents statistics for first time mothers with AUDIT score 0-5; AUDIT score 6-9; with AUDIT score 10 and above. This description is based on individual level data from the Maternity Health Care Register for the period 2010-2014; that is, when the studied program is implemented throughout the country. We therefore have AUDIT scores for the vast majority of mothers.

Table 2 reveals that for this later period, 9.6 percent of the pregnant women have elevated AUDIT scores of 6 or above at their sign in visit. Women with high AUDIT scores are younger than the average pregnant woman, and are more likely to have just

compulsory education. The fraction of non-Nordic immigrants with an elevated AUDIT score is lower than among women in general.

About half of the first time pregnant women say they are in good or excellent health and 25 percent have normal BMI at registration. A remarkable difference between the different groups of women is that 24 percent of women with AUDIT ten or above smoked at registration while the corresponding fraction for low-AUDIT women was only 4 percent. This pattern also persists during pregnancy. Moreover, we see that fewer women with elevated AUDIT breastfeed fully or partially when the child is a month old.

Table 2. Characteristics and behavior sign-in visit AUDIT score 2010-2014

	AUDIT 0-5	AUDIT 6-9	AUDIT ≥ 10
characteristics of woman			
Age	29.1	27.7	26.3
young (<25)	0.21	0.32	0.47
old (>34)	0.16	0.10	0.08
university education	0.50	0.37	0.21
compulsory education	0.047	0.057	0.161
non-nordic immigrant	0.15	0.04	0.04
in good health at registration	0.49	0.50	0.47
BMI normal at registration	24.3	24.5	24.5
smoking at registration	0.038	0.104	0.235
in good health during pregnancy	0.50	0.50	0.48
smoking in w 32	0.026	0.071	0.183
breastfeeding at 1 month	0.87	0.85	0.79
Observations	118496	11863	2256

6 Results

We present the results of estimating the effect of implementing a screening and brief intervention alcohol prevention program in antenatal care on children's health. First we present results on the probability that the child is prescribed a drug or is admitted to hospital during the first years of life. Then we present results relating to specific health problems, heterogeneous effects across groups of mothers and whether screening pregnant women has differential effects on boys and girls or affects the sex ratio, and thereafter we analyze socioeconomic outcomes of parents. Finally we present some robustness checks.

6.1 The effect of the program on child health

The first two columns in Panel A of Table 3 show the effect of the program on the probability that a child is prescribed a pharmaceutical drug during its first year of life.

The estimate in column 1 shows that the program decreases the probability of being prescribed a drug. To make sure the result is not due to compositional effects we in the second column control for parental and municipal characteristics. The estimate is somewhat lower but still statistically significant at the 1 percent level and suggests that children of treated mothers have a 4.3 percentage points, or 8.4 percent, lower probability of being prescribed a drug during their first year of life compared to children of mothers who were not treated by the program. Columns 1 and 2 in Panel B show that the program also reduces the probability that a child is admitted to hospital during the first year of life. The estimate presented in column 2, which includes family and municipal controls, suggests a reduction in admittance with 1.4 percentage points and is significant at the 10 percent level. Compared to the average incidence of 189 children per 1000 this estimate implies a reduction of 7.5 percent. In the last two columns we analyze effects during the second year of life; the estimates are close to zero. This suggests that effects of the program on drug prescriptions and hospitalization are concentrated to the first year of life. This suggests that effects are either limited to the first year of life or that our health measures are too coarse to pick-up more long run effects. We will therefore focus the rest of the analysis on the first year of life, choosing the model with control variables as our main specification.

Table 3. Effects of the program on drug prescription and hospital admission

	First year of life		Second year of life	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Panel A: Drug prescription (per cent)				
Program	-0.046*** (0.015)	-0.043*** (0.014)	-0.001 (0.010)	0.001 (0.010)
Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes
Observations	72690	72690	72690	72690
Municipalities	231	231	231	231
Mean of outcome	0.512		0.716	
Panel B: Hospital admissions (per thousand)				
Program	-15.615* (8.214)	-14.219* (8.256)	0.821 (4.710)	1.007 (4.553)
Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes
Observations	108562	108562	108562	108562
Municipalities	231	231	231	231
Mean of outcome	188.91		84.173	

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth month fixed effects. Control variables include age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

6.2 Which health conditions are affected?

To better understand how the program affects alcohol exposure in utero and mothers' behaviors, we study what type of health problems that are reduced as characterized by type of drug or admission diagnosis.

Panel A of Table 4 presents the estimates of the effect of the program on the probability of being prescribed drugs related to respiratory conditions and infections. Children of treated women have significantly lower probability of being prescribed drugs against infections, but for drugs for respiratory conditions we find no effect. The estimated effect on antiinfectives is 4.4 percentage points, or 20 percent, suggesting that children of treated mothers may have a stronger immune system or that they are less exposed to infections. Increased susceptibility to infections through a weaker immune system is a potential consequence of poor nutrition due to impaired placental function caused by alcohol exposure (Burd et al, 2007).

Panel B presents the estimates of the effect of the program on different causes for hospitalization. The conditions included in the first two columns are diagnoses related to the perinatal period, and diagnoses related to eye and ear infections and respiratory conditions. The next two columns are hospitalizations in diagnoses where admissions are avoidable, and hospitalizations which are related to injuries, poisoning or other external causes. The results suggest that it is mainly avoidable causes and injuries that are affected by the program: avoidable hospitalizations are reduced by 3.9 percentage points, or 24 percent, while injuries are reduced by 42 percent. The point estimates for perinatal, eye and ear infections and respiratory conditions are negative and substantial in size but not statistically significant. This suggests that the program affects admissions related to parental behavior after birth rather than alcohol exposure during (especially early) pregnancy.

This is also supported by the results in Table A2 in Appendix A, where we have estimated the baseline results but excluded health events within the first month after birth. While the result for drug prescription is virtually unaffected, the point estimates for hospitalizations are slightly reduced.

Table 4. Effects of the program on drug prescription and hospital admission during the first year of life: Specific conditions

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Panel A: Drug prescription (per cent)				
	Respiratory	Infection		
Program	-0.003 (0.012)	-0.044** (0.019)		
Observations	72690	72690		
Municipalities	231	231		
Mean of outcome	0.266	0.217		
Panel B: Hospital admissions (per thousand)				
	Perinatal diagnoses	Eye, Ear, Respiratory diagnoses	Avoidable Diagnoses	Injuries
Program	-5.038 (7.612)	-2.434 (2.924)	-3.854** (1.949)	-3.365** (1.511)
Observations	108562	108562	108562	108562
Municipalities	231	231	231	231
Mean of outcome	109.185	29.355	15.855	8.027

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth-month fixed effects, and controls for age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

The differences in results between drugs and admissions in Table 4 may stem from hospitalizations capturing more severe health events than health conditions captured by drugs, which are typically prescribed in primary care.

6.3 Heterogenous effects

The characteristics of the parents may be associated with different drinking patterns, as well as with different responsiveness to the screening and treatment. Parental characteristics may thus affect the impact of the program. Table 5 shows the results when the sample is split along socio-economic status. Panel A shows results for drug prescriptions and Panel B for hospital admittance. First we split the sample according to the mother's educational level. The results presented in columns 1 and 2 suggest that the effect of the program do not differ between mothers with a university degree and mothers without a higher education. For drug prescriptions the estimate is slightly larger for mothers with university education but the difference is not statistically different. For hospitalization the estimates for both groups are negative but less precisely estimated and not statistically significant for any of the groups.

In columns 3 and 4, the sample is split according to the mother's income level. For drugs we find no difference in effects between mothers with an income below the 20th percentile of Swedish women and mothers with higher incomes. However, for

hospitalizations we find that the program mainly affects low income mothers. The results suggest that children of low income mothers have 2.8 percentage points lower probability of being admitted as a results of the program, while the estimate for children to mothers with higher incomes is close to zero and not statistically significant. We find similar results for fathers' income; for drug prescriptions there is no heterogeneity across fathers, but for hospital admissions again the effect of the program is accounted for by children of fathers with low income (See Table A3 in Appendix A).

In the last two columns the sample is split by the mother's age, and also here the two health measures show different patterns. The effect on drug prescriptions is more than twice as large for mothers above, compared to mothers below, the age of 30 (p-value of the difference is 0.097). For hospital admissions, on the other hand, the estimated effect of the program is larger for children of young mothers and significant at the 10-percent level, but not statistically different from the effect of the program on children of older mothers.

An explanation for this pattern may be that children admitted to hospital are in poorer health than children being prescribed a drug. The different results across outcomes could therefore pick-up different health status and health seeking behaviors across socio-economic groups, where low income (and younger) families are more inclined to seek hospital care for their children while pharmaceutical drugs prescriptions is the affected margin for children of older mothers. Similarly, we also find that effects on prescriptions are larger in municipalities where alcohol sales are below average (See Table A4 in Appendix A).²³

²³ In Table A4 in Appendix A we find no heterogeneity, either for prescriptions or admissions, across municipalities with AUDIT scores above and below the median. Similarly we find no differences for the effect on admissions between municipalities where alcohol sales are above and below the median.

Table 5. Effects of the program on drug prescription and hospital admission during the first year of life: By socio-economic background

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A: Drug prescription (per cent)						
Program	-0.038** (0.015)	-0.055** (0.021)	-0.038** (0.017)	-0.047** (0.018)	-0.032** (0.014)	-0.070*** (0.024)
Sample	No University	University	Below inc at P20	Above inc at P20	Below age 30	Above age 30
P-value difference	0.479		0.673		0.097	
Observations	40378	32312	40149	32541	49138	23552
Municipalities	231	231	231	231	231	231
Mean of outcome	0.521	0.495	0.507	0.514	0.522	0.485
Panel B: Hospital admissions (per thousand)						
Program	-11.625 (9.598)	-17.621 (11.711)	-28.271*** (9.373)	1.477 (11.755)	-15.366* (8.994)	-10.232 (14.318)
Sample	No University	University	Below inc at P20	Above inc at P20	Below age 30	Above age 30
P-value difference	0.651		0.010		0.735	
Observations	61858	46704	59764	48798	73596	34966
Municipalities	231	231	231	231	231	231
Mean of outcome	198.14	175.15	195.30	179.60	187.09	190.84

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth month fixed effects, and controls for whether parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. Columns 1, 2, 5 and 6 also control for age of mother and father * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

6.4 Sex differences

Earlier studies have shown that harsh conditions, such as maternal stress, malnutrition and alcohol consumption, in particular in early gestation (up to the 5th months) are likely to be more detrimental for boy fetuses with consequences for the sex-ratio at birth and worse outcomes for boys (e.g. Valente 2015; Almond and Currie, 2011; Nilsson, 2015).

In Table 6 we therefore explore effects of the program on sex-differences in health and on the sex-ratio at birth. In columns 1-4 we report separate effects, on drug prescriptions and admissions during the first year of life, for boys and girls. The results show no sex-differences: for prescriptions the estimates are similar for boys and girls; for hospital admissions the point estimates are larger for boys, but in neither case are the differences statistically significant. In column 5 the baseline model is estimated on an indicator for sex of the child (taking the value 1 if the child is a boy). We find no evidence that the program affects the sex-ratio.

Given that the intervention takes place sometime towards the end of the first trimester, this is to be expected. This result reflects that the health effects of the program are more likely to stem from reductions in alcohol consumption later in the pregnancy or after birth. The results are also consistent with the interpretation that that our effects on health stem from reductions in moderate consumption.

Table 6. Gender differences in effects of the program

	Drug prescription (percent) first year of life		Hospital admissions (per thousand) first year of life		Share boys
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Program	-0.042** (0.018)	-0.049*** (0.014)	-17.469 (10.938)	-9.961 (9.512)	-0.008 (0.009)
Sample	Boy	Girl	Boy	Girl	All
P-value difference	0.663		0.545		
Observations	37512	35178	55994	52568	108562
Municipalities	231	231	231	231	231
Mean of outcome	0.544	0.474	205.080	170.427	0.516

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth-month fixed effects, and controls for age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita. Columns 1-4 also include the sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

6.5 Socio-economic outcomes of parents

The objective of the Swedish maternity care system is to monitor the health of the mother and of the fetus during pregnancies; to prepare parents for parenthood; and to discover and help parents in need of special support. Health education is an important aspect of prenatal care and focuses mainly on lifestyle changes during pregnancy. Even if the main focus is on the child, the parents are likely to be affected. As the evidence on avoidable hospital admissions and injuries (in Section 6.2) suggests that the program induces behavioral change beyond the pregnancy, the program may thus also have longer run consequences for the health and welfare of parents.

In Table 7 we therefore analyze effects on socio-economic outcomes such as family stability and the likelihood of receiving social assistance (SA). Social assistance is strictly means tested at the household level and conditional on the recipient household having no alternative sources of income or assets to sell in order support themselves. The result in column 1 shows no effects of the program on family stability; that is, the probability of the mother and father living together the year after the child is born is not affected by the program. In column 2-5 we assess if the program affects the likelihood of the parents receiving any social assistance during the calendar year after the pregnancy; even if one of the parents is on parental leave, a family can receive social assistance if the money does not last a full month until the next parental benefit payment. The result in column 2 suggests that being subjected to the program reduced the probability of mothers being social assistance recipients with 0.8 percentage points, which corresponds to a 14 percent reduction at the mean. This result is robust to controlling for social assistance the year before the pregnancy in column 3. For fathers,

we also find negative point estimates; the effect becomes significant in column 5 when controlling for fathers social assistance before the pregnancy. In order to corroborate the results on social assistance we (in columns 6-7) estimate the impact of the program on the likelihood of receiving social assistance pre-pregnancy. The point estimates are positive and insignificant in this placebo analysis.

Table 7. Effects of the program on the probability of the parents living together and on being a social assistance recipient the first year after the child is born

	Cohabiting	SA recipient year after pregnancy				SA recip. year before pregnancy	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Program	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.008** (0.004)	-0.009** (0.003)	-0.004 (0.004)	-0.008** (0.003)	0.004 (0.004)	0.005 (0.004)
SA recipient before pregnancy			0.248*** (0.008)		0.345*** (0.007)		
Sample	All	Mother	Mother	Father	Father	Mother	Father
Observations	103649	103649	99217	103482	101333	99477	101715
Municipalities	231	231	231	231	231	231	231
Mean of outcome	0.089	0.057		0.045		0.053	0.054

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth-month fixed effects, and controls for age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

We also analyze if there is any direct effects on mothers health. The results presented in Table A5 in Appendix A show no effect of the program on drug prescriptions to mothers' or on hospitalizations during the first year after giving birth, but show suggestive evidence (significant at 10 percent) that hospitalizations in the longer run is reduced. For fathers there is no effect of our health outcomes (See Table A6 in Appendix A).

6.6 Robustness of results

We have done several tests to check the robustness of the results with respect to sampling restrictions and the identifying assumptions.

In Table 8 we analyze the sensitivity of the estimates to the restrictions made on the sample: the exclusion of municipalities with multiple antenatal clinics which implemented the program in different years and the exclusion of the implementation year. Including children for whom there is uncertainty whether their mothers are treated or not dilutes our treatment indicator and increases the measurement error and should weaken the result. Columns 1 and 4 display our main result from Table 3. In columns 2 and 5 we include municipalities with multiple clinics where the year of introduction

varies across antenatal clinics within the municipality: these municipalities are defined as treated when the largest clinic in the municipality introduces the program. Adding these municipalities lowers the estimates but they are still statistically significant. Next we instead include the years when the program was introduced. The results in columns 4 and 6 shows that including these years also weakens the effect: the point estimate on prescribed drugs is smaller and still statistically significant (10 percent level), but the estimate on admittance to hospital is no longer statistically significant. While weakening the results, the underlying pattern stays the same when relaxing these sample restrictions.

Table 8. Effects of the program on drug prescription and hospital admission during the first year of life: Different sampling restrictions

	Drug prescription (per cent)			Hospital admissions (per thousand)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Program	-0.043*** (0.014)	-0.023** (0.010)	-0.020* (0.011)	-14.219* (8.256)	-11.697* (7.046)	-5.258 (5.460)
Conflict info	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Impl year	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	72690	145645	91653	108562	221259	130594
Municipalities	231	273	231	231	273	231
Mean of outcome	0.510	0.495	0.512	188.300	172.340	188.696

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth-month fixed effects, and controls for age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

An important assumption for the identification strategy in this study is the parallel trends assumption. The concern is that municipalities which implement the program early have a negative trend in hospitalization and drug use among infants giving rise to a negative estimate of the program. A typical way to assess this assumption is to analyze the pattern of pre-effects where treatment is characterized in event—rather than calendar—time. In our setting where the implementation is mainly centered to a few years, the pre-effects become relatively noisy when moving away from the implementation year as they are identified on a limited set of late implementers. Similarly, the precision of the estimated treatment-effects also becomes noisy if allowing for dynamic effects in the post treatment period. In Table 9 we therefore estimate a model where the impact of the program is captured with our standard post-treatment parameter, but where we let the year before implementation serve as a reference point (i.e. captured by the constant) and allow for a separate parameter to

capture pre-treatment outcomes *two years before implementation and earlier*. If the pre-treatment effect is positive our results may be due to a trend, if it is negative it suggests that the year before treatment may be different. For prescription drugs, in column 1, we find the estimated treatment parameter to be of the same size as in our baseline results (in Table 3). We also find pre-treatment outcomes two years before implementation and earlier to be substantially lower than the treatment-effect but still more negative than the year before implementation and marginally significant. It needs to be pointed out that estimates away from the implementation year are based on an imbalanced sample of municipalities, because data availability on drug prescriptions is limited to the post 2005-period. Hence, some caution is warranted when interpreting the effect sizes for drug prescriptions. For hospital admissions, in column 2, we again find a treatment-effect of the same order of magnitude as in the baseline results (in Table 3), while the parameter for pre-treatment outcomes two years before implementation and earlier is positive but insignificant. It is worth noting that the sample period for this analysis is longer. These results are largely consistent with the parallel trends assumption, even if they are not conclusive for drug prescriptions where the sample period is restrictive.

We also assess the parallel trends assumption by re-estimating our baseline model for infant hospitalization using admissions during the first year of life for children born 6 years earlier in the same municipality as the outcome.²⁴ The results from this placebo analysis using the population of first-born children born between 1997 and 2002 are presented in column 3 of Table 9. The estimate is not significant, and of opposite sign to those in the main analysis; i.e. consistent with the parallel trends assumption being fulfilled. A drawback with this placebo is that children in this sample are born six years prior to those in the main analysis, which may make them less comparable. Still, the small and not significant point estimate in Table 8 is reassuring.

²⁴ This placebo is not possible for drug prescriptions since the drug data is only available from 2005.

Table 9. Effects of the program on drug prescription and hospital admission during the first year of life: Pre-effects and placebo

	Drug prescription (per cent)	Hospital admissions (per thousand)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Program	-0.0398*** (0.0133)	-14.75* (8.165)	2.143 (9.339)
Program t-2 and earlier	-0.0175* (0.00934)	4.493 (6.707)	
Sample			first-born children 1997-2002
Observations	72,724	108562	93052
Municipalities	232	231	231
Mean of outcome	0.510	188.300	191.251

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth-month fixed effects, and controls for age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

Another part of the parallel trends assumption is that the timing of implementation of the screening program must be exogenous. As mentioned, the reason for the staggered implementation across the country was time restrictions in the training of midwives. To confirm that the timing of the implementation is not related to the initial alcohol related health situation in the municipality, we have estimated the relation between alcohol related hospitalizations of women in the ages 20-39 in each municipality in 2003 and an indicator for the municipality being an early implementer (=1 if implementing before 2007 and 0 otherwise) as outcome, also including county-fixed effects. As shown in column 1 of Table 10 we find no such relationship, thus suggesting that the implementation among municipalities within a county is not related to the initial alcohol related health among women of childbearing age. Similarly, in columns 2-5 we correlate municipal averages of parental characteristics in 2003 to the timing of implementation. We only find that the age of the father is statistically significant (10 percent level) and weakly related to implementation; more specifically, municipalities with a one standard deviation older fathers, compared to the mean, are about 4 percent more likely to implement the program 2007 or later.

Based on results from an events-study approach, a placebo analysis of a previous time period and on an analysis where we attempt to predict the timing of implementation, our over all assessment is that the data supports a causal interpretation of our results. Some caution is warranted as regards the results for drug prescriptions since data availability restricts our ability to draw firm conclusions.

Table 10. Relation between timing of implementation and municipal characteristics (2003)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Alcohol related hospitalizations	0.027 (0.026)				
Average age of mothers		-0.036 (0.027)			
Average age of fathers			-0.050* (0.029)		
Share of mothers with uni. degree				-0.304 (0.294)	
Share of immigrant mothers					-0.502 (0.475)
Mean of outcome	1.581	27.908	31.197	0.386	0.135
Standard deviation	0.843	1.083	0.892	0.096	0.064
Observations	188	231	231	231	231

Note: The outcome is an indicator of the timing of implementation (=1 if implementing before 2007 and 0 otherwise). All models include fixed county effects. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

7 Effects of the program on pregnant women's behavior using survey data

The results found so far suggest that introducing screening and BI for alcohol at the antenatal clinics affect child health and maternal behaviors, and that the effects extend beyond the birth of the child. To further understand these behavioral changes we explore additional information from survey data covering the years 2003-2008 for women registered at antenatal clinics. The data is collected by midwives and include information on behaviors which should be important for child health such as smoking before and during pregnancy and whether the mother breastfed the child 4 weeks after birth, as well as some information on whether the pregnancy ended in a miscarriage. This is the same data as used in Section 5.4, but for the 2003-2008 period we use here the registration practices were less developed, so the data suffers from some misreporting and problems with missing data (coverage varies across questions).

As discussed in section 5.4, women with high AUDIT scores are more likely to smoke. Smoking may be connected to alcohol consumption for at least two reasons. First, smoking is culturally associated with alcohol and more socially accepted when drinking. Second, women who are unable to stop smoking when pregnant may also find it difficult to stop drinking alcohol. Thus, studying the effect of the intervention on smoking behavior may be informative of changes in alcohol consumption. It should also be noted that the motivational interviewing technique probably does not only affect how

midwives are able to motivate reductions in risky alcohol consumption, but also other behaviors which have adverse effects on the child, such as smoking.

This survey data allows us to link women to the antenatal clinic they are registered at. We can thus estimate the effect of the program using the staggered implementation of the program across clinics. In other words, we use the same difference-in-difference approach as in previous analyses but at clinic level. To this end we merge the clinic level data on whether the clinic uses the program, with the survey data on pregnant women. As in the previous study we remove the year when the program was introduced since it is not clear who was screened. Women are considered treated if they are registered at a clinic which has implemented program. We do not capture all women as not all clinics report information to the Maternity Health Care Register. The data, nevertheless cover a substantial fraction of first time mothers; for example, in 2007 the survey data include 77 percent of all births in Sweden.

For this clinic level analysis the empirical model is given by:

$$y_{iact} = \alpha + \beta Treatment_{at} + \gamma_a + \eta_{ct} + \mathbf{K}_{kt}\lambda + \varepsilon_{iact}, \quad (2)$$

where y_{iact} is the outcome of child/mother i at antenatal clinic a in county c in year t . Similar to the previous analysis, we control for η_{ct} a vector of county specific time effect and γ_a being a vector of antenatal clinic fixed effects. The variations between clinics within a county identify the effect. We also include municipal unemployment level and municipal alcohol sales per capita in the regression to control for time-varying differences in municipal characteristics, \mathbf{K}_{kt} . However, as we are not able to link the individual level survey data to population registers, we are unable to control for background characteristics of the parents and the birth month of the child. According to the instruction to the midwives, the data should however be registered on the year the child is born. As in the previous analyses we exclude the year of introduction of the treatment since we do not know when during the year the program was implemented. Again, the coefficient of interest is β , which is the estimate of the treatment effect. Standard errors are clustered at the clinic level. We focus on women pregnant with their first child and singleton births only.

Using the survey data we construct an indicator of whether the pregnant woman smoked at registration in week 8-12 but not in week 32 (*quit smoking*) and a variable indicating whether she began smoking in the same time period (*start smoking*). We also study whether the child was breastfed fully or partially 4 weeks post birth and whether the birth ended in a *miscarriage*. The number of observations differs across variables since, not all of the questions are reported for all women. If the program affected behavior in a positive direction we expect smoking to decrease and the likelihood of breastfeeding to increase. However, we do not expect miscarriages to be affected as the program is unlikely to affect outcomes related to early alcohol exposure.

The identification strategy hinges on the assumption that implementation of structured screening and BI was not determined by infant health and maternal alcohol consumption, or that pregnant women systematically choose clinic based on screening practices. This last point could potentially be a greater problem when studying clinics rather than municipalities, since it is easier to select a specific type of clinic if there are several to choose from. To test whether the registered pregnant women at the clinics implementing structured screening were different we study whether women were more likely to smoke at the first visit at the antenatal clinics or more likely to have quit smoking before the first visit, ie. outcomes that are predetermined.

The first column in Table 11 shows that the program induced more women to cease smoking. The probability to quit smoking between registration and week 32 is increased by 0.6 percentage points, corresponding to 25 percent at the mean. Since 7.5 percent of the women smoked at registration, this implies an 8 percent decrease in smoking. Very few pregnant women take up smoking during pregnancy; in column 2 we see that the share who do is reduced by 0.02 percentage points. This implies a reduction by 45 percent. The results are also suggestive of a positive effect on the likelihood of breastfeeding, even if the point estimate does not reach statistical significance (P-value=0.123). There are no statistically significant effects on miscarriages in column 4. And in the last two columns we see that women registered at clinics which implemented the program do not differ from women registering at clinics without the program in the

sense that they were as likely to smoke or have stopped smoking before the initial visit at the clinic.²⁵

Table 11. Effects of the program on maternal behavior and child health indicators using survey data

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Quit smoking between registration and week 32	Start smoking between registration and week 32	Breast-feed at 1 month	Mis- carriage	Smoke at registration	Quit smoking between 3 months before pregnancy
Program	0.006* (0.003)	-0.002** (0.001)	0.010 (0.006)	-0.001 (0.001)	0.005 (0.004)	-0.010 (0.006)
Observations	132,135	132,135	116,372	133,860	134,077	133,938
Mean of outcome	.023900	.004458	.88880	.005409	.074837	.113127

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at clinic level. All models include clinic and county-year fixed effects, and controls for municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

These results give further support to the notion that the program affects a wider range of maternal behavior than just alcohol consumption. However, we cannot determine if the effects on smoking cessation (or not starting to smoke) and breastfeeding are spillovers from effects of screening and BI related to alcohol, or to what extent midwives have utilized their MI training also in other domains.

8 Conclusion

Most expecting women are aware that excessive alcohol consumption during pregnancy can be harmful for the child. But changing consumption patterns with a shift towards more daily drinking habits (Göransson, 2003, 2004) and an increased questioning of the recommendations to completely abstain from alcohol during pregnancy (Oster, 2013), raises concerns for increased alcohol exposure in utero.

Hence, identifying effective methods for preventing harmful alcohol consumption is of importance for policies aimed at improving health and development of children. In this paper we study the introduction of a screening and brief alcohol intervention program at Swedish antenatal clinics. Within the program midwives screen pregnant

²⁵ The population used in this section differs somewhat to the population used in the analysis in Section 6. To compare the results we restrict the population to the same clinics as in the previous analysis and weight the regression with the number of firstborn births in the municipality that year, see Table A7 in Appendix A. The results show a qualitatively similar pattern from smoking, albeit somewhat stronger. In this sample there is also a positive effect of screening on breastfeeding.

women for alcohol in gestation week 8-12 with the AUDIT instrument; use MI-techniques to induce behavioral change; remit women—if necessary—to other health care professionals or to the social services. By exploiting the staggered implementation of the program across municipalities we are able to identify causal effects of the program on infant health.

We find that introducing screening and brief intervention for alcohol in antenatal care improves infant health. The program lowers the probability that a child is prescribed a pharmaceutical drug during the first year of life by 8.4 percent relative to the population average, and lowers the probability that children are admitted to hospital during their first year of life by 7.5 percent. We find no evidence that effects on drug prescriptions and hospitalizations extend after the first year of life. While the program reduces the likelihood that infants of low income (and young) mothers are hospitalized, the program reduces the likelihood that infants of older mothers are prescribed drugs. This may reflect age differences in maternal alcohol consumption behavior, with more bingeing among younger low income mothers and therefore that screening had impact on more severe conditions that lead to hospitalizations. At the same time this result could reflect differences in health seeking behavior, where older women may be more likely to consult primary care at an earlier stage. Effects on hospitalization are mainly driven by reductions in inpatient care due to injuries and avoidable conditions. This suggests that behavioral changes caused by the program extend beyond the birth of the child through an improved home environment. The reductions in drug prescriptions are mainly related to infections, which would suggest that the impact of screening may also run through improved fetal conditions throughout the pregnancy. Still it is difficult to rule out that this also stem from improved care and attention after birth. We also find that the program reduced social assistance dependency. Moreover we find that the program reduced smoking. The results suggest, overall, that the program led to behavioral changes among treated mothers and that these effects persist after the birth of the child.

Are the results a consequence of reduced alcohol intake during and after pregnancy? This can unfortunately not be answered with certainty. It is possible that the effects shown in the various indicators of children's health are a result of reduced drinking both during and after pregnancy. But it is also possible that midwives' training in MI gives

them tools to promote a healthy lifestyle more broadly. Smoking and alcohol consumption are often related, and if smoking has decreased then it is likely that also alcohol consumption is reduced.

Our results are important from a policy perspective. Whatever the exact mechanisms underlying the improvements in children's health, the effects of the program have been beneficial. Poor health due to fetal and early childhood alcohol exposure is preventable and screening and BI are shown to be an effective instrument to modify maternal behavior.

References

- Abel, E.L. (1984). "Prenatal effects of alcohol." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 14(1): 1-10.
- Abel, E.L. and J.H. Hannigan (1995). "j-shaped relationship between drinking during pregnancy and birth weight: reanalysis of prospective epidemiological data." *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 30(3): 345-355.
- Abel, E.L. and R.J. Sokol (1987). "Incidence of fetal alcohol syndrome and economic impact of FAS-related anomalies." *Drug and alcohol dependence* 19(1): 51-70.
- Almond, D. (2006). "Is the 1918 influenza pandemic over? long-term effects of in utero influenza exposure in the post-1940 us population." *Journal of political Economy* 114(4): 672-712.
- Almond, D. and B. Mazumder (2011). "Health capital and the prenatal environment: the effect of Ramadan observance during pregnancy." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economic* 3(4): 56-85.
- Almond, D. and J. Currie (2011). "Killing me softly: The fetal origins hypothesis." *Journal of economic perspectives* 25(3): 153-173.
- Almond, D., L. Edlund and M. Palme (2009). "Chernobyl's subclinical legacy: Prenatal exposure to radioactive fallout and school outcomes in Sweden." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124(4): 1729-1772.
- Babor, T.F., J.C. Higgins-Biddle, J.B. Saunders and M.G. Monteiro (2001). *Audit: The alcohol use disorders identification. Test guidelines for use in primary care* (second edition). Geneva: World Health Organization Department of Mental Health and Substance Dependence.
- Barker, D.J. (1990). "The fetal and infant origins of adult disease." *British Medical Journal* 301(6761): 1111.
- Barreca, A. and E. Page (2013). "A pint for a pound? reevaluating the relationship between minimum drinking age laws and birth outcomes." Department of Economics Working Paper 1220. New Orleans: Tulane University.

- Barry, K.L., R. Caetano, G. Chang, M.C. DeJoseph, L.A. Miller, M.J. O'Connor and S. Dolina (2009). "Reducing alcohol-exposed pregnancies: A report of the national task force on fetal alcohol syndrome and fetal alcohol effect." Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Bergman, H. and H. Källmén (2003). "Swedish women have developed more risky and more harmful alcohol drinking habits. A survey of alcohol drinking changes among Swedes between 1997-2001." *Läkartidningen* 100(12): 1028-30.
- Bharadwaj, P., J.V. Johnsen and K.V Löken (2014). "Smoking bans, maternal smoking and birth outcomes." *Journal of Public economics* 115(July): 72-93.
- Black, S.E., A. Bütikofer, P.J. Devereux and K.G. Salvanes (2013). "This is only a test? Longrun impacts of prenatal exposure to radioactive fallout." Working Paper 18987. Boston: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Burd L, D. Roberts, M. Olson and H. Odendaal (2007). "Ethanol and the placenta: A review", *Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine* 20(5):361-75.
- Burns, E., R. Gray and L.A. Smith (2010). "Brief screening questionnaires to identify problem drinking during pregnancy: a systematic review." *Addiction* 105(4): 601-614.
- Catalano, R., T. Bruckner, and K.R. Smith (2008). "Ambient temperature predicts sex ratios and male longevity." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105(6): 2244-2247.
- Chay, K.Y. and M. Greenstone (2003). "The impact of air pollution on infant mortality: Evidence from geographic variation in pollution shocks induced by a recession." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118(3): 1121-1167.
- Clarke, M.E. and W.B. Gibbard (2003). "Overview of fetal alcohol spectrum disorders for mental health professionals." *Canadian child and adolescent psychiatry review* 12(3): 57.
- Coles, C. (1994). "Critical periods for prenatal alcohol exposure: Evidence from animal and human studies." *Alcohol Research and Health* 18(1): 22.

- Crawford-Williams F, A. Fielder, A. Mikocka-Walus and A. Esterman (2015) "A critical review of public health interventions aimed at reducing alcohol consumption and/or increasing knowledge among pregnant women" *Drug and alcohol review* 34(2): 154-161.
- Cunha, F. and J. Heckman (2007). "The technology of skill formation." Working Paper 12840. Boston: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Currie, J. and M. Rossin-Slater (2013). "Weathering the storm: Hurricanes and birth outcomes." *Journal of health economics* 32(3): 487-503.
- Currie, J. and R. Walker (2011). "Traffic congestion and infant health: Evidence from e-zpass." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 3(1): 65-90.
- Currie, J., M. Greenstone and E. Moretti (2011). "Superfund cleanups and infant health." *American economic review* 101(3): 435-441.
- Currie, J., M. Neidell and J.F. Schmieder (2009). "Air pollution and infant health: Lessons from new jersey." *Journal of health economics* 28(3): 688-703.
- Cutler, D.M., A. Lleras-Muney and T. Vogl (2008). "Socioeconomic status and health: dimensions and mechanisms." Working Paper 14333. Boston: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Damström Thakker, K. (2011), "Det är tack vare Riskbruksprojektet som vi på vår mottagning kunnat utvecklas ... Summering och utvärdering av Mödrahälsovårdens delprojekt inom Stockholms läns landstings Riskbruksprojekt åren 2006–2010" Rapport 2011:20. Stockholm: Karolinska Institutet, Institutionen för folkhälsovetenskap, Avdelningen för tillämpat folkhälsoarbete.
- Doblhammer, G., G.J. van den Berg and L.H. Lumey (2011). "Long-term effects of famine on life expectancy: a re-analysis of the great finnish famine of 1866-1868." Discussion Papers 5534. Bonn: IZA.
- Fertig, A.R. and T. Watson (2009). "Minimum drinking age laws and infant health outcomes." *Journal of Health Economics* 28(3): 737-747.
- Folkhälsoinstitutet (2010) "Alkoholfrågor i vardaglig hälso- och sjukvård: Riskbruksprojektet – bakgrund, strategi och resultat." Östersund.

- Folkhälsoinstitutet (2014). "Alkoholfri graviditet: Kvalitetssäkring av arbetet inom mödrahälsovården." Östersund.
- Gauthier, T. W. (2015). "Prenatal Alcohol Exposure and the Developing Immune System", *Alcohol Research Current Reviews* 37(2): 279–285.
- Gilinsky A, V. Swanson and K. Power (2011). "Interventions delivered during antenatal care to reduce alcohol consumption during pregnancy: A systematic review." *Addiction Research & Theory* 19(3): 235-250.
- Göransson, M., A. Magnusson, H. Bergman, U. Rydberg and M. Heilig (2003). "Fetus at risk: prevalence of alcohol consumption during pregnancy estimated with a simple screening method in Swedish antenatal clinics." *Addiction* 98(11): 1513-1520.
- Göransson, M., E. Faxelid and M. Heilig (2004). "Beliefs and reality: detection and prevention of high alcohol consumption in Swedish antenatal clinics." *Acta obstetricia et gynecologica Scandinavica* 83(9): 796-800.
- Gray, R. and J. Henderson (2006). "Review of the fetal effects of prenatal alcohol exposure." Report to the Department of Health. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Guerri, C. (2002). "Mechanisms involved in central nervous system dysfunctions induced by prenatal ethanol exposure." *Neurotoxicity research* 4(4): 327-335.
- Handmaker N.S. and P. Wilbourne (2001) "Motivational interventions in prenatal clinics." *Alcohol Research and Health* 25(3): 219-229.
- Jones, K. and D. Smith (1973). "Recognition of the fetal alcohol syndrome in early infancy." *The Lancet* 302:(7836): 999-1001.
- Jones, K., D. Smith, C. Ulleland and A. Streissguth (1973). "Pattern of malformation in offspring of chronic alcoholic mothers." *The Lancet* 301(7815): 1267-1271.
- Lindeboom, M., F. Portrait and G.J. Van den Berg (2010). "Long-run effects on longevity of a nutritional shock early in life: the dutch potato famine of 1846-1847." *Journal of health economics* 29(5): 617-629.
- Lindo, J.M. (2011). "Parental job loss and infant health." *Journal of Health Economics* 30(5): 869-879.

- Maternity Health Care Register (2010). "Annual report 2010, maternity health register." Stockholm.
- McBride, W.G. (1961). "Thalidomide and congenital abnormalities." *Lancet* 278(7216): 1358.
- Miller, W.R. (1983) "Motivational Interviewing with Problem Drinkers," *Behavioural Psychotherapy* 11(2): 147-172.
- Miller, W.R., and S. Rollnick (1991). *Motivational interviewing: Preparing people for change*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Mörk, E., H. Svalery, and A. Sjögren (2014). *Hellre rik och frisk: Om familjebakgrund och barns hälsa*. Stockholm: SNS förlag.
- NICE (2014). "Information for the public: Routine antenatal care for healthy pregnant women." London.
- Nilsen P., S. Wåhlin and N. Heather (2011). "Implementing Brief Interventions in Health Care: Lessons Learned from the Swedish Risk Drinking Project" *International journal of environmental research and public health* 8(9): 3609-3627.
- Nilsen, P., J. Skagerström, M. Rahmqvist, E. Hultgren and M. Blomberg (2012). "Alcohol prevention in Swedish antenatal care: effectiveness and perceptions of the Risk Drinking project counseling model", *Acta obstetricia et gynecologica Scandinavica*, 91(6): 736-743.
- Nilsson, P. (2015). "Alcohol availability, prenatal conditions, and long-term economic outcomes." *Journal of Political Economy*. Forthcoming.
- O'Donnell A., P. Anderson, D. Newbury-Birch, B. Schulte, C. Schmidt, J. Reimer and E. Kaner (2014) "The Impact of Brief Alcohol Interventions in Primary Healthcare: A Systematic Review of Reviews." *Alcohol and Alcoholism*, 49(1): 66-78.
- Oster, E. (2013). *Expecting better: why the conventional pregnancy wisdom is wrong and what you really need to know*. Penguin Books, New York.
- Page, A., Ambrose, S., Glover, J. and D. Hetzel (2007) "Atlas of Avoidable Hospitalisations in Australia: ambulatory care-sensitive conditions." Adelaide: The University of Adelaide, Public Health Information Development Unit.

- Polygenis, D., S. Wharton, C. Malmberg, N. Sherman, D. Kennedy, G. Koren and T.R. Einarson (1998). "Moderate alcohol consumption during pregnancy and the incidence of fetal malformations: a meta-analysis." *Neurotoxicology and teratology* 20(1): 61-67.
- Reinert, D.F. and J.P. Allen (2007). "The alcohol use disorders identification test: an update of research findings." *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 31(2): 185-199.
- Riley, E.P. and C.L. McGee (2005). "Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders: an overview with emphasis on changes in brain and behavior." *Experimental biology and medicine* 230(6): 357-365.
- Rubak, S., A. Sandbæk, T. Lauritzen and B. Christensen (2004) "Motivational interviewing: a systematic review and meta-analysis." *British Journal of General Practice* 55(513): 305-312.
- Saunders, J.B., O.G. Aasland, T.F. Babor, J.R. de la Fuente, and M. Grant (1993). "Development of the alcohol use disorders identification test (AUDIT): WHO collaborative project on early detection of persons with harmful alcohol consumption." *Addiction* 88(6): 791-804.
- Sexton, M. and J.R. Hebel (1984). "A clinical trial of change in maternal smoking and its effect on birth weight." *Jama* 251(7): 911-915.
- Socialstyrelsen (1979). "Mödra- och barnhälsovård: Förslag till principprogram (maternity care and child health care: Proposal for a programme principle)." Socialstyrelsen redovisar 1974:4. Stockholm.
- Socialstyrelsen (1981). "Hälsovård för mödrar och barn inom primärvården." Socialstyrelsens allmänna råd 1981:4. Stockholm.
- Socialstyrelsen (2005). "Folkhälsorapport 2005." Stockholm.
- Socialstyrelsen (2008). "En utvärdering av alkoholförebyggande insatser inom hälso- och sjukvården 2006-2007." Stockholm.
- Socialstyrelsen (2009). "Mödrahälsovårdens metoder för att förebygga psykisk ohälsa hos barn." Stockholm.

- Socialstyrelsen (2011). "Ojämna villkor för hälsa och vård, jämlikhetsperspektiv på hälso- och sjukvården." Stockholm.
- Sokol, R.J., V. Delaney-Black and B. Nordstrom (2003). "Fetal alcohol spectrum disorder." *Jama* 290(22): 2996-2999.
- Streissguth, A.P., H.M. Barr, P.D. Sampson and F.L. Bookstein (1994). "Prenatal alcohol and offspring development: the first fourteen years." *Drug and alcohol dependence* 36(2): 89-99.
- Streissguth, A., H. Barr, J. Kogan and F. Bookstein (1996). "Understanding the occurrence of secondary disabilities in clients with fetal alcohol syndrome (fas) and fetal alcohol effects (fae)." Final report to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 96-06. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Valente, C. (2015). "Civil conflict, gender-specific fetal loss, and selection: A new test of the trivers-willard hypothesis." *Journal of health economics* 39: 31-50.
- van den Berg, G.J., G. Doblhammer-Reiter and K. Christensen (2011). "Being born under adverse economic conditions leads to a higher cardiovascular mortality rate later in life: Evidence based on individuals born at different stages of the business cycle." *Demography* 48(2): 507-530.
- van den Berg, G.J., M. Lindeboom, and F. Portrait (2006). "Economic conditions early in life and individual mortality." *American Economic Review* 96(1): 290-302.
- Västra Götalandsregionen (2008). "Handlingsprogram alkoholförebyggande arbete under graviditet och i småbarnsfamiljer vid familjecentraler, mhv och bhv i skaraborg."
- von Hinke Kessler Scholder, S., G.L. Wehby, S. Lewis and L. Zuccolo (2014). "Alcohol exposure in utero and child academic achievement." *Economic Journal* 124(576): 634-667.
- von Lenz, W. and K. Knapp (1962). "Die thalidomide-embryopathie." *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift* 87(24): 1232-1242.
- West, J.R. and C.A. Blake (2005). "Fetal alcohol syndrome: an assessment of the field." *Experimental Biology and Medicine* 230(6): 354-356.

Wüst, M. (2010). "The effect of cigarette and alcohol consumption on birth outcomes." Department of Economics Working Paper 10-05. Aarhus: Aarhus School of Business.

Young, M.M., A. Stevens, J. Galipeau, T. Pirie, C. Garritty, K. Singh, ... and A. Porath-Waller (2014). "Effectiveness of brief interventions as part of the Screening, Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) model for reducing the nonmedical use of psychoactive substances: a systematic review." *Systematic reviews* 3(1): 1.

Zhang, N. (2010). "Alcohol taxes and birth outcomes." *International journal of environmental research and public health* 7(5): 1901-1912.

Appendix A

Table A1. ICD and ATC codes

Hospital admission	International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problem, ICD 10
Certain conditions originating in the perinatal period	=1 if admitted to hospital with code P00-P96
Eye and Ear conditions, and Diseases of the respiratory system	=1 if admitted to hospital with code J00-J99, H00-H95
Avoidable Conditions	=1 if admitted to hospital with code D50, E10-E11, E13-E14, E86 G40-G41, H66-H67, H66-H67, I11, I20, I29, I50, J02-J03, J06,J43-J47, K24, K26-K28, K52, N10-N12, N70, N73-N74, O15, R56
Injury, poisoning and certain other consequences of external causes	=1 if admitted to hospital with code S00-T98
Drug prescription	Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical Classification, ATC
Respiratory system	=1 if prescribed a pharmaceuticals in chapter R
Antiinfectives	=1 if prescribed a pharmaceuticals in chapter J

Table A2. Effects of the program on drug prescription and hospital admission during the first year of life excluding events within one month after birth

	Drug prescription (per cent)		Hospital admissions (per thousand)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Program	-0.045*** (0.015)	-0.041*** (0.014)	-10.099** (4.928)	-9.198* (4.980)
Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes
Observations	72690	72690	108562	108562
Municipalities	231	231	231	231
Mean of outcome	0.495		86.752	

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth month fixed effects. Control variables include age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

Table A3. Effects of the program on drug prescription and hospital admission during the first year of life: By fathers' level of income

	Drug prescription (per cent)		Hospital admissions (per thousand)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Program	-0.040** (0.017)	-0.041** (0.020)	-32.084*** (10.962)	5.624 (10.933)
Sample	Below inc at P20	Above inc at P20	Below inc at P20	Above inc at P20
P-value difference	0.955		0.005	
Observations	38845	33845	57853	50709
Municipalities	231	230	231	231
Mean of outcome	0.511	0.508	193.923	182.106

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth-month fixed effects, and controls for age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

Table A4. Effects of the program on drug prescription and hospital admission during the first year of life by fathers' level of income, 2012 AUDIT score and alcohol consumption in the municipality.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Panel A: Drug prescription (per cent)				
Program	-0.036** (0.018)	-0.047** (0.020)	-0.026* (0.014)	-0.077*** (0.025)
Sample	Above median AUDIT score	Below median AUDIT score	Above median alcohol cons.	Below median alcohol cons.
P-value difference	0.676		0.074	
Observations	25727	46963	34764	37926
Municipalities	87	144	130	101
Mean of outcome	0.504	0.513	0.502	0.517
Panel B: Hospital admissions (per thousand)				
Program	-15.017 (11.038)	-16.179 (12.384)	-14.122 (11.774)	-14.921 (10.771)
Sample	Above median AUDIT score	Below median AUDIT score	Above median alcohol cons.	Below median alcohol cons.
P-value difference	0.944		0.960	
Observations	39669	68893	52731	55831
Municipalities	87	144	130	101
Mean of outcome	165.234	201.606	183.532	192.804

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth-month fixed effects, and controls for age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

Table A5. Effects of the program on drug prescription and hospital admission for mothers

	Drug prescription (per cent)				Hospital admissions (per thousand)			
	First year after childbirth		Second year after childbirth		First year after childbirth		Second year after childbirth	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Program	-0.010 (0.010)	-0.007 (0.010)	-0.003 (0.010)	-0.000 (0.010)	0.640 (5.467)	0.417 (5.579)	-8.089* (4.719)	-7.818* (4.706)
Observations	71744	71744	71744	71744	108877	107094	108877	107094
Municipalities	231	231	231	231	231	231	231	231
Mean of outcome	0.679		0.699		97.354		60.131	

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth-month fixed effects, and controls for age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

Table A6. Effects of the program on drug prescription and hospital admission for fathers

	Drug prescription (per cent)				Hospital admissions (per thousand)			
	First year after childbirth		Second year after childbirth		First year after childbirth		Second year after childbirth	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Program	-0.002 (0.011)	-0.001 (0.011)	-0.009 (0.012)	-0.007 (0.012)	-0.291 (2.628)	-0.557 (2.604)	-3.168 (3.275)	-3.397 (3.231)
Observations	71532	71532	71532	71532	106432	106432	106432	106432
Municipalities	231	231	231	231	231	231	231	231
Mean of outcome	0.419		0.463		30.645		34.838	

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at municipality level. All models include municipality, county-year and birth-month fixed effects, and controls for age of mother and father, if parents live together at time of birth of the child, immigrant status of mother, maternal educational level, municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%

Table A7. Effects of the program on maternal behavior and child health indicators using survey data and municipal level variation

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	<i>Quit smoking between registration and week 32</i>	<i>Start smoking between registration and week 32</i>	<i>Breast-feed at 1 month</i>	<i>Mis-carriage</i>	<i>Smoke at registration</i>	<i>Quit smoking between 3 months before pregnancy</i>
Program	0.015*** (0.005)	-0.004*** (0.001)	0.037* (0.021)	-0.000 (0.003)	-0.018 (0.018)	0.001 (0.013)
Observations	83,717	83,717	83,717	83,717	83,717	83,717
Mean of outcome	.0273145	.0050756	.8665916	.005468	.0875983	.1190173

Note: Standard errors in parenthesis, clustered at clinic level. All models include clinic and county-year fixed effects, and controls for municipal unemployment level, municipal level of alcohol sales per capita, and sex of the child. * Significant at 10%; ** at 5%; *** at 1%




Figure A1. Share of clinics with a structured working methods to detect women with risky alcohol consumption 2003-2008



Figure A2. Share of children hospitalized during first year of life 2003-2009




Figure A3. Share of children with drug prescription during first year of life 2005-2009

Appendix B. AUDIT questionnaire

Box 10

The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test: Self-Report Version

PATIENT: Because alcohol use can affect your health and can interfere with certain medications and treatments, it is important that we ask some questions about your use of alcohol. Your answers will remain confidential so please be honest.
Place an X in one box that best describes your answer to each question.

Questions	0	1	2	3	4	
1. How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?	Never	Monthly or less	2-4 times a month	2-3 times a week	4 or more times a week	
2. How many drinks containing alcohol do you have on a typical day when you are drinking?	1 or 2	3 or 4	5 or 6	7 to 9	10 or more	
3. How often do you have six or more drinks on one occasion?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily	
4. How often during the last year have you found that you were not able to stop drinking once you had started?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily	
5. How often during the last year have you failed to do what was normally expected of you because of drinking?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily	
6. How often during the last year have you needed a first drink in the morning to get yourself going after a heavy drinking session?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily	
7. How often during the last year have you had a feeling of guilt or remorse after drinking?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily	
8. How often during the last year have you been unable to remember what happened the night before because of your drinking?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily	
9. Have you or someone else been injured because of your drinking?	No		Yes, but not in the last year		Yes, during the last year	
10. Has a relative, friend, doctor, or other health care worker been concerned about your drinking or suggested you cut down?	No		Yes, but not in the last year		Yes, during the last year	
					Total	

Source: Babor et al. (2001)

Publication series published by IFAU – latest issues

Rapporter/Reports

- 2016:1** Engdahl Mattias and Anders Forslund "En förlorad generation? Om ungas etablering på arbetsmarknaden"
- 2016:2** Bastani Spencer, Ylva Moberg and Håkan Selin "Hur känslig är gifta kvinnors sysselsättning för förändringar i skatte- och bidragssystemet?"
- 2016:3** Lundin Martin, Oskar Nordström Skans and Pär Zetterberg "Kåren och karriären: Studentpolitiken som språngbräda"
- 2016:4** Brommesson Douglas, Gissur Erlingsson, Johan Karlsson Schaffer, Jörgen Ödalen and Mattias Fogelgren "Att möta den högre utbildningens utmaningar"
- 2016:5** Egebark Johan "Effekter av skatter på ungas egenföretagande"
- 2016:6** Mannelqvist Ruth, Berndt Karlsson and Bengt Järvholm "Arbete och arbetsmarknad i sjukförsäkringen"
- 2016:7** Rosenqvist Olof "Rösträtt och ungdomars kunskap om politik"
- 2016:8** Lindgren Karl-Oskar, Sven Oskarsson and Mikael Persson "Leder bättre tillgång till utbildning till ökat politiskt deltagande?"
- 2016:9** Moberg Ylva "Är lesbiska föräldrar mer jämställda?"
- 2016:10** Hinnerich Björn T. and Jonas Vlachos "Skillnader i resultat mellan gymnasieelever i fristående och kommunala skolor"
- 2016:11** Engdahl Mattias "Invandringens arbetsmarknadseffekter: lärdomar från den internationella litteraturen och svenska resultat"
- 2016:12** Hagen Johannes "Hälsoeffekter av senarelagd pensionering"
- 2016:13** Grönqvist Erik, Anna Norén, Anna Sjögren and Helena Svaleryd "Nyktrare mammor, friskare barn? Effekter av AUDIT-screening och motiverande samtal i svensk mödravård"

Working papers

- 2016:1** Bastani Spencer, Ylva Moberg and Håkan Selin "Estimating participation responses using transfer program reform"
- 2016:2** Lundin Martin, Oskar Nordström Skans and Pär Zetterberg "Leadership experiences, labor market entry and early career trajectories"
- 2016:3** van den Berg Gerard J., Lena Janys, Enno Mammen and Jens P. Nielsen "A general semi-parametric approach to inference with marker-dependent hazard rate models"
- 2016:4** Egebark Johan "Effects of taxes on youth self-employment and income"
- 2016:5** Holmlund Helena "Education and equality of opportunity: what have we learned from educational reforms?"
- 2016:6** Rosenqvist Olof "Rising to the occasion? Youth political knowledge and the voting age"
- 2016:7** Lindgren Karl-Oskar, Sven Oskarsson and Mikael Persson "How does access to education influence political candidacy? Lessons from school openings in Sweden"
- 2016:8** Moberg Ylva "Does the gender composition in couples matter for the division of labor after childbirth?"
- 2016:9** Hinnerich Björn T. and Jonas Vlachos "The impact of upper-secondary voucher school attendance on student achievement. Swedish evidence using external and internal evaluations"
- 2016:10** Farbmacher Helmut, Raphael Guber and Johan Vikström "Increasing the credibility of the twin birth instrument"
- 2016:11** Hagen Johannes "What are the health effects of postponing retirement? An instrumental variable approach"

- 2016:12** de Luna Xavier, Philip Fowler and Per Johansson “Proxy variables and nonparametric identification of causal effects”
- 2016:13** Björklund Maria, Mikael Carlsson and Oskar Nordström Skans “Fixed wage contracts and monetary non-neutrality”
- 2016:14** Rosenqvist Olof “Is there a gender difference in the ability to deal with failures? Evidence from professional golf tournaments”
- 2016:15** Hall Caroline, Kaisa Kotakorpi, Linus Liljeberg and Jukka Pirttilä “Screening through activation: differential effects of a youth activation programme”
- 2016:16** Grönqvist Erik, Anna Norén, Anna Sjögren and Helena Svaleryd “Sober mom, healthy baby? Effects of brief alcohol interventions in Swedish maternity care”

Dissertation series

- 2016:1** Hagen Johannes “Essays on pensions, retirement and tax evasion”