medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Heterogeneity and heterotypic continuity of emotional and behavioural profiles across development

Running head: Behavioural profiles across development

João Picoito[1,2,3], Constança Santos[2,3,4], Carla Nunes[2,3]

1 - Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Hospital Pediátrico, Centro Hospitalar e Universitário de Coimbra, Portugal.

2 - Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Portugal.

3 - Public Health Research Center, Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Portugal.

4 - Department of Pediatrics, Centro Hospitalar Universitário Cova da Beira, Covilhã, Portugal.

Correspondence to João Picoito, MD, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Hospital Pediátrico, Centro Hospitalar e Universitário de Coimbra, Portugal, 3000-602; e-mail: joao.picoito@chuc.min-saude.pt

ORCID

João Picoito – 0000-0001-6059-2528

Constança Santos – 0000-0002-3423-2462

Carla Nunes - 0000-0003-4562-1057

Acknowledgments: The authors are grateful to the Centre for Longitudinal Studies (CLS), UCL Institute of Education, for the use of these data and to the UK Data Service for making them available. However, neither CLS nor the UK Data Service bear any responsibility for the analysis or interpretation of these data.

Funding: The authors have no funding to report.

Conflict of interest: On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Purpose: To identify profiles of emotional and behavioural symptoms from early childhood to adolescence, their stability across development and associated factors.

Methods: Our sample included 17,216 children assessed at ages 3, 5, 7, 11, and 14 from the UK Millennium Cohort Study. We used latent profile and latent transition analysis to study their emotional and behavioural profiles from early childhood to adolescence. We included sociodemographic, family, and parenting variables to study the effect on the latent profile's membership and transitions.

Results: The number and specific profiles of emotional and behavioural symptoms change with the developmental stage. We found a higher number of profiles for ages 3, 5, and 14, which suggests greater heterogeneity in the presentation of emotional and behavioural symptoms for early childhood and adolescence compared to late childhood. There was greater heterotypic continuity between ages 3 and 5, particularly in transitions from higher to lower severity profiles. Children exposed to socioeconomic disadvantages were more likely to belong or transition to any moderate or high emotional and behavioural symptoms profiles. Maternal psychological distress and harsh parenting were associated with internalizing and externalizing profiles, respectively. Higher levels of internalizing and externalizing symptoms across development were associated with lower mental wellbeing and higher rates of self-harm and substance use in adolescence.

Conclusion: Emotional and behavioural symptoms develop early in life, with levels of heterogeneity and heterotypic stability that change throughout development. These results call for interventions for the prevention and treatment of pediatric mental illness that can account for the heterogeneity and stability of symptoms across development.

Keywords: emotional, behavioural, heterotypic, homotypic, transition

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Emotional and behavioural (EB) symptoms develop early in life and have a lasting impact across development [1]. Children and adolescents with EB symptoms have higher odds of developing psychiatric disorders, poor academic achievement, and risk behaviours [2]. These enduring effects on the lives of young children have motivated research on the specific manifestations of early psychopathology. Identifying specific profiles of EB symptoms, and their transitions and associated factors is crucial for effective interventions in childhood and adolescence mental health.

Traditionally, research on EB profiles in childhood and adolescence has focused on internalizing (such as depression and anxiety) and externalizing symptoms (such as hyperactivity, aggression, and oppositional behaviour). Internalizing symptoms in childhood are associated with mood and anxiety disorders in adolescence and young adulthood [3]. Externalizing symptoms in childhood are, in turn, associated with conduct disorder and antisocial behaviors in adolescence [4]. Although internalizing and externalizing symptoms are indeed distinct in terms of phenomenology, they tend to cluster together [5]. This warrants the need to study these manifestations with person-centered methods such as latent class or latent profile analysis to capture different patterns of expression for internalizing and externalizing symptomatology instead of studying these manifestations separately. Additionally, the different patterns of internalizing and externalizing symptoms may change from early childhood to adolescence as EB regulation skills develop, and new challenges and difficulties arise in their lives.

EB symptoms can have a variable course across development [3]. Some children will develop similar problems (homotypic continuity), while others will develop different types of symptomatology (heterotypic continuity). The degree of homotypic or heterotypic stability, and the factors that influence these transitions have been a topic of much research [6–8]. While homotypic stability has been reported as the norm [6], other studies have reported similar degrees of homotypic and heterotypic continuity [8]. It remains elusive whether some developmental periods are more prone to heterotypic or homotypic transitions, and which contextual and individual factors are associated with specific transitions.

In the current study, we wanted to know whether different developmental stages were associated with different degrees of heterogeneity in the expression of EB symptoms, and different degrees of homotypic and heterotypic continuity. Additionally, we wanted to explore which contextual and ecological factors had a greater influence on specific EB symptoms profiles and developmental stages. Thus, our main objectives were 1) to identify profiles of EB symptoms from early childhood to adolescence, and to study their transitions across development; 2) to assess the effect of socioeconomic, family and parenting factors on membership and transition to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

specific profiles; and 3) to explore the association between membership to specific EB symptoms profiles across development and mental wellbeing, self-harm, and substance use in adolescence. To achieve these objectives, we used person-centered statistical methods, namely latent profile analysis and latent transition analysis, on a large general population sample.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

Participants

Data for this study was drawn from the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS; http://www.cls.ioe.ac.uk/mcs) which is an ongoing longitudinal study, held in the United Kingdom, which has followed a sample of children since their infancy [9]. A stratified random sampling approach was used to overrepresent areas of high child poverty, and areas with high proportions of ethnic minorities. From the two initial sweeps (at age nine months and three years, respectively), 19,243 families in total were enrolled in MCS. Subsequent sweeps were conducted at ages 3, 5, 7, 11, and 14 that included 15,590, 15,246, 13,857, 13,287, and 11,726 families, respectively. Additional details on study design, sampling, attrition, and ethics can be found elsewhere [10]. For the analysis, we included cohort members (singletons and first-born twins or triplets) with data on EB symptoms in at least one of sweeps 2–6, comprising 17,216, from 19,243 participants. Children excluded from the analysis (n=2,027) were more likely to be male, and from ethnic minorities, to live in a monoparental family, and to be from lower-income households (supplementary material Table S1). Table 1 reports sample characteristics.

Measures

The cohort members' *EB profiles* were measured at ages 3, 5, 7, 11, and 14 with the parent-reported Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), a brief behavioural screening questionnaire for children aged 3–16 years [11]. It is composed of 25 items, scored 0–2 (not true, somewhat true, and certainly true), and divided into five subscales: emotional symptoms, conduct problems, hyperactivity and inattention, peer relationship problems, and prosocial behaviour. Scores for each subscale were in the range 0–10 with higher scores indicating more problems or difficulties. We assessed the reliability of the SDQ subscales by computing ordinal coefficient alpha, which is considered a suitable alternative to Cronbach's alpha for ordinal scales, particularly for scales with few response items [12, 13]. The reliability was good for all SDQ subscales with ordinal alpha ranging across sweeps at 0.76–0.82 for emotional symptoms, 0.65–0.8 for peer relationship problems, 0.78–0.86 for hyperactivity and inattention, 0.77–0.85 for conduct problems, and 0.77–0.86 for prosocial behaviour. Each subscale was used in the analysis as continuous variables. To interpret the severity, we used proposed cut-off points by Goodman, based on British norms [11] (5 for emotional problems, 4 for conduct and peer problems, 7 for hyperactivity/inattention, and 4 for prosocial behaviour) [14]. At age 3, the cut-off point was lower for emotional problems (4) and higher for conduct problems (5) and prosocial behaviour (7) [15].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The sociodemographic and family variables included gender, ethnicity (white vs. other), living in a monoparental family, family income poverty (equivalized income <60% of the national median), and maternal professional qualification at nine months of age for cohort member (National Vocational Qualification level 4 or higher vs. other) [16]. Maternal psychological distress was measured with the self-reported Kessler K6 [17] (Cronbach's alpha 0.87–0.89). Harsh parenting was assessed with the sum of three items from Straus's Conflict Tactics Scale [18], (Cronbach's alpha 0.66–0.67). These items measure how often a parent uses violent physical or verbal discipline practices such as smacks, shouts and "telling off," with higher values indicating a higher frequency [19]. Living in a monoparental family, family income poverty, maternal psychological distress, and harsh parenting were measured at each age (except for harsh parenting, which was only measured at ages 3, 5 and 7), entering the model as time-varying covariates. These covariates were chosen based on the existing literature [5, 20, 21].

We also assessed functional outcomes measured at age 14, namely mental wellbeing, self-harm, and lifetime substance use, including alcohol, binge drinking, tobacco, and cannabis. Mental wellbeing was measured using a six-item questionnaire (Cronbach's alpha = 0.86) in which adolescents reported their level of happiness with various aspects of their lives, namely family, school, appearance, and life overall. For self-harm, adolescents were asked "Have you hurt yourself on purpose in any way in the past year?"

Data analysis

To assess EB profiles from early childhood to adolescence, we conducted the analysis in several steps.

First, we performed a cross-sectional latent profile analysis (LPA) on the SDQ subscale scores and determined separately for each time-point the number of profiles. LPA is a type of finite mixture modeling that identifies discrete groups of individuals within a population, in which the latent variable is categorical, and the indicators are treated as continuous [22]. For each age we included all cases that had data for at least one SDQ subscale. The sample size included for each age were as follows: age 3 n=14830, age 5 n=14768, age 7 n=13486, age 11 n=12817, age 14 n=11336. Missing values for the SDQ subscales were dealt with full-information maximum likelihood (FIML) procedures incorporated in LPA, assuming to be missing at random. To select the optimal number of latent profiles we used different criteria, namely Bayesian information criterion (BIC), with lower values indicating better fit; Lo-Mendell-Rubin test (LMRT), which tests if an additional profile improves model fit; and Entropy for each model, measured on a 0 to 1 scale, with values approaching 1 indicating less classification error; as well as interpretability, clinical meaningfulness and parsimony. More details on these fit indices can be found elsewhere [23].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Second, to study the transitions between profiles from early childhood to adolescence we performed latent transition analysis (LTA), which is a longitudinal extension of LPA that allowed us to calculate the transition probability from a profile at time t to another profile at time t+1 [22]. It is common in latent transition analysis to test for full measurement invariance, i.e. whether profiles are equal across time, because it allows for a straightforward interpretation of latent profiles across time [23]. However, as we were interested in capturing developmental changes in EB profiles from childhood to adolescence, measurement non-invariance was conceptually more appropriate for the present study than full measurement invariance. Additionally, full measurement invariance could mask significant developmental differences from childhood to adolescence [24]. This way, we tested for partial measurement invariance, which is a middle ground between full measurement invariance and measurement non-invariance, allowing for equal profiles across some, but not all, transitions. These models were compared with a model with measurement non-invariance, using BIC, with lower values indicating better fit.

Third, we included covariates in the LTA model to assess the effect of socioeconomic, family and parenting factors on membership to specific EB symptoms profiles.

Fourth, we explored the influence of socioeconomic, family and parenting factors on how the children transition between EB symptoms profiles. This was achieved allowing for the covariates to have an interaction on the transition probabilities, as described in [25].

For all LTA models, we used the manual three-step specification [25]. This method has two major advantages: 1) preventing a profile at time t from influencing the formation of another profile at time t+1, and vice-versa; and 2) avoiding measurement parameter shifts with the inclusion of covariates in the LTA model.

The manual three-step specification involved the estimation of the unconditional mixture model (latent profile analysis), the assignment of each participant to latent profiles using modal class assignment, and then estimating the models with measurement parameters that were fixed at values that accounted for the measurement error in the class assignment. A final LTA model was estimated using the three-step variables obtained earlier for each LPA model combined, including all time-points. The LTA models included all participants that had at least one latent profile assignment, comprising a total of 17216. Missing latent profile assignments were dealt with FIML procedures incorporated in LTA.

Fifth, we explored the association between membership to specific EB symptoms profiles across development and mental wellbeing, self-harm, and substance use in adolescence. To this aim, we performed a series of models, regressing each adolescence outcome on age-specific EB symptoms profiles separately, adjusting for sociodemographic, family and parenting factors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Missingness on the covariates cannot be treated with FIML approaches. Therefore, we multiply imputed by chained equations 25 datasets, using a model comprised of all covariates and the SDQ subscale scores, and other variables related to the missing covariates. All analyses accounted for the stratified clustered sample design of the MCS. Data analysis was performed with Mplus version 8.3 [26], and the package MplusAutomation [27] for R version 3.5.1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Results

Latent profile analysis of EB symptoms

A series of LPA models were fit separately for each age, with models ranging from one to six classes. At ages 3 and 5, a five-profile solution was considered the best fitting model, with the LMRT supporting the better fit of a five-profile compared to a four-profile solution, and with good entropy values (0.78 and 0.85 for ages 3 and 5, respectively). Although the six-profile solution presented better information criteria for ages 3 and 5, the LMRT p-value was not significant and entropy was lower at both ages compared to the five-profile solutions. At ages 7 and 11, solutions with six profiles also provided the lowest information criteria. However, the LMRT did not support a five- or six-profile solution, so we chose a four-profile solution for ages 7 and 11. Additionally, the entropy for the four-profile solutions was better than the nearest profiles for both ages 7 and 11. At age 14, the LMRT supported a five-profile solution with good entropy (0.85). Examining the resulting models for interpretability, clinical and developmental meaningfulness, and parsimony, we chose five-profile solutions for ages 3, 5, and 14, and four-profile solutions for ages 7 and 11. Tables S2-6 show the fit indices that supported model selection.

Figure 1 shows the different latent profiles from early childhood to adolescence. Examining the plots, we can see a marked difference in the shape of the profiles between ages 3 and 5. This difference is attenuated between ages 7 and 11 and changes again at age 14 at the start of adolescence. Across all time points, we found a profile characterized by average scores for each SDQ subscale (*low symptoms*) comprising the majority of the sample (57.1% at age 3 peaking at 72.6% at age 11). The second most common profile was *moderate externalizing*, characterized by borderline scores on conduct problems and hyperactivity/inattention, with a stable shape from childhood to adolescence. From ages 3 through to 7, we found a profile of slightly raised peer relationship problems with average scores in the remaining subscales comprising 13.8, 8.3, and 9.1%, at ages 3, 5, and 7, respectively. A similar profile develops at ages 11 and 14, but with borderline scores on emotional problems and peer relationship problems named *moderate internalizing.* At age 14, additional to the *moderate internalizing* profile, we found a profile with higher scores for emotional and peer relationship problems (*high internalizing*), with a prevalence of 5.1%. At age 3, we found a *high emotional and conduct* profile (3.9%) that was not found at age 5, a *moderate emotional* profile appeared at that age instead (6.4%). A profile of high externalizing symptoms (conduct problems and hyperactivity/inattention) emerged from childhood to adolescence, albeit with some distinct nuances. At age 3, this latter profile was associated with low prosocial behaviors (*high externalizing and low prosocial*, 3.8%), and at ages 5 and 7 it was instead associated with borderline emotional problems (*high externalizing and*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

moderate emotional, 3.4, 4.2, and 3.1%, respectively). At age 11, this high externalizing profile was associated with higher emotional problems (*high externalizing and high emotional*, 3.8%).

We also examined four-profile solutions for ages 3, 5, and 14 (figures S1-3) and found clinically meaningful differences compared to the chosen five-profile solutions. For example, the age 3 four-profile solution lacked the *high externalizing and low prosocial*, as well as the *moderate peer problems* profiles; the age 5 four-profile solution lacked the *moderate emotional* profile (comprising 6.4% of the children in the five-profile solution); age 14 four-profile solution lacked the *moderate internalizing* profile (10.3% of the adolescents in the five-profile solution).

As the sample size differed across time points, we examined if this was responsible for the changes in number and specificity of profiles of EB symptoms across development. To accomplish this, we regressed latent profile membership at each age on being missing at the following age, controlling for gender, ethnicity, monoparental family, poverty and maternal professional qualification (Tables S7-10). We controlled for these variables because they are associated with attrition in the MCS [28]. At age 3, there was no association between latent profile membership and being missing at age 5. At age 5, children in the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* profile, compared to the *low symptoms* profile, were more likely to be missing at age 7. For ages 7 and 11, children in the *moderate externalizing* profile were more likely to be missing in the following sweeps. As the profiles associated with later missingness were all present at subsequent time points, we can conclude that the differences found in EB profiles across development are not due to missingness.

Latent transition analysis of EB symptoms from childhood to adolescence

As we found an equal number of profiles between ages 3 and 5, and ages 7 and 11, we estimated three models with partial measurement invariance (a model with equal profiles across ages 3 and 5; a model with equal profiles across ages 7 and 11; and a model with equal profiles across ages 3 and 5, and 7 and 11). Testing for full measurement invariance was not possible because of the different number of profiles found across development. The model with measurement non-invariance had a lower BIC (1,234,036.35) than models with equal profiles across ages 3 and 5 (BIC=1,268,788.32); across ages 7 and 11 (BIC = 1,264,576.19); and across ages 3 and 5, and 7 and 11 (BIC=1,269,297.72). The likelihood ratio tests indicated that the model with measurement non-invariance provided a better fit to the data, comparing with the partial measurement invariance models. We then chose the model with measurement non-invariance as the best model, which was used in subsequent analyses.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

To test if measurement non-invariance would still hold if we have chosen four-profile solutions for ages 3, 5 and 14, we tested for full measurement invariance and measurement non-invariance in LTA models with four-profile solutions across time. The model with measurement non-invariance had a lower BIC (1,268,449.08) than the model with full measurement invariance (BIC = 1,279,205.75). The models with partial measurement invariance also had higher BIC than the model with measurement non-invariance.

Figure 2 shows the transitions between latent profiles across time. Children in the *low symptoms* profile had a high probability of remaining in the same profile at a later time-point, with transition probabilities of 93.2% (age 3 to 5) to 83.4% (age 11 to 14). Children in the *moderate externalizing* profile at age 3 were most likely to remain in the same profile at age 5 (48.4%) but also to transition to the *low symptoms* profile (31.1%). From age 5 onwards, the probability of staying in the *moderate externalizing* profile were higher, ranging 58.0–74.3%, while the probability of transitioning to the *low symptoms* profile decreased (10.4–26.4%). The *moderate peer problems* profile, from ages 3 to 5, had a higher probability of transitioning to the *low symptoms* profile (50.5%) than staying in the same profile (27.5%). This pattern of a higher probability of transitioning to the *low symptoms* profile then changes in later transitions with slightly higher probability of remaining in the same profile, and from ages 7–11 and 11–14 moving to the closely related *moderate internalizing* profile (44.4 and 35.7%, respectively). Children in the *high emotional and conduct problems* profile (specific to age 3) were likely to transition to the lower severity *moderate emotional* profile (38.4%), but also to others such as the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (17.5%) or the *low symptoms* profiles (14.5%). At age 3, those in the *high externalizing and low prosocial* profile had a slightly higher probability of transitioning to the related *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (38.3%) or *moderate externalizing* profiles (36.6%). From ages 5 to 7, children in the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* profile had a 65.3% probability of remaining in the same profile. This changed from age 7 to 11 with a lower probability of transitioning by age 11 to the closely related *high externalizing and high emotional* (47.5%) or the *moderate externalizing* profiles (34.7%). Children in the *high externalizing and high emotional* profile had a similar probability of transitioning to the related *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (38.4%) or the *high internalizing* profiles (33.2%).

Socioeconomic and contextual differences

Figure 3 and supplementary tables S15-19 present the results of the LTA with covariates. Boys were more likely to be in high and moderate externalizing profiles (except at ages 11 and 14) than girls, with higher odds for the age 3 *high externalizing and low prosocial* (odds ratio [OR] = 3.01, 95% confidence interval (CI) 2.43–3.74). White children were consistently less likely to belong to the *moderate peer problems* profile from ages 3 to 7 (age 3 OR: 0.49 CI: 0.41–0.6; age 5 OR:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

0.53 CI: 0.42–0.67; age 7 OR: 0.54 CI: 0.42–0.69). Children from monoparental families and households with income below the poverty line were more likely to belong to any EB profile than to the *low symptoms* profile from ages 3 to 11, particularly at age 3 *high externalizing and low prosocial* (monoparental family OR: 3.68 CI: 3.01–4.5; poverty OR: 5.33 CI: 4.32–6.57), and *high emotional and conduct* (monoparental family OR: 2.81 CI: 2.31–3.41; poverty OR: 5.49 CI: 4.54–6.64). Similarly, adolescents living in households with income below the poverty line were more likely to belong to the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (OR: 6.95 CI: 4.85–9.95). Children from mothers with a high professional qualification were more likely to belong to the *low symptoms* profile. This association is true for ages 3–7, for all moderate and high EB profiles, and at age 11 for the *high externalizing and emotional* profile (OR: 0.53 CI: 0.38–0.73). Higher maternal distress was consistently associated with a higher risk of inclusion in any EB symptoms profile, compared to the *low symptoms* profile at any age. Harsh parenting was associated with higher odds of membership in any externalizing profile at any age, but particularly at age 7 (*high externalizing and moderate emotional* OR: 1.75 CI: 1.61–1.9; *moderate externalizing* OR: 1.62 CI: 1.54–1.71).

Influence of covariates on the transition probabilities

We additionally tested if contextual covariates modified the probability of a child transitioning among profiles (Supplementary tables S20–33). Children from monoparental families and households with income poverty were more likely to transition to higher severity profiles, internalizing or externalizing, at any developmental stage (for example, age 3 *moderate externalizing* to age 5 *high externalizing and moderate emotional* profile: poverty OR: 1.79 CI: 1.15–2.77, monoparental family OR: 2.49 CI: 1.44–4.31). Harsh parenting was associated with maintenance of or transition to moderate externalizing profiles such as age 5 *moderate externalizing* to age 7 *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (OR: 1.23 CI: 1.07–1.43), or age 5 *moderate peer problems* to age 7 *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (OR: 1.41 CI: 1.19–1.68). Maternal distress was consistently associated with higher odds of transitioning to moderate or high internalizing profiles, namely from age 3 *low symptoms* to age 5 *moderate emotional* (OR: 1.11 CI: 1.04–1.19), age 7 *low symptoms* to age 11 *moderate internalizing* (OR: 1.19 CI: 1.08–1.16), age 11 *moderate internalizing* to age 14 *high internalizing* (OR: 1.13 CI: 1.08–1.19). High maternal professional qualification was associated with a lower risk of transitioning to moderate or high severity profiles, as from age 5 *low symptoms* to age 7 *moderate externalizing* (OR: 0.6 CI: 0.42–0.84), from age 7 *low symptoms* to age 11 *moderate internalizing* (OR: 0.57 CI: 0.41–0.80) or from age 11 *low symptoms* to age 14 *moderate externalizing* (OR: 0.60 CI: 0.56–0.79).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Association between EB symptoms profiles and adolescence mental wellbeing, self-harm, and substance use (Table 2)

Children and adolescents from any EB profile (except for age 3 *moderate peer problems*) were more likely to report lower mental wellbeing in adolescence, especially for the high externalizing profiles. Ages 5 and 7 *high externalizing and moderate emotional*, and *moderate externalizing* profiles were associated with higher odds of reporting self-harm in adolescence. For ages 11 and 14, all EB profiles were associated with self-harm, especially age 14 *high externalizing and moderate emotional* (OR: 4.11 CI: 3.17–5.34), and *high internalizing* (OR: 3.45 CI: 2.81–4.25). Children and adolescents in the age 5, 7, 11 and 14 *moderate externalizing* profiles had higher odds of reporting in adolescence positive alcohol, binge drinking, smoking, and cannabis lifetime use. Age 3 *moderate externalizing* was also associated with smoking (OR: 1.30 CI:1.01-1.49) and cannabis use (OR: 1.34 CI: 1.07-1.67) in adolescence. Contrastingly, ages 3, 5 and 7 *moderate peer problems* were associated with a lower risk of a positive lifetime alcohol use in adolescence.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

We used latent profile and latent transition analysis to capture developmental changes in EB profiles from childhood to adolescence. We found that the number and specific profiles of EB symptoms that could best explain heterogeneity in the data changed with the developmental stage. Early childhood was characterized by profiles with higher internalizing and externalizing symptoms, compared with later stages, with two unique profiles found at age 3, namely *high externalizing and low prosocial*, and *high emotional and conduct*. At age 5, we found the emergence of a profile with mixed externalizing and internalizing symptomatology (*high externalizing and moderate emotional*), that persisted until adolescence. At ages 11 and 14, we found increased levels of internalizing symptoms. The higher number of profiles for ages 3, 5, and 14 suggests increased heterogeneity in the presentation of EB difficulties for early childhood and adolescence when compared with late childhood (ages 7 and 11).

Using data from the MCS, a recent study found five different groups of EB symptoms for ages 3–11 based on the conduct problems and emotional problems subscale of the SDQ [5]. The five subgroups were similar to our results, namely low symptoms (57% of the sample), moderate behavioural (21%), moderate emotional (12.5%), high emotional and moderate behavioural (5.5%), and high behavioural and moderate emotional classes (4%) [5]. Our study further builds on these findings by applying latent profile analysis separately at each age and including additional SDQ subscales, which allows for the assessment of developmental differences on EB symptoms. We assumed measurement non-invariance and allowed for the profiles to change across time. This was also the case for a recent latent transition analysis study on problematic behaviour across the preschool years using items from the Child Behavior Checklist [7]. The authors described four profiles of problem behaviour at age 1.5, 3, and 6, including an internalizing and externalizing profile, that displays higher scores for aggressive behaviour and dysregulation at age 6 [7].

Compared to later developmental stages, there was more heterotypic continuity between ages 3 and 5, particularly transitions from high to moderate profiles and transitions to the *low symptoms* profile. The decline in externalizing symptoms from age 3 to 5 has been reported in the literature and is explained by the typical maturation and development of cognition and affect regulation processes [29, 30]. In contrast, homotypic transition was the rule from age 5 to 11 with a consistently high probability of remaining in the same profile. A community study of childhood psychiatric disorders in Norway found higher homotypic continuity between 8 and 10 years than between 4 and 6 years [6]. Another previous study on childhood psychiatric disorders between ages 3 and 6, reported a similar magnitude of homotypic and heterotypic stability in this age range [8]. It appears that past early childhood, emotional and behavioural problems tend to crystallize

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

and stabilize, with fewer children transitioning to the *low symptoms* profile. Indeed, early childhood is considered a developmentally sensitive period that is particularly permeable to protective and risk factors [31, 32]. The transition to adolescence was also associated with a higher degree of heterotypic continuity, particularly to internalizing profiles and to lower prevalence in the *low symptoms* profile. Accordingly, adolescence has been associated with increased rates of internalizing disorders [33] with homotypic and heterotypic pathways to these disorders [34].

Our analysis includes a set of socioeconomic and contextual covariates to study the effects of these factors on membership to specific EB profiles, and to assess the effect on the transition probabilities. Living in a monoparental family and household poverty were associated with a higher probability of membership and transition to any moderate or high EB profile. These odds were particularly high in early childhood. A systematic review on socioeconomic inequalities and mental health among children and adolescents reported that socioeconomic hardship was more strongly associated with mental health problems among younger children than among adolescents [35]. Single parenthood has been linked with a range of functional and mental health problems in both children and adolescents [36, 37]. This association may stem from the higher probability of economic hardship, mental illness in parents, and adverse life events in single-parent families [38]. Maternal distress was associated with membership in any moderate or high EB problems profile compared to the *low symptoms* profile and was consistently associated with higher odds of transition to an internalizing profile. Maternal psychological distress and mental illness have been considered strong predictors of children's mental ill-health and adjustment, being this way an important focus for treatment and prevention of pediatric mental illness [39]. Children exposed to harsh parenting practices were more likely to belong or transition to externalizing profiles (including mixed internalizing and externalizing). The association between externalizing symptoms and harsh parenting has been consistently replicated in the literature, particularly within a transactional theoretical framework [40]. A recent study that used data from the MCS found that harsh parenting measured at age 3 was associated with fewer conduct problems but higher emotional problems at age 11 [41]. The methodological differences with our study could explain the apparently contrasting results, namely that we used a person-centric approach and included harsh parenting as a time-varying covariate (measured at ages 3, 5, and 7). However, the common co-occurrence of internalizing and externalizing symptoms (also evidenced in our results for the *high externalizing and moderate emotional* profile, for example) could also explain these differences. Children from mothers with high maternal professional qualification had higher odds of belonging to the low symptoms profile, particularly from age 3 to 7. Low paternal education has been associated with both mental illness in children and adolescents and its persistence and severity [42], with higher effects for younger children [43].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

We studied the association between EB profiles across development and mental well-being, self-harm and substance use in adolescence. These associations helped validate the profiles' clinical meaningfulness. Children and adolescents in the *high externalizing and moderate emotional*, and *moderate externalizing* profiles had the highest likelihood of reporting positive lifetime use of alcohol, binge drinking, smoking, and cannabis, as well as self-harm and lower mental wellbeing. These associations were found even for age 3 and 5 externalizing profiles. The link between internalizing and externalizing symptoms, mental well-being, and risk behaviours in adolescence may stem from the behavioural and emotional self-control and regulation that develops early in life [44].

To our best knowledge, this is the first study to assess EB profiles from early childhood to adolescence within a latent transition analysis framework that includes five time points. We have included both time-invariant and time-varying covariates and studied the effect of these covariates on the transition probabilities. Although computationally heavy, these models allowed us to capture developmental changes from childhood to adolescence. We used the five subscales of the SDQ and allowed for more nuanced EB profiles that could not have been achieved using just a subset of the subscales. The additional strengths are the large sample provided by the MCS and its national representativeness. One limitation is the use of parent-report for only the SDQ subscales and covariates, which can produce some bias in the results [45]. The EB profiles do not represent clinical disorders. However, the SDQ has shown good predictive power for clinical diagnoses [11]. Another limitation is the higher attrition rate for socioeconomically disadvantaged families and from ethnic minorities in each sweep of the MCS.

In conclusion, EB symptoms tend to develop early in life, with levels of heterogeneity, as well as heterotypic stability that change with the developmental stage. There is more heterogeneity in the presentation of emotional and behavioural difficulties in early childhood and adolescence, compared with late childhood. Past early childhood, emotional and behavioural problems tend to crystallize and stabilize, with fewer children transitioning to the low symptoms profile. Children from socioeconomically disadvantaged families were more likely to belong to moderate or high internalizing or externalizing profile, while high maternal professional qualification was protective, particularly for younger children. Higher levels of internalizing and externalizing symptoms, even in early childhood, were associated with lower mental wellbeing and higher rates of self-harm and substance use later on. Thus, within an ecological framework, earlier intervention on emotional and behavioural symptoms is crucial for better mental health in children and adolescents. These results highlight the need to implement developmentally sensitive interventions on the prevention and treatment of mental disorders in children and adolescents that can account for the heterogeneity and stability of symptoms across development.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to the Centre for Longitudinal Studies (CLS), UCL Institute of Education, for the use of these data and to the UK Data Service for making them available. However, neither CLS nor the UK Data Service bear any responsibility for the analysis or interpretation of these data.

Funding

The authors have no funding to report.

Conflict of interest

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

References

1. Angold A, Egger HL (2007) Preschool psychopathology: Lessons for the lifespan. J Child Psychol & Psychiat 48:961–966. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01832.x

2. Luby JL, Gaffrey MS, Tillman R, et al. (2014) Trajectories of preschool disorders to full DSM depression at school age and early adolescence: continuity of preschool depression. Am J Psychiatry 171:768–776. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.13091198

3. Roza SJ, Hofstra MB, van der Ende J, Verhulst FC (2003) Stable prediction of mood and anxiety disorders based on behavioral and emotional problems in childhood: a 14-year follow-up during childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood. Am J Psychiatry 160:2116–2121. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.160.12.2116

4. Pardini DA, Fite PJ (2010) Symptoms of conduct disorder, oppositional defiant disorder, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and callous-unemotional traits as unique predictors of psychosocial maladjustment in boys: advancing an evidence base for DSM-V. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 49:1134–1144. doi: 10.1016/j.jaac.2010.07.010

5. Patalay P, Moulton V, Goodman A, Ploubidis GB (2017) Cross-Domain Symptom Development Typologies and Their Antecedents: Results From the UK Millennium Cohort Study. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 56:765–776.e2. doi: 10.1016/j.jaac.2017.06.009

6. Wichstrøm L, Belsky J, Steinsbekk S (2017) Homotypic and heterotypic continuity of symptoms of psychiatric disorders from age 4 to 10 years: a dynamic panel model. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 58:1239–1247. doi: 10.1111/jcpp.12754

7. Basten M, Tiemeier H, Althoff RR, et al. (2016) The stability of problem behavior across the preschool years: an empirical approach in the general population. J Abnorm Child Psychol 44:393–404. doi: 10.1007/s10802-015-9993-y

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

8. Bufferd SJ, Dougherty LR, Carlson GA, et al. (2012) Psychiatric disorders in preschoolers: continuity from ages 3 to 6. Am J Psychiatry 169:1157–1164. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2012.12020268

9. University Of London IOE (2019) Millennium Cohort Study: Sixth Survey, 2015. UK Data Service. doi: 10.5255/ukda-sn-8156-4

10. Joshi H, Fitzsimons E (2016) The Millennium Cohort Study: the making of a multi-purpose resource for social science and policy. Longit Life Course Stud. doi: 10.14301/llcs.v7i4.410

11. Goodman A, Goodman R (2009) Strengths and difficulties questionnaire as a dimensional measure of child mental health. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 48:400–403. doi: 10.1097/CHI.0b013e3181985068

12. Zumbo BD, Gadermann AM, Zeisser C (2007) Ordinal versions of coefficients alpha and theta for likert rating scales. J Mod App Stat Meth 6:21–29. doi: 10.22237/jmasm/1177992180

13. Sulik MJ, Blair C, Greenberg M (2017) Child Conduct Problems across Home and School Contexts: A Person-Centered Approach. J Psychopathol Behav Assess 39:46–57. doi: 10.1007/s10862-016-9564-8

14. Youthinmind Ltd. (2015) Scoring the Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire for age 4-17. https://www.sdqinfo.com/py/sdqinfo/b3.py?language=Englishqz(UK). Accessed 30 Oct 2019

15. Youthinmind Ltd. (2016) Scoring the Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire for age 2-4. https://www.sdqinfo.com/py/sdqinfo/b3.py?language=Englishqz(UK). Accessed 30 Oct 2019

16. Hernández-Alava M, Popli G (2017) Children's development and parental input: evidence from the UK millennium cohort study. Demography 54:485–511. doi: 10.1007/s13524-017-0554-6

17. Kessler RC, Barker PR, Colpe LJ, et al. (2003) Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. Arch Gen Psychiatry 60:184–189. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.60.2.184

18. Straus MA, Hamby SL (1997) Measuring Physical & Psychological Maltreatment of Children with the Conflict Tactics Scales.

19. Flouri E, Midouhas E (2017) Environmental adversity and children's early trajectories of problem behavior: The role of harsh parental discipline. J Fam Psychol 31:234–243. doi: 10.1037/fam0000258

20. Patalay P, Fitzsimons E (2016) Correlates of mental illness and wellbeing in children: are they the same? results from the UK millennium cohort study. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 55:771–783. doi: 10.1016/j.jaac.2016.05.019

21. Mazza JRSE, Lambert J, Zunzunegui MV, et al. (2017) Early adolescence behavior problems and timing of poverty during childhood: A comparison of lifecourse models. Soc Sci Med 177:35–42. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.01.039

22. Collins LM, Lanza ST (2010) Latent class and latent transition analysis: With applications in the social, behavioral, and health sciences. John Wiley & Sons

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

23. Nylund KL, Asparouhov T, Muthén BO (2007) Deciding on the Number of Classes in Latent Class Analysis and Growth Mixture Modeling: A Monte Carlo Simulation Study. Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal 14:535–569. doi: 10.1080/10705510701575396

24. Nylund KL (2007) Latent transition analysis: Modeling extensions and an application to peer victimization. Undergraduate thesis, University of California, Los Angeles Doctoral dissertation

25. Nylund-Gibson K, Grimm R, Quirk M, Furlong M (2014) A Latent Transition Mixture Model Using the Three-Step Specification. Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal 21:439–454. doi: 10.1080/10705511.2014.915375

26. Muthen LK, Muthén BO (2017) Mplus Version 8 User's Guide. 944.

27. Hallquist MN, Wiley JF (2018) MplusAutomation: An R Package for Facilitating Large-Scale Latent Variable Analyses in Mplus. Struct Equ Modeling 25:621–638. doi: 10.1080/10705511.2017.1402334

28. Plewis I (2007) Non-response in a birth cohort study: the case of the millennium cohort study. Int J Soc Res Methodol 10:325–334. doi: 10.1080/13645570701676955

29. Montroy JJ, Bowles RP, Skibbe LE, et al. (2016) The development of self-regulation across early childhood. Dev Psychol 52:1744–1762. doi: 10.1037/dev0000159

30. Wakschlag LS, Tolan PH, Leventhal BL (2010) Research Review: "Ain"t misbehavin': Towards a developmentally-specified nosology for preschool disruptive behavior. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 51:3–22. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02184.x

31. Conway AM, McDonough SC (2006) Emotional resilience in early childhood: developmental antecedents and relations to behavior problems. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1094:272–277. doi: 10.1196/annals.1376.033

32. Khan A, McCormack HC, Bolger EA, et al. (2015) Childhood Maltreatment, Depression, and Suicidal Ideation: Critical Importance of Parental and Peer Emotional Abuse during Developmental Sensitive Periods in Males and Females. Front Psychiatry 6:42. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2015.00042

33. Adkins DE, Wang V, Elder GH (2009) Structure and Stress: Trajectories of Depressive Symptoms across Adolescence and Young Adulthood. Soc Forces 88:31. doi: 10.1353/sof.0.0238

34. Shevlin M, McElroy E, Murphy J (2017) Homotypic and heterotypic psychopathological continuity: a child cohort study. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol 52:1135–1145. doi: 10.1007/s00127-017-1396-7

35. Reiss F (2013) Socioeconomic inequalities and mental health problems in children and adolescents: a systematic review. Soc Sci Med 90:24–31. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.04.026

36. Fergusson DM, Boden JM, Horwood LJ (2007) Exposure to single parenthood in childhood and later mental health, educational, economic, and criminal behavior outcomes. Arch Gen Psychiatry 64:1089–1095. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.64.9.1089

37. Sieh DS, Visser-Meily JMA, Meijer AM (2013) The relationship between parental depressive symptoms, family type, and adolescent functioning. PLoS One 8:e80699. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0080699

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

38. Hoffmann JP (2017) Family structure and adolescent substance use: an international perspective. Subst Use Misuse 52:1667–1683. doi: 10.1080/10826084.2017.1305413

39. O'Connor TG, Monk C, Burke AS (2016) Maternal affective illness in the perinatal period and child development: findings on developmental timing, mechanisms, and intervention. Curr Psychiatry Rep 18:24. doi: 10.1007/s11920-016-0660-y

40. Wiggins JL, Mitchell C, Hyde LW, Monk CS (2015) Identifying early pathways of risk and resilience: The codevelopment of internalizing and externalizing symptoms and the role of harsh parenting. Dev Psychopathol 27:1295–1312. doi: 10.1017/S0954579414001412

41. Rajyaguru P, Moran P, Cordero M, Pearson R (2019) Disciplinary parenting practice and child mental health: evidence from the UK millennium cohort study. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 58:108–116.e2. doi: 10.1016/j.jaac.2018.06.033

42. McLaughlin KA, Breslau J, Green JG, et al. (2011) Childhood socio-economic status and the onset, persistence, and severity of DSM-IV mental disorders in a US national sample. Soc Sci Med 73:1088–1096. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.06.011

43. Meyrose A-K, Klasen F, Otto C, et al. (2018) Benefits of maternal education for mental health trajectories across childhood and adolescence. Soc Sci Med 202:170–178. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.02.026

44. Wills TA, Simons JS, Sussman S, Knight R (2016) Emotional self-control and dysregulation: A dual-process analysis of pathways to externalizing/internalizing symptomatology and positive well-being in younger adolescents. Drug Alcohol Depend 163 Suppl 1:S37–45. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.08.039

45. Curhan AL, Rabinowitz JA, Pas ET, Bradshaw CP (2019) Informant Discrepancies in Internalizing and Externalizing Symptoms in an At-Risk Sample: The Role of Parenting and School Engagement. J Youth Adolesc. doi: 10.1007/s10964-019-01107-x

Data References

1. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Longitudinal Family File, 2001-2015. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-8172-2
2. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: First Survey, 2001-2003. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-4683-4
3. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Second Survey, 2003-2005. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-5350-4
4. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Third Survey, 2006. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-5795-4
5. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Fourth Survey, 2008. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-6411-7
6. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Fifth Survey, 2012. UK Data Service. 2017. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-7464-4
7. University Of London IOE. Millennium Cohort Study: Sixth Survey, 2015. UK Data Service. 2019. doi:10.5255/ukda-sn-8156-4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1 Weighted descriptive statistics (n= 17216)

		n (%) / mean (standard error)	Missing n (%)
Gender (male)		8804 (51.1)	-
Ethnicity (white)		14138 (87.8)	100 (0.6)
Mother's professional qualification (high)		4963 (34.6)	702 (4.1)
Family income poverty			
	Age 3	5053 (26.1)	1880 (10.9)
	Age 5	5115 (27.1)	2118 (12.3)
	Age 7	4155 (23.2)	3396 (19.7)
	Age 11	3298 (17.6)	3949 (22.9)
	Age 14	3457 (21.3)	5511 (32)
Monoparental family			
	Age 3	2691 (15.3)	1817 (10.6)
	Age 5	3014 (17.9)	2028 (11.8)
	Age 7	2912 (19.2)	3378 (19.6)
	Age 11	3129 (22.2)	3949 (22.9)
	Age 14	2881 (23.5)	5511 (32.0)
SDQ Emotional problems			
	Age 3	1.31 (0.17)	2473 (14.4)
	Age 5	1.35 (0.02)	2490 (14.5)
	Age 7	1.49 (0.02)	3773 (21.9)
	Age 11	1.82 (0.03)	4421 (25.7)
	Age 14	1.97 (0.03)	5889 (34.2)
SDQ Conduct problems			
	Age 3	2.75 (0.03)	2446 (14.2)
	Age 5	1.46 (0.02)	2471 (14.4)
	Age 7	1.34 (0.02)	3744 (21.7)
	Age 11	1.34 (0.02)	4418 (25.7)
	Age 14	1.35 (0.02)	5887 (34.2)
SDQ Hyperactivity/inattention score			
	Age 3	3.86 (0.03)	2584 (15)
	Age 5	3.23 (0.03)	2557 (14.9)
	Age 7	3.30 (0.04)	3794 (22.0)
	Age 11	3.05 (0.04)	4445 (25.8)
	Age 14	2.90 (0.04)	5894 (34.2)
SDQ Peer problems score			
	Age 3	1.48 (0.02)	2570 (14.9)
	Age 5	1.09 (0.02)	2500 (14.5)
	Age 7	1.17 (0.02)	3764 (21.9)
	Age 11	1.32 (0.02)	4414 (25.6)
	Age 14	1.68 (0.03)	5884 (34.2)
SDQ Prosocial score			
	Age 3	7.34 (0.02)	2549 (14.8)
	Age 5	8.39 (0.02)	2472 (14.4)
	Age 7	8.60 (0.02)	3740 (21.7)
	Age 11	8.78 (0.02)	4411 (25.6)
	Age 14	8.32 (0.02)	5886 (34.2)
Maternal distress (Kessler-6)			
	Age 3	3.14 (0.04)	3627 (21.1)
	Age 5	3.07 (0.04)	2885 (16.8)
	Age 7	3.03 (0.05)	4053 (23.5)
	Age 11	3.87 (0.06)	5511 (32)
	Age 14	4.16 (0.07)	6849 (39.8)
Harsh parenting			
	Age 3	9.39 (0.03)	4220 (24.5)
	Age 5	8.37 (0.02)	3073 (17.8)
	Age 7	8.11 (0.02)	4203 (24.4)

Results are presented as n (%) for categorical variables, and as mean (standard error) for continuous variables. n – unweighted frequency. % - weighted percentage. SDQ – Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire



Figure 1 – Latent profiles of emotional and behavioural symptoms

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



LS = Low symptoms; He+C = High emotional + conduct; MPP = Moderate peer problems; ME = Moderate externalizing; HE+LP = High externalizing + low prosocial; Me = Moderate emotional; HE+Me = High externalizing + moderate emotional; MI = moderate internalizing; HE+He = High externalizing + high emotional; HI = High internalizing

Thickness of nodes represents the proportion of cases most likely assigned to that profile. Thicker and darker edges represent greater probability of transitioning from a time t profile to a time t+1 profile.

Figure 2 – Latent transition probabilities and classification probabilities



Figure 3 – Results of the latent transition analysis with covariates. Monoparental family, poverty, high maternal professional qualification, maternal distress and harsh parenting odds ratios are adjusted for gender and ethnicity. Reference class = low symptoms.



Figure 3 (continued) – Results of the latent transition analysis with covariates. Monoparental family, poverty, high maternal professional qualification, maternal distress and harsh parenting odds ratios are adjusted for gender and ethnicity. Reference class = low symptoms.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2019.12.26.19015917; this version posted March 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2 - Association between EB symptoms profiles and adolescence mental wellbeing, self-harm, and substance use

Latent profiles (ref. Low symptoms)	Mental wellbeing Coeff. (95% CI)	Self-harm OR (95% CI)	Lifetime alcohol use OR (95% CI)	Lifetime binge drinking OR (95% CI)	Lifetime smoking OR (95% CI)	Lifetime cannabis use OR (95% CI)
Age 3						
High externalizing and low prosocial	**-1.52 (-2.23, -0.81)**	1.08 (0.80, 1.46)	**0.64 (0.52, 0.80)**	0.98 (0.66, 1.45)	1.25 (0.94, 1.66)	0.94 (0.58, 1.53)
Moderate externalizing	**-0.72 (-1.07, -0.38)**	1.11 (0.97, 1.27)	1.02 (0.93, 1.12)	1.12 (0.97, 1.31)	**1.30 (1.01, 1.49)**	**1.34 (1.07, 1.67)**
Moderate peer problems	-0.29 (-0.64, 0.06)	1.05 (0.89, 1.22)	**0.77 (0.69, 0.85)**	0.84 (0.70, 1.01)	0.91 (0.78, 1.05)	0.75 (0.57, 1.01)
High emotional and conduct	**-0.55 (-0.97, -0.13)**	0.96 (0.73, 1.25)	**0.68 (0.55, 0.84)**	1.06 (0.74, 1.52)	1.19 (0.94, 1.52)	1.13 (0.77, 1.67)
Age 5						
High externalizing and moderate emotional	**-1.60 (-2.28, -0.92)**	**1.39 (1.06, 1.83)**	**0.65 (0.52, 0.82)**	1.06 (0.74, 1.52)	**1.43 (1.09, 1.88)**	0.98 (0.64, 1.50)
Moderate externalizing	**-0.80 (-1.14, -0.45)**	**1.27 (1.09, 1.48)**	**1.14 (1.01, 1.28)**	**1.34 (1.13, 1.59)**	**1.40 (1.21, 1.62)**	**1.43 (1.12, 1.83)**
Moderate peer problems	**-1.04 (-1.5, -0.59)**	1.01 (0.82, 1.24)	**0.77 (0.67, 0.89)**	0.85 (0.67, 1.08)	1.03 (0.87, 1.23)	1.02 (0.77, 1.36)
Moderate emotional	**-0.80 (-1.30, -0.31)**	1.09 (0.88, 1.35)	**0.73 (0.61, 0.87)**	0.96 (0.73, 1.26)	0.99 (0.82, 1.21)	0.90 (0.62, 1.30)
Age 7						
High externalizing and moderate emotional	**-2.29 (-2.99, -1.59)**	**1.79 (1.38, 2.33)**	0.97 (0.78, 1.19)	1.23 (0.90, 1.67)	**1.87 (1.45, 2.43)**	**1.65 (1.12, 2.43)**
Moderate externalizing	**-0.99 (-1.33, -0.66)**	**1.37 (1.19, 1.57)**	**1.15 (1.05, 1.27)**	**1.36 (1.15, 1.60)**	**1.77 (1.54, 2.04)**	**1.85 (1.48, 2.30)**
Moderate peer problems	**-0.99 (-1.43, -0.56)**	1.22 (0.99, 1.47)	**0.85 (0.74, 0.98)**	0.96 (0.79, 1.17)	1.09 (0.91, 1.30)	1.08 (0.77, 1.51)
Age 11						
High externalizing and high emotional	**-3.12 (-3.87, -2.38)**	**2.39 (1.79, 3.19)**	0.84 (0.67, 1.05)	0.99 (0.69, 1.42)	**1.84 (1.38, 2.43)**	**1.86 (1.21, 2.85)**
Moderate externalizing	**-1.96 (-2.35, -1.57)**	**1.49 (1.27, 1.74)**	**1.26 (1.11, 1.44)**	**1.6 (1.34-1.91)**	**2.10 (1.82, 2.42)**	**2.21 (1.76, 2.79)**
Moderate internalizing	**-1.89 (-2.35, -1.43)**	**1.62 (1.36, 1.92)**	**0.77 (0.68, 0.88)**	0.91 (0.72, 1.15)	0.88 (0.71, 1.09)	0.98 (0.68, 1.40)
Age 14						
High externalizing and moderate emotional	**-5.37 (-6.12, -4.63)**	**4.11 (3.17, 5.34)**	**1.86 (1.48, 2.33)**	**3.11 (2.30, 4.22)**	**5.57 (4.35, 7.13)**	**7.06 (5.09, 9.79)**
Moderate externalizing	**-2.11 (-2.44, -1.77)**	**1.69 (1.46, 1.95)**	**1.42 (1.27, 1.59)**	**1.88 (1.61, 2.19)**	**2.44 (2.14, 2.77)**	**2.65 (2.15, 3.27)**
Moderate internalizing	**-2.54 (-2.95, -2.12)**	**2.19 (1.85, 2.60)**	0.88 (0.77, 1.00)	0.99 (0.81, 1.23)	1.00 (0.82, 1.23)	0.99 (0.66, 1.50)
High internalizing	**-4.52 (-5.13, -3.91)**	**3.45 (2.81, 4.25)**	0.91 (0.75, 1.10)	**1.43 (1.09, 1.87)**	**2.06 (1.66, 2.56)**	**2.51 (1.76, 3.56)**

Results adjusted for gender, ethnicity, poverty (at 9 months of age), monoparental family (at 9 months of age), high maternal professional qualification (at 9 months of age), harsh parenting (at age 3), an maternal distress (at age 3),