Title Page

Title:
Identifying the Factor Structure of the DSM-5 Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure

Author names and affiliations:
Alison Gibbons, Cristan Farmer, Jacob Shaw, Joyce Y Chung *

National Institute of Mental Health, Office of the Clinical Director, 10 Center Drive, NIH Building 10, Room 6-5340, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA

***Corresponding author**:
Joyce Y Chung, MD
National Institute of Mental Health
joyce.chung@nih.gov
Phone: 301-443-8466
NIH Clinical Center
10 Center Dr., Bldg. 10, Rm 6-5340
Bethesda, MD 20892

Abstract
The DSM-5 Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure (DSM-XC) is a transdiagnostic mental health symptom measure that has shown promise in informing clinical diagnostic evaluations and as a screening tool for research. However, few studies have assessed the latent dimensionality of the DSM-XC or provided guidance on how to score the survey. In this report, we examined the factor structure of the DSM-XC in a sample of over 3500 participants enrolled in a protocol on the mental health impact of COVID-19 conducted through the National Institute of Mental Health Intramural Research Program (NIMH IRP) (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT04339790). We began by conducting an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to identify the best solution for our data, and then employed a confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) to evaluate the fit of the two-factor solution proposed by Lace and Merz (Lace & Merz, 2020), the fit of our proposed solution, and the measurement invariance of our proposed solution across age, sex, and calendar time. We found a six-factor solution stemming from our EFAs to best fit our data. Each factor captures symptoms related to a specific construct of psychopathology: mood, worry, activation, somatic, confusion, and substance use. Future research should evaluate this six-factor structure using additional datasets to confirm its consistency across research populations and settings.

Keywords: mental health, clinical research, transdiagnostic, factor analysis, COVID-19

1. Introduction

According to the 2019 National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), an estimated 20.6%, or 51.5 million adults aged 18 or older in the United States were diagnosed with any mental illness (AMI), defined as a mental, behavioral, or emotional disorder that can vary in impairment (SAMHSA, 2020). Furthermore, fewer than half (44.8%) of those with AMI received mental health services in the past year. Given these high rates of current mental illness and low rates of treatment, there is a need to better assess mental health problems in the general population. While there are existing mental health measures in use, many are limited to symptoms within one diagnostic category, such as the Patient Health Questionnaire 9 (PHQ-9), which focuses on depression (Kroenke et al., 2001). In addition, because symptoms associated with discrete mental health diagnoses often co-occur, a tool that is broader and transdiagnostic would be useful both in clinical settings and in research studies.

The DSM-5 Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measures (DSM-XC) were developed by the American Psychiatric Association (APA) as a transdiagnostic mental health symptom measure (adult, child and parent versions). They were developed in response to recommendations that the DSM-5 include dimensional assessments in addition to strict categorical diagnoses utilized in previous versions of the DSM (Jones, 2012). The adult measure includes 23 self-report questions covering 13 cross-diagnostic domains of psychopathology: depression, anger, mania, anxiety, somatic symptoms, suicidal ideation, psychosis, sleep problems, memory, repetitive thoughts and behaviors, dissociations, personality functioning, and substance use (Narrow et al., 2013). The survey was intended to inform a clinical diagnostic evaluation and provide clinicians with a tool to track the presence, frequency, and severity of cross-cutting psychiatric symptoms (Clarke & Kuhl, 2014). An early study evaluated the measure in routine clinical practice and found it to be both clinically useful and favorably viewed by clinicians and patients (Mościcki et al., 2018). It has also been recommended for use in clinical research (NOT-MH-15-009, 2015).

There are multiple ways that the DSM-XC can be used in research and clinical practice, including as a screener for mental illness. The limited psychometric data available for the DSM-XC primarily pertain to this purpose. Our group used a modified version of the DSM-XC to screen volunteers for mental health research and found good specificity but poor sensitivity when used alone, but improved sensitivity when combined with additional clinical data, e.g. use of psychotropic medication (Mahoney et al., 2020). Conversely, among patients with substance use disorders in a correctional program, the DSM-XC had good sensitivity but poor specificity for DSM diagnoses of depression, mania, psychosis, and anxiety (Bastiaens & Galus, 2018).

The DSM-XC can also be used as a dimensional measure of psychopathology for research. Given that the need for such a measure was the impetus behind the DSM-XC's development, it is surprising that few published studies have assessed its latent dimensionality or provided

guidance on how to interpret DSM-XC responses at the item, domain or total survey level. One study that administered the DSM-XC to non-treatment seeking college students found it to have acceptable convergent validity when the domain total scores were compared to longer measures of the intended mental health construct (Bravo et al., 2018). A study conducted by the APA in concert with DSM field trials administered the survey to adult psychiatric patients and reported mean scores for the DSM-XC items in their supplementary materials. However, they made no claims that the scores within domains measure a unidimensional construct. Whether and how the items included in the DSM-XC measures dimensional mental health constructs (e.g., mood) is an empirical question that should be further investigated.

To date, three studies have explored the factor structure of the DSM-XC, each with limitations. A Turkish study reported an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on data collected from healthy volunteers and psychiatric patients (n=206), and found that a three-factor structure capturing neurosis, psychosis, and substance use best suited the data (Çökmüş et al., 2017). Using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), another group demonstrated adequate fit of the 13 DSM-XC domain structure to data from 362 Pakistani prisoners (Ishfaq & Kamal, 2019). Both studies used translated versions of the measure (Turkish and Urdu, respectively) and collected data from distinct populations (i.e., psychiatric patients and their relatives, prisoners), which could limit the generalizability of their findings. A recent study employed both EFA and CFA methods on the adult version of the DSM-XC in English (Lace & Merz, 2020). They recruited and collected data from 400 participants using Amazon Mechanical Turk, a crowdsourcing website (n=191 EFA, n= 209 CFA). Lace and Merz report that a two-dimensional hierarchical model, comprising internalizing/serious mental illness and internalizing/affective constructs, best fit their data. All three studies utilized sample sizes which were small relative to recommendations by psychometric experts (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Further, none of these studies performed invariance analyses to demonstrate robustness of the identified solution.

In this report, we sought to address the limitations outlined above by examining the factor structure of the DSM-XC in a large sample of participants enrolled in a protocol conducted through the National Institute of Mental Health Intramural Research Program (NIMH IRP) (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT04339790). This online study was launched to examine the mental health impact of the COVID-19 pandemic among a convenience sample with a wide range of mental health histories, and the psychometric evaluation of the DSM-XC is a secondary analysis. Following an EFA to identify the best solution for our data, we employed CFA to evaluate the fit of the two-factor solution proposed by Lace and Merz (Lace & Merz, 2020), the fit of our proposed solution, and the measurement invariance of our proposed solution across age, sex, and calendar time.

2. Method

These data were collected as part of a NIMH study that was carried out in accordance with the latest version of the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the National Institutes of Health. For this purpose of this report, we will primarily focus on methodology relevant to the collection of the DSM-XC survey data.

2.1 Participants

Participants were recruited through a variety of means, including email invitations, social media ads, list-serv postings, clinicaltrials.gov and direct mail postcards. Exclusion criteria were minimal: participants were required to be 18 years or older and to speak and understand English. The sample was intended to be representative of the general population. For this analysis, we included participants who had provided responses to all 22 DSM-XC items at the time of enrollment (n=3533).

2.2 Measure

The DSM-XC was chosen for the parent study because of its cross-diagnostic approach to mental health symptoms. In addition, the DSM-XC was promoted by the NIMH as a common measure in funded research projects (NOT-MH-15-009, 2015). The measure consists of 23 items, each rated on a 5-point Likert scale (0=none, 4=severe). We chose to omit one item on thoughts of self-harm (question 11) because the study was conducted online and therefore participants who may endorse self-harm could not be reliably contacted for further safety evaluation.

2.3 Procedures

Study enrollment occurred from April 4th to November 15th, 2020. After signing an electronic consent form, participants used a secure website to complete several surveys, including the DSM-XC. Participants were then invited to complete a smaller set of surveys which included the DSM-XC every two weeks for 6 months. The study website was HIPAA compliant and did not collect personally identifiable information. Compensation was not provided for participation.

2.4 Statistical Analysis

2.4.1 Data preparation. The analysis set of 3,533 individuals was separated into exploratory (n = 1,202) and confirmatory sets (n = 2,331) using a randomly generated number for each participant. Response category cell size for each item was reviewed, and adjacent categories were collapsed to achieve a minimum cell size of n=50 in the exploratory set (see Supplementary Information for a list of response categories). The same transformations were applied to the confirmatory set.

2.4.2 Exploratory analysis. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted using Mplus Version 8.4, and the R package MplusAutomation (Hallquist and Wiley, 2018) was used to process the output. Given the ordinal nature of the data, we employed a categorical factor model

with diagonally weighted least squares estimation with mean- and variance-adjusted chi-square statistics and standard errors, and geomin (oblique) rotation. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), and standardized root mean residual (SRMR) were generated and interpreted as described below. We selected the best model from these candidates by first determining which solutions had relatively better fit, and then evaluating the clinical interpretability of each solution. Items were adopted onto a factor if they possessed a loading >0.30; cross-loading was allowed because it is theoretically consistent with the constructs measured by the DSM-XC.

2.4.3 Confirmatory analyses. The confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted using lavaan version 0.6-7 (Rosseel, 2012) in R version 4.0.2. lavaan also employs diagonally weighted least squares estimation for ordinal data, and the Santorra-Bentler correction was applied to the test statistic. The robust fit indices (RMSEA, CFI, TLI, and SRMR) are reported and interpreted as described below.

2.4.4 Invariance analyses. Measurement invariance analyses were conducted using semTools version 0.5-4 (Jorgensen et al., 2021). We sequentially tested increasing levels of measurement invariance: configural, thresholds, metric, and scalar. Change in the relative (robust) fit indices RMSEA, CFI, and TLI were interpreted as described below. The measurement invariance of the selected solution across age (18-29 years, n = 1330; 40-59 years, n = 1370 ; 60+ years, n = 791) and sex (males, n=589; females, n = 2921) was evaluated using the full sample (combined testing and training, N = 3,533). Respondents missing age or sex data were excluded from the respective invariance analysis. We also evaluated the invariance of the solution across pandemic time, comparing baseline administrations for participants who started in the first month of study (4/4-5/4/20, n = 1380) to those who started during months 5 - 7 of study (9/1-10/31/20, n = 490).

2.4.5 Interpretation of fit indices. While several sets of guidelines for the interpretation of fit indices exist (e.g. Hu & Bentler, 1999), so do strong arguments against the use of cutoffs, especially when diagonally weighted least squares estimation was used (e.g. Barrett, 2007; Cook et al., 2009; Marsh et al., 2004; McIntosh, 2007; Xia & Yang, 2019). Without a universally agreed upon alternative, we chose to use the RMSEA, CFI, TLI, and SRMR to guide our modelling decisions. Rather than classify these indices into “good” or “bad,” we evaluated each from a relative perspective. In other words, lower (scaled) chi-square to DF ratios, lower SRMR and RMSEA, and higher TLI or CFI are preferred, regardless of their actual values.

The Mplus and R code files for all analyses are provided in Supplementary Information. For more information on how to interpret factor scores, please see DiStefano et al., 2009.

3. Results

During the 7-month period of study recruitment, 3654 participants from all 50 U.S. states signed an electronic consent form and completed the study enrollment surveys. Of these participants,

3533 provided responses to all 22 DSM-XC items in our version of the survey and were included in this analysis. The mean age of this final sample was 46.5 +/- 14.8 with a range from 18 to 87 years. The sample was majority female (83.2%) and white (90.2%). The majority of the sample (71.6%) endorsed a history of mental health counseling. Additionally, about half (53.2%) endorsed a history of medication for a mental health condition and 13.8% endorsed a past psychiatric hospitalization (Table 1).

Exploratory factor analysis. Based on clinical usage of the instrument and six eigenvalues greater than 1, we explored solutions with one through six factors in the training dataset (n = 1202). The fit indices for these solutions are shown in Table 2 and the standardized loadings for each solution are shown in Supplementary Table 1. EFA correlations are shown in Supplementary Table 2. Based on the fit indices and interpretability, we selected the six-factor solution. We propose that the six factors represent the following constructs: mood, worry, activation, somatic, confusion, and substance use (Figure 1).

Confirmatory factor analyses. The results of the CFA indicated that the six-factor solution was a good fit for the testing data (n = 2331; Table 2). The standardized loadings on each factor were moderate-to-high (Table 3). We also evaluated the existing Lace and Merz (Lace & Merz, 2020) two-factor solution, and found that this solution was a mediocre fit to our data (Table 3).

Measurement invariance. Configural, threshold, metric, and scalar measurement invariance across age (n = 3491), sex (n = 3510), and enrollment date (pandemic time; n = 1870) were evaluated sequentially. Because the fifth factor is comprised entirely of items which cross-load, the mean of that factor could not be freed, and scalar invariance of that factor could therefore not be evaluated. Further, owing to the smaller sample size for the enrollment date analyses, too few non-zero responses to the items "Hearing things…" and "…hear your thoughts" meant that they had to be excluded from the solution. Full measurement invariance was supported across age, sex, and time (Table 4).

4. Discussion

In this secondary analysis, we explored the factor structure of the DSM-XC using a large data set of individuals with varying degrees of psychological health. While the previously published solution of internalizing and externalizing factors (Lace & Merz, 2020) had only mediocre fit to our data, we found support for a higher-dimensional model comprised of six factors. Given the lack of literature on the DSM-XC and its latent dimensionality, we believe these findings will help future researchers score and interpret DSM-XC responses.

Our six-factor solution exhibited strong factorial validity, demonstrated through a confirmatory analysis in a withheld subset of our data and a series of measurement invariance analyses. Importantly, however, this solution holds considerable face validity and appears to be clinically coherent. The items on each factor suggest that they represent the following constructs

(respectively): mood, worry, activation, somatic, confusion, and substance use (Figure 1). While the DSM-XC was organized across 13 domains of psychopathology (one of which, suicidal ideation, was excluded from this study), our six-factor solution suggests that these items are better conceptualized as fewer, broader constructs. In most cases, items which shared a domain on the DSM-XC also shared a factor in our proposed solution (e.g., the two depression items load onto factor 1, three anxiety items load onto factor 2).

These findings are particularly relevant for research. First, they confirm that the DSM-XC is a multidimensional instrument. While researchers may decide to use the DSM-XC as an indicator of overall symptom burden and simply tally the total score of all items, all available factor analyses of the instrument, including ours, indicate that the scale is not unidimensional. Second, our findings provide a scoring solution for future researchers who wish to measure distinct mental health constructs. While 13 clinically derived domains are provided, our findings suggest that there are fewer, broader constructs, and fitting with our conceptualization of mental health, that many items are not unique to a particular construct. This solution therefore accounts for cross-cutting symptoms that are related to multiple constructs of interest. The use of factor scores, rather than subscale totals, enable researchers to measure with more precision the dimensional mental health constructs reflected by the scale. Future research should evaluate the six-factor structure proposed in this paper to confirm its consistency across research populations and settings. An important future direction is the evaluation of the validity of the six-factor solution with convergent measures; such an analysis was outside the scope of this secondary analysis.

Several limitations stem from the fact that this study was conducted online during a global pandemic. First, given constraints on recruitment methods during the COVID-19 pandemic, we enrolled a convenience sample with demographic characteristics not representative of the general population (i.e., 90% white, 83% female, 52% advanced degree). It is also important to note that our population was likely subject to sampling bias due to the study's focus on mental health: over 50% of our sample endorsed a history of psychiatric medication use, which is substantially higher than rates of use in the general population (Terlizzi & Zablotsky, 2020). Similarly, factor scores are likely elevated due to the COVID-19 pandemic (Panchal et al., 2021; Xiong et al., 2020). Finally, this study is of a modified version of the DSM-XC, as we were required to omit the self-harm item. These results may therefore be particularly relevant for investigators in similar situations, when participants who endorse the self-harm item cannot be reliably contacted.

Despite these limitations, this study contributes to the growing body of literature on the DSM-XC and can help with the interpretation of scores for future research. The measure has been recommended for clinical research by the NIMH Extramural Research Program (NOT-MH-15-009, 2015) and for further evaluation by the APA (American Psychiatric Association, 2019). Continued evaluation of its psychometric properties is supported by a need to better identify

mental health in the general population; while many domain-specific mental health surveys have been validated, the DSM-XC captures symptoms that cross-cut psychiatric diagnostic categories which accounts for the dimensionality and frequent co-occurrence of mental illnesses.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (2019). *Online Assessment Measures*. https://www.psychiatry.org/psychiatrists/practice/dsm/educational-resources/assessment-measures

Barrett, P. (2007). Structural equation modelling: Adjudging model fit. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *42*(5), 815–824. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.018

Bastiaens, L., & Galus, J. (2018). The DSM-5 Self-Rated Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure as a Screening Tool. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, *89*(1), 111–115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11126-017-9518-7

Bravo, A., Villarose-Hurlocker, M., Pearson, M., & Protective Strategies Study Team. (2018). College Student Mental Health: An Evaluation of the DSM–5 Self-Rated Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure. *Psychological Assessment*, *30*(10), 1382–1389. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pas0000628

Clarke, D. E., & Kuhl, E. A. (2014). DSM-5 cross-cutting symptom measures: a step towards the future of psychiatric care? *World Psychiatry*, *13*(3), 314–316. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20154

Çökmüş, F., Balıkçı, K., Aydemir, Ö., & Grubu, D. (2017). Reliability and validity of Turkish Form of DSM-5 Self-Rated Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Scale-Adult Version. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*, *18*(2), 5. https://doi.org/10.5455/apd.228806

Cook, K. F., Kallen, M. A., & Amtmann, D. (2009). Having a fit: impact of number of items and distribution of data on traditional criteria for assessing IRT's unidimensionality assumption.

Quality of Life Research: An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care and Rehabilitation, *18*(4), 447–460. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-009-9464-4

Costello, A., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868

DiStefano, C., Zhu, M., & Mîndrilã, D. (2009). Understanding and Using Factor Scores: Considerations for the Applied Researcher. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7275/da8t-4g52

Hallquist, M. N., & Wiley, J. F. (2018). *MplusAutomation* : An *R* Package for Facilitating Large-Scale Latent Variable Analyses in *Mplus*. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *25*(4), 621–638. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2017.1402334

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Ishfaq, N., & Kamal, A. (2019). Mental health and imprisonment: Measuring cross-cutting symptoms among convicts in Punjab, Pakistan. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, *44*, 127–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2019.07.036

Jones, K. D. (2012). Dimensional and Cross-Cutting Assessment in the *DSM-5*. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *90*(4), 481–487. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2012.00059.x

Jorgensen, T. D., Pornprasertmanit, S., Schoemann, A. M., Rosseel, Y., Miller, P., Quick, C., Garnier-Villarreal, M., Selig, J., Boulton, A., Preacher, K., Coffman, D., Rhemtulla, M., Robitzsch, A., Enders, C., Arslan, R., Clinton, B., Panko, P., Merkle, E., Chesnut, S., … Rönkkö,

M. (2021). *semTools: Useful Tools for Structural Equation Modeling* (0.5-4) [Computer software]. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTools

Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. W. (2001). The PHQ-9. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *16*(9), 606–613. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x

Lace, J. W., & Merz, Z. C. (2020). DSM-5 Level 1 cross-cutting measure in an online sample: evaluating its latent dimensionality and utility detecting nonspecific psychological distress. *Psychiatry Research*, *294*, 113529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113529

Mahoney, M. R., Farmer, C., Sinclair, S., Sung, S., Dehaut, K., & Chung, J. Y. (2020). Utilization of the DSM-5 Self-Rated Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure-Adult to Screen Healthy Volunteers for Research Studies. *Psychiatry Research*, *286*, 112822. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112822

Marsh, H. W., Wen, Z., & Hau, K.-T. (2004). Structural Equation Models of Latent Interactions: Evaluation of Alternative Estimation Strategies and Indicator Construction. *Psychological Methods*, *9*(3), 275–300. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.9.3.275

McIntosh, C. N. (2007). Rethinking fit assessment in structural equation modelling: A commentary and elaboration on Barrett (2007). *Personality and Individual Differences*, *42*(5), 859–867. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.020

Mościcki, E. K., Clarke, D. E., Kuramoto, S. J., Kraemer, H. C., Narrow, W. E., Kupfer, D. J., & Regier, D. A. (2013). Testing DSM-5 in Routine Clinical Practice Settings: Feasibility and Clinical Utility. *Psychiatric Services*, *64*(10), 952–960. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201300098

Narrow, W. E., Clarke, D. E., Kuramoto, S. J., Kraemer, H. C., Kupfer, D. J., Greiner, L., & Regier, D. A. (2013). DSM-5 Field Trials in the United States and Canada, Part III: Development

and Reliability Testing of a Cross-Cutting Symptom Assessment for DSM-5. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *170*(1), 71–82. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2012.12071000

NOT-MH-15-009: Notice Announcing Data Harmonization for NIMH Human Subjects Research via the PhenX Toolkit. (n.d.). Retrieved February 24, 2021, from https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-MH-15-009.html

Panchal, N., Kamal, R., Cox, C., & Garfield, R. (2021). The Implications of COVID-19 for Mental Health and Substance Use. *KFF*.

Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*(1), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2020). Key substance use and mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2019 National Survey on Drug Use and Health (HHS Publication No. PEP20-07-01-001, NSDUH Series H-55). Rockville, MD: Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Retrieved from https://www.samhsa.gov/data/

Terlizzi, E., & Zablotsky, B. (2020). Mental Health Treatment Among Adults: United States, 2019 (Data Brief No. 380; p. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/databriefs/db380.htm). US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Xia, Y., & Yang, Y. (2019). RMSEA, CFI, and TLI in structural equation modeling with ordered categorical data: The story they tell depends on the estimation methods. *Behavior Research Methods*, *51*(1), 409–428. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-1055-2

Xiong, J., Lipsitz, O., Nasri, F., Lui, L. M. W., Gill, H., Phan, L., Chen-Li, D., Iacobucci, M., Ho, R., Majeed, A., & McIntyre, R. S. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health in

the general population: A systematic review. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *277*, 55–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.08.001

Table 1. Demographics

Demographic Characteristics	Total Sample
Age (Range)	46.5 ± 14.8 (18-87)
Sex	
Male, *n* (%)	589 (16.8%)
Female, *n* (%)	2921 (83.2%)
Race	
White, *n* (%)	3150 (90.2%)
Black, *n* (%)	104 (3.0%)
Asian, *n* (%)	85 (2.4%)
Multiple, *n* (%)	155 (4.4%)
Education	
< college degree, *n* (%)	395 (11.1%)
Associates, *n* (%)	175 (5.0%)
Bachelors, *n* (%)	1112 (31.6%)
Advanced, *n* (%)	1840 (52.3%)
Self-Report Clinical History	
Psych Hospitalization, *n* (%)	487 (13.8%)
Psych Medication Use, *n* (%)	1880 (53.2%)
Mental Health Counseling, *n* (%)	2315 (71.6%)

Table 2. Fit indices from Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analyses.

Exploratory Factor Analyses						
Solution	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA [95% CI]	SRMR
1	1408.03	209	.952	.947	.069 [.066 - .070]	.08
2	931.02	188	.970	.964	.057 [.054 - .061]	.067
3	535.89	168	.985	.980	.043 [.039 - .047]	.054
4	372.34	149	.991	.986	.035 [.031 - .040]	.044
5	244.78	131	.995	.992	.027 [.022 - .032]	.037
6	186.79	114	.997	.994	.023 [.017 - .029]	.029
Confirmatory Factor Analyses						
Lace and Merz 2-Factor	2315.59	231	0.826	0.802	0.081 [0.078-0.084]	.072
Proposed 6-Factor Solution	737.33	187	0.994	0.993	0.038 [0.036-0.040]	.044

χ^2 – Chi Square, df – Degrees of Freedom, CFI – Comparative Fit Index, TLI – Tucker Lewis Index, RMSEA – Root Mean Square Error of Approximation, SRMR - Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.
*Solution proposed by Lace and Merz, 2020.
Note: Robust indices used for Confirmatory Factor Analyses.

Table 3. Standardized Loadings for 6-Factor Solution.

Item*	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Little interest or pleasure in doing things?	0.885					
Feeling down, depressed of hopeless?	0.905					
Feeling more irritated, grouchy, or angry than usual?	0.747					
Not knowing who you really are or what you want out of life?	0.666				0.365	
Not feeling close to other people or enjoying relationships?	0.713				0.308	
Feeling detached from yourself, your body, your surroundings?	0.689				0.365	
Feeling nervous, anxious, worried or on edge?		0.908				
Feeling panic or being frightened?		0.901				
Avoiding situations that make you anxious?		0.780				
Feeling driven to perform certain behaviors over and over?		0.596			0.481	
Unpleasant thoughts, urges or images repeatedly enter your mind?		0.714			0.517	
Starting more projects or doing more risky things than usual?			0.567			
Sleeping less than usual, but still have a lot of energy?			0.427			
Problems with sleep that affected your sleep quality over all?			0.746			
Problems with memory or with location?				0.743		
Unexplained aches and pains?				0.674		
Feeling that your illnesses are not being taken seriously?				0.784		
Hearing things that other people couldn't hear, such as voices?				0.556	0.346	
Feeling that someone could hear your thoughts?				0.512	0.364	
Drinking at least 4 drinks of alcohol in a single day?						0.318
Smoking cigarettes, a cigar, pipe, using snug or chewing tobacco?						0.680
Using medications without a doctor's prescription?						0.735

*Some items abbreviated in table. For full DSMXC measure, please see Appendix A.

Table 4. Fit Indices from Measurement Invariance Analyses Across Age, Sex and Time.

		Fit Indices					Comparison to less restrictive model (change)				
Invariance Grouping	Invariance Model	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Age	Configural	561	0.980	0.975	0.0426	0.0600					
	Threshold	605	0.979	0.976	0.0418	0.0600	44	-0.000728	0.000991	-0.000850	1.65E-07
	Metric	651	0.982	0.980	0.0376	0.0630	46	0.00270	0.00457	-0.00417	0.00296
	Scalar*	679	0.980	0.980	0.0379	0.0614	28	-0.00115	-0.000363	0.000348	-0.00160
Sex	Configural	374	0.987	0.983	0.0369	0.0552					
	Threshold	397	0.986	0.984	0.0361	0.0552	23	-0.000225	0.000697	-0.000785	8.75E-08
	Metric	420	0.988	0.987	0.0332	0.0551	23	0.00146	0.00247	-0.002934	-0.000103
	Scalar*	434	0.988	0.987	0.0329	0.0556	14	-0.000238	0.000178	-0.000222	0.000509
Time**	Configural	300	0.984	0.980	0.0429	0.0479					
	Threshold	316	0.984	0.981	0.0420	0.0479	16	-0.000117	0.000875	-0.000947	-2.6E-08
	Metric	335	0.985	0.983	0.0392	0.0491	19	0.00116	0.00240	-0.00271	0.00126
	Scalar*	347	0.985	0.984	0.0383	0.0491	12	0.000187	0.000784	-0.000929	-3.9E-06

df – Degrees of Freedom, CFI – Comparative Fit Index, TLI – Tucker Lewis Index, RMSEA – Root Mean Square Error of Approximation, SRMR - Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. * The scalar invariance model did not free the mean of factor 5, because it was composed entirely of cross-loaded items. ** All invariance models for time excluded the items, “Hearing things…” and “…hear your thoughts” due to insufficient non-zero response in the later time point group.



Figure 1. Path Diagram for 6-factor solution.

Supplementary Table 1. Standardized Fit Loadings for all solutions from Exploratory Factor Analyses.

	1 Factor Solution	2 Factor Solution		3 Factor Solution			4 Factor Solution				5 Factor Solution					6 Factor Solution					
Item	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6
Little interest	0.848	0.419	0.516	0	0.422	0.693	0.416	0.04	0.021	0.598	0.572	0.001	-0.016	0.019	0.541	0.743	0.008	-0.01	0.298	-0.004	-0.016
Feeling down	0.856	0.526	0.418	0.001	0.528	0.613	0.557	-0.008	-0.042	0.533	0.508	0.192	-0.03	-0.051	0.461	0.714	0.181	-0.008	0.195	-0.01	-0.106
Feeling more irritated	0.717	0.428	0.362	0.181	0.352	0.398	0.451	0.037	0.063	0.343	0.323	0.22	0.026	0.026	0.333	0.451	0.221	0.026	0.152	0.028	0.015
Not know want life	0.419	-0.182	0.623	0.653	-0.296	-0.002	-0.018	0.768	-0.002	-0.036	-0.016	-0.013	0.839	-0.017	-0.033	-0.017	-0.021	0.843	-0.013	0.018	-0.001
Not feeling close	0.465	-0.163	0.651	0.685	-0.282	0.001	0.034	0.657	0.045	-0.004	-0.009	0.051	0.634	0.025	0.043	0.02	0.048	0.588	0.026	0.057	0.063
Feeling detached	0.837	0.918	-0.01	0.437	0.616	0.012	0.933	-0.039	-0.034	0.029	0.108	0.867	0.015	-0.075	0.038	0.175	0.866	0.021	-0.086	-0.03	-0.007
Feeling nervous, anxious	0.839	0.878	0.021	0.6	0.533	-0.119	0.913	-0.009	0.058	-0.086	0.056	0.849	0.02	0.093	-0.06	0.009	0.858	0.009	0.017	-0.001	0.089
Feeling panic	0.76	0.561	0.277	0.612	0.284	0.012	0.593	0.04	0.255	0.005	0.058	0.552	0.035	0.234	0.071	0.014	0.576	-0.001	0.136	0.097	0.21
Avoiding situations	0.568	0.181	0.441	0.503	0.038	0.1	0.239	0.136	0.293	0.065	0.332	-0.026	0.001	0.533	0.006	0.059	0.011	-0.015	0.574	0.055	0.117
Driven to perform behaviors	0.7	0.276	0.492	0.649	0.077	0.064	0.359	0.195	0.309	0.031	0.437	0.027	0.03	0.697	-0.124	0.004	0.079	0.018	0.752	0.02	0.093
Unpleasant thoughts	0.562	-0.033	0.628	0.677	-0.169	0.042	0.039	-0.07	0.717	-0.009	-0.013	0.044	-0.146	0.645	0.178	0.029	0.051	-0.127	0.314	0.516	0.011
Starting more projects	0.617	-0.164	0.808	0.873	-0.319	-0.014	-0.056	0.148	0.772	-0.074	0.017	-0.085	0.051	0.778	0.094	-0.023	-0.081	0.071	0.446	0.545	-0.042
Sleeping less	0.641	0.203	0.5	0.435	0.089	0.233	0.301	0.416	0.004	0.188	0.331	0.053	0.362	0.129	0.113	0.273	0.063	0.352	0.282	-0.034	-0.018
Problems with sleep	0.642	0.096	0.601	0.57	-0.042	0.178	0.161	0.189	0.384	0.126	0.166	0.031	0.125	0.393	0.196	0.155	0.047	0.109	0.319	0.23	0.09
Problems with memory	0.743	0.34	0.479	0.668	0.103	0.081	0.369	0.003	0.498	0.04	-0.039	0.405	0.007	0.351	0.207	0.116	0.404	0.018	0.076	0.409	0.002
Unexplained aches	0.626	0.274	0.413	0.783	0.002	-0.135	0.314	-0.006	0.58	-0.168	-0.172	0.444	-0.02	0.497	0.007	-0.108	0.447	0.006	0.084	0.506	-0.089
Illnesses not taken seriously	0.712	0.124	0.652	0.486	0.008	0.326	0.148	0.039	0.497	0.248	-0.013	0.174	0.075	0.197	0.467	0.34	0.157	0.081	-0.016	0.451	0.01
Hearing things	0.707	0.009	0.752	0.255	-0.001	0.586	-0.012	-0.097	0.566	0.483	-0.027	0.025	-0.018	0.034	0.82	0.586	-0.002	-0.027	-0.157	0.534	0.101
Someone hear thoughts	0.734	0.009	0.786	0.284	-0.01	0.6	0.008	0.012	0.499	0.483	0.109	-0.041	0.062	0.103	0.706	0.551	-0.054	0.047	0.018	0.399	0.119
Drinking at least 4 drinks	0.118	-0.084	0.208	-0.023	-0.046	0.213	-0.081	0.107	0.004	0.181	0.035	-0.097	0.127	-0.123	0.231	0.042	-0.082	0.052	0.036	-0.206	0.472
Smoking cigarettes	0.338	-0.093	0.45	0.283	-0.135	0.2	-0.088	0.077	0.344	0.146	-0.13	0.026	0.114	0.065	0.341	-0.073	0.063	0.005	0.003	0.083	0.622
Using medications	0.421	0.131	0.329	0.181	0.079	0.256	0.136	0.056	0.157	0.213	0.016	0.139	0.081	-0.04	0.327	0.107	0.17	0	0.005	-0.022	0.433

Supplementary Table 2. Correlations Between Exploratory Factor Analysis Solutions.

Solution		X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6
1-Factor	1	1					
2-Factor	1	1					
	2	0.663	1				
3-Factor	1	1					
	2	0.461	1				
	3	0.659	0.255	1			
4-Factor	1	1					
	2	0.422	1				
	3	0.587	0.517	1			
	4	0.46	0.338	0.349	1		
5-Factor	1	1					
	2	0.571	1				
	3	0.224	0.4	1			
	4	0.185	0.487	0.478	1		
	5	0.33	0.605	0.456	0.583	1	
6-Factor	1	1					
	2	0.616	1				
	3	0.321	0.37	1			
	4	0.438	0.625	0.39	1		
	5	0.242	0.355	0.392	0.505	1	
	6	0.407	0.238	0.308	0.228	0.344	1

Supplemental File: DSM-5 Self-Rated Level 1 Cross-Cutting Symptom Measure—Adult

Rights granted: This measure can be reproduced without permission by researchers and by clinicians for use with their patients. Rights holder: American Psychiatric Association

Note: Item with strike through was not included in this study and thus not included in the analyses.

	During the past **TWO (2) WEEKS**, how much (or how often) have you been bothered by the following problems?	**None** Not at all	**Slight** Rare, less than a day or two	**Mild** Several days	**Moderate** More than half the days	**Severe** Nearly every day
I.	1. Little interest or pleasure in doing things?	0	1	2	3	4
	2. Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless?	0	1	2	3	4
II.	3. Feeling more irritated, grouchy, or angry than usual?	0	1	2	3	4
III.	4. Sleeping less than usual, but still have a lot of energy?	0	1	2	3	4
	5. Starting lots more projects than usual or doing more risky things than usual?	0	1	2	3	4
IV.	6. Feeling nervous, anxious, frightened, worried, or on edge?	0	1	2	3	4
	7. Feeling panic or being frightened?	0	1	2	3	4
	8. Avoiding situations that make you anxious?	0	1	2	3	4
V.	9. Unexplained aches and pains (e.g., head, back, joints, abdomen, legs)?	0	1	2	3	4
	10. Feeling that your illnesses are not being taken seriously enough?	0	1	2	3	4
~~VI.~~	~~11. Thoughts of actually hurting yourself?~~	0	1	2	3	4
VII.	12. Hearing things other people couldn't hear, such as voices even when no one was around?	0	1	2	3	4
	13. Feeling that someone could hear your thoughts, or that you could hear what another person was thinking?	0	1	2	3	4
VIII.	14. Problems with sleep that affected your sleep quality over all?	0	1	2	3	4
IX.	15. Problems with memory (e.g., learning new information) or with location (e.g., finding your way home)?	0	1	2	3	4
X.	16. Unpleasant thoughts, urges, or images that repeatedly enter your mind?	0	1	2	3	4
	17. Feeling driven to perform certain behaviors or mental acts over and over again?	0	1	2	3	4
XI.	18. Feeling detached or distant from yourself, your body, your physical surroundings, or your memories?	0	1	2	3	4
XII.	19. Not knowing who you really are or what you want out of life?	0	1	2	3	4
	20. Not feeling close to other people or enjoying your relationships with them?	0	1	2	3	4
XIII.	21. Drinking at least 4 drinks of any kind of alcohol in a single day?	0	1	2	3	4
	22. Smoking any cigarettes, a cigar, or pipe, or using snuff or chewing tobacco?	0	1	2	3	4
	23. Using any of the following medicines ON YOUR OWN, that is, without a doctor's prescription, in greater amounts or longer than prescribed [e.g., painkillers (like Vicodin), stimulants (like Ritalin or Adderall), sedatives or tranquilizers (like sleeping pills or Valium), or drugs like marijuana, cocaine or crack, club drugs (like ecstasy), hallucinogens (like LSD), heroin, inhalants or solvents (like glue), or methamphetamine (like speed)]?	0	1	2	3	4

DSM5 Level 1 Crosscutting Symptom Measure – Adult: Factor Analysis Syntax

```
# This file contains the R and mplus syntax for all analyses

# load required libraries
library(tidyverse)
library(lavaan)
library(semTools)
library(MplusAutomation)

# create collapsed dataset (recoded) from raw data (df)
# functions to collapse responses
rec.01 <- function(var) {recode(var, '0'="0", '1'="1", '2'="1", '3'="1", '4'="1")}
rec.012 <- function(var) {recode(var, '0'="0", '1'="1", '2'="2", '3'="2", '4'="2")}
rec.0123 <- function(var) {recode(var, '0'="0", '1'="1", '2'="2", '3'="3", '4'="3")}

## collapse responses for EFA and CFA
recoded <- df %>%
  mutate(DOING_MORE=rec.0123(DOING_MORE),
         HEARING_THINGS=rec.01(HEARING_THINGS),
         HEAR_THOUGHTS=rec.01(HEAR_THOUGHTS),
         TOBACCO=rec.012(TOBACCO)) %>%
  mutate(across(LITTLE_INTEREST:SELF_MEDICATED, as.ordered))

## collapse responses for MI analyses (separate dataset for each grouping variable)
time.mi <- df %>%
  mutate(HEAR_THOUGHTS = rec.01(HEAR_THOUGHTS),
         HEARING_THINGS = rec.01(HEARING_THINGS),
         ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY =
rec.01(ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY),
         SELF_MEDICATED = rec.01(SELF_MEDICATED),
         TOBACCO = rec.01(TOBACCO),
         DISTANT_SELF = rec.012(DISTANT_SELF),
         DOING_MORE = rec.012(DOING_MORE),
         MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY = rec.012(MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY),
         PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS = rec.012(PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS),
         PROBLEMS_MEMORY = rec.012(PROBLEMS_MEMORY),
         DOWN_HOPELESS = rec.0123(DOWN_HOPELESS),
         LITTLE_INTEREST = rec.0123(LITTLE_INTEREST),
         MORE_IRRITATED = rec.0123(MORE_IRRITATED),
         NOT_FEELNG_CLOSE = rec.0123(NOT_FEELNG_CLOSE),
         PANIC = rec.0123(PANIC),
         SLEEPNG_LESS = rec.0123(SLEEPNG_LESS),
         UNEXPLAIND_PAIN = rec.0123(UNEXPLAIND_PAIN),
         UNPLEASANT_THOUGHTS = rec.0123(UNPLEASANT_THOUGHTS)) %>%
  mutate(across(LITTLE_INTEREST:SELF_MEDICATED, as.ordered))
```

```
sex.mi <- df %>%
  mutate(DOING_MORE=rec.01(DOING_MORE),
         SLEEPNG_LESS=rec.0123(SLEEPNG_LESS),
         UNEXPLAIND_PAIN=rec.0123(UNEXPLAIND_PAIN),

ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY=rec.012(ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY),
         HEARING_THINGS=rec.01(HEARING_THINGS),
         HEAR_THOUGHTS=rec.01(HEAR_THOUGHTS),
         PROBLEMS_MEMORY=rec.012(PROBLEMS_MEMORY),
         PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS=rec.012(PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS),
         DISTANT_SELF=rec.012(DISTANT_SELF),
         MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY=rec.0123(MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY),
         TOBACCO=rec.012(TOBACCO),
         SELF_MEDICATED=rec.012(SELF_MEDICATED)) %>%
  mutate(across(LITTLE_INTEREST:SELF_MEDICATED, as.ordered))

age.mi <- df %>%
  mutate(MORE_IRRITATED=rec.0123(MORE_IRRITATED),
         DOING_MORE=rec.012(DOING_MORE),
         SLEEPNG_LESS=rec.0123(SLEEPNG_LESS),

ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY=rec.012(ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY),
         HEARING_THINGS=rec.01(HEARING_THINGS),
         HEAR_THOUGHTS=rec.01(HEAR_THOUGHTS),
         PROBLEMS_MEMORY=rec.0123(PROBLEMS_MEMORY),
         PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS=rec.012(PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS),
         DISTANT_SELF=rec.012(DISTANT_SELF),
         NOT_LIFE_WANT=rec.0123(NOT_LIFE_WANT),
         MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY=rec.012(MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY),
         TOBACCO=rec.01(TOBACCO),
         SELF_MEDICATED=rec.012(SELF_MEDICATED)) %>%
  mutate(across(LITTLE_INTEREST:SELF_MEDICATED, as.ordered))
```

 # EFA analyses (these are Mplus code, not R code)

```
title: DSM XC EFA
  data: file is recode_train.txt;
  variable:
    names are ID LITTLE_INTEREST  DOWN_HOPELESS  MORE_IRRITATED
SLEEPNG_LESS  DOING_MORE  NERVOUS_ANXIOUS  PANIC  AVOIDNG_ANXIOUS
UNEXPLAIND_PAIN  ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY  HEAR_THINGS
HEAR_THOUGHTS  PROB_SLEEP  PROB_MEMORY  UNPLEASANT_THOUGHTS
PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS  DISTANT_SELF  NOT_LIFE_WANT
NOT_FEELNG_CLOSE  MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY  TOBACCO  SELF_MEDICATED;
```

```
  categorical are LITTLE_INTEREST  DOWN_HOPELESS  MORE_IRRITATED
SLEEPNG_LESS  DOING_MORE  NERVOUS_ANXIOUS  PANIC  AVOIDNG_ANXIOUS
UNEXPLAIND_PAIN  ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY  HEAR_THINGS
HEAR_THOUGHTS  PROB_SLEEP  PROB_MEMORY  UNPLEASANT_THOUGHTS
PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS  DISTANT_SELF  NOT_LIFE_WANT
NOT_FEELNG_CLOSE  MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY  TOBACCO  SELF_MEDICATED;

  usevariables
  LITTLE_INTEREST  DOWN_HOPELESS  MORE_IRRITATED  SLEEPNG_LESS
DOING_MORE  NERVOUS_ANXIOUS  PANIC  AVOIDNG_ANXIOUS
UNEXPLAIND_PAIN  ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY  HEAR_THINGS
HEAR_THOUGHTS  PROB_SLEEP  PROB_MEMORY  UNPLEASANT_THOUGHTS
PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS  DISTANT_SELF  NOT_LIFE_WANT
NOT_FEELNG_CLOSE  MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY  TOBACCO  SELF_MEDICATED;

  analysis:   type = efa 1 6;
```

 # Extract information for selected EFA solution

```
mplusresults <- readModels("dsm xc efa.out")
summaries <- bind_rows(mplusresults$summaries)
solutions <- bind_rows(mplusresults$parameters$efa$f1$loadings$estimates %>%
                          data.frame() %>% rownames_to_column() %>% mutate(soln = 1),
                        mplusresults$parameters$efa$f2$loadings$estimates %>%
                          data.frame() %>% rownames_to_column() %>% mutate(soln = 2),
                        mplusresults$parameters$efa$f3$loadings$estimates %>%
                          data.frame() %>% rownames_to_column() %>% mutate(soln = 3),
                        mplusresults$parameters$efa$f4$loadings$estimates %>%
                          data.frame() %>% rownames_to_column() %>% mutate(soln = 4),
                        mplusresults$parameters$efa$f5$loadings$estimates %>%
                          data.frame() %>% rownames_to_column() %>% mutate(soln = 5),
                        mplusresults$parameters$efa$f6$loadings$estimates %>%
                          data.frame() %>% rownames_to_column() %>% mutate(soln = 6))
```

 # CFA analyses

```
## factor models: Lace and Merz solution (soln.lm), NIH 6-factor solution (soln.6), NIH 6-factor
solution excluding two items for use in MI analyses (soln.6m)
soln.lm <- '
internalizing =~ LITTLE_INTEREST + DOWN_HOPELESS + MORE_IRRITATED +
SLEEPNG_LESS + NERVOUS_ANXIOUS + PANIC + AVOIDNG_ANXIOUS +
UNEXPLAIND_PAIN + ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY + PROBLEMS_SLEEP +
UNPLEASANT_THOUGHTS + NOT_LIFE_WANT + NOT_FEELNG_CLOSE
externalizing =~ DOING_MORE + HEAR_THOUGHTS + HEARING_THINGS +
PROBLEMS_MEMORY + PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS + DISTANT_SELF +
MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY + TOBACCO + SELF_MEDICATED'

soln.6 <- '
```

```
Factor1 =~ LITTLE_INTEREST + DOWN_HOPELESS + MORE_IRRITATED +
NOT_LIFE_WANT + NOT_FEELNG_CLOSE + DISTANT_SELF
Factor2 =~ NERVOUS_ANXIOUS + PANIC + AVOIDNG_ANXIOUS +
PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS + UNPLEASANT_THOUGHTS
Factor3 =~ DOING_MORE + SLEEPNG_LESS + PROBLEMS_SLEEP
Factor4 =~ PROBLEMS_MEMORY + UNEXPLAIND_PAIN +
ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY + HEARING_THINGS + HEAR_THOUGHTS
Factor5 =~ HEARING_THINGS + HEAR_THOUGHTS + PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS +
UNPLEASANT_THOUGHTS + DISTANT_SELF + NOT_LIFE_WANT +
NOT_FEELNG_CLOSE
Factor6 =~ MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY + TOBACCO + SELF_MEDICATED'

soln.6m <- '
Factor1 =~ LITTLE_INTEREST + DOWN_HOPELESS + MORE_IRRITATED +
NOT_LIFE_WANT + NOT_FEELNG_CLOSE + DISTANT_SELF
Factor2 =~ NERVOUS_ANXIOUS + PANIC + AVOIDNG_ANXIOUS +
PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS + UNPLEASANT_THOUGHTS
Factor3 =~ DOING_MORE + SLEEPNG_LESS + PROBLEMS_SLEEP
Factor4 =~ PROBLEMS_MEMORY + UNEXPLAIND_PAIN +
ILLNESS_NOT_TAKEN_SERIOUSLY
Factor5 =~ PERFORM_REPEATNG_ACTS + UNPLEASANT_THOUGHTS +
DISTANT_SELF + NOT_LIFE_WANT + NOT_FEELNG_CLOSE
Factor6 =~ MORE_4_DRINK_PER_DAY + TOBACCO + SELF_MEDICATED'

## CFA of Lace and Merz and NIH six-factor solution
fit.lm <- cfa(model = soln.lm, data = recoded.test, test = "Satorra-Bentler")
fit.nih <- cfa(model = soln.6, data = recoded.test, test = "Satorra-Bentler")

# MI analyses, repeated across three MI datasets (time.mi, sex.mi, age.mi)
mi.func <- function(mod.cat, df.cat, group) {
  syntax.config <- measEq.syntax(configural.model = mod.cat,
                                 data = df.cat,
                                 parameterization = "theta",
                                 ID.fac = "std.lv",
                                 ID.cat = "Wu.Estabrook.2016",
                                 group = group)
  syntax.thresh <- measEq.syntax(configural.model = mod.cat,
                                 data = df.cat,
                                 parameterization = "theta",
                                 ID.fac = "std.lv",
                                 ID.cat = "Wu.Estabrook.2016",
                                 group = group,
                                 group.equal = "thresholds")
  syntax.metric <- measEq.syntax(configural.model = mod.cat,
                                 data = df.cat,
                                 parameterization = "theta",
```

```
                        ID.fac = "std.lv",
                        ID.cat = "Wu.Estabrook.2016",
                        group = group,
                        group.equal = c("thresholds","loadings"))
  syntax.scalar <- measEq.syntax(configural.model = mod.cat,
                        data = df.cat,
                        parameterization = "theta",
                        ID.fac = "std.lv",
                        ID.cat = "Wu.Estabrook.2016",
                        group = group,
                        group.equal = c("thresholds","loadings","intercepts"))

  ### threshold versus configural ###

  fit.config <- cfa(as.character(syntax.config),
              data = df.cat, group = group, parameterization = "theta")

  fit.thresh <- cfa(as.character(syntax.thresh),
              data = df.cat, group = group, parameterization = "theta")

  thresh_config <- summary(compareFit(fit.config, fit.thresh))

  ### metric versus threshold ###

  fit.metric <- cfa(as.character(syntax.metric),
              data = df.cat, group = group, parameterization = "theta")

  metric_thresh <- summary(compareFit(fit.thresh, fit.metric))

  ### Scalar versus metric ###

  fit.scalar <- cfa(as.character(syntax.scalar),
              data = df.cat, group = group, parameterization = "theta")

  scalar_metric <- summary(compareFit(fit.metric,fit.scalar))

  out <- list(thresh_config = thresh_config,
          metric_thresh = metric_thresh,
          scalar_metric = scalar_metric)
return(out)
}

age_mi <- mi.func(mod.cat = soln.6, df.cat = age.mi, group = "agegroup")
sex_mi <- mi.func(mod.cat = soln.6, df.cat = sex.mi, group = "sex")
time_nohear <- mi.func(mod.cat = soln.6m, df.cat = time.mi, group = "monthgrp")
```

```
extract.fit <- function(df){bind_rows(df$thresh_config$fit.indices %>% data.frame(),
                              df$metric_thresh$fit.indices %>% data.frame(),
                              df$scalar_metric$fit.indices %>% data.frame()) %>%
   unique() %>%
   rownames_to_column() }

extract.chg <- function(df){bind_rows(df$thresh_config$fit.diff  %>% data.frame(),
                              df$metric_thresh$fit.diff %>% data.frame(),
                              df$scalar_metric$fit.diff %>% data.frame()) %>%
   unique() %>%
   rownames_to_column() }

age_mi_results <- bind_rows(extract.fit(age_mi),
                      extract.chg(age_mi)) %>% mutate(var = "age")

sex_mi_results <- bind_rows(extract.fit(sex_mi),
                      extract.chg(sex_mi)) %>% mutate(var = "sex")

time_mi_results <- bind_rows(extract.fit(time_nohear),
                       extract.chg(time_nohear)) %>% mutate(var = "time")
```