Transdiagnostic Profiles of Behaviour and Communication Relate to Academic and Socio-emotional Functioning and Neural White Matter Organisation

Silvana Mareva[1], Danyal Akarca[1], The CALM team[1], Joni Holmes[1,2]

[1]Medical Research Council Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge

Abstract

Behavioural and language difficulties co-occur in multiple neurodevelopmental conditions. Our understanding of these problems has arguably been slowed by an overreliance on case-control designs, which limit the conclusions we can draw because they fail to capture the overlap across different neurodevelopmental disorders and the heterogeneity within them. In this study, we recruited a large transdiagnostic cohort of children with complex diagnosed and undiagnosed needs ($N = 805$) to identify distinct subgroups of children with common profiles of behavioural and language strengths and difficulties. We then investigated whether and how these data-driven groupings could be distinguished from a comparison sample ($N = 158$) on academic, socio-emotional, and neural white matter characteristics. We identified three distinct subgroups of children, each with different levels of difficulties in structural language, pragmatic communication, and hot and cool executive functions. All three subgroups struggled with academic and socio-emotional skills relative to the comparison sample, potentially representing three alternative but related developmental pathways to difficulties in these areas. The children with the weakest language skills had the most widespread difficulties with learning, whereas those with more pronounced difficulties with hot executive skills experienced the most severe difficulties within the socio-emotional domain. Each data-driven subgroup could be distinguished from the comparison sample based on both shared and subgroup-unique patterns of neural white matter organisation. These findings advance our understanding of commonly co-morbid behavioural and language problems and their relationship to behavioural outcomes and neurobiological substrates.

Key words: Neurodevelopment, Transdiagnostic, Learning, Socio-emotional Development, Executive Function, Language and Communication

Transdiagnostic Profiles of Behaviour and Communication Relate to Academic and Socio-emotional Functioning and Neural White Matter Organisation

Silvana Mareva[1], Danyal Akarca[1], The CALM team[1], Joni Holmes[1,2]

[1]Medical Research Council Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge

15 Chaucer Road, Cambridge, CB2 7EF

[2]School of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of East Anglia

Norwich Research Park, Norwich, Norfolk, NR4 7TJ

Correspondence to: Silvana Mareva, silvana.mareva@mrc-cbu.cam.ac.uk, MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences, 15 Chaucer Road, CB2 7EF, Cambridge, UK.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements: The CALM Team includes lead investigators Duncan Astle, Kate Baker, Susan Gathercole, Joni Holmes, Rogier Kievit and Tom Manly. Data collection is assisted by a team of researchers and PhD students that includes Danyal Akarca, Joe Bathelt, Marc Bennett, Giacomo Bignardi, Sarah Bishop, Erica Bottacin, Lara Bridge, Diandra Brkic, Annie Bryant, Sally Butterfield, Elizabeth Byrne, Gemma Crickmore, Edwin Dalmaijer, Fánchea Daly, Tina Emery, Laura Forde, Grace Franckel, Delia Furhmann, Andrew Gadie, Sara Gharooni, Jacalyn Guy, Erin Hawkins, Agnieszka Jaroslawska, Sara Joeghan, Amy Johnson, Jonathan Jones, Silvana Mareva, Elise Ng-Cordell, Sinead O'Brien, Cliodhna O'Leary, Joseph Rennie, Ivan Simpson-Kent, Roma Siugzdaite, Tess Smith, Stephani Uh, Maria Vedechkina, Francesca Woolgar, Natalia Zdorovtsova, Mengya Zhang. The authors would particularly like to thank Dr Duncan Astle and Dr Roma Siugzdaite for their advice regarding the analysis of the neuroimaging data. The authors wish to thank the many professionals working in children's services in the South-East and East of England for their support, and to the children and their families for giving up their time to visit the clinic.

Authorship contributions: SM and JH conceived and designed the study. The CALM team collected the data. DA pre-processed the neuroimaging data and provided advice about the neuroimaging analyses. SM analysed the data. SM and JH wrote the manuscript with contributions from DA. All authors approved the final version.

Data Sharing and Data Accessibility: The CALM dataset is not yet available as the study is still ongoing. The data will be made available via managed open access once the study is complete.

Ethics Approval: Ethical approval was granted by the National Health Service (REC: 13/EE/0157). Parents/caregivers provided written consent and child verbal assent was obtained.

Research Highlights

- Three subgroups with distinct profiles of behavioural and communication strengths and difficulties were identified in a transdiagnostic cohort of children referred by health and educational professionals.
- All three data-driven subgroups had more difficulties with academic and socio-emotional functioning relative to a demographically matched non-referred group.
- The subgroups could be differentiated from the non-referred sample based on both shared and unique features of neural white matter organisation.
- These three communication and behavioural profiles potentially represent three alternative but related pathways to difficulties in academic and socio-emotional functioning.

Transdiagnostic Profiles of Behaviour and Communication Relate to Academic and Socio-emotional Functioning and Neural White Matter Oragnisation

Difficulties with social communication, executive functions (EF), and behaviour are common across a range of neurodevelopmental conditions. Pragmatic or social communication impairments are among the diagnostic criteria for autistic spectrum disorders (ASD) and social (pragmatic) communication disorder (SPCD); difficulties with attention and/or behaviour are characteristic of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD); and structural language problems are the hallmark of developmental language disorder (DLD, American Psychiatric Association, 2013). These difficulties commonly co-occur across different diagnoses. For example, children with ADHD often have pragmatic language difficulties (Green et al., 2014), and structural communication problems are common in both children with ADHD (Korrel et al., 2017) and ASD (Mandy et al., 2017). Similarly, behavioural and attentional difficulties occur in both ASD and DLD (Henry et al., 2012; Rommelse et al., 2011). The high prevalence of these comorbidities suggests that difficulties across these domains may not be independent and disorder specific. Instead, they likely share common aetiological origins and/or may interact dynamically, such that difficulties in one of these areas of functioning may trigger developmental cascades leading to more widespread problems (see Masten et al., 2005).

Comorbidity is one of the main challenges to the current diagnostic system, which is further compounded by the high levels of symptom variability within diagnostic categories: very different profiles of strengths and difficulties are common among children with the same diagnostic label (e.g. Astle et al., 2019; Kushki et al., 2019). For example, not all children with ADHD have executive function impairments, and there is substantial heterogeneity among those who do (Kofler et al., 2019). This has led to widespread recognition of the limitations of diagnostic frameworks for guiding research and support strategies (Casey et al., 2014), and an increase in the application of transdiagnostic approaches for understanding neurodevelopment (see Astle et al., 2021 for a review).

Transdiagnostic Approaches to Neurodevelopment

The case-control design, which has dominated the study of neurodevelopmental disorders, typically compares one group of children with a neurodevelopmental disorder to another diagnostic group or a typically developing group, using univariate analytical approaches to tease apart differences.

Transdiagnostic approaches adopt alternative recruitment and analytical strategies. In these studies, children with a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders are recruited, or diagnosis-based enrolment is replaced with enrolment based on needs. In the latter case, children who experience difficulties in the studied realm(s) are sampled regardless of whether their needs meet diagnostic thresholds (e.g. Holmes et al., 2019). Alternatively, large demographically representative cohorts, including individuals spanning the full spectrum of ability, are studied (e.g. Alexander et al., 2017).

In terms of analyses, one goal is to identify dimensional characteristics that can predict or explain difficulties experienced across individuals irrespective of diagnostic status (e.g. Brislin et al., 2020). The relations between different dimensions and their links to neural and genetic factors can then be studied to identify potential mechanisms of shared or unique variance (e.g. Holmes et al., 2020; Parkes et al., 2021). A complimentary analytical approach, often described as *clustering* or *subtyping*[1], focuses on deriving homogenous data-driven groupings of children with similar profiles of relative strengths and weaknesses along the studied dimensions (e.g. Feczko et al., 2018). These novel groupings can then be similarly used to facilitate the discovery of common aetiological pathways to specific difficulties, or to stratify individuals to support strategies appropriate for their needs.

Both approaches provide important and complimentary insights into the aetiology of transdiagnostic symptoms and their implications for functioning. As one example, consider EFs. Dimensional approaches provide support for two dimensions of EF linked to separate neurodevelopmental pathways (Zelazo, 2020): cool EFs refer to the ability to regulate behaviour and cognition in emotionally neutral contexts, whereas hot EF skills are implicated in situations of stronger motivational and emotional valence (Castellanos et al., 2006). Studies using dimensional analyses reveal these dimensions of EF are related, but are associated with relatively distinct neural networks (see Salehinejad et al., 2021 for an overview of the neuroimaging literature) and have somewhat different predictive validity in terms of cool EF being more closely related to academic achievement and hot EF more predictive of disruptive behaviours (e.g. Willoughby et al., 2011).

[1] Subtyping is usually used in the context of applying clustering techniques within a sample of children with the same diagnosis to uncover different presentations of the same disorder (e.g., ADHD-combined and ADHD-inattentive). For clarity, we use the term clustering or subgrouping from this point forward to refer to data-driven clustering approaches applied in diverse samples rather than within a diagnostic category.

Subgrouping approaches similarly reveal that different EF profiles have different neural correlates and are associated with different outcomes. For example, Vaidya et al. (2020) identified three data-driven EF-subgroups across typically-developing, autistic and ADHD children. These subgroups explained more variance in frontal-parietal engagement (inferred via functional MRI) during a sustained attention task than diagnostic groupings. Similarly, Bathelt et al. (2018) identified three distinct EF-subgroups in a transdiagnostic sample of struggling youth. Each subgroup was associated with different variations in white matter connections in prefrontal regions and there was more within-group homogeneity in the behavioural profiles of the subgroups than in groupings based on diagnosis. Both examples demonstrate that studying subgroups in transdiagnostic samples can facilitate the linking of behavioural phenotypes to neurophysiological mechanisms.

Transdiagnostic Approaches to Neurodevelopmental Comorbidities

The examples of transdiagnostic designs described so far are typical of the field, with a focus on *one* domain of function (e.g., EF). An important next step is to apply these methods to multiple areas of functioning to advance our understanding of the co-occurrence of difficulties across *multiple* domains. We attempted to do this in an earlier study by exploring how symptoms of communication, behaviour and EF difficulties relate to one another in a transdiagnostic cohort of children (Mareva et al., 2019). Using a network approach, we were able to investigate how specific symptoms cluster together and start to unpack how these *clusters of difficulties* are linked.

Four densely interrelated clusters of symptoms were identified relating to structural language and learning, hot EF, pragmatic communication and peer relationships, and cool EF. The symptoms within each cluster did not align with the diagnostic features of any diagnosis. Moreover, specific symptoms bridged these clusters (e.g., inappropriate initiation of communication linked the pragmatic communication and hot EF clusters), providing some insight into the co-occurrence of symptoms across domains of difficulty. It may be the case that these bridging symptoms can trigger difficulties through developmental cascades (Masten et al., 2005) or, alternatively, they may be particularity susceptible to the influence of symptoms in other domains. It is also possible that bridging symptoms do not signal interacting areas of difficulties, but instead reflect aspects of shared neural and/or genetic underpinnings.

Aetiological factors likely underlie the co-occurrence of behavioural symptoms across different domains, but their influence can be masked in traditional diagnostic comparisons. In the current study we were interested in extending our earlier transdiagnostic approach to capture potential links to brain structure. Using diffusion tensor imaging (DTI), we are able to estimate the macroscopic organisation of white-matter connectivity of the brain *in vivo*, which is known as a structural connectome (Basser et al., 2000). This offers a window into exploring how the brain's connectivity may vary between individuals and how such variation relates to individual differences in the domains of interest. Research insights from case-control designs suggest there are both shared and distinct differences at the structural neural level across children with different neurodevelopmental disorders (Ameis et al., 2016; Baribeau et al., 2019; Moreau et al., 2018). Examples of structural neural substrate variation implicated in multiple neurodevelopmental disorders include the corticostriatal (Arnsten & Rubia, 2012; Beauchaine et al., 2019) and interhemispheric circuits (e.g., Ameis et al., 2016; Aoki et al., 2017).

The current study

The aim of the current study was to identify homogenous subgroups of children with similar behavioural, EF, and communication strengths/difficulties in a large transdiagnostic sample. Subsequently, we explored how the profiles of these transdiagnostic subgroups related to measures of brain structure, and academic and socio-emotional functioning. Our previous study included a subsample of the currently studied population, and focussed on identifying *clusters of symptoms* that characterised the sample (Mareva & Holmes, 2019). Here, we use a complimentary subgrouping approach to study how this space is occupied *by participants*. In other words, we searched for individuals with similar profiles across the four previously identified clusters of difficulties. The measures included in the subgrouping were chosen to capture transdiagnostic features (i.e., those that have been previously implicated in several disorders). These were measured by parent ratings on scales commonly used across health and educational settings. To explore the external validity of the subgroups and further characterise their profiles, we investigated how they differed on external (i.e., not included in the subgroup identification) measures of nonverbal cognitive ability, academic and socio-emotional functioning, which are theorised to be related to interindividual differences in communication and EF (e.g., Arnold et al., 2020; Harpin et al., 2016; Helland & Helland, 2017). We did not formulate a

hypothesis about the number of groups, their specific profiles, or the neural and external behavioural features that would differentiate them. However, based on previous literature we expected that both difficulties with structural language and cool EF would be related to difficulties with academic performance, while pragmatic and hot EF difficulties were expected to relate more strongly to socio-emotional functioning.

Methods and design

The data presented here were collected as part of a cohort study at the Centre for Attention, Learning, and Memory (CALM). Data collection took part between 2014 and 2021. The study was approved by the local National Health Service (NHS) research ethics committee (Reference: 13/EE/0157). Parents/caregivers provided written consent and children gave verbal assent.

Recruitment

Full details about the CALM cohort are available in the study protocol (Holmes et al., 2019). Briefly, two groups of children were recruited. The first included children between the ages of 5 and 18 years, referred to the study by health and education practitioners for difficulties with attention, memory, and / or learning. Children were enrolled irrespective of diagnostic status, providing they met the following inclusion criteria: (1) native English speaker, (2) no uncorrected sensory impairments, and (3) no confirmed presence of genetic or neurological conditions known to affect cognitive ability. The second group, referred to as the comparison/non-referred group, consisted of non-referred children attending the same schools as those who were in the referred group. The same exclusion criteria were applied. The two groups were recruited from the same schools to ensure they had similar socio-demographic profiles.

Participants

The referred cohort included 805 children (CALM800: 69% male, M_{age} = 9.48, SD_{age} = 2.38) and the comparison 158 children (CALM200: 56% male, M_{age} = 10, SD_{age} = 2.33). The majority (63%) of the struggling cohort were referred by education practitioners (e.g., educational psychologist, special educational needs coordinator, etc.); 33% were referred by health professionals (e.g., clinical

psychologist, child psychiatrist, etc.); and 4% by speech and language therapists. Most of the sample (60%) were undiagnosed, despite being recognised by a professional as having additional needs, and 8% had more than one diagnosis. Among those with diagnoses ADHD was the most common (*N* = 197), followed by ASD (*N* = 57), and diagnoses of learning disorders (e.g., dyslexia, dyscalculia, developmental language disorder, *N*=62). The non-referred sample consisted mostly of children without any diagnoses (96%), and among those with diagnoses one had ADHD, two had DLD, and two had dyslexia.

Assessments

Each child completed a battery of standardised neuropsychological assessments following the procedures documented in the assessment's testing kits (see Holmes et al., 2019 for details). Parents/caregivers provided ratings of their child's behaviour, communication, and socio-emotional functioning. All children were invited to participate in an optional neuroimaging session within six months of their behavioural assessment (CAM800: *N* = 313, age at scan: *M* = 10.23, *SD* = 2.32; CALM200: *N* = 77, age at scan: *M* = 10.75, *SD* = 2.01). The assessments included in the current study, and the MRI data acquisition procedure, are described below.

Community Detection

Conners-3. The Conners Parent Rating Short Form 3rd Edition (Conners-3, 2008) asks about the child's ADHD-related difficulties in the past month. Item ratings are summarised into six subscales: Inattention, Hyperactivity/ Impulsivity, Learning problems, Executive function, Aggression, and Peer relations.

Brief Rating Inventory of Executive Function. The Behaviour Rating Inventory of Executive Function (BRIEF, Gioia, Isquith, Guy, & Kenworthy, 2000) captures everyday behaviours related to EF. The 80 items in the checklist cover eight domains: Inhibition, Shifting, Emotional control, Initiation, Working memory, Planning, Organisation, and Monitoring.

Children's Communication Checklist. The Children's Communication Checklist (CCC-2, Bishop, 2006; Norbury, Nash, Baird, & Bishop, 2004) focuses on communication strengths and

weaknesses. Items are organised into ten subscales: Speech, Syntax, Semantics, Coherence; Inappropriate initiation, Stereotyped language, Use of context, Nonverbal communication, Social relations, and Interests.

Subgroup Validation

Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ, Goodman, 1997; Goodman, 2001) measures everyday social and emotional functioning. Items are organised into five subscales, but only four were analysed in the current study: Emotional Problems (to index of the tendency to internalise problems); Conduct Problems (to index of the tendency to externalise problems), Peer Problems (to index the ability to build and maintain social relationships), and Prosocial (index of social strengths and resources, rather than difficulties). The focus on these subscales was motivated by extensive literature showing that communication and EF skills are related to individual differences in these realms. The final SDQ subscale was omitted because it captures hyperactivity and conceptually overlaps with the Hyperactivity/Impulsivity subscale of the Conners that was included in the subtyping. Age-uncorrected SDQ scores were used in all analyses. Analyses using age-regressed scores supported the same conclusions (see Supplement Table S2).

Reading and Mathematics. To assess children's academic abilities the Word Reading and Numerical Operations subtests of the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-II (WIAT-II, Wechsler, 2005) were administered. Raw scores for each subtest were converted to standard scores (M = 100, SD = 15).

Nonverbal cognitive ability. The Matrix Reasoning subtest of the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI-II, Wechsler, 2011) was administered as an index of non-verbal cognitive ability. The raw score, corresponding to the number of correctly completed matrices, was converted into a T-score (M = 50, SD = 10).

MRI Data Acquisition

The magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) data were collected at the Medical Research Council Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, Cambridge, United Kingdom on a Siemens 3 T Prisma-fit system

using a 32-channel quadrature head coil. T1-weighted volume scans were acquired using a whole brain coverage 3D Magnetization Prepared Rapid Acquisition Gradient Echo (MP RAGE) sequence acquired using 1 mm isometric image resolution. Echo time was 2.98ms, and repetition time was 2,250ms. Diffusion scans were obtained using echo-planar diffusion-weighted images with an isotropic set of 68 noncollinear directions, using a weighting factor of $b = 1{,}000\text{s} \times \text{mm}^{-2,}$ interleaved with 4 T2-weighted ($b = 0$) volume. Whole brain coverage was based on 60 contiguous axial slices and isometric image resolution of 2 mm. Echo time was 90ms and repetition time was 8500ms. Both MRI pre-processing and reconstruction were performed using QSIPrep 0.13.0RC1, which is based on Nipype 1.6.0 (Gorgolewski et al., 2011). All pre-processing steps are reported in the Supplementary Materials. Whole-brain white matter connectivity matrices (i.e. connectomes) were constructed for each child based on the Brainnetome atlas (Fan et al., 2016). For each pairwise combination of regions ($N = 246$), the number of streamlines intersecting them was estimated and transformed to a 246 x 246 streamline matrix.

Statistical Analysis Overview

A data-driven community detection algorithm was applied to the child-by-child associations across the behaviour, EF, and communication ratings in the referred sample (CALM800) to identify subgroups of children with similar profiles of behavioural and communication strengths and difficulties. The demographic and diagnostic characteristics, academic performance, socio-emotional ratings, and neural white matter connections were then compared across the derived subgroups and the comparison sample. The details for each step of the analyses are presented below.

Community Detection

A network was built to represent the child-by-child correlations across the 24 subscales of the CCC-2, Conners-3, and BRIEF questionnaires for those in the CALM800 sample. Child-by-child correlations were the focus of the community detection to capture similarities and differences in children's profiles across the subscales. The method has been previously used to identify subgroups of children with similar neuropsychological profiles, temperaments, and EF-related behavioural problems (Bathelt et al., 2018; Fair et al., 2012; Karalunas et al., 2014). Before estimating the child-by-child

correlations, age was regressed from each scale and residuals were normalised to ensure the community detection was not biased by age (see Supplementary Materials for details). The community detection was based on the Louvain weight-conserving algorithm (gamma set at default value of 1), as implemented in the Brain Connectivity Toolbox (BCT: Rubinov & Sporns, 2011). The strength of the community separation was quantified using the asymmetric modularity (Q) index, which conceptually represents the overall segregation between identified communities, with values above 0.3 considered evidence for sufficient community separation (Newman & Girvan, 2004). This method performs well in recovering the true number of communities across a range of conditions (Gates et al., 2016). To reach a stable community assignment, we applied the consensus clustering method with 1000 iterations (Lancichinetti & Fortunato, 2012), a procedure that has demonstrated robustness even at substantial levels of noise in the data (Bathelt et al., 2018).

Subgroup Profiles and Behavioural Validation

A series of two-tailed t-tests with Holm corrected p-values were run to compare the profiles of the derived subgroups to each other, and the comparison group, to quantify variation in the severity of difficulties across data-driven groups and to capture differences relative to the non-referred children. To facilitate the interpretation of the subgroup profiles, the communication and behavioural data used in the community detection was reduced via Principal Component analyses (PCA) and component scores were extracted and compared across the groups. Data from both the referred and comparison samples was combined for the PCA, and the optimal number of components to retain was chosen based on the results of parallel analyses (see Supplementary Materials for details; note that repeating the PCA separately for the referred and non-referred samples supported the same conclusions). Additional group comparisons were conducted on measures not included in the community detection to externally validate and further characterise the profiles of the subgroups.

Neuroimaging Analysis

Neural white matter connectome data was analysed using graph theory. The nodes of the network were the 246 regions of interest (ROI-s) of the Brainnetome atlas (Fan et al., 2016) and the connections (or edges) corresponded to the number of streamlines intersecting each pair of regions. All

connectome analyses are based on weighted unthresholded matrices. This choice was motivated by observing that the application of consistency-thresholding (Roberts et al., 2017) to retain all but the top 30% or 20% of most consistent edges (on the assumption that the connections with the highest inter-subject variability are spurious) fully reproduced the results based on unthresholded matrices. We explored whether and how each derived subgroup differed from the comparison sample, and did not compare the data-driven subgroups to one another. This approach was chosen to investigate both common and subgroup-unique differences among the referred children relative to the non-referred children. Due to the presence of outliers in the data, the metrics of the data-driven subgroups were compared to the comparison group using 10% trimmed-means pairwise *t*-tests with false-discovery rate correction.

Global and Local Metrics. At the whole-brain level, we focussed on global efficiency (E_G) and global clustering coefficients (GCC). Global efficiency describes the potential for information exchange in the network and is the average inverse distance from any node (i.e. brain-region) to any other node (Sporns et al., 2007). Global clustering quantifies the fraction of each node's neighbours that are also neighbours of each other. Subsequently, to explore the local properties of the connectomes with the minimal number of comparisons, the 246 brain regions in the Brainnetome atlas (Fan et al., 2016) were grouped according to their corresponding intrinsic connectivity networks (ICN) as defined by Yeo et al. (2011): Default mode, Dorasal attention, Frontoparietal, Limbic, Somatomotor, and Visual networks. Subcortical regions were also grouped together. The sum of all connections within each network (and the subcortex) of the connectome was calculated. For each data-driven subgroup, networks that showed a significant difference from the comparison group were selected for further analyses. Subsequently, the node strength (i.e., sum of all connections) in each region within the networks flagged as significantly different was tested against the comparison group. The global clustering metric was normalised according to the average of 1000 random graphs using the algorithms for weighted undirected networks implemented in the GRETNA toolbox (Wang et al., 2015). Prior to the analyses, age, gender, and motion artefacts (average frame displacement) were regressed from each graph metric using a robust regression approach to account for outliers.

Network-Based Statistics. To investigate differences in the connections between regions we used network-based statistics (Zalesky et al., 2010). This involved comparing each data-driven subgroup to the comparison group in a series of between-group *t*-tests for any pair of regions. For each group comparison, a pre-determined threshold of Cohen's *d* effect size ≥ 0.4 (i.e., $t = 2.8$) was used to select which pairs of regions would be chosen for further analyses. Pairs of regions that met this condition were then used to identify subnetworks for which a path could be found between any two regions. A family-wise error (FWE)-corrected *p*-value was then obtained for each subnetwork via permutation tests ($N = 1000$). For each permutation, the children were randomly exchanged between the data-driven subgroup and the comparison group. The size of the subnetwork can be measured in terms of its extent (i.e., the total number of connections) or intensity (i.e., sum of test statistic values across all connections). The probability of observing a subnetwork of a given extent or intensity is estimated as the proportion of permutations for which the largest subnetwork was the same size or greater. In the current analyses, we focused on intensity and considered subnetworks which met the FWE-corrected threshold of $p < 0.01$ significantly different between groups. Notably, the FWE-correction does not allow inferences to be drawn at the level of individual connections. Age, gender, and average frame displacement were used as covariates in all analyses to mitigate their potential confounding effects. To ensure the robustness of the results, we repeated all procedures by varying the target *t*-threshold, exploring the extent-based measure of size, and setting a more liberal FWE-correction ($p < .05$).

Results

Community Detection

Community detection applied to the child-by-child correlation network based on the Louvain algorithm identified three subgroups of children ($Q = .43$; see Figure S1 for community separation).

Subgroup Profiles

The profiles of the subgroups identified by the community detection and the comparison group across the 24 subscales are displayed in Figure 1a. Descriptive statistics and Cohen's *d* effect size are presented in Table S1. To aid the interpretation of the differences across the groups, data was reduced

with PCAs, separately applied to the CCC-2, and BRIF and Conners data. The CCC-2 data reduction identified two components capturing structural and pragmatic communication, which in combination explained 80% of the variance. Two components broadly corresponding to hot EF and cool EF summarised the Conners and BRIEF data, cumulatively explaining 68% of the variance (see Figures 1b and 1c, and Supplementary Materials for a full report).

Group profiles across the four components are displayed in Figure 1d. The data-driven subgroups had significantly more difficulties across all components relative to the comparison sample, except for Subgroup 2 (S2) who had similar hot EF to the comparison sample. The children in each subgroup had different patterns of specific strengths and difficulties. Subgroup 1 (S1) were characterised by poor structural language, children in S2 had weaknesses in cool EF, and children in Subgroup 3 (S3) had pronounced difficulties with hot EF and pragmatics (for descriptive statistics see Supplementary Materials Table S2). The same patterns were evident in the subgroup profiles on the subscales that most strongly loaded on the respective principal components (see Table S1 and Figure 1a). There were no significant differences in age across the subgroups (F (1,803) = 3.138, p = 0.08, see Table 1). Using a chi-square test, which compared the overall proportion of boys and girls in the non-referred sample to the proportion observed in each subgroup, we observed that girls were overrepresented in S1, while boys were overrepresented in S3 (Table 1). The same chi-square analyses were used to investigate whether there were differences in the prevalence of different diagnoses across subgroups. We focused on children with ADHD and ASD, because overall numbers for other diagnoses were too low to make meaningful comparisons. Children with ADHD and ASD were represented in each subgroup, but children with ADHD were overrepresented in S3 and underrepresented S1, and children with ASD were underrepresented in S2 and overrepresented in S3 (Table 1). Finally, children who had recently received Speech and Language Therapy were overrepresented in S1 and underrepresented in the other two subgroups (Table 1).

Subgroup Profiles: Behavioural Validation

The groups were compared on external measures not used in the community detection (see Figure 2). In terms of socio-emotional functioning and cognitive and academic performance, all three

subgroups derived from the referred sample had significantly more difficulties than the comparison sample (Figure 2). There were differences in the patterns of severity among the subgroups. Children in S1 had most pronounced difficulties with maths, reading, and non-verbal reasoning, scoring significantly lower than the other two data-driven groups. Children in S3 had better performance than the other two subgroups on math and reading, but significantly more difficulties with emotion, conduct, peer relations, and prosocial behaviour (Figure 2). Overall, there was a consistent pattern in which children in S3 had more pronounced socio-emotional difficulties, whereas children in S1 and S2 showed more difficulties with cognitive and academic skills.

Subgroup Profiles: Neural White Matter

Graph Measures.

At the global level, S1 and S2 had significantly lower global efficiency relative to the comparison sample (S1, N_{imaging}=109: $p_{corrected}$ = 0.035, ξ = 0.28; S2, N_{imaging} = 120: $p_{\text{corrected}}$ = 0.013, ξ = 0.27). The difference between the comparison sample and S3 (N_{imaging} = 84) was not significant ($p_{corrected}$ = 0.10, ξ = 0.22). There were no differences in global clustering between the comparison sample and any of the subgroups (uncorrected *p*-s > 0.25). These results are presented in Figure S6. At the ICN-level, all subgroups had weaker overall connections in the limbic network and subcortical areas relative to the comparison sample (see Figure S7). Follow-up analyses showed that relative to the non-referred sample all subgroups had reduced regional strength in the same sub-regions of the basal ganglia, hippocampus, thalamus, inferior temporal gyrus, and fusiform gyrus. Some unique patterns of reduced regional strength were observed for each subgroup relative to the comparison group (Figure 3 and supplement Tables S3 and S4 for descriptive statistics, *p*-values and effect sizes). For children in S1, unique differences were observed in sub-regions of the basal ganglia, amygdala, and inferior temporal gyrus; for S2, unique differences were within parahippocampal gyrus, superior temporal gyrus, and basal ganglia sub-regions; and for S3 these differences were in the basal ganglia, cingulate gyrus, and thalamus.

Network-based Statistics

Subnetworks that were significantly different for each subgroup relative to the comparison group are displayed in Figure 4. There was greater connectivity in the non-referred group relative to S1 in a subnetwork comprising five connections across limbic—subcortical and subcortical—subcortical areas ($p_{corrected}$ = .001). This subnetwork involved six ROI-s located within the basal ganglia, orbital gyrus, and thalamus (Table S5). For S2, there was reduced connectivity relative to the comparison group in a subnetwork spanning nine connections across ten regions ($p_{\text{corrected}}$ = .003). This subnetwork included connections across the following networks: somatomotor — dorsal attention, limbic — dorsal attention, dorsal attention — visual, frontoparietal — somatomotor, visual — visual, and dorsal attention — subcortical. The involved ROI-s fell within the lateral occipital cortex, medioventral occipital cortex, orbital gyrus, parahippocampal gyrus, precuneus, superior parietal lobule, superior temporal gyrus, and thalamus (Table S6). Finally, S3 had reduced connection strength relative to the comparison group in a subnetwork comprised of eight links ($p_{corected}$ = .002) across limbic — subcortical, limbic — visual, visual — subcortical, and subcortical — subcortical ROI-s. The eight ROI-s involved formed part of the basal ganglia, lateral occipital cortex, middle frontal gyrus, orbital gyrus, precuneus (the same ROI was also part of the network that differentiated S2), and thalamus (Table S7). Sensitivity analyses supported the robustness of the findings: taking the extent-based measure of size fully reproduced the results; and setting the *t*-threshold in the range 2.6 to 3, produced similar results, which followed the expected tendency to discover larger subnetworks at lower *t*-thresholds (see Supplementary Materials, Figure S9; for an investigation of the influence of the *t*-threshold see Beare et al., 2017). Results based on the more liberal FWE-corrected threshold of $p < 0.05$ suggested further differences in connectivity for S3 (see Figure S8).

Figure 1

Profiles of the data-driven subgroups and the comparison group.



Note. **Panel A** shows group profiles across all BRIEF, Conners, and CCC-2 subscales used in community the detection. To put all measures on the same scale, age-referenced subscale scores were converted to z-scores where higher values indicate strengths and lower values indicate difficulties. **Panel B** shows the varimax loadings from Principal component analyses (PCA) of the CCC-2 subscales based on combined data from the referred and comparison samples. The first principal component (PC1) explained 46% of the variance and was labelled Pragmatic communication, the second principal component (PC2) explained additional 34% of the variance and was labelled Structural language. **Panel C** shows the loadings from the same analyses applied to the BRIEF and Conners data. PC1 explained 37% of the variance and was labelled Cool executive function (EF) and PC2 explained additional 31% of the variance and was labelled Hot EF. **Panel D** shows group performance across the four components identified in the PCA: higher values indicate strengths and lower values indicate difficulties. Comparisons are based on two-tailed *t*-tests, *p*-values are Holm-corrected. *** p <.001; ** p < .01, * p < .05.
S1 = Subgroup 1; S2 = Subgroup 2; S3 = Subgroup 3; Conners (Conners Parent Rating Short Form 3rd Edition) subscales; INT = Inattention; HYP = Hyperactivity/Impulsivity; LRN = Learning Problems; AGG = Aggression; PEER = Peer Relationships; BRIEF (Brief Rating Inventory of Executive Function) subscales: INH = Inhibition; SHIF =Shifting; EMO = Emotional Control; INIT = Initiation; WM = Working memory; PLAN = Planning/Organisation; ORG = Organisation of Materials; MONT = Monitoring; CCC-2 (Children's Communication Checklist) subscales: SYN = Syntax; SEM = Semantics; COH = Coherence; INAP = Inappropriate Initiation; STER = Stereotyped Language; CONT = Use of Context; NVER= Nonverbal Communication; SOC = Social Relations; INTR = Interests.

Figure 2

Group comparisons across measures of socio-emotional functioning, cognitive, and academic skills.



Note. The top panel includes the Emotion problems, Conduct problems, Peer problems, and Prosocial subscales derived from the Strengths and difficulties questionnaire (SDQ, parent-report). Higher scores indicate more difficulties, with the exception of the Prosocial scale, which has the reverse interpretation.
The bottom panel shows performance on the Word reading and Numerical operations subsets of the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test-II, and the Matrix reasoning subset of Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence II. All scores are based on the age-referenced norms: higher scores indicate better performance. The grey-dotted line represents the age-expected mean.
For both panels, the observed mean in each group is represented by the large dot within each boxplot. All comparisons are based on two-tailed *t*-tests, *p*-values are Holm-corrected. S1 = Subgroup 1 (most severe structural language difficulties); S2 = Subgroup 2 (most severe *cool* executive difficulties); S3 = Subgroup 3 (most severe difficulties with *hot* executive skills & pragmatic communication).
*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Figure 3

Comparison of the regional strength of connections across groups.



Note. **Panel A** shows regions of interest (ROI-s) within the subcortex and the limbic network that showed reduced connection strength in all data-driven subgroups relative to the comparison group. **Panel B** shows subcortical and limbic ROI-s that had reduced connection strength in two subgroups relative to the comparison group. Note that non-significant comparisons are omitted from the figure. **Panel C1** shows subcortical and limbic ROI-s that were significantly different between S1 and the comparison group. **Panel C2** shows subcortical and limbic ROI-s that were significantly different between S2 and the comparison group. **Panel C3** shows subcortical and limbic ROI-s that were significantly different between S3 and the comparison group. S1 = Subgroup 1 (most severe structural language difficulties); S2 = Subgroup 2 (most severe *cool* executive difficulties); S3 = Subgroup 3 (most severe difficulties with *hot* executive skills & pragmatic communication). See Tables S3 and S4 in supplementary materials for descriptive statistics, *p*-values and effect sizes.

Figure 4

Subnetworks of the neural white matter connectome identified as significantly weaker in each data-driven subgroup relative to the comparison group.



Note. Subgroup 1: most severe structural language difficulties; Subgroup 2: most severe *cool* executive difficulties; Subgroup 3: most severe difficulties with *hot* executive skills & pragmatic communication. For nodal labels, please see Supplementary Materials, Tables S5-S7.

Table 1

Subgroup demographics.

Subgroup	Age			Sex			ADHD			ASD			SLT		
	N	*M*	*SD*	N_{boys}	χ^2	*p*	N_{ADHD} (%)	χ^2	*p*	N_{ASD} (%)	χ^2	*p*	N_{SLT} (%)	χ^2	*p*
S1	300	9.6	2.5	184	7.3	0.007	42 (21)	17.8	<.001	20 (35)	0.1	0.78	93 (57)	21.5	<.001
S2	261	9.7	2.4	174	0.4	0.51	56 (28)	1.3	0.26	7 (12)	7.7	0.006	36 (22)	6.7	0.009
S3	244	9.2	2.2	194	13.5	<.001	99 (50)	34.2	<.001	30 (53)	10.1	0.001	34 (21)	6.02	0.014

Note. ADHD = Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; ASD = Autism spectrum disorders; SLT = Speech and Language therapy in the last two years or ongoing. S1 = Subgroup 1 (most severe structural language difficulties); S2 = Subgroup 2 (most severe *cool* executive difficulties); S3 = Subgroup 3 (most severe difficulties with *hot* executive skills & pragmatic communication).

Discussion

The current study adopted a data-driven approach to identify subgroups of children with homogeneous profiles across different domains of function as measured by rating of communication, behaviour, and executive function (EF). A transdiagnostic approach was used: enrolment was based on cognitive and academic needs rather than diagnostic status. Differences in brain structure and behaviour were compared across the subgroups in relation to a comparison group of non-referred children. Three subgroups of children were identified. Each performed poorer than the comparison group across measures of communication, behaviour, and EF, and was distinguished from the other subgroups by different profiles of strengths and weaknesses in these areas. These differences extended to measures of cognitive, academic, and socio-emotional functioning that were not included in the identification of the subgroups. Shared and specific patterns of differences in neural white matter organisation were observed across the groups. These results are discussed below.

Subgroups

Three data-driven subgroups were identified based on parent/carer ratings of behaviour, communication, and EF in a large transdiagnostic sample of children referred by practitioners for difficulties in attention, learning, and/or memory. One subgroup (S1) was characterised by relative difficulties in structural language use, a second by *cool* cognitive difficulties (S2), and a third by co-occurring pragmatic communication difficulties and *hot* affective cognitive problems (S3). All three subgroups had greater difficulties in behaviour, communication, EF, socio-emotional functioning, and academic attainment relative to a demographically matched comparison group of non-referred children.

There were both similarities and differences in the way neural white matter was organised in the three subgroups relative to the comparison group. The two subgroups with most pronounced difficulties in cognitive and academic skills (S1 & S2) showed reduced global efficiency, which has been previously linked to educational attainment (Bathelt et al., 2019; Lou et al., 2019). However, no differences were observed in global clustering coefficients. At the intrinsic connectivity networks-level, all groups showed reduced connectivity within the subcortex and the limbic network relative to the comparison group. Exploring differences in the connectivity of specific ROI-s within these areas, all

three subgroups showed reduced regional strength relative to the comparison sample in subregions of the hippocampus, basal ganglia, inferior temporal gyrus, thalamus, and fusiform gyrus. These findings demonstrate that the subgroups of referred children identified by the data-driven approach have shared and distinct behavioural and neural features relative to a non-referred comparison group. In the following sections, the detailed profiles of the three subgroups are considered.

Subgroup 1

The children in S1 were characterised by elevated difficulties with structural language skills relative to the other subgroups, and those who had attended Speech and Language Therapy in the past two years were overrepresented in this group. They also had the most severe difficulties in learning. Finding concurrent difficulties in structural language use and academic achievement is consistent with previous reports (Dockrell et al., 2011; Mareva & Holmes, 2019), and might reflect underlying phonological processing difficulties that have been implicated in language, reading, and maths difficulties (e.g., De Smedt et al., 2010; Ramus et al., 2013).

The neural subregions that showed significantly reduced connectivity only for children in S1 relative to the comparison group were in the right inferior temporal gyrus (lateral area 20), the left ventromedial putamen, and lateral amygdala. A left-lateralised subnetwork of primarily limbic-subcortical connections that involved subregions of medial orbitofrontal cortex, thalamus, and basal ganglia also distinguished this group. Consistent with their language and learning difficulties, corticostriatal and thalamocortical pathways are involved in procedural learning, language development, goal-directed behaviour, and reward processing (Arnsten & Rubia, 2012; Krishnan et al., 2016).

Subgroup 2

The most pronounced area of weakness for the second subgroup (S2) was in cool EF where their scores were lower than those for children in the other two subgroups. These difficulties encompassed everyday difficulties in attention, planning, and working memory - skills that have been implicated in classroom learning (Holmes et al., 2020; Peng et al., 2018; Yeniad et al., 2013). Consistent

with this, children in this subgroup had difficulties in maths and reading, although these were not as severe as those for children in S1. Relative to the other two subgroups, children in S2 had relative strengths in social skills and affective cognition, with comparable hot EF ratings to the comparison group.

Subregions that uniquely deviated in S2 included ROI-s within caudate, parahippocampal gyrus, and superior temporal gyrus (medial area 38). The subnetwork that differentiated them from the comparison group was relatively wide-spread and involved right-lateralised temporal-parietal pathways and medioventral and lateral occipital ROI-s. Some of the implicated subregions of these dorsal attention and visual networks are known to interact to suppress attention to irrelevant stimuli (Castellanos & Proal, 2012; Shulman et al., 2009), and as such reduced connectivity in this neural circuit might contribute to the cool EF-related difficulties characteristic of this subgroup.

Subgroup 3

The children in S3 were characterised by having the most severe difficulties with hot EF and pragmatic communication, but relative strengths in structural language skills, maths and reading, compared to the children in the other two subgroups. Strong associations between social communication skills and affective behavioural problems have been reported previously (e.g., Hawkins et al., 2016; Mareva & Holmes, 2019), and difficulties in these areas commonly co-occur in ADHD and ASD (Geurts & Embrechts, 2008; Green et al., 2014; Helland et al., 2014) alongside socio-emotional difficulties (Staikova et al., 2013). Indeed, a disproportionate number of autistic children and children with an ADHD diagnosis were assigned to this subgroup, and they had substantial problems with behavioural conduct, emotion, peer relationships, and prosocial behaviour. Identifying a subgroup with this profile and composition suggests the intersection of pragmatic communication, hot EF, and socio-emotional difficulties may be relevant for understanding some of the comorbidity between ADHD and ASD.

The neural characteristics that specifically differentiated children in S3 from the comparison group were ROI-s within the putamen, thamalus, and cingulate gyrus (rostroventral area 24). They had reduced connectivity strength in a left-lateralised, primarily frontostriatal subnetwork, which also

included regions of the visual network (precuneus and lateral occipital cortex). Corresponding to the severity of their hot EF difficulties, these circuits play role in goal-directed behaviours related to rewards, affect, and motivation (Arnsten & Rubia, 2012; Castellanos & Proal, 2012)

Summary

In summary, we identified three subgroups of children with distinct communication, behavioural, and EF profiles. These subgroups were characterised by primary difficulties in structural language, cool EF, or hot EF and pragmatics, respectively, and provide initial evidence for three alternative but related pathways to academic and socio-emotional difficulties. While a greater number of children receiving speech and language therapy were assigned to the structural language subgroup, and more autistic children and those with ADHD to the hot EF and pragmatics subgroup, none of the subgroup profiles aligned with the diagnostic features of a particular disorder, and children with each of these diagnoses were present in each of the three subgroups. This finding suggests the subgroups were not synonymous with disorder-based categories, adding to growing support for transdiagnostic approaches to understanding neurodevelopment (Astle et al., 2021).

The three subgroups were further distinguished by patterns of differences in the connectivity of circuits previously implicated in procedural learning, visual attention, and reward processing. For the most part, these differences corresponded to previously reported neurobiological correlates of the behavioural difficulties of the subgroups, suggesting they may be distinguished at the neural level. That said, it should be noted that the subgroups also shared atypicalities in subcortical and temporal regions relative to the comparison group, and their profiles of behavioural weaknesses were all relative, so the correspondence between brain and behaviour was not one-to-one.

Limitations & Future directions

There were several caveats to the current subtyping approach. First, the community detection was based on parent ratings, which are prone to subjective bias. However, the differences between the subgroups identified through these ratings were reflected in differences on performance-based measures of cognition and learning, providing some validity to the ratings and suggesting the algorithm was not overfitting the data. Second, the wide age range and cross-sectional nature of the cohort did not allow

us to explore questions about age-related heterogeneity or developmental continuity, which remain key issues to be addressed in future research.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates the value of data-driven subgrouping approaches for understanding common, complex and co-occurring neurodevelopmental difficulties across multiple domains and their relationships to behavioural outcomes and neurobiology. It shows that homogeneous groups can be identified and differentiated in terms of distinct profiles of relative strengths and difficulties. The identified subgroups unpack some of the heterogeneity and provide initial evidence for three alternative but related developmental pathways to difficulties with academic and socio-emotional functioning.

References

Alexander, L. M., Escalera, J., Ai, L., Andreotti, C., Febre, K., Mangone, A., Vega-Potler, N., Langer, N., Alexander, A., Kovacs, M., Litke, S., O'Hagan, B., Andersen, J., Bronstein, B., Bui, A., Bushey, M., Butler, H., Castagna, V., Camacho, N., … Milham, M. P. (2017). An open resource for transdiagnostic research in pediatric mental health and learning disorders. *Scientific Data*, *4*, 170181. https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2017.181

Ameis, S. H., Lerch, J. P., Taylor, M. J., Lee, W., Viviano, J. D., Pipitone, J., Nazeri, A., Croarkin, P. E., Voineskos, A. N., Lai, M. C., Crosbie, J., Brian, J., Soreni, N., Schachar, R., Szatmari, P., Arnold, P. D., & Anagnostou, E. (2016). A diffusion tensor imaging studyin children with ADHD, autism spectrum disorder, OCD, and matched controls: Distinct and non-distinct white matter disruption and dimensional brain-behavior relationships. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *173*(12), 1213–1222. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.15111435

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5®).* American Psychiatric Pub.

Aoki, Y., Yoncheva, Y. N., Chen, B., Nath, T., Sharp, D., Lazar, M., Velasco, P., Milham, M. P., & Di Martino, A. (2017). Association of White Matter Structure With Autism Spectrum Disorder and Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *74*(11), 1120–1128. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.2573

Arnold, L. E., Hodgkins, P., Kahle, J., Madhoo, M., & Kewley, G. (2020). Long-Term Outcomes of ADHD: Academic Achievement and Performance. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, *24*(1), 73–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054714566076

Arnsten, A. F. T., & Rubia, K. (2012). Neurobiological circuits regulating attention, cognitive control, motivation, and emotion: Disruptions in neurodevelopmental psychiatric disorders. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *51*(4), 356–367. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2012.01.008

Astle, D. E., Bathelt, J., & Holmes, J. (2019). Remapping the cognitive and neural profiles of children

who struggle at school. *Developmental Science*, *22*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12747

Astle, D. E., Holmes, J., Kievit, R., & Gathercole, S. E. (2021). Annual Research Review: The transdiagnostic revolution in neurodevelopmental disorders. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13481

Baribeau, D. A., Dupuis, A., Paton, T. A., Hammill, C., Scherer, S. W., Schachar, R. J., Arnold, P. D., Szatmari, P., Nicolson, R., Georgiades, S., Crosbie, J., Brian, J., Iaboni, A., Kushki, A., Lerch, J. P., & Anagnostou, E. (2019). Structural neuroimaging correlates of social deficits are similar in autism spectrum disorder and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: analysis from the POND Network. *Translational Psychiatry 2019 9:1*, *9*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-019-0382-0

Basser, P. J., Pajevic, S., Pierpaoli, C., Duda, J., & Aldroubi, A. (2000). In Vivo Fiber Tractography Using DT-MRI Data. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, *44*, 625–632.

Bathelt, J., Holmes, J., Astle, D. E., Holmes, J., Gathercole, S., Astle, D. E., Manly, T., & Kievit, R. (2018). Data-Driven Subtyping of Executive Function–Related Behavioral Problems in Children. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *57*(4), 252-262.e4. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JAAC.2018.01.014

Bathelt, J., Scerif, G., Nobre, A. C., & Astle, D. E. (2019). Whole-brain white matter organization, intelligence, and educational attainment. *Trends in Neuroscience and Education*, *15*, 38–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tine.2019.02.004

Beare, R., Adamson, C., Bellgrove, M. A., Vilgis, V., Vance, A., Seal, M. L., & Silk, T. J. (2017). Altered structural connectivity in ADHD: a network based analysis. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*, *11*(3), 846–858. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682-016-9559-9

Beauchaine, T. P., Zisner, A. R., & Hayden, E. P. (2019). Neurobiological Mechanisms of Psychopathology and Treatment Action. In T. H. Ollendick, S. W. White, & B. A. White (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology* (Vol. 1). Oxford University

Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/OXFORDHB/9780190634841.013.54

Bishop, D. V. M. (2003). *Children's Communication Checklist-2 (CCC-2)*. Pearson Assessment.

Brislin, S. J., Martz, M. E., Joshi, S., Duval, E. R., Gard, A., Clark, D. A., Hyde, L. W., Hicks, B. M., Taxali, A., Angstadt, M., Rutherford, S., Heitzeg, M. M., & Sripada, C. (2020). Differentiated nomological networks of internalizing, externalizing, and the general factor of psychopathology (' p factor') in emerging adolescence in the ABCD study. *Psychological Medicine*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291720005103

Casey, B. J., Oliveri, M. E., & Insel, T. (2014). A neurodevelopmental perspective on the research domain criteria (RDoC) framework. *Biological Psychiatry*, *76*(5), 350–353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.01.006

Castellanos, F. X., & Proal, E. (2012). Large-scale brain systems in ADHD: Beyond the prefrontal-striatal model. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *16*(1), 17–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2011.11.007

Castellanos, F. X., Sonuga-Barke, E. J. S. S., Milham, M. P., & Tannock, R. (2006). Characterizing cognition in ADHD: Beyond executive dysfunction. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *10*(3), 117–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.01.011

Conners, C. K. (2008). *Conners 3rd edition (Conners 3)* (Third Edit). Multi-Health Systems Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

De Smedt, B., Taylor, J., Archibald, L., & Ansari, D. (2010). How is phonological processing related to individual differences in children's arithmetic skills? *Developmental Science*, *13*(3), 508–520. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00897.x

Dockrell, J. E., Lindsay, G., & Palikara, O. (2011). Explaining the academic achievement at school leaving for pupils with a history of language impairment: Previous academic achievement and literacy skills. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, *27*(2), 223–237. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265659011398671

Fair, D., Bathula, D., Nikolas, M., & Nigg, J. T. (2012). Distinct neuropsychological subgroups in typically developing youth inform heterogeneity in children with ADHD. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *109*(17), 6769–6774. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1115365109

Fan, L., Li, H., Zhuo, J., Zhang, Y., Wang, J., Chen, L., Yang, Z., Chu, C., Xie, S., Laird, A. R., Fox, P. T., Eickhoff, S. B., Yu, C., & Jiang, T. (2016). The Human Brainnetome Atlas: A New Brain Atlas Based on Connectional Architecture. *Cerebral Cortex*, *26*(8), 3508–3526. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhw157

Feczko, E., Balba, N. M., Miranda-Dominguez, O., Cordova, M., Karalunas, S. L., Irwin, L., Demeter, D. V., Hill, A. P., Langhorst, B. H., Grieser Painter, J., Van Santen, J., Fombonne, E. J., Nigg, J. T., & Fair, D. A. (2018). Subtyping cognitive profiles in Autism Spectrum Disorder using a Functional Random Forest algorithm. *NeuroImage*, *172*, 674–688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.12.044

Gates, K. M., Henry, T., Steinley, D., & Fair, D. A. (2016). A Monte Carlo Evaluation of Weighted Community Detection Algorithms. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*, *10*, 45. https://doi.org/10.3389/fninf.2016.00045

Geurts, H. M., & Embrechts, M. (2008). Language profiles in ASD, SLI, and ADHD. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *38*(10), 1931–1943. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-008-0587-1

Gioia, G. A., Isquith, P. K., Guy, S. C., & Kenworthy, L. (2000). *Behavior rating inventory of executive function: BRIEF*. Psychological Assessment Resources Odessa, FL.

Goodman, R. (2001). Psychometric properties of the strengths and difficulties questionnaire. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *40*(11), 1337–1345. https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-200111000-00015

Goodman, Robert. (1997). The strengths and difficulties questionnaire: A research note. *Journal of*

Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, *38*(5), 581–586. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1997.tb01545.x

Gorgolewski, K., Burns, C. D., Madison, C., Clark, D., Halchenko, Y. O., Waskom, M. L., & Ghosh, S. S. (2011). Nipype: A flexible, lightweight and extensible neuroimaging data processing framework in Python. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*, *5*(August). https://doi.org/10.3389/fninf.2011.00013

Green, B. C., Johnson, K. A., & Bretherton, L. (2014). Pragmatic language difficulties in children with hyperactivity and attention problems : an integrated review. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, *49*(1), 15–29. https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12056

Harpin, V., Mazzone, L., Raynaud, J. P., Kahle, J., & Hodgkins, P. (2016). Long-Term Outcomes of ADHD: A Systematic Review of Self-Esteem and Social Function. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, *20*(4), 295–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054713486516

Hawkins, E., Gathercole, S., Astle, D., & Holmes, J. (2016). Language problems and ADHD symptoms: How specific are the links? *Brain Sciences*, *6*(4), 15–17. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci6040050

Helland, W. A., & Helland, T. (2017). Emotional and behavioural needs in children with specific language impairment and in children with autism spectrum disorder: The importance of pragmatic language impairment. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *70*(March), 33–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2017.08.009

Helland, W. A., Lundervold, A. J., Heimann, M., & Posserud, M.-B. B. (2014). Stable associations between behavioral problems and language impairments across childhood - The importance of pragmatic language problems. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *35*(5), 943–951. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.02.016

Henry, L. A., Messer, D. J., & Nash, G. (2012). Executive functioning in children with specific

language impairment. *Journal Of Child Psychology And Psychiatry*, *53*(1), 37–45. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2011.02430.x

Holmes, J., Bryant, A., & Gathercole, S. E. (2019). Protocol for a transdiagnostic study of children with problems of attention, learning and memory (CALM). *BMC Pediatrics*, *19*(1), 10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-018-1385-3

Holmes, J., Guy, J., Kievit, R. A., Bryant, A., Mareva, S., Team, the C., & Gathercole, S. E. (2020). Cognitive dimensions of learning in children with problems in attention, learning and memory. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/edu0000644

Karalunas, S. L., Fair, D., Musser, E. D., Aykes, K., Iyer, S. P., & Nigg, J. T. (2014). Subtyping Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder Using Temperament Dimensions. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *71*(9), 1015. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2014.763

Kofler, M. J., Irwin, L. N., Soto, E. F., Groves, N. B., Harmon, S. L., & Sarver, D. E. (2019). Executive Functioning Heterogeneity in Pediatric ADHD. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *47*(2), 273–286. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-018-0438-2

Korrel, H., Mueller, K. L., Silk, T., Anderson, V., & Sciberras, E. (2017). Research Review: Language problems in children with Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder - a systematic meta-analytic review. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *58*(6), 640–654. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12688

Krishnan, S., Watkins, K. E., & Bishop, D. V. M. (2016). Neurobiological Basis of Language Learning Difficulties. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *20*(9), 701–714. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.06.012

Kushki, A., Anagnostou, E., Hammill, C., Duez, P., Brian, J., Iaboni, A., Schachar, R., Crosbie, J., Arnold, P., & Lerch, J. P. (2019). Examining overlap and homogeneity in ASD, ADHD, and OCD: a data-driven, diagnosis-agnostic approach. *Translational Psychiatry*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-019-0631-2

Lancichinetti, A., & Fortunato, S. (2012). Consensus clustering in complex networks. *Scientific Reports*, *2*(1), 336. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00336

Lou, C., Duan, X., Altarelli, I., Sweeney, J. A., Ramus, F., & Zhao, J. (2019). White matter network connectivity deficits in developmental dyslexia. *Human Brain Mapping*, *40*(2), 505–516. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24390

Mandy, W., Wang, A., Lee, I., & Skuse, D. (2017). Evaluating social (pragmatic) communication disorder. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *10*, 1166–1175. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12785

Mareva, S., & Holmes, J. (2019). Transdiagnostic associations across communication, cognitive, and behavioural problems in a developmentally at-risk population: A network approach. *BMC Pediatrics*, *19*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-019-1818-7

Masten, A. S., Roisman, G. I., Long, J. D., Burt, K. B., Obradović, J., Riley, J. R., Boelcke-Stennes, K., & Tellegen, A. (2005). Developmental cascades: Linking academic achievement and externalizing and internalizing symptoms over 20 years. *Developmental Psychology*, *41*(5), 733–746. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.41.5.733

Moreau, D., Wilson, A. J., McKay, N. S., Nihill, K., & Waldie, K. E. (2018). No evidence for systematic white matter correlates of dyslexia and dyscalculia. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, *18*, 356–366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2018.02.004

Newman, M. E. J., & Girvan, M. (2004). Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, *69*(2). https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.69.026113

Norbury, C. F., Nash, M., Baird, G., & Bishop, D. V. M. (2004). Using a parental checklist to identify diagnostic groups in children with communication impairment: a validation of the Children's Communication Checklist--2. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, *39*(3), 345–364. https://doi.org/10.1080/13682820410001654883

Parkes, L., Moore, T. M., Calkins, M. E., Cook, P. A., Cieslak, M., Roalf, D. R., Wolf, D. H., Gur, R. C., Gur, R. E., Satterthwaite, T. D., & Bassett, D. S. (2021). Transdiagnostic dimensions of psychopathology explain individuals' unique deviations from normative neurodevelopment in brain structure. *Translational Psychiatry*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-021-01342-6

Peng, P., Wang, C., & Namkung, J. (2018). Understanding the Cognition Related to Mathematics Difficulties: A Meta-Analysis on the Cognitive Deficit Profiles and the Bottleneck Theory. *Review of Educational Research*, 003465431775335. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317753350

Ramus, F., Marshall, C. R., Rosen, S., & van der Lely, H. K. J. J. (2013). Phonological deficits in specific language impairment and developmental dyslexia: Towards a multidimensional model. *Brain*, *136*(2), 630–645. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/aws356

Roberts, J. A., Perry, A., Roberts, G., Mitchell, P. B., & Breakspear, M. (2017). Consistency-based thresholding of the human connectome. *NeuroImage*, *145*, 118–129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.09.053

Rommelse, N. N. J. J., Geurts, H. M., Franke, B., Buitelaar, J. K., & Hartman, C. A. (2011). A review on cognitive and brain endophenotypes that may be common in autism spectrum disorder and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and facilitate the search for pleiotropic genes. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *35*(6), 1363–1396. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.02.015

Rubinov, M., & Sporns, O. (2011). Weight-conserving characterization of complex functional brain networks. *NeuroImage*, *56*(4), 2068–2079. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/07e7/5f181b9837871ec4b1a48458a9260e17bf2f.pdf

Salehinejad, M. A., Ghanavati, E., Rashid, M. H. A., & Nitsche, M. A. (2021). Hot and cold executive functions in the brain: A prefrontal-cingular network. *Brain and Neuroscience Advances*, *5*, 239821282110077. https://doi.org/10.1177/23982128211007769

Shulman, G. L., Astafiev, S. V., Franke, D., Pope, D. L. W., Snyder, A. Z., McAvoy, M. P., & Corbetta, M. (2009). Interaction of Stimulus-driven reorienting and expectation in ventral and dorsal frontoparietal and basal Ganglia-cortical networks. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *29*(14), 4392–4407. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5609-08.2009

Sporns, O., Honey, C., & Kötter, R. (2007). Identification and Classification of Hubs in Brain Networks. *PloS One*, *2*(10), e1049. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0001049

Staikova, E., Gomes, H., Tartter, V., McCabe, A., & Halperin, J. M. (2013). Pragmatic deficits and social impairment in children with ADHD. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, *54*(12), 1275–1283. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12082

Vaidya, C. J., You, X., Mostofsky, S., Pereira, F., Berl, M. M., & Kenworthy, L. (2020). Data-driven identification of subtypes of executive function across typical development, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *61*(1), 51–61. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13114

Wang, J., Wang, X., Xia, M., Liao, X., Evans, A., & He, Y. (2015). GRETNA: A graph theoretical network analysis toolbox for imaging connectomics. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *9*(JUNE), 386. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00386

Wechsler, D. (2005). *Wechsler Individual Achievement Test II* (Second Edi). Pearson Assessment.

Wechsler, D. (2011). *Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence* (Second Edi). Pearson Assessment.

Willoughby, M., Kupersmidt, J., Voegler-Lee, M., & Bryant, D. (2011). Contributions of hot and cool self-regulation to preschool disruptive behavior and academic achievement. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, *36*(2), 162–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/87565641.2010.549980

Yeniad, N., Malda, M., Mesman, J., van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Pieper, S. (2013). Shifting ability predicts math and reading performance in children: A meta-analytical study. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *23*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LINDIF.2012.10.004

Yeo, B. T. T., Krienen, F. M., Sepulcre, J., Sabuncu, M. R., Lashkari, D., Hollinshead, M., Roffman,

J. L., Smoller, J. W., Zöllei, L., Polimeni, J. R., Fisch, B., Liu, H., & Buckner, R. L. (2011). The organization of the human cerebral cortex estimated by intrinsic functional connectivity. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *106*(3), 1125–1165. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00338.2011

Zalesky, A., Fornito, A., & Bullmore, E. T. (2010). Network-based statistic: Identifying differences in brain networks. *NeuroImage*, *53*, 1197–1207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.06.041