

Running Head: Heterogeneity of Irritability

Heterogeneity of Irritability: Psychometrics of The Irritability and Dysregulation of Emotion Scale (TIDES-13).

Andrew S. Dissanayake¹; Annie Dupuis, PhD²; Paul D. Arnold, MD, PhD^{1,3,4}; Christie Burton, PhD³; Jennifer Crosbie, PhD^{1,3}; Russell J. Schachar, MD^{1,3}; Tomer Levy, MD^{5,6}

¹Department of Psychiatry, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada, ²Department of Biostatistics, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Canada ³Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Canada, ⁴The Mathison Centre for Mental Health Research & Education, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Shalvata Mental Health Center, Hod Hasharon, Israel⁵, Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel⁶.

Corresponding Author:

Russell J. Schachar, MD
Senior Scientist and Staff Psychiatrist
The Hospital for Sick Children (Neurosciences and Mental Health/Psychiatry)
Phone: 416.813.7654 ex 206564
Fax: 416.813.6565
Email: russell.schachar@sickkids.ca

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (R.J.S., MOP-93696 and P.D.A., MOP-106573) and the Alberta Innovates Translational Health Chair in Child and Youth Mental Health (P.D.A.). The statistical expert on the manuscript is Dr. Annie Dupuis.

Keywords: Irritability, Heterogeneity, TIDES-13, psychometric properties, scale validation

Conflict of interest: None.

1 *Running Head: Heterogeneity of Irritability*

2
3
4
5
6
7 **Heterogeneity of Irritability: Psychometrics of The Irritability and Dysregulation of**
8
9 **Emotion Scale (TIDES-13).**

10
11 **ABSTRACT**

12
13
14 **Objective.** We designed The Irritability and Dysregulation of Emotion Scale (TIDES-13) to test
15 whether irritability consisted of several sub-dimensions that would correlate differentially with
16 internalizing/externalizing psychopathology, age, and gender. **Method.** Parent-report (n = 3935,
17 mean age = 8.9) and youth self-report (n = 579, mean age = 15.1) versions of TIDES-13 were
18 administered to a population-based sample. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were
19 conducted on separate sub-samples. We fit multivariable regression models between TIDES-13
20 sub-dimensions and age, gender, anxiety, depression, ODD and ADHD trait levels. **Results.** A
21 higher order model with a global irritability dimension and Proneness to Anger, Internalized
22 Negative Emotional Reactivity, Externalized Negative Emotional Reactivity and Reactive
23 Aggression sub-dimensions showed good to excellent fit in both parent-report and self-report.
24 The global irritability dimension had a strong influence on all item variance ($\omega_{\text{Hierarchical; parent report}}$
25 = .94, $\omega_{\text{Hierarchical; self report}}$ = .90). Proneness to Anger, Externalized Negative Emotional
26 Reactivity and Reactive Aggression decreased with age in males, whereas Internal Negative
27 Emotional Reactivity increased with age in females. Internalized Negative Emotional Reactivity
28 was associated with internalizing traits, over and above global irritability. ODD and ADHD were
29 predicted primarily by the global irritability. **Conclusion.** Although irritability can be estimated
30 as an essentially unidimensional construct, differential associations of Internalized Negative
31 Emotional Reactivity with gender and age, and internalizing psychopathology warrant
32 examination in clinical populations. These results support TIDES-13 as a reliable and valid

1
2
3
4 multidimensional measure of irritability and thus may be useful for research and clinical
5
6 purposes.
7

8 9 INTRODUCTION

10
11 Irritability is the one of the most common reasons for psychiatric evaluation and
12 treatment in children and youth.^{1,2} Irritability is associated with a wide range of internalizing (eg.
13 anxiety and depression)³ and externalizing psychopathology (eg. attention-deficit/hyperactivity
14 disorder (ADHD)⁴ and oppositional defiant disorder (ODD⁵) and predicts significant concurrent
15 and future impairment (eg. academic problems, poverty, and suicidality).^{6,7} Despite its
16 importance, there is a lack of consensus on how to best conceptualize and measure irritability.⁸
17 This difficulty arises because irritability may manifest through a wide range of emotions,
18 behaviors and internal states.⁹ For example, irritability may encompass excessive reaction to
19 external (e.g., auditory stimulus, external cognitive distraction) or internal stimuli (e.g., fatigue
20 or hunger) with negative emotions (ie. negative emotional reactivity),¹⁰⁻¹² proneness to anger
21 outbursts (i.e., “phasic irritability”), persistent irritable moods (i.e, tonic irritability),¹³ low
22 tolerance for frustration in the face of blocked goal attainment (i.e., frustration intolerance),^{14,15}
23 and a low threshold for maladaptive responses to threat with reactive aggression.^{11,16}
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Existing measures focus on a subset of possible manifestations of irritability, treating the
44 construct as a homogeneous or unidimensional construct rather than a heterogeneous or
45 multidimensional concept obscuring the possibility that sub-dimensions of irritability may exist
46 and have distinct correlates. For example, the Affective Reactivity Index (ARI), a widely-used
47 six item irritability scale in children and youth, primarily includes items that center on
48 expressions of anger¹⁷ (ie. “stays angry for a long time”, “is angry most of the time”, “gets angry
49 frequently”). On the other hand, the Bite Scale includes only items pertaining to an internal
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 enduring state, alternatively characterized as tonic irritability^{18,19} (ie. “I have been grumpy, other
5 people have been getting on my nerves”, “Things have been bothering me more than they
6 normally do”, “I have been feeling irritable”). Despite these unidimensional conceptualizations,
7 there is growing evidence for the hypothesis that irritability is a multidimensional trait with sub-
8 dimensions that represent different states, emotions and behaviors.^{19–22} Thus, a measure that
9 encompasses the variable sub-dimensions of irritability with strong internal reliability and
10 discriminant validity would be an asset to clinical practice and scientific research progress.^{8,9,17}

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Prior to this study, we developed The Irritability and Dysregulation of Emotion Scale
22 (TIDES-13) to measure a wide range of theoretical manifestations of the construct including
23 proneness to anger (i.e., tonic irritability),¹⁶ anger outbursts (i.e., phasic irritability),^{10,12,18}
24 negative emotional reactivity,¹² and frustration intolerance¹³ (see supplementary materials). This
25 present study assessed whether TIDES-13 captured a unified construct corresponding to
26 irritability, as described previously in the literature, or whether irritability consists of sub-
27 dimensions with distinct correlates. Using data from a large community sample, we used
28 exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses to determine whether multiple irritability sub-
29 dimensions could be discerned. Finally, we assessed the predictive validity of irritability sub-
30 dimensions by examining their differential associations with age, gender, internalizing
31 psychopathology and externalizing psychopathology.^{19–22} We also tested the hypothesis that a
32 sub-dimension pertaining to anger would show the strongest levels of convergence with the ARI,
33 given that the ARI mainly measures proneness to anger.⁸

34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

Methods for Scale Development are described in the supplement.

Participants

Visitors aged 4-19 years to a local science center (N = 4413) participated in this study in 2019. Sample characteristics are presented in Table 1. Parents were the informants for participants ages 4 to 19 (N = 3880); participants aged 10-19 (N = 533) provided self-report.

Ethical considerations

Informed consent, and verbal assent when applicable, were obtained from all participants, as approved by the local institution's ethics review board.

Predictive Validity

To assess the predictive validity of irritability sub-dimensions, a subsets of parents and youth completed the ARI (parent: N = 802; self: N = 77), as well as measures of ADHD (parent: N = 3867; self: N = 516) ODD (parent: N = 1256; self: N = 54), anxiety (parent: N = 1554, self: N = 109) and depression (parent: N = 1555; self: N = 109) traits. Anxiety and Depression traits were measured by summing the 6 item depression subscale and the 10 item subscale of the Revised Children's Anxiety and Depression Scale-25 (RCADS).²³ ADHD and ODD traits were measured by summing the 18 ADHD items and the 8 ODD items, respectively, in the Strength and Weakness of ADHD and Normal behavior scale (SWAN).²⁴ SWAN scores were reversed so that higher scores reflected higher levels of the trait for consistency with the other measures.

Statistical Analyses

To evaluate TIDES-13's dimensionality, we randomly split the parent-report data into an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) sample (N = 1937) and a confirmatory factor analysis sample (CFA; N = 1938). The self-report sample (N = 516) was used entirely for CFA. Detailed

1
2
3
4 procedure for the EFA can be found in the supplemental materials. In CFA, we used a robust
5
6 maximum likelihood estimator (MLR) due to moderate violations to multivariate normality, as
7
8 indicated by visual examinations of the Chi-Squared Q-Q plot. Model fit was assessed based on
9
10 the following fit indices: Comparative Fit index (CFI;.95 and above indicate excellent fit
11
12 whereas .90-0.95 indicate acceptable fit), the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI; values above .95
13
14 indicate excellent fit whereas .90-.95 indicate acceptable fit), the root means square error of
15
16 approximation (RMSEA; values smaller than .08 indicate acceptable fit), and the standardized
17
18 root mean square residual (SRMR; recommended cut-off at .08).²⁵ We additionally tested the fit
19
20 of multiple higher order models with a single higher order global dimension and the sub-
21
22 dimensions extracted from EFA to assess the degree to which the sub-dimensions of irritability,
23
24 in fact, contributed to a single underlying construct. To compare the relative contributions of a
25
26 higher order global dimension versus each sub-dimension to the item's variance, we performed
27
28 Schmid-Leiman transformations²⁶ to the best fitting higher order model, which enabled variance
29
30 partitioning between global dimensions and the sub-dimensions. We also used the standardized
31
32 loadings from the Schmid-Leiman transformations to calculate indices of internal consistency
33
34 reliability (ie. the proportion of variance in the calculated score attributed to the construct of
35
36 interest).²⁷ We calculated omega total, omega hierarchical (ω_h), and omega sub-dimension.
37
38 Omega total estimates the proportion of variance of a total score attributable to all sources of
39
40 common variance, where a high omega value reflects a highly reliable multidimensional
41
42 composite.²⁸ ω_h represents the proportion of variance attributable to a common factor and is a
43
44 measure of general factor saturation,²⁸ where a high ω_h indicates that the general factor is a
45
46 dominant source of test score variance.²⁹ Omega sub-dimension represents the internal
47
48 consistency reliability of each sub-dimension score to measure the corresponding sub-dimension,
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 over and above the global construct.³⁰ Each omega value can range from 0 (no reliability) to 1
5
6 (perfect reliability). CFA models were fitted using lavaan³¹ and the Schmid-leimen
7
8 transformation and omega values were calculated using EFAtools.³² Both packages are freely
9
10 available in R Studio.
11
12

13
14 Multivariable regression models were fit to examine associations of TIDES-13 sub-
15
16 dimensions with age and gender. Age by gender interactions were also examined, and a
17
18 subsequent gender-stratified analysis was performed when the interaction term was significant.
19
20 Parent and self-report data were combined to examine the associations between irritability and
21
22 age along the full age continuum (ie. 4-19 yrs), with adjustment for respondent.
23
24

25
26 We evaluated the associations of each TIDES sub-dimension with anxiety, depression,
27
28 ADHD and ODD traits by first calculating the Pearson correlations between each trait measure
29
30 and each TIDES-13 sub-dimension in the subsample of participants with both measures
31
32 available. We compared the TIDES-13 sub-dimensions correlation between other outcome
33
34 variables and other sub-dimensions using Hitner's, May and Silver's method for comparing
35
36 dependent correlations.³³ We then fit multivariable regression models for each outcome with
37
38 each TIDES sub-dimension as a predictor, adjusting for covariates such as age and gender.
39
40 Parent-reported outcomes were predicted by parent-reported variables; self-reported outcomes
41
42 were predicted by self-reported variables. To test the degree to which associations were driven
43
44 by variance unique to specific sub-dimensions or rather by shared variance between each sub-
45
46 dimension (i.e., the global factor), we performed a regression commonality analysis.³⁴ Variance
47
48 inflation factors (VIF) were also calculated to ensure the results were not severely degraded by
49
50 multicollinearity. VIF's under 10 were considered acceptable with no severe violations.³⁵
51
52
53 Statistical significance was considered at $p < .05$ for all analyses.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

RESULTS

Dimensionality

EFA and CFA revealed a four-dimension model with dimensions corresponding to Proneness to Anger (P. Anger), Reactive Aggression (R. Aggression), externalized negative emotional reactivity (Ext. Reactivity), and internalized negative emotional reactivity (Int. Reactivity) fit the data best in both parent-report and self-report. However, as model selection based fit statistics is generally unadvisable,³⁰ we further examined the corresponding higher order model with the same four dimensions as sub-dimensions and an additional higher order global irritability (IRRIT) dimension (Figure 1) due to the moderate to high inter-dimension correlations (Table 2). This higher order model showed excellent fit in parent-report data ($CFI_{parent} = .973$, $TLI_{parent} = .965$, $RMSEA_{parent} = .76$, $SRMR = .027$) and self-report data ($CFI_{self} = .971$, $TLI_{self} = .944$, $RMSEA_{self} = .78$, $SRMR = .044$). The loadings of the higher order model with four sub-dimensions (Figure 1) revealed that each item influenced its corresponding sub-dimension ($\lambda_{parent} > .74$; Median $\lambda_{parent} = .88$; $\lambda_{self} > .61$; Median $\lambda_{self} = .82$), indicating that the sub-dimensions were well defined.

The loadings of the sub-dimensions onto the global irritability dimension (from $\lambda_{parent} = .86$ (R. Aggression) to $\lambda_{parent} = .98$ (P. Anger); from $\lambda_{self} = .85$ (R. Aggression) to $\lambda_{self} = .96$ (P. Anger) demonstrated that each the sub-dimension was strongly influenced by IRRIT (Figure 1). The high standardized loadings from the Schmid-Leiman transformation of the higher order four sub-dimension model (Table 3) also suggested a strong underlying global irritability dimension. The median of the standardized item loadings on IRRIT was $\lambda = .81$ (range: $\lambda = .72$ to $\lambda = .92$) in

1
2
3
4 parent report and $\lambda = .72$ (range: $\lambda = .58$ to $\lambda = .87$) in self-report. However, each item also had
5
6 consistent non-negligible loadings onto its corresponding sub-dimensions (Median $\lambda_{\text{parent}} = .24$;
7
8 range: from $\lambda_{\text{parent}} = .18$ to $\lambda_{\text{parent}} = .46$; Median $\lambda_{\text{self}} = .24$; range: from $\lambda_{\text{self}} = .24$ to $\lambda_{\text{self}} = .46$) which
9
10 suggested that the sub-dimensions had incremental impact on the corresponding item scores over
11
12 and above IRRIT. Descriptions of all models that were extracted in EFA and compared in CFA,
13
14 along with their respective fit indices, can be found in the supplemental materials along with
15
16 their respective fit indices in Table S1.
17
18
19
20

21 Model-based omega estimates suggested that IRRIT had excellent internal consistency
22
23 reliability and contributed to a large proportion of the total variance of all the items (Table 3). All
24
25 estimated omega values can be found in Table 3. The ω_{h} values for each sub-dimension were
26
27 satisfactory to excellent (Median $\omega_{\text{H parent}} = .81$; range: from $\omega_{\text{H parent}} = .67$ (R. Aggression) to ω_{H}
28
29 $\text{parent} = .89$ (P. Anger); Median $\omega_{\text{H self}} = .68$; range: $\omega_{\text{H self}} = .63$ to $\omega_{\text{H self}} = .81$). The ω_{h} value
30
31 corresponding to IRRIT was very high in parent report ($\omega_{\text{H}} = .94$) and self report ($\omega_{\text{H}} = .90$)
32
33 suggesting a strong underlying global factor. Correspondingly, the omega sub-dimension values
34
35 for the sub-dimensions were low (Median $\omega_{\text{parent}} = .11$; range: $\omega_{\text{parent}} = .04$ to $\omega_{\text{parent}} = .25$; Median
36
37 $\omega_{\text{self}} = .14$; range: $\omega_{\text{self}} = 0.08$ to $\omega_{\text{self}} = .24$), further confirming that a large proportion of the
38
39 reliable variance was captured by IRRIT
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Predictive Validity of TIDES-13 sub-dimensions**

49

50 In multivariable regression models examining age and gender effects, the age by gender
51
52 interaction terms were significant for each sub-dimension. In subsequent gender stratified
53
54 analyses, IRRIT, P. Anger, Ext. Reactivity and R. Aggression decreased with age in males but
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 showed no significant associations with age in females whereas Int. Reactivity increased with
5
6 age in females but showed no significant associations with age in males (Table S2).
7
8

9 In parent- and self-report, Int. Reactivity was significantly more correlated with anxiety
10 traits than all the other TIDES-13 sub-dimensions (Table 2): P. Anger (parent: $z = 6.47$, $p < .001$;
11 self: $z = 3.53$, $p < .001$), Ext. Reactivity (parent: $z = 3.38$, $p < .001$; self: $z = 2.3$, $p = .021$), and
12 R. Aggression (parent: $z = 5.58$, $p < 0.001$; self: $z = 2.55$, $p = .011$). Similarly, parent reported
13 Int. Reactivity was also significantly more correlated with depression traits than all the other sub-
14 dimensions (Table 2): P. Anger ($z = 5.74$, $p < .001$), Ext. Reactivity ($z = 3.86$, $p < 0.001$) and R.
15 Aggression ($z = 5.23$, $p < .001$). Self-reported Int. Reactivity was significantly more correlated
16 with depression traits than P. Anger ($z = 2.64$, $p = .008$) and R. Aggression ($z = 2.37$, $p = .018$)
17 but no significant differences were found when compared to the correlation between depression
18 traits and Ext. Reactivity ($z = 1.69$, $p = .092$).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 As expected, P. Anger had the highest correlation with the ARI (Table 2). Parent-
34 reported P. Anger was significantly more correlated with the ARI than Ext. Reactivity ($z = 3.7$, p
35 $< .001$) and R. Aggression ($z = 4.56$, $p < .001$) however, no significant difference was found
36 between the correlation of the ARI and P. Anger, and the correlation of the ARI and Int.
37 Reactivity ($z = 1.36$, $p = .174$). Self-reported P. Anger was significantly more correlated with the
38 ARI than Ext. Reactivity was ($z = 1.20$, $p = .048$), but no significant differences were found
39 when comparing the correlation of the ARI and P. Anger to the correlation of the ARI and Int.
40 Reactivity ($z = 0.31$, $p = .757$) and the correlation of the ARI and R. Aggression ($z = 0.06$, $p =$
41 $.952$).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Parent-reported P. Anger was significantly more correlated with ODD traits than Int.
56 Reactivity ($z = 5.79$), Ext. Reactivity ($z = 3.2$, $p = .0013$) and R. Aggression ($z = 3.40$, $p =$
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 .0007). In self-report, although, R. Aggression had the greatest correlation with ODD traits, it
5
6 was not significantly greater than the correlations between ODD traits and the other sub-
7
8 dimensions
9

10
11 In multivariable regression models, Int. Reactivity was the strongest significant predictor
12 (i.e., largest beta coefficient) of anxiety and depression (Table 4). A similar trend was seen in
13
14 self-report, where Int. Reactivity was the sole significant predictor of anxiety and depression
15
16 traits (Table 4). Further commonality analysis revealed that in parent report data, Int. Reactivity
17
18 uniquely explained 31.1% and 23.9% of the total variance explained by the regression models
19
20 predicting anxiety and depression traits respectively, whereas 41.5% and 54.4% of the variance
21
22 explained was shared by all sub-dimensions. These results suggest IRRIT explains a substantial
23
24 portion of the anxiety and depression trait variance, however, Int. Reactivity is uniquely
25
26 associated with internalizing traits, over and above the associations of IRRIT. In self-report data,
27
28 surprisingly, a greater proportion of the variance of anxiety and depression traits was uniquely
29
30 explained by Int. Reactivity (77.8% and 78.3% respectively) than the variance explained by
31
32 IRRIT (14.4% and 11.4% respectively), suggesting that Int. Reactivity primarily predicted
33
34 internalizing traits, even more so than IRRIT.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 In multivariable regression models, parent reported P. Anger was the strongest predictor
44 of ODD traits; however, substantially more of the variance explained by the model was shared
45
46 by all sub-dimensions (60.4%) than what was uniquely explained by P. Anger (6.9%). In self-
47
48 reported data, no sub-dimensions were significant predictors, however, there a limited number of
49
50 self-report participants who had completed both the TIDES-13 and the ODD subscale (n = 54).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 All sub-dimensions were similarly correlated with ADHD traits and had overlapping
5
6 confidence intervals (Table 2). In regression models (Table 4), a majority of the variance
7
8 explained was explained by IRRIT (parent report: % shared = 61.7, self report: % shared = 48.8).
9
10

11 12 13 14 **DISCUSSION**

15
16 This article examined the heterogeneity of irritability symptoms in a large community
17
18 sample using TIDES-13, a novel scale designed to capture various expressions of irritability. Our
19
20 first aim was to use exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses to see if irritability sub-
21
22 dimensions could be discerned. Our results lend further support to the notion that irritability is a
23
24 heterogeneous construct with highly interrelated, yet distinct, ways of manifesting. We identified
25
26 highly correlated, but distinguishable sub-dimensions that showed excellent fit across
27
28 respondents (parent vs self): P. Anger, R. Aggression, Int. Reactivity, and Ext. Reactivity. Three
29
30 of these sub-dimensions aligned with our hypothesis that dimensions relating to proneness to
31
32 anger, reactive aggression, and internal affective state (Int. Reactivity) would emerge. However,
33
34 within the remaining items, an external (Ext. Reactivity) response to stimuli also emerged.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The empirical distinction between P. Anger, characterized by anger outbursts, and Int.
44
45 Reactivity, an internal persistent state, within our results aligns with the a priori differentiation
46
47 between phasic (i.e., severe and developmentally inappropriate anger outbursts) and tonic (ie.
48
49 persistent irritable mood between outbursts) irritability. The separation of these two sub-
50
51 dimensions is also consistent with recent empirical findings that suggest phasic and tonic
52
53 irritability are distinct, yet highly related irritability dimensions.^{19,21}
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The emergence of reactive aggression sub-dimension within our results is also important
5
6 given the debate on whether notions of irritability should include behavioral aspects such as
7
8 aggression. The result from our higher order modeling reveals that R. Aggression loaded onto the
9
10 global factor (IRRIT) to a similar extent as other irritability sub-dimensions. This supports the
11
12 conceptualization of R. Aggression as a distinguishable behavioral manifestation of irritability.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Given the calls for more nuanced irritability measures that are better able to differentiate
20
21 irritability-related constructs such as tonic and phasic irritability from each other,¹⁹ having P.
22
23 Anger, R. Aggression, Int. Reactivity, and Ext. Reactivity sub-dimensions within a measure of
24
25 irritability may enable more nuanced explorations of the construct's phenomenology. However,
26
27 we also found a high degree of unity within the isolated sub-dimensions, which may explain why
28
29 irritable sub-dimensions have been so difficult to distinguish previously. We observed that P.
30
31 Anger, R. Aggression, Int. Reactivity, and Ext. Reactivity showed high degrees of
32
33 interrelatedness and loaded strongly onto a global dimension (IRRIT) with high internal
34
35 reliability. Furthermore, when evaluating the association of sub-dimensions with other forms of
36
37 psychopathology, we saw that ADHD and ODD traits were driven primarily by IRRIT rather
38
39 than individual sub-dimensions. We also observed high ω_h values of IRRIT (.94 and .90)
40
41 suggesting that much of the item variance was driven by one underlying factor. These findings
42
43 are consistent with studies conducted in a general population that suggest irritability sub-
44
45 dimensions show high levels of inter-relatedness in normative samples.¹³ Paired with our
46
47 findings, these studies suggest that within a normative sample, irritability can be considered
48
49 essentially unidimensional implying the existence of a unique unidimensional latent trait in the
50
51 presence of minor sub-dimensions.³⁶ In light of these findings, we suggest that investigators
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 using TIDES-13 to measure irritability in normative samples may utilize a total score as a valid
5
6 and reliable measure of global irritability.
7
8
9

10
11 However, these results do not invalidate the potential of measuring irritability through
12 sub-dimensions. Our results indicated that measuring irritability sub-dimensions provides
13
14 additional information beyond irritability in general. We observed that Int. Reactivity increased
15
16 with age in females and showed no association with age in males, contrary to the other sub-
17
18 dimensions which decreased with age in males and showed no association in females. We also
19
20 observed that Int. Reactivity was also uniquely associated with internalizing traits alluding to its
21
22 discriminant validity. This differential association is consistent with work that suggests that
23
24 mood-related irritability items predict depression in early adulthood over and above oppositional
25
26 defiant dimension related items,²⁰ lending support to the Int. Reactivity's predictive validity.
27
28
29 Given the emerging consensus that irritability in children is a longitudinal predictor of anxiety
30
31 and depression,³ further examination of the longitudinal associations with TIDES-13 sub-
32
33 dimensions may also yield a better understanding of whether these associations are primarily
34
35 driven by specific sub-dimensions of irritability. Furthermore, recent evidence suggests that
36
37 different subtypes of irritability with different developmental trajectories may exist.^{22,37} One of
38
39 these isolated subtypes showed an increasing association with age and female preponderance
40
41 similar to Int. Reactivity's associations with age/gender, whereas other irritability subtypes show
42
43 male preponderance and an inverse association with age, similar to the cross sectional trend
44
45 observed in the remaining TIDES sub-dimensions.²² However, developmental studies often
46
47 utilize overall irritability scores, combining items from the different potential sub-dimensions of
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 irritability obscuring the possibility that these subtypes are driven by particular irritability sub-
5
6 dimensions.

7
8
9 We also found that parent-reported P. Anger was more strongly correlated with the ARI
10
11 than most other sub-dimensions confirming that ARI items tend to reflect proneness to anger.
12
13 However, it should be noted that although the magnitude of correlation coefficients in self-report
14
15 suggested a similar trend, many of the comparisons of correlation coefficients in self report were
16
17 non-significant. This could be partially due to the limited power available due to the small subset
18
19 of self respondents who completed both the ARI and TIDES-13 (N = 73). Also, in the parent
20
21 report, the differences in correlation coefficients between P. Anger and the ARI and Int.
22
23 Reactivity and the ARI were non-significant. This may be due to the ARI's item content as five
24
25 of the items relate to P. Anger, and one item taps into Int. Reactivity (i.e., "easily annoyed").
26
27 Further examination of the differences between P. Anger and Int. Reactivity may bring clarity as
28
29 to whether any differences between the two constructs are being masked by combining into a
30
31 single dimension within existing measures.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 There are some limitations of this study that should be noted. The study sample was
42
43 population-based, and thus the number of participants with mental-health diagnoses was
44
45 proportional to that in a general population. However, an irritability scale with variable sub-
46
47 dimensions such as TIDES-13 would enable evaluations of the factor structure in different
48
49 clinical populations. Future validation studies for TIDES-13 should aim to replicate the factor
50
51 structure and cross-sectional associations in clinical samples so that differences between
52
53 irritability sub-dimensions can be further explored. The cross-sectional nature of our results also
54
55 limited inferences about the stability and long-term predictive validity of irritability factor
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 structure found in the current study. Given the available data, we were only able to assess
5
6 TIDES-13's internal reliability. Future studies should administer TIDES to multiple raters across
7
8 different respondents and different time points to examine the scale's test-retest and inter-rater
9
10 reliability.
11
12

13 14 **CONCLUSIONS**

15
16 In a large general population sample with both self and parent report measures, we found
17
18 unity and diversity between irritability sub-dimensions. Irritability can manifest variably as
19
20 highly interrelated sub-dimensions P. Anger, Int. Reactivity, Ext. Reactivity and R. Aggression
21
22 with distinct correlates of psychopathology. These results support TIDES-13 as a reliable and
23
24 valid measure which captures a broader spectrum of the construct's phenotype and thus may be
25
26 useful for research or clinical purposes. We specifically underscore a need to further examine the
27
28 hypothesis that the association between irritability and internalizing psychopathology may be
29
30 primarily driven by Int. Reactivity.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

1. Peterson BS, Zhang H, Santa Lucia R, King RA, Lewis M. Risk factors for presenting problems in child psychiatric emergencies. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 1996;35(9):1162-1173. doi:10.1097/00004583-199609000-00014
2. Stringaris A, Vidal-Ribas P, Brotman MA, Leibenluft E. Practitioner Review: Definition, recognition, and treatment challenges of irritability in young people. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2018;59(7):721-739. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12823
3. Vidal-Ribas P, Brotman MA, Valdivieso I, Leibenluft E, Stringaris A. The Status of Irritability in Psychiatry: A Conceptual and Quantitative Review. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2016;55(7):556-570. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2016.04.014
4. Eyre O, Langley K, Stringaris A, Leibenluft E, Collishaw S, Thapar A. Irritability in ADHD: Associations with depression liability. *J Affect Disord*. 2017;215:281-287. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2017.03.050
5. Burke JD, Boylan K, Rowe R, et al. Identifying the Irritability Dimension of ODD: Application of a Modified Bifactor Model Across Five Large Community Samples of Children. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 2014;123(4):841-851. doi:10.1037/a0037898
6. Copeland WE, Shanahan L, Egger H, Angold A, Costello EJ. Adult diagnostic and functional outcomes of DSM-5 disruptive mood dysregulation disorder. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2014;171(6):668-674. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.13091213
7. Conner KR, Meldrum S, Wieczorek WF, Duberstein PR, Welte JW. The association of irritability and impulsivity with suicidal ideation among 15- to 20-year-old males. *Suicide Life Threat Behav*. 2004;34(4):363-373. doi:10.1521/suli.34.4.363.53745
8. Toohey MJ, DiGiuseppe R. Defining and measuring irritability: Construct clarification and differentiation. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2017;53:93-108. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2017.01.009
9. Malhi G, Bell E, Outhred T. Getting irritable about irritability? *Evid Based Ment Health*. 2019;22(3):93-94. doi:10.1136/ebmental-2019-300101
10. Caprara GV, Cinanni V, D'Imperio G, Passerini S, Renzi P, Travaglia G. Indicators of impulsive aggression: Present status of research on irritability and emotional susceptibility scales. *Personal Individ Differ*. 1985;6(6):665-674. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(85)90077-7
11. Leibenluft E, Stoddard J. The developmental psychopathology of irritability. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2013;25(4 Pt 2):1473-1487. doi:10.1017/S0954579413000722
12. Rabinowitz JA, Osigwe I, Drabick DAG, Reynolds MD. Negative emotional reactivity moderates the relations between family cohesion and internalizing and externalizing

- 1
2
3
4 symptoms in adolescence. *J Adolesc.* 2016;53:116-126.
5 doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.09.007
6
7
8 13. Copeland WE, Brotman MA, Costello EJ. Normative Irritability in Youth: Developmental
9 Findings From the Great Smoky Mountain Study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.*
10 2015;54(8):635-642. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2015.05.008
11
12 14. Amsel A. The role of frustrative nonreward in noncontinuous reward situations. *Psychol*
13 *Bull.* 1958;55(2):102-119. doi:10.1037/h0043125
14
15 15. Insel T, Cuthbert B, Garvey M, et al. Research Domain Criteria (RDoC): Toward a New
16 Classification Framework for Research on Mental Disorders. *Am J Psychiatry.*
17 2010;167(7):748-751. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2010.09091379
18
19 16. Leibenluft E. Pediatric irritability: A systems neuroscience approach. *Trends Cogn Sci.*
20 2017;21(4):277-289. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2017.02.002
21
22 17. Stringaris A, Goodman R, Ferdinando S, et al. The Affective Reactivity Index: a concise
23 irritability scale for clinical and research settings. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry.*
24 2012;53(11):1109-1117. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2012.02561.x
25
26 18. Holtzman S, O'Connor BP, Barata PC, Stewart DE. The Brief Irritability Test (BITe): A
27 Measure of Irritability for Use Among Men and Women. *Assessment.* 2015;22(1):101-115.
28 doi:10.1177/1073191114533814
29
30 19. Cardinale EM, Freitag GF, Brotman MA, Pine DS, Leibenluft E, Kircanski K. Phasic
31 Versus Tonic Irritability: Differential Associations With Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity
32 Disorder Symptoms. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* Published online January 10,
33 2021. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2020.11.022
34
35 20. Hawes MT, Carlson GA, Finsaas MC, Olinio TM, Seely JR, Klein DN. Dimensions of
36 irritability in adolescents: longitudinal associations with psychopathology in adulthood.
37 *Psychol Med.* Published online October 2019:1-9. doi:10.1017/S0033291719002903
38
39 21. Silver J, Carlson GA, Olinio TM, et al. Differential outcomes of tonic and phasic irritability
40 in adolescent girls. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry.* 2021;62(10):1220-1227.
41 doi:10.1111/jcpp.13402
42
43 22. Riglin L, Eyre O, Thapar AK, et al. Identifying Novel Types of Irritability Using a
44 Developmental Genetic Approach. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2019;176(8):635-642.
45 doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.18101134
46
47 23. Ebesutani C, Bernstein A, Nakamura BJ, Chorpita BF, Weisz JR. A Psychometric Analysis
48 of the Revised Child Anxiety and Depression Scale—Parent Version in a Clinical Sample. *J*
49 *Abnorm Child Psychol.* 2010;38(2):249-260. doi:10.1007/s10802-009-9363-8
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 24. Burton CL, Wright L, Shan J, et al. SWAN scale for ADHD trait-based genetic research: a
5 validity and polygenic risk study. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2019;60(9):988-997.
6 doi:10.1111/jcpp.13032
7
- 8
9 25. Yu C yun. *Evaluating Cutoff Criteria of Model Fit Indices for Latent Variable Models with*
10 *Binary and Continuous Outcomes.*; 2002.
11
- 12 26. Wolff HG, Preising K. Exploring item and higher order factor structure with the Schmid-
13 Leiman solution: Syntax codes for SPSS and SAS. *Behav Res Methods*. 2005;37(1):48-58.
14 doi:10.3758/BF03206397
15
- 16
17 27. Dunn TJ, Baguley T, Brunsden V. From alpha to omega: a practical solution to the
18 pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation. *Br J Psychol Lond Engl 1953*.
19 2014;105(3):399-412. doi:10.1111/bjop.12046
20
- 21
22 28. Watkins MW. The reliability of multidimensional neuropsychological measures: from alpha
23 to omega. *Clin Neuropsychol*. 2017;31(6-7):1113-1126.
24 doi:10.1080/13854046.2017.1317364
25
- 26
27 29. Flora DB. Your Coefficient Alpha Is Probably Wrong, but Which Coefficient Omega Is
28 Right? A Tutorial on Using R to Obtain Better Reliability Estimates. *Adv Methods Pract*
29 *Psychol Sci*. 2020;3(4):484-501. doi:10.1177/2515245920951747
30
- 31
32 30. Rodriguez A, Reise SP, Haviland MG. Applying Bifactor Statistical Indices in the
33 Evaluation of Psychological Measures. *J Pers Assess*. 2016;98(3):223-237.
34 doi:10.1080/00223891.2015.1089249
35
- 36
37 31. Rosseel Y. lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *J Stat Softw*.
38 2012;48(1):1-36. doi:10.18637/jss.v048.i02
39
- 40
41 32. Steiner M, Grieder S. EFAtools: An R package with fast and flexible implementations of
42 exploratory factor analysis tools. *J Open Source Softw*. 2020;5(53):2521.
43 doi:10.21105/joss.02521
44
- 45
46 33. Hittner JB, May K, Silver NC. A Monte Carlo evaluation of tests for comparing dependent
47 correlations. *J Gen Psychol*. 2003;130(2):149-168. doi:10.1080/00221300309601282
48
- 49
50 34. Nimon K, Lewis M, Kane R, Haynes RM. An R package to compute commonality
51 coefficients in the multiple regression case: An introduction to the package and a practical
52 example. *Behav Res Methods*. 2008;40(2):457-466. doi:10.3758/BRM.40.2.457
53
- 54
55 35. Vittinghoff E, Glidden DV, Shiboski SC, McCulloch CE. Predictor Selection. In:
56 Vittinghoff E, Glidden DV, Shiboski SC, McCulloch CE, eds. *Regression Methods in*
57 *Biostatistics: Linear, Logistic, Survival, and Repeated Measures Models*. Statistics for
58 Biology and Health. Springer US; 2012:395-429. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-1353-0_10
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

36. Strout WF. A new item response theory modeling approach with applications to unidimensionality assessment and ability estimation. *Psychometrika*. 1990;55(2):293-325. doi:10.1007/BF02295289
37. Wiggins JL, Mitchell C, Stringaris A, Leibenluft E. Developmental trajectories of irritability and bidirectional associations with maternal depression. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2014;53(11):1191-1205, 1205.e1-4. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2014.08.005

23 **Table 1:** Sample Characteristics

	Parent-Report	Self-Report
	Overall (N=3875)	Overall (N=516)
Female (n, %)	1882 (48.6%)	305 (59.1%)
Value	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Age	8.91 (2.29)	15.2 (1.93)
Trait Measures		
Anxiety (N parent = 1554 ; N self = 109)	5.49 (4.46)	12.2 (8.40)
Depression (N parent = 1555, N self = 109)	3.07 (3.10)	9.38 (6.60)
ADHD (N parent = 3867, N self = 516)	-0.48 (0.99)	-0.60 (0.92)

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 ODD (N parent = 1256, N self = 54) -0.18 (1.07) -0.64 (1.54)
22
23

24 **TIDES-13 Dimensions**

25
26
27
28 IRRIT -0.34 (1.16) -0.31 (1.14)
29
30

31
32
33 Ext. Reactivity -0.22 (1.13) -0.23 (1.14)
34
35

36
37
38 P. Anger -0.22 (1.33) -0.43 (1.38)
39
40

41
42 R. Aggression -0.96 (1.42) -0.95 (1.38)
43
44

45
46 Int. Reactivity 0.02 (1.22) 0.36 (1.32)
47
48

49
50 **Notes:** ADHD = Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, anxiety = Anxiety, depression
51 = Depression, ODD = Oppositional Defiant Disorder, Ext. Reactivity = externalized
52 Negative Emotional Reactivity sub-dimensions; R. Aggression = Reactive Aggression
53 sub-dimensions; P. Anger = Proneness to Anger sub-dimension; Int. Reactivity =
54 internalized Negative Emotional Reactivity; M = mean; SD = Standard Deviation,
55 parent = parent-reported data, self = self-reported data.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2: Pearson correlations and 95 CI between TIDES sub-dimensions, ARI and other psychopathology.

	IRRIT	Ext. Reactivity	R. Aggression	P. Anger	Int. Reactivity	ARI	ADHD	Anxiety	Depression	ODD
IRRIT	-	0.93 [0.92, 0.93]	0.90 [0.89, 0.9]	0.94 [0.94, 0.94]	0.90 [0.89, 0.9]	0.68 [0.64, 0.71]	0.42 [0.4, 0.45]	0.28 [0.24, 0.33]	0.38 [0.34, 0.42]	0.70 [0.67, 0.73]
Ext. Reactivity	0.89 [0.88, 0.91]	-	0.76 [0.75, 0.77]	0.82 [0.81, 0.83]	0.80 [0.79, 0.81]	0.60 [0.56, 0.64]	0.40 [0.38, 0.43]	0.28 [0.23, 0.32]	0.36 [0.32, 0.4]	0.63 [0.59, 0.66]
R. Aggression	0.92 [0.91, 0.93]	0.80 [0.77, 0.83]	-	0.80 [0.79, 0.81]	0.69 [0.67, 0.71]	0.59 [0.55, 0.64]	0.37 [0.34, 0.4]	0.23 [0.19, 0.28]	0.30 [0.25, 0.34]	0.62 [0.59, 0.66]
P. Anger	0.95 [0.94, 0.96]	0.76 [0.73, 0.80]	0.86 [0.83, 0.88]	-	0.83 [0.82, 0.84]	0.66 [0.62, 0.69]	0.40 [0.37, 0.43]	0.21 [0.16, 0.25]	0.33 [0.28, 0.37]	0.70 [0.67, 0.72]
Int. Reactivity	0.84 [0.82, 0.87]	0.63 [0.58, 0.68]	0.65 [0.6, 0.69]	0.81 [0.78, 0.84]	-	0.63 [0.59, 0.67]	0.38 [0.35, 0.41]	0.34 [0.29, 0.38]	0.43 [0.39, 0.47]	0.61 [0.58, 0.65]
ARI	0.77 [0.66, 0.85]	0.49 [0.30, 0.65]	0.70 [0.57, 0.8]	0.86 [0.78, 0.91]	0.75 [0.63, 0.83]	-	0.33 [0.26, 0.39]	0.38 [0.32, 0.44]	0.45 [0.4, 0.5]	0.59 [0.53, 0.65]
ADHD	0.54 [0.47, 0.59]	0.52 [0.45, 0.58]	0.50 [0.44, 0.56]	0.48 [0.42, 0.55]	0.42 [0.35, 0.49]	0.24 [0.04, 0.43]	-	0.54 [0.11, 0.21]	0.52 [0.26, 0.35]	0.48 [0.57, 0.63]

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

	0.67	0.66	0.45	0.58	0.74	0.54	0.40 ^{n.s}		0.71	0.18
Anxiety	[0.55, 0.76]	[0.54, 0.75]	[0.29, 0.59]	[0.44, 0.69]	[0.64, 0.81]	[0.38, 0.67]	[0.24, 0.54]	-	[0.68, 0.73]	[0.13, 0.24]
	0.30	0.31	0.03 ^{n.s}	0.23 ^{n.s}	0.54	0.20	0.32 ^{n.s}	0.73		0.33
Depression	[0.12, 0.46]	[0.13, 0.47]	[-0.15, 0.22]	[0.05, 0.4]	[0.4, 0.66]	[-0.01, 0.38]	[0.15, 0.47]	[0.64, 0.8]	-	[0.28, 0.38]
	0.38	0.39	0.43	0.34	0.19 ^{n.s}	0.23 ^{n.s}	0.40	0.2 ^{n.s}	-0.06 ^{n.s}	
ODD	[0.12, 0.59]	[0.13, 0.59]	[0.19, 0.63]	[0.08, 0.55]	[-0.08, 0.44]	[-0.12, 0.53]	[0.24, 0.54]	[-0.03, 0.44]	[-0.3, 0.19]	-

Notes: CI = Confidence Interval, n.s = not significant, IRRIT = Global Irritability dimension; Ext. Reactivity = externalized Negative Emotional Reactivity sub-dimension; R. Aggression = Reactive Aggression sub-dimension; P. Anger = Proneness to Anger sub-dimension; Int. Reactivity = internalized Negative Emotional Reactivity sub-dimension, ARI = Affective Reactivity Index, ADHD = Attention-Deficit / Hyperactivity Disorder traits, Anxiety = Anxiety traits, Depression = Depression traits, ODD = Oppositional Defiant Disorder traits, n.s = non-significant. Parent report data is above the diagonal and the self report data is below.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 3: Schmid-Leiman Transformed Standardized factor loadings, Fit indices, and Reliability estimates of TIDES-13

Tides Item	Parent Report (n = 1940) [†]					Self Report (n = 516)				
	IRRIT	Ext. Reactivity	R. Aggression	P. Anger	Int. Reactivity	IRRIT	Ext. Reactivity	R. Aggression	P. Anger	Int. Reactivity
8. Grumpy or Bad tempered	0.81	0.25				0.78	0.32			
10. Complains or whines	0.72	0.22				0.63	0.26			
11. Irritable during body discomfort	0.74	0.23				0.58	0.24			
7. Angry when not getting what they want	0.83	0.26				0.72	0.30			
9. Explosive	0.73		0.44			0.67		0.32		

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

12. Physically aggressive	0.80	0.48		0.78	0.37
13. Verbally offensive	0.73	0.44		0.61	0.29
1. Gets Angry	0.87	0.19		0.76	0.24
2. Temper Tantrums	0.89	0.20		0.81	0.25
5. Loose temper	0.91	0.20		0.87	0.27
3. Easily frustrated	0.80		0.33	0.73	0.46
4. Annoyed by minor things	0.82		0.34	0.71	0.45
6. Annoyed by others	0.89		0.32	0.68	0.42
Fit Indices					
CFI	0.97			0.96	

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

TLI	0.97					0.96				
RMSEA	0.76					0.78				
SRMR	0.03					0.04				

**Reliability
Indices**

ω_{Total}	0.97	0.88	0.91	0.94	0.90	0.95	0.83	0.81	0.89	0.87
$\omega_{\text{Hierarchical}}$	0.94	0.81	0.67	0.89	0.77	0.90	0.71	0.66	0.81	0.63
$\omega_{\text{sub-dimension}}$		0.08	0.25	0.04	0.13		0.12	0.15	0.08	0.24

Notes: IRRIT = Global Irritability dimension; Ext. Reactivity = externalized Negative Emotional Reactivity sub-dimension; R. Aggression = Reactive Aggression sub-dimension; P. Anger = Proneness to Anger sub-dimension; Int. Reactivity = internalized Negative Emotional Reactivity sub-dimension; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; † the parameters in this table were calculated by transforming the loadings from the best fitting factor model in confirmatory factor analysis so only the confirmatory parent sample was used.

Table 4: Multiple regression results of associations between TIDES sub-dimensions with Anxiety, Depression, ODD, and ADHD traits.

DV	IV	Parent Report			Self Report					
		B [95 CI]	Model R ² (%)	Unique R ² (%)	Shared R ² (%)	B	95 CI	Model R ²	% Unique R ²	% Shared R ²
<i>Internalizing</i>										
Anxiety traits	Ext. Reactivity	0.45* [0.05, 0.79]		2.2		0.44	[-1.74, 2.61]		1.2	
	R. Aggression	0.17 [-0.09, 0.34]		0.7		0.47	[-1.42, 2.36]		0.1	
	P. Anger	-0.69*** [-1.07, -0.34]		6.4		-1.55	[-3.42, 0.32]		9.3	
	Int. Reactivity	1.45*** [1.2, 1.8]		32		3.47**	[1.42, 5.36]		62.1	
			13.1						41.5	16.7

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Depression
traits

Ext.
Reactivity

R.
Aggression

P. Anger

Int.
Reactivity

0.33 [-0.3, 0.46]

0.20* [0.05, 0.37]

-0.32** [-0.60, -0.11]

0.92*** [0.84, 1.3]

0.9

1.9

2.4

23.9

0.27 [-1.48, 2.02]

0.12 [-1.40, 1.64]

-0.61 [-2.12, 0.89]

2.04** [0.68, 3.40]

3.0

1.9

3.3

58.1

20.5

54.4

16

Externalizing

ODD traits

Ext.
Reactivity

R.
Aggression

P. Anger

Int.
Reactivity

0.1*** [0.06, 0.22]

0.1*** [0.09, 0.19]

0.26*** [0.20, 0.35]

0.14*** [-0.05, 0.10]

1.2

2.8

5.0

0.0

0.51 [0.01, 1.01]

0.17 [-0.27, 0.61]

0.20 [0.32, 0.72]

-0.27 [-0.73, 0.19]

19.9

3.2

5.0

10.3

44.1

61.2

31.2

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

ADHD traits	Ext.	0.16***	[0.08, 0.18]	2.8	0.01	[-0.01, 0.21]	5.2
	Reactivity						
	R.	0.08***	[0.06, 0.13]	2.8	0.10*	[0.01,0.18]	4.9
	Aggression						
	P. Anger	0.0	[0.01, 0.11]	0.61	0.07	[-0.03, 0.17]	2.0
	Int.	0.1***	[0.06, 0.15]	1.8	0.04	[-0.05, 0.13]	0.9
	Reactivity						
				23.6			61.7
							48.8


Notes: DV = Dependent Variable, IV = Independent Variable, B = Beta coefficient, CI = Confidence Interval, Ext. Reactivity = Externalized Negative Emotional Reactivity sub-dimension; R. Aggression = Reactive Aggression sub-dimension; P. Anger = Proneness to Anger sub-dimension; Int. Reactivity = Internalized Negative Emotional Reactivity sub-dimension; Model R²= percentage of the dependent variable’s variance explained by the overall model. % Unique R² = percentage of the variance explained by the model that is unique to each corresponding sub-dimension; % Shared R² = ercentage of the variance explained by the model that is common to all sub-dimensions, and therefore represents the global irritability dimension. *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001. The strongest significant predictor of a given trait is bolded.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


Figure Captions

Figure 1: Higher Order Model of Irritability and Factor loadings. Both parent-reported (A) and self-reported (B) The Irritability and Dysregulation of Emotion Scale (TIDES-13) scores showed a higher order model of irritability with a global irritability dimension (IRRIT) and externalized negative emotional reactivity (Ext. Reactivity), reactive aggression (R. Aggression), proneness to anger (P. Anger), internalized negative emotional reactivity (Int. Reactivity). The numbers on the straight lines represent the standardized loading. The numbers placed around the circular arrows represents the corresponding variable's variance.

A: Parent Report



B: Self Report



Supplementary material

Table S1: CFA Model Fit indices

Model	Parent Report				Self Report			
	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Unidimensional	0.902	0.899	0.139	0.047	0.883	0.859	0.125	0.058
2 Dimension	0.947	0.935	0.1	0.033	0.9	0.878	0.116	0.054
3 Dimension	0.964	0.954	0.087	0.031	0.939	0.921	0.096	0.054
4 Dimension	.979†	.972†	.068†	.023†	.966†	.955†	.070†	.040†
H 2 Dimension	0.95	0.939	0.101	0.033	0.9	0.877	0.117	0.054
H 3 Dimension	0.962	0.952	0.088	0.030	0.929	0.911	0.099	0.051
H 4 Dimension	0.972	0.964	0.076	0.028	0.957	0.944	0.078	0.044

Notes: CFA = confirmatory factor analysis; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = tucker lewis index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardised root mean residual; H = higher order model with additional higher order global dimensions, † = best fitting model. This table summarizes the confirmatory factor analysis fit indices of multiple factor models extracted from exploratory factor analysis conducted in a separate exploratory sample.

Table S2: Associations of TIDES sub-dimensions with Age and Gender

		<i>Dependent variable:</i>														
		IRRIT			P. Anger			Int. Reactivity			Ext. Reactivity			R. Aggression		
		Beta (Std. Error)			Beta (Std. Error)			Beta (Std. Error)			Beta (Std. Error)			Beta (Std. Error)		
Sample		Overall	Female	Male	Overall	Female	Male	Overall	Female	Male	Overall	Female	Male	Overall	Female	Male
Age		0.015 (0.010)	0.003 (0.011)	- 0.028 * (0.01 1)	0.007 (0.011)	-0.011 (0.012)	- 0.045 *** (0.01 2)	0.045*** (0.010)	0.033 ** (0.011)	0.010 (0.012)	0.009 (0.010)	-0.005 (0.011)	- 0.041 *** (0.011)	0.002 (0.012)	-0.003 (0.013)	- 0.050 *** (0.013)
Gender																
Female		ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.		
Male		0.676 *** (0.117)			0.733 *** (0.129)			0.045 *** (0.124)			0.641 *** (0.117)			0.814 *** (0.142)		
Respondent																
Parent		ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.			ref.		
Self		0.080 (0.072)	0.232 * (0.095)	- 0.098 (0.10 8)	-0.082 (0.080)	0.056 (0.106)	- 0.245 * (0.12 0)	0.199** (0.076)	0.360 *** (0.100)	0.010 (0.116)	0.313*** (0.072)	0.490 *** (0.096)	0.105 (0.108)	0.172* (0.087)	0.234 * (0.116)	0.099 (0.132)
Age:Gender		-0.055 *** (0.012)			-0.055 *** (0.013)			-0.048 *** (0.012)			- 0.063 *** (0.012)			-0.057 *** (0.014)		

*Notes: Ext. Reactivity = Externalized Negative Emotional Reactivity sub-dimension; R. AGGR = Reactive Aggression sub-dimension; P. Anger = Proneness to Anger sub-dimension; Int. Reactivity = Internalized Negative Emotional Reactivity sub-dimension, Std. Error = standard error, ref = reference category for categorical variables. Beta coefficients estimated for categorical variables are in comparison to the reference category. *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001. This table summarizes the results from multiple regression analyses examining the association between TIDES-13 sub-dimensions with age and gender. Gender-stratified analyses were undertaken when the Age: Gender interaction term was significant.*

TIDES-13 Development

We began by reviewing the existing definitions of irritability and identifying components within these definitions including proneness to anger (phasic irritability), negative emotional reactivity, grumpy or grouchy mood (tonic irritability), and reactive aggression. We then created a large pool of candidate items corresponding to these five components from existing irritability measures. Responses were measured from strengths (-3) to weakness (3) to capture the full distribution of irritability in a general population sample. The existing item pool was administered to a development sample consisting of parents of children attending a psychiatric clinic at [XXXXXXXXXX] Hospital (n = 149). Parents responding to the items were asked a list of qualitative questions probing their interpretations of each item. These results informed item modification and deletion. Items were further deleted based on low item-scale correlation, low contributions to internal consistency, and considerations of face validity. After these final modifications, we arrived at the 13-item scale used in this present study. TIDES-13 has two parts: the first is 13-item measure of irritability traits on a continuum, where parents/youth were asked to rate the participant/themselves compared to others of the same age over the past year on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from -3 (far less than others) to 3 (far more than others). The second part of the scale contains four additional items measuring the frequency of temper outbursts, frequency of physically aggressive outbursts and level of the irritability-related impairment, all of which correspond to DSM-5 criterion for DMDD and IED to aid in establishing research diagnoses.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) Methods

In EFA, the number of factors to retain was informed by parallel analyses and the scree test. EFA models were extracted using varimax rotations in anticipation of highly correlated factors. We assigned items to factors when the factor loading was greater than 0.4. All EFA analysis was conducted using the stats package that runs freely in R studio.

Exploratory Factor Analysis Results:

Parallel analysis suggested extracting four factors, however visual examination of the scree plot for “elbowing” was not clearly distinguishable between two, three and four-factor solutions so we extracted all one through four- factor solutions to determine the number of sub-dimensions that best described TIDES-13-dimensional structure. The first was a unidimensional model with all items loading onto one latent variable. The two-factor model had two factors: Reactive Aggression and the remaining items. The three-factor model had mood, phasic, and reactive aggression factors. The four-factor factor model had externalized negative emotional reactivity (Ext. Reactivity), reactive aggression (R. Aggr), proneness to anger (P. Anger), internalized negative emotional reactivity (Int. Reactivity) factors.