Strong Genetic Overlaps Between Dimensional and Categorical Models of Bipolar Disorders in a Family Sample

Alejandro Arbona-Lampaya[1], Heejong Sung[1], Alexander D'Amico[1], Emma E. M. Knowles[2], Emily K. Besançon[1], Ally Freifeld[1], Ley Lacbawan[1], Fabiana Lopes[1], Layla Kassem[1], Antonio E. Nardi[3], Francis J. McMahon[1]

[1]Intramural Research Program, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA; [2]Department of Psychiatry, Boston Children's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.; [3]Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Objective: Bipolar disorder (BD) often presents with a broad range of symptoms, but there is little agreement as to the heritability and genetic relationships between dimensional and categorical models of this often-disabling disorder.

Methods: Participants in the Amish-Mennonite Bipolar Genetics (AMBiGen) study, which enrolls families with BD and related disorders from Amish and Mennonite communities in North and South America, were assigned a categorical mood disorder diagnosis by structured psychiatric interview and asked to complete the Mood Disorder Questionnaire (MDQ), which assesses lifetime history of cardinal manic symptoms and associated impairment. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was performed to analyze the dimensions of the MDQ in 726 participants, 212 of whom carried a categorical diagnosis of major mood disorder. SOLAR-ECLIPSE (v9.0.0) was used to estimate heritability and genetic overlaps between MDQ-derived measures and categorical diagnoses among 432 genotyped participants.

Results: As expected, MDQ scores were significantly higher among individuals diagnosed with BD and related disorders. PCA suggested a three-component model for the MDQ, consistent with the literature. Heritability of the MDQ symptom score was estimated at 30% ($p<0.001$), which was evenly distributed across its three principal components. Strong and significant genetic correlations were found between categorical diagnoses and most MDQ measures, especially impairment.

Conclusion: The results support the MDQ as a dimensional measure of BD. Furthermore, significant heritability and high genetic correlations between MDQ scores and categorical diagnoses suggest a genetic continuity between dimensional and categorical measures of major mood disorders.

1. Introduction

Bipolar disorder (BD) is a mental health condition marked by cyclic fluctuations between manic and depressive mood and behavioral states, which impede ability to function and execute everyday activities. BD affects an estimated 2-4% of adults in the United States at some point in their lives[1]. BD can begin with a depressive episode, indistinguishable from unipolar depression, and is frequently unrecognized or misdiagnosed for several years after onset[2]. Individuals with BD who are misdiagnosed with major depression disorder (MDD) have a poorer quality of life than patients who are accurately diagnosed with either MDD or BD[3]. In addition, many individuals suffer from subclinical symptoms that do not meet categorical diagnostic thresholds[4]. This has led to an increasing focus on dimensional measures of psychopathology that may better reflect the full spectrum of BD presentations[5–8].

The Mood Disorder Questionnaire (MDQ) is one such dimensional measure that is commonly used as a screening tool for BD and related disorders. The MDQ is a self-report questionnaire that assesses 13 manic symptoms; occurrence of these symptoms during distinct episodes and asks respondents to rate to what degree any symptoms led to problems with behavior[9]. Each endorsed symptom constitutes one point for the MDQ Score (MDQS), with scores ranging from zero to 13. The MDQ has a good capacity to detect individuals with probable BD at the widely agreed MDQS of seven or more, with sensitivity around 0.60 and specificity around 0.85 [10]. Several studies have shown that the MDQ is an effective screening tool for BD in urban and rural clinical settings[11–14].

We have previously demonstrated that the MDQ is a sensitive and specific screening tool for BD in Anabaptist families ascertained through probands with BD[15]. Anabaptists include well-

known communities such as the Amish and Mennonites, both of which originated in Western Europe, as well as other lesser-known communities of various ancestries[14]. Anabaptists are religious groups with substantial genetic isolation, large families, well-documented pedigree structures, rural lifestyles, and a low prevalence of substance abuse[14]. These characteristics offer a unique opportunity to study the genetic underpinnings of common diseases like BD. We have previously shown that the symptom profiles of manic and depressive episodes are similar between Anabaptist and non-Anabaptist groups[14]. We have also observed a wide range of MDQ scores among relatives, suggesting a genetic continuum between categorical BD diagnoses and dimensional symptoms of mania.

To further investigate this observation, we carried out a genetic study of the MDQ in a large sample of participants enrolled in the Amish Mennonite Bipolar Genetics Study (AMBiGen). First, we examined the factor structure of the MDQ to test whether this structure differed from that in other populations. By exploring the factor structure of the MDQ in this more genetically homogeneous population, we aimed to contribute to the ongoing debate regarding the psychometric properties of the MDQ. The factor structure of the MDQ is important for its use as a dimensional measure of genetic risk for BD and can inform clinical practice by improving the accuracy of diagnosis and treatment selection for individuals with BD.

We tested the heritability of the MDQS, and scores derived from the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to determine which components were most heritable. The analysis gives insight on the extent to which the variance observed in the components can be attributed to inherited genetic variation. Finally, we tested for genetic overlap between MDQ measures and categorical BD diagnoses in this sample. High genetic overlap would shed light upon the continuum of

symptoms observed in at-risk groups, support the validity of the MDQ as a screening tool for genetic risk of BD, and would have important implications for clinical practice and public health.

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

Participants were recruited as part of the AMBiGen[14] study. In North America, families were recruited through a proband with a diagnosis of BD. We sought to assess all first- or second-degree relatives who were at least 18 years of age. Exclusion criteria included major physical, neurological, or substance use disorders that complicated diagnosis. South American participants all belonged to one of three Mennonite settlements in Brazil who were all descended from a relatively small number of founding couples[16].

Participants who had an MDQS greater than or equal to seven[15], or who otherwise endorsed a history of mental health problems based on the Past History Schedule[17] underwent a direct assessment with the Diagnostic Interview for Genetic Studies (DIGS). The DIGS is a widely-used, semi-structured psychiatric examination that reliably elicits diagnostic criteria for major depression, mania, psychosis, alcohol and drug use, suicidal behavior, and anxiety disorders[18]. The DIGS assesses lifetime symptoms as well as the most severe periods of major depression and mania. Following the DIGS, two clinicians independently assigned a best estimate final diagnosis[19] based on the interview, available medical records, and reports from relatives.

Categorical diagnoses were grouped into “narrow” and “broad” diagnostic categories based on established family studies[20]. Participants diagnosed with bipolar type I (BD1), bipolar type II (BD2) with recurrent depression, and schizoaffective bipolar disorder (SABP) were assigned to

the "narrow" categorical diagnosis. The "broad" diagnosis included “narrow” along with BD2 with a single episode of depression, schizoaffective depressive disorder (SAD), schizophrenia (SZ), recurrent MDD, and bipolar disorder not otherwise specified. All other participants, including those with a single episode of major depression (n = 40), were assigned to the “unaffected” diagnostic category, A total of 726 participants were included in this study (484 from North America and 242 from Brazil, South America). Of these, 112 were assigned a "narrow" diagnosis (BD1 = 89, BD2 recurrent depression = 20, SABP = 3), 212 with a "broad" diagnosis (BD1 = 89, BD2 recurrent depression = 20, SABP = 3, BD2 with single episode of depression = 15, MDD (recurrent) = 43, schizoaffective depression = 2, SZ = 6, other major mood disorders = 34). A total of 514 subjects did not meet the criteria for a “narrow” or “broad” diagnosis, therefore were considered as unaffected.

2.2 MDQ Screening

As part of the AMBiGen study protocol, participants were administered the MDQ. This widely used screening instrument rates 13 cardinal symptoms of mania, their temporal clustering, and associated impairment. Consistent with the literature, we assigned MDQ scores as a sum of the 13 cardinal symptoms, regardless of their temporal clustering. Thus, scores ranged from zero to 13. The concurrent symptoms question (CQ) was scored separately: “Of the things we just talked about, have several of these ever happened during the same period of time?” and was converted from Yes or No to 1 or 0. The impairment question (PQ) was also scored separately: “How much of a problem did any of these cause you – like being unable to work; having family, money, or legal troubles; getting into arguments or fights?” and was converted from an ordinal scale ("no problem," "minor problem," "moderate problem," and "serious problem") to a numerical scale (0 for “no problem“ or “minor problem”, and 1 for “moderate” or “serious” problem). We also

explored the impact of adding the PQ value to the total MDQ score (MDQP), which expanded the maximum score to 14. Prior to statistical analysis, we excluded (n = 50) participants whose MDQ responses contained more than 20% unanswered questions; missing MDQ items among the remaining participants were treated as a zero (no).

2.3 Data Analysis

A PCA was conducted using XLSTAT in order to explore the factor structure of the MDQ in this sample. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test value was 0.932 indicating that this sample is adequate for PCA. Varimax rotations of two and three factors were run in order to determine which model fit best with the data. Varimax rotation simplifies item loadings by removing the middle ground and clarifying the factor on which data load is based[21]. Higher loading values show a factor's importance in explaining the data, and these values represent the amount of variability in the data that each factor explains.

A genomic relationship matrix (GRM) was created using high-quality SNP data. The GRM is a key tool in estimating heritability using genomic data, since it enables more accurate estimation of the genetic variance and covariance among individuals, as opposed to relying solely on pedigree information.

$$h^2 = \frac{\sigma_G^2}{\sigma_P^2} \tag{1}$$

On a related note, it is important to consider the impact of the reduction of the sample size on the heritability analysis. The sample size for the heritability analysis was reduced from 726 to 432 because GRM data was not available for 294 subjects. A heritability analysis using Solar-Eclipse (v9.0.0) was performed on 432 participants assigned to a GRM. Heritability (h^2) represents

the portion of the phenotypic variance (σ^2_P) accounted for by additive genetic variance (σ^2_G), as seen in **equation 1**. The traits chosen for the heritability analysis were MDQS, CQ, PQ, MDQP, and the rotated components (RC) from the three-factor PCA with varimax rotation (RC1, RC2, and RC3 referring exclusively to the rotated components of the three-factor varimax rotation). Before analysis, the traits underwent an inverse normal transformation to normalize their distributions and facilitate accurate statistical comparisons. This was necessary since most of the MDQs in our sample had an MDQS of zero (**Figure S1**), resulting in right-skewed data. "Narrow", "broad", geographic location, sex, age, age^2, sex $\times$ age, and sex $\times$ age^2 were each tested for significance as a potential covariate. Subjects with missing birth dates (n = 10) were assigned the mean age (47 yr) for analysis purposes. Given that there were no covariates that were shared among all the examined traits, the final model contains no covariates.

$$\rho G = \frac{cov(G1, G2)}{\sqrt{var(G1) \times var(G2)}} \tag{2}$$

$$\rho P = \frac{cov(P1, P2)}{\sqrt{var(P1) \times var(P2)}} \tag{3}$$

A correlation analysis was also performed with SOLAR-Eclipse. This was done using a method called restricted maximum likelihood, which estimates the variance-covariance matrix of the genetic effects on the two traits. The genetic correlation (ρG) was then calculated as the ratio of the estimated genetic covariance to the square root of the estimated genetic variances for the two traits, providing an estimate of the extent to which the genetic factors underlying the two traits are correlated. This is shown in **equation 2**. The phenotypic correlation (ρP) was estimated with a similar approach, shown in **equation 3**. A ρG value of zero means that the two traits do not share genetic factors, a ρG value of 1.00 suggests that the genetic factors are entirely shared, and a ρG

value of -1.00 would imply that all of the genetic influences on one trait are opposite to those on another trait[22]. ρG values of exactly -1.00 or 1.00 should not be overvalued since these values constitute a boundary constraint in the analysis, and it's more probable that the correlation reached this barrier due to modeling limitations rather than being a true reflection of the relationship. Results that report a value of -1.00 or 1.00 should be considered as close to -1.00 or 1.00, but not exactly -1.00 or 1.00. Each pairwise correlation of MDQS, CQ, PQ, MDQP, and RC1, RC2, and RC3 with the "narrow" and "broad" diagnoses were examined. To test the significance of the ρG values, we compared the ln likelihood of a restricted null model (with ρG fixed at zero) to that of an alternative model in which the ρG parameter was estimated[23].

3. Results

3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Sample characteristics can be seen in **Table 1**. MDQS ranged from zero to 13 (mean = 2.83, SD = 3.49). A total of 109 subjects (15.01%) had an MDQS ≥ 7, the conventional cutoff for a diagnosis of BD in screening studies. As expected, MDQS scores differed between participants diagnosed with BD1 (mean 5.25, 95% CI ± 0.925) and BD2 (mean 4.46, 95% CI ± 1.24) compared to those with no diagnosis (mean 2.22, 95% CI ± 0.284) (**Figure 1**). In the total sample, the endorsement rate of symptoms on the core 13 items of the MDQ ranged from 7.71% (item 13, "spending money got into trouble") to 36.36% (item 7, "easily distracted"). The endorsement rate of symptoms for subjects diagnosed with BD (n = 124) was much higher, ranging from 28.23% (item 13) to 78.23% (item 7). Subjects with a psychiatric diagnosis other than BD (n = 167) had an endorsement rate lower than subjects with a BD diagnosis. For example, in the former group, the endorsement rate was 6.59% for item 13 and 50.30% for item 7. Subjects with no diagnosis (n

= 435) had a much lower endorsement rate than subjects with any diagnosis, e.g., 2.23% for item 13 and 19.08% for item 7 (details in Supplementary Results) (**Table S1)**. These results indicate that the MDQ performed as expected in this sample, effectively discriminating between categorical diagnoses.

3.2 Principal Component Analysis

The PCA revealed that the first two components accounted for 53.05% of the variance in the data. PC1 had an eigenvalue of 5.85 and accounted for 45.05% of the variance while PC2 had an eigenvalue of 1.04 and accounted for 8.00% of the variance. PC3 had an eigenvalue of 0.93, which is below the usual cutoff of 1.0, but was included in the analysis due to its similar variance (7.12%) to PC2 (**Figure S2**). The factor loadings for PC1 were above |0.5| for each item of the MDQ, which indicates a clear and meaningful relationship between the variables in that component. PC2 had two factor loadings above |0.5| for items 2, and 7. PC3 had one factor loading above |0.5|, for item 13 (**Table S3**).

Since PC1 was not highly differentiated in the factor loadings, two PCAs with varimax rotation were performed to clarify the relationship among the components and the MDQ items. The PCA with a two-factor varimax rotation maintained the 53.05% variability among the two RCs. However, the variability was spread more evenly across the two components. The first RC had a variability of 34.01% and the second had a variability of 19.04%. Factor loadings were more differentiated than PC1 and PC2 (**Table S4**). The first RC had factor loadings above |0.5| for items 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. The second RC had factor loadings above |0.5| for items 2, 6, and 7.

The PCA with a three-factor varimax rotation captured 60.18% of the variance among RC, RC2 and RC3. RC1 accounted for 25.92% of the variance, RC2 accounted for 16.58% of the

variance, and RC3 accounted for 17.68% of the variance (**Figure 3**). The three-factor varimax rotation showed a distribution of factor loadings that was well balanced among all 3 RCs. RC1 had factor loadings above |0.5| for items 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 11. RC2 had factor loadings above |0.5| for items 2, 6, and 7 (similar to the second RC of the two-factor varimax rotation). RC3 had factor loadings above |0.5| for items 1, 10, 12, and 13 (**Figure 4**). Full heatmap of the factor loadings can be seen in **Table S5**.

3.3 Heritability analysis

The results of the heritability analysis are shown in **Table 2**. Of all traits tested, the MDQP and the MDQS had the highest h^2, 36% and 30% respectively, followed by the PQ with 26%; all were significantly different from zero ($p \leq 0.001$). The CQ did not show any statistically significant heritability. Consistent with these results, the rotated principal components of the MDQ were also significantly heritable. RC1 and RC2 both showed significant heritability (RC1: $h^2 = 0.15$, $p < 0.05$; RC2: $h^2 = 0.18$, $p < 0.05$), while RC3 was slightly less heritable ($h^2 = 0.13$, $p = 0.056$).

3.4 Genetic Correlations

Genetic overlaps between MDQ traits and categorical diagnoses were estimated as genetic correlations (**Table 3)**. Strong genetic correlations were found between the categorical diagnoses and every MDQ measure studied, with values ranging from 0.62 to 1.00, but statistical significance could not be determined for every MDQ-diagnosis pair tested. The highest genetic correlations were observed between categorical diagnoses and MDQ items/factors involving impairment. In contrast, phenotypic correlations, while significant, were much weaker, with a maximum value of 0.42 for RC2 and the “broad” categorical diagnosis.

4. Discussion

This is the first study to investigate the heritability of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire in families with BD. Studying the heritability of the MDQ can help us better understand the genetic basis of manic symptoms and their relationship with categorical diagnoses of BD or related mood disorders. As expected, MDQ scores were significantly higher among individuals diagnosed with BD and related disorders. The MDQS, PQ, and MDQP were all significantly heritable, with values close to the low end of heritability estimates for BD itself (40-85%)[8,24]. PCA suggested a three-component model for the MDQ, consistent with the literature. MDQ heritability was evenly distributed across its three principal components. Strong and significant genetic correlations were found between categorical diagnoses and most MDQ measures, especially those involving impairment.

This study has several limitations. First, because of missing genetic data, the heritability and genetic correlation analyses had a reduced sample size, which decreased power to detect weak effects and may affect precision and generalizability of the apparently stronger effects. Furthermore, the small sample size among subjects with a "narrow" diagnosis rendered statistical significance difficult to achieve and compromised statistical power, increasing the possibility of Type II errors. Second, the recruitment of participants in North America from BD probands resulted in a higher incidence of BD, potentially reducing the generalizability of the genetic associations to populations with varied baseline rates of BD. Third, while the study sheds light on the genetic relationships between dimensional and categorical measures of BD, it does point to specific genes. Nevertheless, the results support the value of the MDQ as a screening test, especially among individuals at high a-priori risk of BD. The MDQP showed the highest heritability of the traits we tested (36%). Given that the MDQP is an exploratory trait, it is

important not to consider these results as definitive. The higher heritability of the MDQP may be attributable to the increased specificity and reduced noise associated with this dimension, as well as the information conveyed by both symptoms and impairment. Further studies are needed to validate MDQP as a dimensional measure of “bipolarity”, however.

Previous MDQ studies have shown either a two-factor[25–28] or three-factor[29–31] model that accounted for a significant portion of the variance. We put this to the test by performing a PCA with varimax rotation on both a two-factor and a three-factor model and comparing the results to a PCA without varimax rotation. In the three-factor model, RC1 showed greater distinction than the two-factor model's first RC and PC1, resulting in a reduction of MDQ items with a factor loading of |0.5| from thirteen to six. RC2 and the second RC in the two-factor model, on the other hand, showed little differences, indicating similarities between the two-factor and three-factor models. Finally, RC3 differentiated better than PC3, with four MDQ items in RC3 having factor loadings of |0.5| compared to only one in PC3. These findings align with similar three-factor structures observed in Korean[30], Chinese[31], and British[32] populations, suggesting a cross-cultural consistency in the underlying dimensions of the MDQ. While specific dimension labels may differ slightly, such as "acceleration," "energy," and "imprudence,"[33] the overall three-factor model (**Figure 3**) remains, indicating the presence of core dimensions capturing hypomanic traits.

The heritability estimates RC1 and RC2 were statistically significant heritability while RC3 was not. These results suggest that the energy, confidence, mood, and cognitive symptoms are the traits that are being inherited, while also suggesting that behavioral symptoms are not inherited. This is further evidenced by the endorsement rate of the symptoms shown in **Figure 2**, as item 1 (So hyper you get into trouble), item 10 (Much more social), item 12 (Excessive, foolish, or risky things,) and item 13 (spending money got into trouble) have the lowest endorsement rate of all the

symptoms across the whole sample. The cultural and environmental factors unique to the Anabaptist group in this study may be responsible for the lack of heritability seen in the behavioral symptoms within this sample.

Our study identified a statistically significant genetic correlation for MDQS-B ($\rho G = 0.90$) showing a strong positive correlation between the two traits. MDQS-B also had a statistically significant phenotypic correlation ($\rho P = 0.21$). This suggests that genetic factors that influence the MDQS are likely to be influencing the "broad" diagnosis to a high degree. A genetic correlation of this magnitude suggests that the two traits are underlain by many the same genetic variants. A similar relationship was found with MDQP-B ($\rho G = 0.95$ and $\rho P = 0.28$). Despite the heritability of "narrow" not being statistically significant, when looking at the correlations of PQ-N, it showed a statistically significant genetic correlation ($\rho G = 1.00$), and a statistically significant phenotypic correlation ($\rho P = 0.37$). The genetic correlation of PQ-N should not be overvalued since $\rho G = 1.00$ constitutes a boundary constraint in the analysis. However, this could suggest that while the MDQS on its own cannot identify genetic risks for BD, the PQ could help fill that gap. The rotated components of the three-factor model were also examined as they contained statistically significant h^2 for the first two components. Similar to the other traits, statistically significant genetic correlations were only observed between the rotated components and the "broad" diagnosis. Both RC1 and RC2 showed strong genetic correlations with the "broad" diagnosis. These results shed new light on the complex genetic relationships underlying the MDQ and major mood disorders.

Two previous studies have examined genetic relationships between dimensional and categorical definitions of BD. Bruce et al. examined the heritability and genetic correlation of a different screening tool for BD, known as the Quantitative Bipolarity Scale (QBS), in an

Anabaptist sample[8]. While not the same, both the QBS and the MDQ aim to identify individuals who may be experiencing symptoms of BD. Their study found that the QBS score had a $h^2 = 0.46$, which was close to our findings ($h^2 = 0.30$), and a $\rho G = 0.55$ between BD and the QBS score, which was lower the genetic correlations found in our study ($\rho G = 1.0$ between the MDQS and the "narrow" diagnosis, and $\rho G = 0.90$ between the MDQS and the "broad" diagnosis) despite them having a lower sample size. Mundy et al. conducted a genome-wide association study of MDQ on a sample of the UK population that reported anxiety and MDD[32], while our study was composed of families with a history of BD. The purpose of their study was to determine the validity of the MDQ as a screening tool for BD in at-risk populations, in which they conclude that the MDQ is actually capturing symptoms of general distress or psychopathology, rather than hypomania/mania specifically, in at-risk populations. High heritability ($h^2 = 0.30$) of the MDQS in our family sample, compared to their study ($h^2 = 0.07$) would suggest that manic symptoms reported by relatives of people with BD are more likely to share common genetic determinants with BD than manic symptoms reported by the general population. Their results are aligned with the observed genetic correlations between the MDQS and the "broad" diagnosis. Their study showed that the MDQS and a few mood disorders, including MDD ($\rho G = 0.42$), and PTSD ($\rho G = 1.0$), have statistically significant genetic correlations.

This study revealed that individuals diagnosed with BD had higher MDQ scores compared to those without the disorder in this sample (**Figure 1**), showing that the MDQ performed as expected and. supporting the value of the MDQ as a dimensional measure of BD. Most components of the MDQ were significantly heritable (**Table 2**), and genetic correlations were strong (**Table 3**), demonstrating strong genetic overlap between dimensional and categorical measures of BD within a family sample.

Correspondence

Alejandro Arbona-Lampaya, Intramural Research Program, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA. Email: alejandro.arbona@upr.edu

Francis J. McMahon, Intramural Research Program, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA. Email: mcmahonf@mail.nih.gov

Author Contributions

AAL and FJM designed the study. EKB, AEN, FL, AD, and AF acquired the data. EKB, LK, LL, and FJM conducted patient interviews. AAL, HS, and FJM analyzed the data. AAL drafted the manuscript. All the authors contributed to the editing of the manuscript and have approved the final version.

Acknowledgements

We thank the participants and their families for contributing to this study. This work utilized the computational resources of the NIH HPC Biowulf cluster (http://hpc.nih.gov).

Ethical Statement

This study conforms with the principles of ethical research and complies with all applicable regulations and guidelines. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the National Institutes of Health reviewed and approved the study protocol prior to data collection. Participants provided informed consent under protocol 80-M-0082. Data was analyzed and reported anonymously to ensure sure that no individual participant could be identified.

Data Availability Statement

Study data is available upon request. Due to the nature of the data, including personal information and potential privacy concerns, they cannot be made openly accessible. Requests for data access can be directed to FJM.

Funding Information

This study was supported in part by the Intramural Research Program of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), ZIA MH002843.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Bipolar Disorder. National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Accessed May 18, 2023. https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/bipolar-disorder

2. Carta MG, Angst J. Screening for bipolar disorders: A public health issue. *J Affect Disord*. 2016;205:139-143. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2016.03.072

3. Awad AG, Rajagopalan K, Bolge SC, McDonnell DD. Quality of Life Among Bipolar Disorder Patients Misdiagnosed With Major Depressive Disorder. *Prim Care Companion J Clin Psychiatry*. 2007;9(3):195. doi:10.4088/pcc.v09n0305

4. Axelson DA, Birmaher B, Strober MA, et al. Course of subthreshold bipolar disorder in youth: diagnostic progression from bipolar disorder not otherwise specified. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2011;50(10):1001-1016.e3. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2011.07.005

5. Parker GB, Graham RK, Hadzi-Pavlovic D. Are the bipolar disorders best modelled categorically or dimensionally? *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 2016;134(2):104-110. doi:10.1111/acps.12567

6. Casey BJ, Craddock N, Cuthbert BN, Hyman SE, Lee FS, Ressler KJ. DSM-5 and RDoC: progress in psychiatry research? *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2013;14(11):810-814. doi:10.1038/nrn3621

7. Merikangas KR, Jin R, He JP, et al. Prevalence and correlates of bipolar spectrum disorder in the world mental health survey initiative. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2011;68(3):241-251. doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.12

8. Bruce HA, Kochunov P, Mitchell B, et al. Clinical and genetic validity of quantitative bipolarity. *Transl Psychiatry*. 2019;9(1):1-8. doi:10.1038/s41398-019-0561-z

9. Hirschfeld RMA, Williams JBW, Spitzer RL, et al. Development and Validation of a Screening Instrument for Bipolar Spectrum Disorder: The Mood Disorder Questionnaire. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2000;157(11):1873-1875. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.157.11.1873

10. Wang HR, Woo YS, Ahn HS, Ahn IM, Kim HJ, Bahk WM. The Validity of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire for Screening Bipolar Disorder: A Meta-Analysis. *Depress Anxiety*. 2015;32(7):527-538. doi:10.1002/da.22374

11. Twiss J, Jones S, Anderson I. Validation of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire for screening for bipolar disorder in a UK sample. *J Affect Disord*. 2008;110(1):180-184. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2007.12.235

12. Hardoy MC, Cadeddu M, Murru A, et al. Validation of the Italian version of the "Mood Disorder Questionnaire" for the screening of bipolar disorders. *Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health*. 2005;1(1):8. doi:10.1186/1745-0179-1-8

13. Rouillon F, Gasquet I, Garay RP, Lancrenon S. Screening for bipolar disorder in patients consulting general practitioners in France. *J Affect Disord*. 2011;130(3):492-495. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2010.10.037

14. Gill KE, Cardenas SA, Kassem L, Schulze TG, McMahon FJ. Symptom profiles and illness course among Anabaptist and Non-Anabaptist adults with major mood disorders. *Int J Bipolar Disord*. 2016;4(1):21. doi:10.1186/s40345-016-0062-4

15. Dumont CM, Sheridan LM, Besancon EK, et al. Validity of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire (MDQ) as a screening tool for bipolar spectrum disorders in anabaptist populations. *J Psychiatr Res*. 2020;123:159-163. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.01.011

16. Lopes FL, Hou L, Boldt ABW, et al. Finding Rare, Disease-Associated Variants in Isolated Groups: Potential Advantages of Mennonite Populations. *Hum Biol*. 2016;88(2):109-120. doi:10.13110/humanbiology.88.2.0109

17. McGuffin P, Katz R, Aldrich J. Past and present state examination: the assessment of "lifetime ever" psychopathology. *Psychol Med*. 1986;16(2):461-465. doi:10.1017/s0033291700009302

18. Nurnberger JI Jr, Blehar MC, Kaufmann CA, et al. Diagnostic Interview for Genetic Studies: Rationale, Unique Features, and Training. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1994;51(11):849-859. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1994.03950110009002

19. Leckman JF, Sholomskas D, Thompson D, Belanger A, Weissman MM. Best Estimate of Lifetime Psychiatric Diagnosis: A Methodological Study. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1982;39(8):879-883. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1982.04290080001001

20. Gershon ES, Hamovit J, Guroff JJ, et al. A family study of schizoaffective, bipolar I, bipolar II, unipolar, and normal control probands. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1982;39(10):1157-1167. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1982.04290100031006

21. Dilbeck KE. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc; 2017. doi:10.4135/9781483381411

22. Man T, Riese H, Jaju D, et al. Heritability and genetic and environmental correlations of heart rate variability and baroreceptor reflex sensitivity with ambulatory and beat-to-beat blood pressure. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9(1):1664. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-38324-6

23. Glahn DC, Curran JE, Winkler AM, et al. High Dimensional Endophenotype Ranking in the Search for Major Depression Risk Genes. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2012;71(1):6-14. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2011.08.022

24. Fabbri C. The Role of Genetics in Bipolar Disorder. *Curr Top Behav Neurosci*. 2021;48:41-60. doi:10.1007/7854_2020_153

25. Ouali U, Jouini L, Zgueb Y, et al. The Factor Structure of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire in Tunisian Patients. *Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health CP EMH*. 2020;16(Suppl-1):82-92. doi:10.2174/1745017902016010082

26. Chung KF, Tso KC, Cheung E, Wong M. Validation of the Chinese version of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire in a psychiatric population in Hong Kong. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2008;62(4):464-471. doi:10.1111/j.1440-1819.2008.01827.x

27. Sanchez-Moreno J, Villagran J, Gutierrez J, et al. Adaptation and validation of the Spanish version of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire for the detection of bipolar disorder. *Bipolar Disord*. 2008;10(3):400-412. doi:10.1111/j.1399-5618.2007.00571.x

28. Carta MG, Massidda D, Moro MF, et al. Comparing factor structure of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire (MDQ): In Italy sexual behavior is euphoric but in Asia mysterious and forbidden. *J Affect Disord*. 2014;155:96-103. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2013.10.030

29. Chung KF, Tso KC, Chung RTY. Validation of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire in the general population in Hong Kong. *Compr Psychiatry*. 2009;50(5):471-476. doi:10.1016/j.comppsych.2008.10.001

30. Jon DI, Hong N, Yoon BH, et al. Validity and reliability of the Korean version of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire. *Compr Psychiatry*. 2009;50(3):286-291. doi:10.1016/j.comppsych.2008.07.008

31. Yang H chen, Yuan C mei, Liu T bang, et al. Validity of the Chinese version Mood Disorder Questionnaire (MDQ) and the optimal cutoff screening bipolar disorders. *Psychiatry Res*. 2011;189(3):446-450. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2011.02.007

32. Mundy J, Hübel C, Adey BN, et al. Genetic examination of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire and its relationship with bipolar disorder. *Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet*. n/a(n/a). doi:10.1002/ajmg.b.32938

33. Massidda D, Giovanni Carta M, Altoè G. Integrating different factorial solutions of a psychometric tool via social network analysis: The case of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire. *Methodol Eur J Res Methods Behav Soc Sci*. 2016;12:97-106. doi:10.1027/1614-2241/a000113

Table 1. Sample characteristics

Variables	Total sample (n = 726)	
Age in year, mean ± SD, (min, max)	47 ± 18, (12-99)	
Female gender, n (%)	397	(54.7)
Geographic location, n (%)		
North America	484	(66.7)
Brazil	242	(33.3)
Diagnosis†, n (%)		
Bipolar 1	89	(12.3)
Bipolar 2	35	(4.8)
Major Depressive Disorder	83	(11.4)
Schizophrenia	6	(0.8)
Schizoaffective Disorder	5	(0.7)
Other	73	(10.1)
No diagnosis	435	(59.9)

Note: SD = Standard Deviation, † Based on DSM codes.

Table 2. Heritability estimates for MDQS, CQ, PQ, MDQP, RC1, RC2, and RC3.

Traits	n	h^2	Std. E	p-value
MDQS	432	0.30	0.10	<0.001
CQ	432	0.09	0.08	0.12
PQ	432	0.27	0.10	<0.001
MDQP	432	0.36	0.11	<0.001
RC1	432	0.21	0.10	<0.05
RC2	432	0.20	0.09	<0.05
RC3	432	0.13	0.09	0.056

Note: MDQS = Mood Disorder Questionnaire score, CQ = concurrent symptoms question ("…have several of these ever happened during the same period of time?") PQ = impairment question ("How much of a problem did any of these cause you…?"), MDQP = MDQS + PQ, RC1 = first rotated component, RC2 = second rotated component, RC3 = third rotated component.

Table 3. Correlation estimates for MDQS, CQ, PQ, MDQP, RC1, RC2, and RC3 with Narrow and Broad categorical diagnoses.

Correlations with “narrow”	ρG	ρP	Correlations with "broad”	ρG	ρP
MDQS-N	1.00†	0.16**	MDQS-B	0.90**	0.21***
PQ-N	1.00**†	0.37***	PQ-B	0.64*	0.40***
MDQP-N	1.00†	0.23***	MDQP-B	0.95***	0.28***
RC1-N	1.00†	0.32***	RC1-B	0.62	0.37***
RC2-N	1.00†	0.30***	RC2-B	1.00†	0.42***
RC3-N	1.00†	0.35***	RC3-B	1.00**†	0.11***

Note: ρG = genotypic correlation, ρP = phenotypic correlation. MDQS = MDQ score, CQ = concurrent symptoms question (“…have several of these ever happened during the same period of time?”) PQ = impairment question (“How much of a problem did any of these cause you…?”), MDQP = MDQS + PQ, RC1 = first rotated component, RC2 = second rotated component, RC3 = third rotated component * $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$. P-values indicate correlations that are significantly different from zero. † Standard error not computable.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Mean MDQ scores for each mood disorder diagnosis. Bar plots showing the mean Mood Disorder Questionnaire score for each mood disorder diagnosis. Error bars represent 95% CI. Sample sizes can be found in Table 1. BD1 = Bipolar Disorder Type I, BD2 = Bipolar Disorder Type 2, MDD = Major Depressive Disorder, SZ = Schizophrenia, SAD = Schizoaffective Disorder, No dx = No diagnosis.

Figure 2. Endorsement rate of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire items. Whole sample (n = 726) is represented by the blue bars, BD sample (n = 124) is represented by the green bars, Non-BD Dx sample (n = 167) is represented by the red bars, No Dx sample (n = 435) is represented by the gray bars. MDQ items: 1 So hyper you get into trouble, 2 Irritable, 3 More self-confident, 4 Less sleep, 5 More talkative, 6 Thoughts raced, 7 Easily distracted, 8 Much more energy, 9 Much more active, 10 Much more social, 11 Much more interested in sex, 12 Excessive, foolish, or risky things, 13 Spending money got into trouble.

Figure 3. Scree Plot comparing the variability percentage between Principal Component Analyses. Eigenvalues are shown a gray bar. The green line represents the variability (%) of the PCA with no varimax rotation. The blue line represents the variability (%) of the PCA with a two-factor varimax rotation The red line represents the variability (%) of the three-factor varimax rotation PCA variability. The dotted line represents where eigenvalues = 1.0. PC = principal component.

Figure 4. Three-factor varimax rotation Principal Component Analysis model with factor loading scores for each rotated component. Factor loadings > 0.5 are shown. RC = rotated component.



Figure 1. Mean MDQ scores for each mood disorder diagnosis. Bar plots showing the mean Mood Disorder Questionnaire score for each mood disorder diagnosis. Error bars represent 95% CI. Sample sizes can be found in Table 1. BD1 = Bipolar Disorder Type I, BD2 = Bipolar Disorder Type 2, MDD = Major Depressive Disorder, SZ = Schizophrenia, SAD = Schizoaffective Disorder, No dx = No diagnosis.



Figure 2. Endorsement rate of the Mood Disorder Questionnaire items. Whole sample (n = 726) is represented by the blue bars, BD sample (n = 124) is represented by the green bars, Non-BD Dx sample (n = 167) is represented by the red bars, No Dx sample (n = 435) is represented by the gray bars. MDQ items: 1 So hyper you get into trouble, 2 Irritable, 3 More self-confident, 4 Less sleep, 5 More talkative, 6 Thoughts raced, 7 Easily distracted, 8 Much more energy, 9 Much more active, 10 Much more social, 11 Much more interested in sex, 12 Excessive, foolish, or risky things, 13 Spending money got into trouble



Figure 3. Scree Plot comparing the variability percentage between Principal Component Analyses. Eigenvalues are shown a gray bar. The green line represents the variability (%) of the PCA with no varimax rotation. The blue line represents the variability (%) of the PCA with a two-factor varimax rotation The red line represents the variability (%) of the three-factor varimax rotation PCA variability. The dotted line represents where eigenvalues = 1.0. PC = principal component



Manic Symptoms	RC1	RC2	RC3
8. Much more energy	0.79		
9. Much more active	0.77		
3. More self-confident	0.75		
11. Much more interested in sex	0.63		
5. More talkative	0.61		
4. Less sleep	0.51		
7. Easily distracted		0.79	
2. Irritable		0.72	
6. Thoughts raced		0.67	
13. Spending money got into trouble			0.74
10. Much more social			0.70
12. Excessive, foolish or risky things			0.67
1. So hyper to get into trouble			0.57
Proportion of Variance (%)	25.92	16.58	17.68

Figure 4. Three-factor varimax rotation Principal Component Analysis model with factor loading scores for each rotated component. Factor loadings > 0.5 are shown. RC = rotated component.