**Testing the sensitivity of diagnosis-derived patterns in functional brain networks to symptom burden in a Norwegian youth sample**

**Authors:**
Irene Voldsbekk[1,2], Rikka Kjelkenes[1,2], Erik R. Frogner[1,2], Lars T. Westlye[1,2,3], Dag Alnæs[1]

[1] Norwegian Centre for Mental Disorders Research (NORMENT), Division of Mental Health and Addiction, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway
[2] Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
[3] KG Jebsen Centre for Neurodevelopmental Disorders, University of Oslo, & Department of Neurology, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

**Corresponding author:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Full name: | Irene Voldsbekk |
| Address: | NORMENT, Oslo universitetssykehus HF<br>Klinikk psykisk helse og avhengighet<br>Seksjon for psykoseforskning/TOP<br>Ullevål sykehus, bygg 49<br>Postboks 4956 Nydalen<br>0424 Oslo |
| Phone: | +47 41495202 |
| Email: | irene.voldsbekk@psykologi.uio.no |


**Keywords:**
Multivariate, validation, generalisability, psychopathology, functional connectivity

**Abstract:**
Aberrant brain network development represents a putative key aetiological component in mental disorders, which typically emerge during childhood and adolescence. Previous resting-state fMRI studies have identified brain connectivity patterns reflecting psychopathology, but the generalisability to other samples and politico-cultural contexts has not been established.

We investigated whether a previously identified cross-diagnostic case-control and autism spectrum disorder (ASD)-specific pattern of resting state functional connectivity (RSFC) (discovery sample; children and adolescents aged 5-21 from New York City, USA; n = 1666) would replicate in a Norwegian convenience-based sample of youth (validation sample; children and adolescents aged 9-25 from Oslo, Norway; n = 531). As a test of generalisability, we investigated if these diagnosis-derived RSFC patterns were sensitive to levels of symptom burden in both samples, based on an independent measure of symptom burden (i.e., not diagnostic criteria).

Both the cross-diagnostic and ASD-specific RSFC pattern was replicated across samples. Connectivity patterns were significantly associated with thematically appropriate symptom dimensions in the discovery sample. In the validation sample, the ASD-specific RSFC pattern showed a weak, inverse relationship with symptoms of conduct problems, hyperactivity, and prosociality, while the cross-diagnostic pattern was not significantly linked to symptoms.

Diagnosis-derived connectivity patterns in a developmental clinical US sample are replicable in a convenience sample of Norwegian youth, however, they were not predictive of mental health symptoms.

## 1 Introduction

Childhood and adolescence constitute periods of life characterised by substantial developmental adaptations. These include rapid physical, hormonal, brain, cognitive, and psychological changes, adapted to the increasing complexity of our social environment and expectations with age. For example, during this time, the functional networks of the brain undergo large-scale reorganisation and maturation (Paus et al., 2008; Power et al., 2010; Sydnor et al., 2021). Adolescence is also a period with a marked increase in the incidence of psychopathology (Kessler et al., 2007). The co-occurrence of these phenomena has led to the hypothesis that increased brain plasticity during this period results in increased susceptibility to mental illness (Paus et al., 2008). Several studies have identified plausible links between psychopathology in youth and resting-state functional connectivity (RSFC) derived from functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). However, the generalisability of such network patterns to vulnerability for mental illness in non-clinical samples is currently not well demonstrated.

In the context of generalisability and vulnerability, a related question is whether RSFC patterns are specific to diagnostic categories of mental disorders or shared across disorders. Considerable effort has been made to characterise RSFC patterns associated with both diagnostic syndromes and dimensional symptom scores. Transdiagnostic patterns can be identified by including participants with a range of (comorbid) diagnoses, or by modelling dimensional scores of multiple symptom domains. Using these approaches, an increasing number of studies have reported that RSFC patterns relating to psychopathology are transdiagnostic or shared across disorders (Elliott et al., 2018; Karcher et al., 2021; Kebets et al., 2023; Lees et al., 2021; Linke et al., 2021; McTeague et al., 2017; McTeague et al., 2020; Sha et al., 2019; Voldsbekk et al., 2023; Xia et al., 2018). For example, in a population-based sample of children (Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development cohort; ABCD), a shared psychopathology factor was derived and linked to RSFC using both symptom data (Karcher et al., 2021) and diagnostic data (Lees et al., 2021).

The convergence of studies on a shared factor across disorders from studies using both symptom scores as well as binary diagnosis information supports the notion of a latent vulnerability factor on which the diagnostic categories represent extremes (Sprooten et al., 2022). The above-mentioned findings linking a shared latent mental illness factor to brain measures are promising with regard to detecting neural signatures of psychopathology risk in the youth brain. However, an important question is whether these clinical RSFC patterns are sensitive to symptom burden and by extension putative risk in youth samples that are not enriched with mental disorder diagnoses.

Recently, we estimated both diagnosis-specific and cross-diagnostic RSFC patterns in a clinical developmental sample. We identified a pattern specific to a diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder (ASD), as well as a shared patterns across attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), ASD, other neurodevelopmental disorders, anxiety, mood-disorders, and other diagnoses versus no diagnosis (Voldsbekk et al., 2023). In the current study we aimed to investigate whether these diagnosis-derived RSFC patterns are sensitive to mental health symptoms in a Norwegian convenience-based sample of youth. To do this, we investigated whether a) the cross-diagnostic and ASD-specific RSFC patterns previously identified could be replicated in the validation sample, and b) if these RSFC patterns could predict levels of

symptom burden in the validation sample. As a further test of external validity, we also tested whether c) the RSFC patterns previously identified could predict levels of symptom burden in the discovery sample.

## 2 Methods

### *2.1 Samples*

#### *2.1.1 Discovery sample - HBN*

Children and adolescents from New York City, USA were recruited to be part of the HBN cohort (Alexander et al., 2017). The majority have a least one diagnosed mental disorder. In the previous study (Voldsbekk et al., 2023), 1880 participants in HBN took part. 1689 of these were in the discovery sample. Of these, 1666 had available both fMRI and symptom score data (symptom data was not part of the previous study). Missing values in the symptom data were imputed with knnimpute in MATLAB (MathWorks, 2020). For more details regarding MRI data cleaning and quality assurance steps, see Voldsbekk et al. (2023). The final sample consisted of 1666 participants (641 females, mean ± sd age: 10.91 ± 3.14, range: 5-21). See Figure 1 for distributions of sample characteristics.

#### *2.1.2 Validation sample – Brainmint*

Children and adolescents in the Oslo region were recruited to participate in the Brains and minds in transition (Brainmint) study. Participants were recruited through convenience sampling by advertising in social media, aiming to recruit young people from the general population interested in contributing to a study investigating brain development and mental health. Per May 4$^{th}$ 2023, 759 participants had undergone magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and 697 had responded to questionnaires. Of these, 531 had available both fMRI and symptom score data. No participants had missing data and so all were included in the sample used for the current analysis (390 females, mean ± sd age: 17.69 ± 2.83, range: 9-25). See Figure 1 for distributions of sample characteristics.

### *2.2 Mental health measures*

In the previous study (Voldsbekk et al., 2023), we investigated diagnosis-derived patterns of RSFC in HBN (discovery sample). Diagnostic information was collected using a computerised version of the Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia – Children´s version (KSADS) (Kaufman et al., 1997), which is a clinician-administered semi-structured psychiatric interview based on DSM-5. We then labelled diagnoses as belonging to either of these categories: “ADHD”, “ASD”, “anxiety disorders”, “mood disorders”, “other neurodevelopmental disorders”, “other disorders” or “no diagnosis”.

For testing the external validity and predictive utility of diagnosis-derived RSFC patterns, the current study obtained HBN symptom scores from the Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (Goodman, 1997), which is a 25-item questionnaire measuring emotional and behavioural problems. The SDQ has five syndrome measures: emotional symptoms, conduct problems, hyperactivity/inattention, peer relationship problems, and prosocial behaviour. For this analysis, we used only the summary syndrome measures. In HBN, the SDQ items were parent-reported. See Figure S1 for symptom load distributions on SDQ summary measures across diagnostic categories in HBN.

Symptom scores in Brainmint were investigated using the same approach as in HBM, only in this sample the SDQ responses were self-reported.




*Figure 1.* Sample distributions. **A.** Age. **B.** Sex. **C.** SDQ summary syndrome scores. HBN; Healthy brain network sample. Brainmint; Brains and minds in transition sample. SDQ; Strengths and difficulties questionnaire.

*2.3 MRI acquisition*

HBN MRI data were acquired at four different sites: a mobile scanner at Staten Island (SI), Rutgers University Brain Imaging Centre, Citigroup Biomedical Imaging Centre (CBIC) and Harlem CUNY Advanced Science Research Centre. A detailed overview of the MRI protocol is available elsewhere (http://fcon_1000.projects.nitrc.org/indi/cmi_healthy_brain_network/MRI%20Protocol.html).

Brainmint MRI data were acquired at Oslo University Hospital Ullevål, using a 3.0 T GE SIGNA Premier scanner using a 48-channel head coil. Structural MRI data was acquired using an $T_1$-weighted MPRAGE sequence (repetition time (TR): 2.526 s, echo time (TE): 2.836 ms, flip angle (FA): 8°, field of view (FOV): 256 mm, slice thickness: 1.0 mm, number of slices: 1). Resting-state functional MRI (rs-fMRI) data was acquired using a T2*-weighted blood-oxygen-level-dependent echo-planar imaging (EPI) sequence with a TR of 800 ms, TE of 30 ms, multiband acceleration factor = 6, number of slices: 60, 750 repetitions and voxel size = 2.4 × 2.4 × 2.4 mm.

*2.4 MRI pre-processing*

Rs-fMRI images in HBN were processed with the following pipeline. First, FSL MCFLIRT (Jenkinson et al., 2002) was applied for motion correction, high-pass temporal filtering, spatial smoothing and distortion correction. The rs-fMRI images were registered to a T1-weighted structural image using FLIRT (Jenkinson et al., 2002) and boundary-based registration (Greve & Fischl, 2009). Next, for additional removal of artefacts and noise, we performed non-aggressive ICA-AROMA (Pruim, Mennes, Buitelaar, et al., 2015; Pruim, Mennes, van Rooij, et al., 2015) and FIX (Griffanti et al., 2014; Salimi-Khorshidi et al., 2014). Estimations of temporal signal-to-noise ratio (tSNR) and mean framewise displacement (FD) were calculated by MRIQC (Esteban et al., 2017) and used as covariates in subsequent analyses. For more details, see our previous study (Voldsbekk et al., 2023).

In Brainmint, preprocessing of rs-fMRI images were run using fMRIPrep v22.0.1 (Esteban et al., 2019), an automated pipeline consisting of head motion correction, high-pass temporal filtering, spatial smoothing and distortion correction using MCFLIRT, slice-timing correction using 3dTshift from AFNI, registration to structural reference image using FLIRT and boundary-based registration, and, finally, non-aggressive ICA-AROMA. Same as for HBN, estimations of tSNR and FD were calculated by MRIQC (Esteban et al., 2017).

*2.5 Network analysis*

RSFC in HBN were derived using the Schaefer parcellation with 100 parcels and 7 networks (Schaefer et al., 2018). These networks include visual A, visual B, visual C, auditory, somatomotor A, somatomotor B, language, salience A, salience B, control A, control B, control C, default A, default B, default C, dorsal attention A and dorsal attention B. The connectivity matrix was then estimated as the L2-norm ridge regression partial correlation between parcel timeseries using FSLNets (https://fsl.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl/fslwiki/FSLNets), as implemented in MATLAB (MathWorks, 2020). This resulted in 4950 unique partial correlations (i.e., edges).

RSFC in Brainmint were derived using the same approach as in HBN, making the edges comparable.

*2.6 Out-of-sample validation*

In the previous work (Voldsbekk et al., 2023), we used partial least squares (PLS) (Krishnan et al., 2011) to identify diagnosis-derived patterns of RSFC, controlling for other diagnosis categories using contrasts. This analysis revealed an ASD-specific pattern, as well as a cross diagnostic case-control pattern.

*2.6.1 Testing the replicability of the HBN-derived brain pattern to Brainmint*

See Figure 2 for an overview of the out-of-sample validation pipeline. First, we decomposed the Brainmint RSFC data by multiplying them with the brain weights estimated in the HBN PLS analysis. These Brainmint brain weights were then correlated with the original Brainmint RSFC data to get Brainmint connectivity loadings. Then, to assess whether the brain pattern was replicated across the two samples, we correlated the Brainmint connectivity loadings with HBN connectivity loadings for each latent variable (LV) using Pearson's correlation. Their significance was tested using permutations (n=1000), randomly

shuffling the rows (participants) of the Brainmint RSFC data. We calculated *p*-values by dividing the count of permuted maximum R values (including the observed non-permuted value) ≥ the non-permuted R values by the number of permutations. Prior to analysis, Brainmint RSFC data was adjusted for age, sex, tSNR and FD, same as HBN RSFC data prior to running PLS. As a proxy for significance, connectivity loadings were thresholded at Z-scores<|3| in visualisations, akin to the procedure in our previous work using PLS.




*Figure 2.* An overview of the out-of-sample validation pipeline. RSFC; resting-state functional connectivity. HBN; Healthy brain network sample. Brainmint; Brains and minds in transition sample.

### *2.6.2 Testing the predictive utility of the brain pattern*

To assess whether the brain pattern had predictive utility, we correlated the derived Brainmint RSFC pattern with Brainmint symptom data. Specifically, we investigated the Spearman's rank correlation between diagnosis-derived brain weights and symptom dimensions from SDQ. To assess the reliability of the associations between brain weights and symptom dimensions, we ran 1000 bootstraps using resampling with replacement. Finally, as a test of external validity, we also ran these correlations between the HBN RSFC pattern and SDQ symptom dimensions in HBN.

## 3 Results

The correlation between Brainmint and HBN connectivity loadings was significant for both the cross-diagnostic pattern (r=.39, permuted *p*<.001; see Figure 3A) and ASD (r=.49, permuted *p*<.001; see Figure 4A), indicating that both brain patterns were replicable across samples. As shown in Figure 3B, the cross-diagnostic RSFC pattern implicated weaker connectivity within the control network, in addition to weaker between-network connectivity between the salience network and control network, as well as between the default mode network (DMN) and limbic network. In terms of symptom dimensions, this connectivity pattern exhibited significant positive associations with anxiety, conduct problems,

hyperactivity, and peer problems in HBN, as well as a negative association with prosocial behaviour (see Figure 3C). In Brainmint, there were no significant associations between the cross-diagnostic connectivity pattern and symptom dimensions (see Figure 3D).

As shown in Figure 4B, the RSFC pattern for ASD implicated weaker within-network connectivity in the somatomotor network, dorsal attention (DA) network, salience network and DMN. In terms of symptom dimensions, this RSFC pattern was significantly associated with more symptoms of peer problems and hyperactivity in HBN, as well as lower degree of conduct problems and prosociality (see Figure 4C). In Brainmint, the ASD-specific RSFC pattern was associated with higher levels of prosocial behaviour and fewer symptoms of hyperactivity and conduct problems (see Figure 4D).




*Figure 3.* Replication of the cross-diagnostic connectivity pattern from HBN to Brainmint. **A.** Pearson's correlation of connectivity weights between samples (left) and corresponding permutation test (right). The dotted line marks the non-permuted R value. **B.** Visualisation of RSFC pattern in each sample. Depicted are thresholded edges (Z-scores<|3|). **C.** Associations between derived brain pattern and SDQ symptom dimensions in Brainmint. **D.** Associations between derived brain pattern and SDQ symptom dimensions in HBN. Associations with symptom dimensions are marked in bold green if 95% confidence interval of the bootstrap distribution did not contain zero. ASD; Autism spectrum disorder. HBN; Healthy brain network sample. Brainmint; Brains and minds in transition sample. SDQ; strength and difficulties questionnaire.




*Figure 4.* Replication of the ASD-specific connectivity pattern from HBN to Brainmint. **A.** Pearson's correlation of connectivity weights between samples (left) and corresponding permutation test (right). The dotted line marks the non-permuted R value. **B.** Visualisation of RSFC pattern in each sample. Depicted are thresholded edges. **C.** Associations between derived brain pattern and SDQ symptom dimensions in Brainmint. **D.** Associations between derived brain pattern and SDQ symptom dimensions in HBN. Associations with symptom dimensions are marked in bold purple if 95% confidence interval of the bootstrap distribution did not contain zero. ASD; Autism spectrum disorder. HBN; Healthy brain network sample. Brainmint; Brains and minds in transition sample. SDQ; strength and difficulties questionnaire.

## 4 Discussion

The current study aimed to investigate whether psychopathology-related RSFC patterns are informative of vulnerability for mental illness in undiagnosed individuals by replicating connectivity patterns derived in a developmental clinical sample from the US in a Norwegian convenience-based sample of youth. However, the RSFC pattern was only sensitive to symptom burden in the discovery sample. Specifically, we found that the RSFC patterns were associated with symptom dimensions thematically overlapping with core symptom characteristics in the discovery sample, while in the validation sample we found a weak, inverse relationship for ASD. This latter association was small, hence exhibiting low predictive utility at the individual level. Taken together, these results show that although diagnosis-derived RSFC patterns replicate across samples, their utility is greatly limited due to their lack of sensitivity to symptom burden.

Replicability and generalisability of neuroimaging findings remain a challenge in the field (Botvinik-Nezer & Wager, 2022). Historically, small sample sizes and lack of methodological rigour have resulted in poor replication rates, possibly reflecting that many published findings are potential false positives (Ioannidis, 2005). To overcome such challenges, increasing effort has been put into developing procedures for reproducible science (Niso et al., 2022). With the advent of multivariate machine learning approaches in neuroscience, issues related to statistical power and extensive univariate testing in small samples have been improved (Botvinik-Nezer & Wager, 2022). However, these multivariate approaches come with new challenges, such as data leakage, overfitting and the need for sufficiently large data sets to ensure robustness (Botvinik-Nezer & Wager, 2022; Davatzikos, 2019; Poldrack et al., 2020; Varoquaux, 2018). Although the current study aimed to overcome some of these challenges, we still did not obtain generalisable results.

Generalisation of RSFC patterns related to psychopathology has been hampered by challenges related to the stability and reliability of RSFC results, as well as variations in mental health profiles across cohorts (Uddin et al., 2017). Data driven approaches to symptom clustering have to some degree yielded reproducible clusters or hierarchies of symptom structure across samples (Caspi et al., 2014). Recently, we derived brain-based latent dimensions of psychopathology using symptom covariance with functional brain networks in HBN (Voldsbekk et al., 2023). Similar brain-based dimensions of psychopathology were identified in ABCD, combining measures of both brain structure and RSFC (Kebets et al., 2023). By decomposing the HBN data using feature weights estimated in ABCD from Kebets et al., we found that the symptom dimensions replicated, however the RSFC patterns did not (Voldsbekk et al., 2023). Previous attempts at replication of brain-symptom mapping in independent samples have shown similar findings of replicating latent clinical dimensions, but weak or non-replicable RSFC patterns (Linke et al., 2021). In light of this, it is surprising that the current study could replicate case-control and ASD-specific RSFC patterns from HBN to Brainmint. Even so, the clinical associations of this pattern in the discovery sample were not replicated in the validation sample.

The current replication effort is conducted across two widely different samples, both in terms of age, sex distribution, and other demographical variables, and in their mental health profile. While the HBN sample consists of mainly children with diagnosed neurodevelopmental disorders, the Brainmint sample consists of adolescents recruited from the community. Some of these adolescents have elevated symptom burden and may meet the diagnostic criteria of a mental disorder, but this sample is not enriched with diagnoses as is the case with HBN. The symptom distribution is also different, with higher prevalence of anxiety symptoms in Brainmint, as compared to conduct problems and peer problems in HBN. In line with this, there is also a marked difference in the sex distribution across the two samples, with higher prevalence of males in HBN and the majority being female in Brainmint. Given these differences, it is all the more striking that the RSFC patterns replicated. Concomitantly, this may also explain the lack of replicable clinical associations. One possible explanation could be that the RSFC patterns do reflect some vulnerability to psychopathology, only it is not sensitive enough to be predictive in a widely different sample.

Consistent with the symptom load distribution in HBN across diagnostic categories, the RSFC pattern in HBN picked up associations with peer problems, hyperactivity, and

prosocial behaviour for the ASD-specific pattern and all symptom dimensions for the cross-diagnostic pattern. This represents a sanity check that the diagnosis-derived RSFC pattern in HBN picks up similar associations with symptom load as the diagnosis groups they are modelled to represent. Reliability of mental health measures has remained a challenge in the field (Nikolaidis et al., 2022). Here we show that RSFC patterns derived from diagnostic information exhibit associations with an independent measurement of symptom load that are overlapping with symptom load associations observed for each diagnostic category. This supports that these RSFC patterns reflect something that overlaps with their corresponding diagnostic categories. However, this sensitivity of the RSFC pattern was not generalisable to Brainmint. The RSFC pattern in Brainmint picked up an inverse relationship with prosocial behaviour, hyperactivity, and conduct problems for the ASD-specific pattern, indicating that higher prosociality and lower conduct problems and hyperactivity was associated with a more "ASD-like" brain pattern. This finding is paradoxical and the opposite of what one would expect. While it is too early to conclude based on one preliminary association only, it is worth noting that the strength of this association was low. Similarly, there was no significant associations with the cross-diagnostic pattern in Brainmint. Given these weak group-level associations, with low predictive utility at the individual level, adding too much emphasis to this preliminary finding is unwarranted. Instead, this result adheres to the previous literature finding generalisation of RSFC results a challenge (Uddin et al., 2017).

Some further limitations should be noted. First, RSFC results are influenced by methodological choices (Sala-Llonch et al., 2019; Shirer et al., 2015). To increase reproducibility of RSFC networks, we utilised an established parcellation scheme (Schaefer et al., 2018). Second, the two samples underwent slightly differing fMRI preprocessing pipelines. However, this difference should diminish, rather than inflate, any reproducibility of the findings across samples. Third, the symptom dimensions from SDQ were measured by parent-report in HBN and by self-report in Brainmint. This may have induced systematic variations in the data across the two samples due to differences in response style, which may explain why the community-based sample seemed to exhibit a higher symptom burden than the clinical sample. This limitation represents an important reminder that low reliability in mental health measures impedes scientific discovery (Nikolaidis et al., 2022) and underscores that the current results must be interpreted with caution.

## 5 Conclusions

This work demonstrates that diagnosis-derived RSFC patterns in a US developmental clinical sample can be extended to a Norwegian convenience-based sample of youth. Both the cross-diagnostic and the ASD-specific RSFC patterns were found to replicate across samples. However, although both connectivity patterns exhibited significant associations with thematically appropriate symptom dimensions in both the discovery sample (HBN), they were not found to be sensitive to overlapping dimensions of symptom burden in the validation sample (Brainmint). Implications of this work is that generalisation of RSFC results remains a challenge. For any psychopathology-related RSFC patterns to be generalisable and clinically relevant, their sensitivity to symptom burden across samples represents a prerequisite.

**Acknowledgements**
This project was funded by research grants from the Research Council of Norway (Grant Nos. L.T.W: 249795, 273345, 300767), the South-Eastern Norway Regional Health Authority (Grant Nos. L.T.W: 2014097, 2015073, 2016083, 2018076, 2019101. D.A: 2019107, 2020086), KG Jebsen Stiftelsen, ERA-Net Cofund through the ERA PerMedproject IMPLEMENT, the Horizon Europe HORIZON-HLTH-2021-STAYHLTH-01 (101057429), and the European Research Council under the European Union s Horizon 2020 research and Innovation program (L.T.W: ERC StG Grant No. 802998).

The work was performed on the Service for Sensitive Data (TSD) platform, owned by the University of Oslo, operated, and developed by the TSD service group at the University of Oslo IT-Department (USIT). Computations were also performed using resources provided by UNINETT Sigma2—the National Infrastructure for High Performance Computing and Data Storage in Norway.

## References


Alexander, L. M., Escalera, J., Ai, L., Andreotti, C., Febre, K., Mangone, A., Vega-Potler, N., Langer, N., Alexander, A., & Kovacs, M. (2017). An open resource for transdiagnostic research in pediatric mental health and learning disorders. *Scientific data*, *4*(1), 1-26.

Botvinik-Nezer, R., & Wager, T. D. (2022). Reproducibility in Neuroimaging Analysis: Challenges and Solutions. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2022.12.006

Caspi, A., Houts, R. M., Belsky, D. W., Goldman-Mellor, S. J., Harrington, H., Israel, S., Meier, M. H., Ramrakha, S., Shalev, I., Poulton, R., & Moffitt, T. E. (2014). The p Factor: One General Psychopathology Factor in the Structure of Psychiatric Disorders? *Clin Psychol Sci*, *2*(2), 119-137. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702613497473

Davatzikos, C. (2019). Machine learning in neuroimaging: Progress and challenges. *NeuroImage*, *197*, 652.

Elliott, M. L., Romer, A., Knodt, A. R., & Hariri, A. R. (2018). A Connectome-wide Functional Signature of Transdiagnostic Risk for Mental Illness. *Biological Psychiatry*, *84*(6), 452-459. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.03.012

Esteban, O., Birman, D., Schaer, M., Koyejo, O. O., Poldrack, R. A., & Gorgolewski, K. J. (2017). MRIQC: Advancing the automatic prediction of image quality in MRI from unseen sites. *PLoS ONE*, *12*(9), e0184661. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0184661

Esteban, O., Markiewicz, C. J., Blair, R. W., Moodie, C. A., Isik, A. I., Erramuzpe, A., Kent, J. D., Goncalves, M., DuPre, E., & Snyder, M. (2019). fMRIPrep: a robust preprocessing pipeline for functional MRI. *Nature methods*, *16*(1), 111-116.

Goodman, R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *38*(5), 581-586.

Greve, D. N., & Fischl, B. (2009). Accurate and robust brain image alignment using boundary-based registration. *Neuroimage*, *48*(1), 63-72. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.06.060

Griffanti, L., Salimi-Khorshidi, G., Beckmann, C. F., Auerbach, E. J., Douaud, G., Sexton, C. E., Zsoldos, E., Ebmeier, K. P., Filippini, N., Mackay, C. E., Moeller, S., Xu, J., Yacoub, E., Baselli, G., Ugurbil, K., Miller, K. L., & Smith, S. M. (2014). ICA-based artefact removal and accelerated fMRI acquisition for improved resting state network imaging. *NeuroImage*, *95*, 232-247. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.03.034

Ioannidis, J. P. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS medicine*, *2*(8), e124.

Jenkinson, M., Bannister, P., Brady, M., & Smith, S. (2002). Improved optimization for the robust and accurate linear registration and motion correction of brain images. *NeuroImage*, *17*(2), 825-841. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-8119(02)91132-8

Karcher, N. R., Michelini, G., Kotov, R., & Barch, D. M. (2021). Associations Between Resting-State Functional Connectivity and a Hierarchical Dimensional Structure of Psychopathology in Middle Childhood. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, *6*(5), 508-517. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2020.09.008

Kaufman, J., Birmaher, B., Brent, D., Rao, U. M. A., Flynn, C., Moreci, P., Williamson, D., & Ryan, N. (1997). Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-

Age Children-Present and Lifetime Version (K-SADS-PL): Initial Reliability and Validity Data. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *36*(7), 980-988. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-199707000-00021

Kebets, V., Piguet, C., Chen, J., Ooi, L. Q. R., Kirschner, M., Siffredi, V., Misic, B., Yeo, B. T., & Bernhardt, B. (2023). Multimodal neural correlates of childhood psychopathology. *bioRxiv*, 2023.2003. 2002.530821.

Kessler, R. C., Angermeyer, M., Anthony, J. C., De Graaf, R., Demyttenaere, K., Gasquet, I., De Girolamo, G., Gluzman, S., Gureje, O., & Haro, J. M. (2007). Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of mental disorders in the World Health Organization's World Mental Health Survey Initiative. *World psychiatry*, *6*(3), 168.

Krishnan, A., Williams, L. J., McIntosh, A. R., & Abdi, H. (2011). Partial Least Squares (PLS) methods for neuroimaging: A tutorial and review. *NeuroImage*, *56*(2), 455-475. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.07.034

Lees, B., Squeglia, L. M., McTeague, L. M., Forbes, M. K., Krueger, R. F., Sunderland, M., Baillie, A. J., Koch, F., Teesson, M., & Mewton, L. (2021). Altered Neurocognitive Functional Connectivity and Activation Patterns Underlie Psychopathology in Preadolescence. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, *6*(4), 387-398. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2020.09.007

Linke, J. O., Abend, R., Kircanski, K., Clayton, M., Stavish, C., Benson, B. E., Brotman, M. A., Renaud, O., Smith, S. M., Nichols, T. E., Leibenluft, E., Winkler, A. M., & Pine, D. S. (2021). Shared and Anxiety-Specific Pediatric Psychopathology Dimensions Manifest Distributed Neural Correlates. *Biological Psychiatry*, *89*(6), 579-587. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2020.10.018

MathWorks. (2020). *MATLAB*. In

McTeague, L. M., Huemer, J., Carreon, D. M., Jiang, Y., Eickhoff, S. B., & Etkin, A. (2017). Identification of Common Neural Circuit Disruptions in Cognitive Control Across Psychiatric Disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *174*(7), 676-685. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2017.16040400

McTeague, L. M., Rosenberg, B. M., Lopez, J. W., Carreon, D. M., Huemer, J., Jiang, Y., Chick, C. F., Eickhoff, S. B., & Etkin, A. (2020). Identification of common neural circuit disruptions in emotional processing across psychiatric disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *177*(5), 411-421.

Nikolaidis, A., Chen, A. A., He, X., Shinohara, R., Vogelstein, J., Milham, M., & Shou, H. (2022). Suboptimal phenotypic reliability impedes reproducible human neuroscience. *bioRxiv*, 2022.2007. 2022.501193.

Niso, G., Botvinik-Nezer, R., Appelhoff, S., De La Vega, A., Esteban, O., Etzel, J. A., Finc, K., Ganz, M., Gau, R., & Halchenko, Y. O. (2022). Open and reproducible neuroimaging: from study inception to publication. *NeuroImage*, 119623.

Paus, T., Keshavan, M., & Giedd, J. N. (2008). Why do many psychiatric disorders emerge during adolescence? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *9*(12), 947-957. https://www.nature.com/articles/nrn2513.pdf

Poldrack, R. A., Huckins, G., & Varoquaux, G. (2020). Establishment of best practices for evidence for prediction: a review. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *77*(5), 534-540.

Power, J. D., Fair, D. A., Schlaggar, B. L., & Petersen, S. E. (2010). The development of human functional brain networks. *Neuron*, *67*(5), 735-748.

Pruim, R. H. R., Mennes, M., Buitelaar, J. K., & Beckmann, C. F. (2015). Evaluation of ICA-AROMA and alternative strategies for motion artifact removal in resting state fMRI. *NeuroImage*, *112*, 278-287. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.02.063

Pruim, R. H. R., Mennes, M., van Rooij, D., Llera, A., Buitelaar, J. K., & Beckmann, C. F. (2015). ICA-AROMA: A robust ICA-based strategy for removing motion artifacts from fMRI data. *NeuroImage*, *112*, 267-277. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.02.064

Sala-Llonch, R., Smith, S. M., Woolrich, M., & Duff, E. P. (2019). Spatial parcellations, spectral filtering, and connectivity measures in fMRI: Optimizing for discrimination. *Human Brain Mapping*, *40*(2), 407-419.

Salimi-Khorshidi, G., Douaud, G., Beckmann, C. F., Glasser, M. F., Griffanti, L., & Smith, S. M. (2014). Automatic denoising of functional MRI data: Combining independent component analysis and hierarchical fusion of classifiers. *NeuroImage*, *90*, 449-468. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.11.046

Schaefer, A., Kong, R., Gordon, E. M., Laumann, T. O., Zuo, X.-N., Holmes, A. J., Eickhoff, S. B., & Yeo, B. T. T. (2018). Local-Global Parcellation of the Human Cerebral Cortex from Intrinsic Functional Connectivity MRI. *Cerebral Cortex*, *28*(9), 3095-3114. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhx179

Sha, Z., Wager, T. D., Mechelli, A., & He, Y. (2019). Common Dysfunction of Large-Scale Neurocognitive Networks Across Psychiatric Disorders. *Biological Psychiatry*, *85*(5), 379-388. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.11.011

Shirer, W. R., Jiang, H., Price, C. M., Ng, B., & Greicius, M. D. (2015). Optimization of rs-fMRI pre-processing for enhanced signal-noise separation, test-retest reliability, and group discrimination. *NeuroImage*, *117*, 67-79.

Sprooten, E., Franke, B., & Greven, C. U. (2022). The P-factor and its genomic and neural equivalents: an integrated perspective. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *27*(1), 38-48.

Sydnor, V. J., Larsen, B., Bassett, D. S., Alexander-Bloch, A., Fair, D. A., Liston, C., Mackey, A. P., Milham, M. P., Pines, A., & Roalf, D. R. (2021). Neurodevelopment of the association cortices: Patterns, mechanisms, and implications for psychopathology. *Neuron*, *109*(18), 2820-2846.

Uddin, L. Q., Dajani, D. R., Voorhies, W., Bednarz, H., & Kana, R. K. (2017). Progress and roadblocks in the search for brain-based biomarkers of autism and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Translational Psychiatry*, *7*(8), e1218-e1218. https://doi.org/10.1038/tp.2017.164

Varoquaux, G. (2018). Cross-validation failure: Small sample sizes lead to large error bars. *NeuroImage*, *180*, 68-77.

Voldsbekk, I., Kjelkenes, R., Dahl, A., Holm, M. C., Lund, M. J., Kaufmann, T., Tamnes, C. K., Andreassen, O. A., Westlye, L. T., & Alnæs, D. (2023). Delineating disorder-general and disorder-specific dimensions of psychopathology from functional brain networks in a developmental clinical sample. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *62*, 101271. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2023.101271

Xia, C. H., Ma, Z., Ciric, R., Gu, S., Betzel, R. F., Kaczkurkin, A. N., Calkins, M. E., Cook, P. A., García de la Garza, A., Vandekar, S. N., Cui, Z., Moore, T. M., Roalf, D. R., Ruparel, K., Wolf, D. H., Davatzikos, C., Gur, R. C., Gur, R. E., Shinohara, R. T., Bassett, D. S., & Satterthwaite, T. D. (2018). Linked dimensions of psychopathology and connectivity in functional brain networks. *Nature Communications*, *9*(1), 3003. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05317-y