medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Empirically validate cognitive abilities as an RDoC transdiagnostic domain for mental health across neural and genetic units of analysis

Yue Wang, MS[1]
Richard Anney, PhD[2] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6083-407X
Narun Pat, PhD[1] https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1459-5255

[1]Department of Psychology, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
[2]MRC Centre for Neuropsychiatric Genetics and Genomics, Division of Psychological Medicine and Clinical Neurosciences, School of Medicine and Wolfson Centre for Young People's Mental Health, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

Corresponding author:
Narun Pat, PhD
Also known as Narun Pornpattananangkul, Department of Psychology, University of Otago, William James Building, 275 Leith Walk, Dunedin 9016, New Zealand
Email: narun.pat@otago.ac.nz
Phone: +64 3 470 4629

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Abstract

A leading transdiagnostic framework, RDoC, posits that cognitive abilities are a major functional domain underlying mental health. Specifically, RDoC assumes the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health to be 1) manifested across neural and genetic units of analysis, 2) environmentally situated, and 3) reliable. To test these assumptions, we applied machine learning and commonality analyses to the ABCD dataset (n=11,876). Mental health predicted cognitive abilities of unseen children at out-of-sample *r*=.39. At baseline, this cognitive-abilities-mental-health relationship was accounted for by neuroimaging (including 45 types of brain MRI; 71%), by polygenic scores (18%) and by socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments (70%). Moreover, the variance in the cognitive-abilities-mental-health that was captured by socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments was explained by neuroimaging (68%) and polygenic scores (28%). These patterns were similar across two years. Consistent with RDoC, the cognitive-abilities-mental-health relationship was 1) manifested in both neuroimaging and polygenic scores, 2) explained by socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments and 3) reliable across two years. This supports RDoC's view of cognitive abilities as an integrative-functional domain for the aetiology of mental health.

Keywords: Research Domain Criteria (RDoC), Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD), cognitive abilities, psychopathology, neuroimaging, polygenic scores

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Over a decade ago, the National Institute of Mental Health launched Research Domain Criteria (RDoC) in an effort to improve mental health aetiology[1]. Conventional diagnostic criteria, such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) and International Classification of Diseases (ICD), classify mental disorders based on consensus among clinician experts who agree on which observable symptoms belong to which disorder[2]. Accordingly, often these diagnostic criteria do not align well with research in neuroscience and genetics and do not integrate the roles of environments, such as socio-demographics and lifestyles[3]. Instead of focusing on specific mental disorders, RDoC focuses on the transdiagnostic relationship between mental health and functional domains, such as cognitive abilities/systems, and more importantly, the extent to which neurobiological and social-environmental factors capture this relationship[4].

Yet, despite being a prominent view with thousands of studies adopting the framework[3], RDoC currently faces the same problem as DSM/ICD – it relies heavily on expert consensus[5]. For example, RDoC's constructs for cognitive abilities were selected based on meetings among experts on cognitive neuroscience and schizophrenia[4,6]. Accordingly, after a decade of work, RDoC is still driven by experts' opinions and in need of empirical evidence to support its framework. Therefore, we aim to empirically investigate if cognitive abilities have the properties of a functional domain as proposed by RDoC.

RDoC stipulates the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health to be manifested across neurobiological units of analysis, from the brain to genes[7]. Recent advances in large-scale data and machine learning[8] allow researchers to build predictive models to estimate cognitive abilities of unseen participants, not part of the modelling process, based on their neuroimaging data (e.g., via different types of brain MRI[9,10]) and genetic risk profiles (e.g., via polygenetic scores[9,11]). Accordingly, these predictive models create neurobiological proxy measures of cognitive abilities, close to what RDoC considers as units of analysis. Thus, RDoC would predict these neurobiological proxy measures to account for the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health.

RDoC, additionally, assumes the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health to be affected by environments (https://www.nimh.nih.gov/research/research-funded-by-nimh/rdoc/developmental-and-environmental-aspects). It is well-accepted that environmental factors play a large role on cognitive abilities[12]. Recent research applied machine learning to compute proxy measures of cognitive abilities in children based on their socio-demographics (e.g., parental income/education), lifestyles (e.g., screen/video game use) along with child developmental adversary (e.g., birth/pregnancy complication)[9,13]. Similar to neurobiological proxy measures, RDoC would predict these proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments to account for the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health. Moreover, RDoC would further predict these variances explained by socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments to be overlapped with those from the neurobiological proxy measures. Such patterns would provide an integrative, holistic account of the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health, as claimed by RDoC.

RDoC also emphasises the reliability of measurements[4,14]. The Adolescent Brain Cognition Development (ABCD)[15], an on-going, population-based cohort study, has already provided cognitive, neuroimaging, genetic and social-environmental data from over 11,000 adolescents

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

at ages 9-10 and 11-12 years old. Therefore, the ABCD is suitable for testing whether the cognitive abilities and mental health relationship is reliably manifested in both the neuroimaging and polygenic scores and affected by socio-demographics, across time points.

Here using the ABCD, we operationalised cognitive abilities as a latent variable of behavioural performance during cognitive tasks, covering most of RDoC's cognitive-ability/systems constructs (apart from perception), including attention, working memory, declarative memory, language and cognitive control[7]. We then built predictive, machine-learning models to predict the cognitive abilities of unseen children from their mental health. These predictive models allowed us to quantify the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health. Following RDoC's holistic view of mental health, covering symptoms, risk factors and family environments[1,4], we included not only children's but also their caretakers' emotional and behavioural problems[16] as well as children's at-risk personalities, including behavioural inhibition/activation[17] and impulsivity[18].

Similar to mental health, we also built predictive models of cognitive abilities based on neuroimaging, polygenic scores, socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments to create different proxy measures of cognitive abilities. For the neuroimaging, we included 45 types of brain MRI, derived from task/resting-state fMRI, structural MRI and diffusion tensor imaging (DTI). For polygenic scores, we used three definitions of cognitive abilities based on previous meta/mega analyses[19–21]. For socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments, we included 44 variables, covering factors, such as parental income/education, screen use and birth/pregnancy complications. Finally, we conducted a series of linear-mixed model commonality analyses[22] to demonstrate the extent to which proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on neuroimaging, polygenic scores and socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments explained the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health. To examine the reliability, we repeated the analyses across two-time points and examined the similarity between the two.

Results

Predictive modelling

Predicting cognitive abilities from mental health

Figure 1a and Supplementary Table 5 show the predictive performance of the Partial Least Square (PLS) models, predicting cognitive abilities from mental-health features. These features included 1) children's (CBCL) and 2) caretakers' (ASR) emotional and behavioural problems and 3) children's at-risk personalities. Using these three sets of mental health features separately led to moderate predictive performance, ranging from r=.21 to r=.31. Combining them into one set of features, "mental health," boosted the performance to around r=.4, similarly across the two time points.

Figure 1b shows loadings and the ratio of variance explained by these PLS models. The first PLS component had the highest ratio of variance explained (19.3%-24.3%). Based on its loadings, this component was driven by features such as attention and social problems, rule-breaking and aggressive behaviours, Behavioural-Activation-System drive and the caretaker's personal strength. We found a similar pattern across the two-time points.

Predicting cognitive abilities from neuroimaging

Figures 2a and Supplementary Figures 2-3 and Supplementary Tables 5-7 show the predictive performance of the opportunistic stacking models, predicting cognitive abilities from 45 sets

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

of neuroimaging features. Predictive performance from each set of neuroimaging features varied considerably, ranging from r around 0 (ENBack: Positive vs Neutral Face) to r around .4 (ENBack: 2-Back vs 0-Back). Drawing information across 45 sets of neuroimaging features into a stacked model boosted the performance to around *r*=.54, similarly across the two time points. In fact, the stacked model (R^2 around .3) accounted for variance in cognitive abilities twice as much as the model based on the best set of neuroimaging features (ENBack: 2-Back vs 0-Back, R^2 around .15). Figures 2b,3 and Supplementary Figure 4 show the feature importance of the opportunistic stacking models. Across the two time points, the top contributing sets of neuroimaging features, reflected by SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP)[23], were ENBack task-fMRI contrasts, rs-fMRI and cortical thickness.

Predicting cognitive abilities from polygenic scores

Figures 2a and Supplementary Tables 5 show the predictive performance of the Elastic Net models, predicting cognitive abilities from three polygenic scores (PGSs) of cognitive abilities. Predictive performance from polygenic scores was *r*=.25 and .24 in baseline and follow-up, respectively. Figures 2c shows the feature importance of these models, suggesting a stronger contribution from Savage and colleagues' PGS[21].

Predicting cognitive abilities from socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments

Figure 4a and Supplementary Table 5 show the predictive performance of the Partial Least Square (PLS) models, predicting cognitive abilities from socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments. Using 44 features covering socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments, we saw predictive performance around *r*=.48, similarly across the two time points. Figure 4b shows loadings and the ratio of variance explained of these PLS models. The first PLS component had the highest ratio of variance explained (around 10%). Based on its loadings, this first component was a) positively driven by features such as parent's income and education, neighbourhood safety and extracurricular activity and b) negatively driven by features such as area deprivation, having a single parent, screen use, economic insecurities, lack of sleep, mature video games play/movies watch and lead risk.

Commonality analyses

Commonality analyses for proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health and neuroimaging

At baseline, having both proxy measures based on mental health and neuroimaging in a linear mixed model explained 33% of the variance in cognitive abilities. And 14.01% of the variance in cognitive abilities was explained by mental health, which included the common effect between the two proxy measures (9.91%) and the unique effect of mental health (4.1%) (see Supplementary Tables 8-9 and Figure 5). This means that neuroimaging accounted for 71% of the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health (i.e., (9.91÷14.01)x100). The common effects varied considerably across sets of neuroimaging features, from around 0.17% to 4.4%, with the highest set being ENBack task fMRI: 2-Back vs 0-Back (see Supplementary Figure 5). The pattern of results was similar across two time points.

Commonality analyses for proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health and polygenic scores

At baseline, having both proxy measures based on mental health and polygenic scores in a linear mixed model explained 11.8% of the variance in cognitive abilities. And 11.4% of the variance in cognitive abilities was explained by mental health, which included the common

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

effect between the two proxy measures (2.06%) and the unique effect of mental health (9.36%) (see Supplementary Tables 10-11 and Figure 5). This means that polygenic scores accounted for over 18% of the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health (i.e., (2.06÷11.4)x100). The pattern of results was similar across two time points.

Commonality analyses for proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health and socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments

At baseline, having both proxy measures based on mental health and socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments in a linear mixed model explained 27.1% of the variance in cognitive abilities. And 14.13% of the variance in cognitive abilities was explained by mental health, which included the common effect between the two proxy measures (9.92%) and the unique effect of mental health (4.21%) (see Supplementary Tables 12-13 and Figure 5). This means that socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments accounted for over 70% of the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health (i.e., (9.92÷14.13)x100). The pattern of results was similar across two time points.

Commonality analyses for proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health, neuroimaging, polygenic scores and socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments

At baseline, having all four proxy measures based on mental health, neuroimaging, polygenic scores and socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments in a linear mixed model explained 28.8% of the variance in cognitive abilities. And 1.59% of the variance in cognitive abilities was the common effect among the four proxy measures. Additionally, out of 11.2% of the variance in cognitive abilities explained by mental health, 9.18% could be explained by any of the other proxy measures. That means the three proxy measures accounted for 82% (i.e., (9.18÷11.2)x100) of the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health (see Supplementary Tables 14-15 and Figure 5). This also means that, among the variance that socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments accounted for in the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health, neuroimaging could capture 68% while polygenic scores could capture 28%. The pattern of results was similar across two time points.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Discussions

Using large-scale data in adolescents collected two years apart, we empirically tested whether cognitive abilities have the properties of a functional domain as proposed by RDoC[7]. We started by quantifying the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health and found a medium-sized out-of-sample r around .4. Consistent with RDoC[4,14], first, this relationship was explained by the neurobiological proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on neuroimaging and polygenic scores (71% and 18%, respectively, at baseline). Second, this relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health was also explained by proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments (70% at baseline). The variance due to socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments was largely accounted for by the proxy measures based on neuroimaging and polygenic scores (68% and 28%, respectively at baseline). Third, this pattern of results was reliable across the two-time points. Accordingly, overall, our results support RDoC's view of cognitive abilities as an integrative, functional domain for mental health.

Our predictive modelling revealed a medium-sized predictive relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health. This aligns with recent meta-analyses linking cognitive abilities and mental disorders[24]. We also found that including, not just children's, but also caretakers' emotional and behavioural problems[16] and children's at-risk personalities[25,26] as mental health features improved the strength of the relationship. This solidifies RDoC's holistic view of mental health as a broad concept, spanning from pathologies to risk factors and incorporating individual and family environments[1,4]. Examining the PLS loading of our predictive models revealed that the relationship was driven by different aspects of mental health, from thought and externalising symptoms to motivation and caretakers' personal strength. Altogether, we confirmed the transdiagnostic nature of cognitive abilities.

Our predictive modelling also created proxy measures of cognitive abilities for two RDoC units of analysis[7]: at the neural, reflected by neuroimaging, and genetic, reflected by polygenic scores, levels. For neuroimaging, combining 45 sets of neuroimaging features via opportunistic stacking led to a relatively high effect size (out-of-sample r=.54 at baseline), as compared to using any single set, consistent with previous research[27–29]. The superior performance from ENBack: 2-Back vs 0-Back was also consistent with work done in adults from the Human Connectome Project[29,30]. For the polygenic scores, using polygenic scores led to a weaker effect size (out-of-sample r=.25 at baseline). However, this predictive strength is still in the ballpark of previous work in children[11]. More importantly, these neurobiological proxy measures of cognitive abilities were able to capture the majority of the relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health, consistent with RDoC.

Similarly, our predictive modelling created proxy measures of cognitive abilities from socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments. In line with previous work[9,13], we could predict unseen children's cognitive abilities based on their socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments at a medium-to-high out-of-sample r=.48 (at baseline). This prediction was driven more strongly by socio-demographics (e.g., parent's income and education, neighbourhood safety, area deprivation, single parenting), somewhat weaker by lifestyles (e.g., extracurricular activities, sleep, screen time, video gaming, mature movie watching and parental monitoring) and much weaker by developments (e.g., pregnancy complications).

More relevant to RDoC, proxy measures based on socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments captured a large proportion of the relationship between cognitive abilities and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

mental health. Furthermore, as predicted by RDoC, this variance captured by socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments overlapped largely with that of the neurobiological proxy measures. This reiterates RDoC's main tenet that understanding the neurobiology of a functional domain, such as cognitive abilities, could lead us to understand how social environments influence mental health[1,4]. More importantly, all of the aforementioned results regarding neuroimaging, polygenic scores, socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments were reliable across two years during a sensitive period for adolescents.

This study has some limitations, mainly due to the availability of the data provided by ABCD[15]. For mental health, even though we relied on four measures (CBCL[16], ASR[16], UPSS-P[26] and BIS/BAS[31]), we may still miss important mental-health variability, such as learning disability. Similarly, for cognitive abilities, while the six cognitive tasks[32,33] covered most of RDoC cognitive abilities/systems constructs, we still missed variability in perception[7]. For neuroimaging, while we used comprehensive multimodal MRI from 45 sets of features, three fMRI tasks included were not chosen based on RDoC cognitive abilities/systems constructs[15]. It is possible to obtain higher predictive performance based on other fMRI tasks. For genetics, we relied on polygenic scores, built to predict adults' cognitive abilities using cognitive tasks different from ABCD's[19–21], which might not translate well to children's cognitive abilities. Lastly, we also relied on 44 variables of socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments included in the study, which might miss some variables relevant to cognitive abilities (e.g., nutrition). ABCD[15] is still ongoing, and future data might be able to address some of these limitations.

Altogether, we provide empirical evidence to support RDoC's view of cognitive abilities as a transdiagnostic domain for mental health. By doing so, we laid a foundation to achieve the four goals set by RDoC[3]. First, we have addressed the aetiology of mental health by showing the reliable and predictable transdiagnostic relationship between cognitive abilities and mental health. Second, we also identified neuroimaging and genetic biomarkers that explain this relationship. Third, with our findings on the socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments, we touched on target identification. Finally, our use of machine learning to make out-of-sample predictions on individual children could lead to further development of personalised interventions. Overall, our findings lend credibility to RDoC focusing on cognitive abilities.

For a decade, RDoC has been driven by experts' opinions[5]. At the start, empirical data that could validate this framework were scarce. The recent revolution in neurobiological big data, such as ABCD[15] and various genome-wide-study consortiums[19–21], has provided us with high-quality mental health and cognitive phenotypes, multimodal neuroimaging, genomics and social-environmental data, across time points. These findings empirically support RDoC's perspective that cognitive abilities are integral to mental health.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Figures





medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Predictive models, predicting cognitive abilities from mental-health features via Partial Least Square (PLS). a) predictive performance of the models, indicated by scatter plots between observed vs predicted cognitive abilities based on mental health. All data points are from test sets. *r* is the average Pearson's *r* across 21 test sites, and a value in the parenthesis is the standard deviation of Pearson's *r* across sites. UPPS-P Impulsive and Behaviour Scale and the Behavioural Inhibition System/Behavioural Activation System (BIS/BAS) were used for child personality traits, conceptualised as risk factors for mental issues. Mental health includes features from CBCL, ASR and child personality. b) Feature importance of mental health, predicting cognitive abilities. The features were ordered based on the loading of the first PLS component. Univariate correlations were Pearson's *r* between each mental-health feature and cognitive abilities. Error bars reflect 95%CIs of the correlations. CBCL = Child Behavioural Checklist, reflecting children's emotional and behavioural problems; ASR = Aseba Adult Self Report, reflecting caretakers' emotional and behavioural problems; UPPS-P = Urgency, Premeditation, Perseverance, Sensation seeking and Positive urgency Impulsive Behaviour Scale; BAS = Behavioural Activation System.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Predictive models predicting cognitive abilities from neuroimaging via opportunistic stacking and polygenic scores via Elastic Net. a) Scatter plots between observed vs predicted cognitive abilities based on neuroimaging and polygenic scores. a) All data points are from test sets. *r* is the average Pearson's *r* across 21 test sites, and a value in the parenthesis is the standard deviation of Pearson's *r* across sites. b) Feature importance of the stacking layer of neuroimaging, predicting cognitive abilities via Random Forest. For the stacking layer of neuroimaging, the feature importance was based on the absolute value of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

SHAP, averaged across test sites. A higher absolute value of SHAP indicates a higher contribution to the prediction. Error bars reflect standard deviations across sites. c) Feature importance of polygenic scores, predicting cognitive abilities via Elastic Net. For polygenic scores, the feature importance was based on the Elastic Net coefficients, averaged across test sites. We also plotted Pearson's correlations between each polygenic score and cognitive abilities, computed from the full data. Error bars reflect 95%CIs of these correlations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Feature importance of each set of neuroimaging features, predicting cognitive abilities in the baseline data. The feature importance was based on the Elastic Net coefficients, averaged across test sites. MID = Monetary Incentive Delay task; SST = Stop Signal Task; DTI = Diffusion Tensor Imaging; FC = functional connectivity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Figure 4. Predictive models, predicting cognitive abilities from socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments via Partial Least Square (PLS). a) Scatter plots between observed vs predicted cognitive abilities based on socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments. All data points are from test sets. *r* is the average Pearson's *r* across 21 test sites, and a value in the parenthesis is the standard deviation of Pearson's *r* across sites. b) Feature importance of socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments, predicting cognitive abilities via Partial Least Square. The features were ordered based on the loading of the first component. Univariate correlations were Pearson's *r* between each feature and cognitive abilities. Error bars reflect 95%CIs of the correlations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Venn diagrams showing common and unique effects of proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health, neuroimaging, polygenic scores and/or socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments in explaining cognitive abilities across test sites. We computed the common and unique effects in % based on the marginal of four sets of linear-mixed models.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Online Methods

The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Dataset

We used data from Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study Curated Annual Release 4.0[34,35] from two time points. The baseline included the data from 11,876 children (5,680 females, 9-10 years old), while the two-year follow-up included the data from the same children two years later (11,225 children, 5,353 females). While the ABCD collected data from 22 sites across the United States, we excluded data from Site 22 since this site only provided data from 32 children at the baseline[36]. Note following the release note[37], we revised the site ID of 25 children whose site ID was incorrectly entered. We also excluded 58 children based on Snellen Vision Screener[32,38]. These children either could not read any line in the chart, could only read the largest line or could read as far as the fourth line clearly but showed difficulty reading stimuli on an iPad, used for administering cognitive tasks (explained below). The study protocols are approved by Institutional Review Boards at each site. For ethical details, such as informed consent, confidentiality and communication with participants about assessment results, please see Clark and colleagues[39].

Measures of cognitive abilities

Cognitive abilities were based on six cognitive tasks, collected with an iPad in a 70-min session outside of MRI at both baseline and two-year follow-up[32,33]. The first task was Picture Vocabulary, measuring language comprehension[40]. The second task was Oral Reading Recognition, measuring language decoding[41]. The third task was Flanker, measuring conflict monitoring and inhibitory control[42]. The fourth task was Pattern Comparison Processing, measuring the speed of processing patterns[43]. The fifth task was Picture Sequence Memory, measuring episodic memory[44]. The sixth task was Rey-Auditory Verbal Learning, measuring memory recall after distraction and a short delay[45]. Note 3,860 children in the follow-up did not complete some of these tasks, and thus were dropped from the analysis involving the follow-up data.

We operationalised individual differences in cognitive abilities across the six cognitive tasks as a factor score of a latent variable ‘g-factor’. To estimate this factor score, we fit the standardised performance of the six cognitive tasks to second-order confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of a ‘g-factor’ model, similar to previous work[9,33,46,47]. In this CFA, we treated the g-factor as the second-order latent variable that underlined three first-layer latent variables, each of which had two manifest variables: 1) ‘language,’ underlying Picture Vocabulary and Oral Reading Recognition, 2) ‘mental flexibility,’ underlying Flanker and Pattern Comparison Processing, and 3) ‘memory recall,’ underlying Picture Sequence Memory and Rey-Auditory Verbal Learning.

We fixed the variance of the latent factors to one and applied the Maximum Likelihood with Robust standard errors (MLR) approach with Huber-White standard errors and scaled test statistics. To provide information about the internal consistency of the g-factor, we calculated Omegal2[48]. We used the lavaan[49] (version 0.6-15), semTools[48], semPlots[50] packages for this CFA of cognitive abilities.

We found the second-order ‘g-factor’ model to fit cognitive abilities across the six cognitive tasks well. This can be seen by several indices: scaled and robust CFI (.994), TLI (.986) and RMSEA (.031, 90%CI [.024-.037]) and robust SRMR (.013) and OmegaL2 (.78). See Supplementary Figure 1 for the standardised weights of this CFA model. This enabled us to use the factor score of the latent variable ‘g-factor’ as the target for our predictive models.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Measures of Mental health

Mental health was based on three sets of features. The first set was parental reports of children's emotional and behavioural problems, reflected by Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL)[16]. Here, we used eight summary scores: anxious/depressed, withdrawn, somatic complaints, social problems, thought problems, attention problems, rule-breaking behaviours and aggressive behaviours. The second set is caretakers' emotional and behavioural problems, reflected by Aseba Adult Self Report (ASR)[16]. Here we included nine summary scores from personal strength and symptom scales: personal strength, anxious/depressed, withdrawn, somatic complaints, thought problems, attention problems, aggressive behaviours, rule-breaking behaviours and intrusive. The third set is children's personality traits conceptualised as risk factors for mental issues[17,51], reflected by the Urgency, Premeditation, Perseverance, Sensation seeking and Positive urgency (UPPS-P) Impulsive Behaviour Scale[26] and the Behavioural Inhibition System/Behavioural Activation System (BIS/BAS)[31]. Here we used nine summary scores: negative urgency, lack of planning, sensation seeking, positive urgency, lack of perseverance, BIS, BAS reward responsiveness, BAS drive and BAS fun.

Measures of Neuroimaging

Neuroimaging was based on the tabulated brain-MRI data, pre-processed by the ABCD. We organised the brain-MRI data into 45 sets of neuroimaging features, covering task-fMRI (including NBack, stop signal (SST), and monetary incentive delay (MID) tasks), resting state fMRI, structural MRI and diffusion tensor imaging (DTI). The ABCD presented details on the MRI acquisition and image processing elsewhere[34,35,52]. The study provided recommended exclusion criteria for brain-MRI data, based on automated and manual quality control (QC) [35]. More specifically, the study created an exclusion flag for each set of neuroimaging features (with the prefix 'imgincl' in the 'abcd_imgincl01 table) based on the criteria involving image quality, MR neurological screening, behavioural performance, and the number of repetition times (TRs) among others. We strictly followed their recommendations by removing data with an exclusion flag at any neuroimaging features, separately for each set of neuroimaging features. In addition, we also removed data from participants whose MRI data were flagged with known issues by the ABCD study (26 at baseline and 4 at follow-up[35]).

We further processed the brain-MRI data, separately for each set of neuroimaging features. Our first step was to detect outliers with over three interquartile ranges from the neatest quartile. We excluded a particular set of neuroimaging features when this set had outliers over 5% of the total number of its neuroimaging features. We, then, standardised each neuroimaging feature across participants and harmonised variation across MRI scanners using ComBat[53–55]. Note see below under predictive modelling for strategies we implemented during predictive modelling to avoid data leakage and to model the data with missing values.

Sets of Neuroimaging Features 1-26: task-fMRI

For task-fMRI sets of features, we used unthresholded generalised-linear model (GLM) contrasts, averaged across two runs[9,56,57]. These contrasts were embedded in the brain parcels based on the FreeSurfer's atlases[58]: 148 cortical-surface Destrieux parcels [59] and subcortical-volumetric 19 ASEG parcels[60], leaving 167 features in each task-fMRI set of features.

Sets of Neuroimaging Features 1-9: ENBack task-fMRI

The "ENBack" or emotional n-back task was designed to elicit fMRI activity related to working memory to neurtral and emotional stimuli[34,61]. Depending on the block, the children

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

were asked whether a picture presented matched the picture shown two trials earlier (2-Back) or the picture shown at the beginning of the block (0-Back). In this version of the task, the pictures shown included emotional faces and places. Accordingly, in addition to working memory, the task also allowed us to extract fMRI activity related to emotion processing and facial processing. We used the following contrasts as nine separate sets of neuroimaging features for ENBack task-fMRI: 2-Back vs 0-Back, Face vs Place, Emotion vs Neutral Face, Positive vs Neutral Face, Negative vs Neutral Face, 2-Back, 0-Back, Emotion and Place.

Sets of Neuroimaging Features 10-19: Monetary Incentive Delay (MID) task-fMRI

The MID task was designed to elicit fMRI activity related to reward-processing[34,62]. Here children responded to a stimulus shown on a screen. If they responded before a stimulus shown on a screen disappeared, they could either win $5 (Large Reward), win $0.2 (Small Reward), lose $5 (Large Loss), lose $0.2 (Small Loss) or not win or lose any money (Neutral), depending on the conditions. At the end of each trial, they then were shown feedback on whether they won money (Positive Reward Feedback), did not win money (Negative Reward Feedback), avoided losing money (Positive Punishment Feedback), or lose money (Negative Punishment Feedback). We used the following contrasts as 10 separate sets of neuroimaging features for MID task-fMRI: Large Reward vs Small Reward anticipation, Small Reward vs Neutral anticipation, Large Reward vs Neutral anticipation, Large Loss vs Small Loss anticipation, Small Loss vs Neutral anticipation, Large Loss vs Neutral anticipation, Loss vs Neutral anticipation, Reward vs Neutral anticipation, Positive vs Negative Reward Feedback and Positive vs Negative Punishment Feedback.

Sets of Neuroimaging Features 20-26: Stop-Signal Task (SST) task-fMRI

The SST was designed to elicit fMRI activity related to inhibitory control[34,63]. Children were asked to withhold or interrupt their motor response to a 'Go' stimulus whenever they saw a 'Stop' signal. Note we used two additional QC exclusion criteria for the SST task: tfmri_sst_beh_glitchflag, and tfmri_sst_beh_violatorflag, which notified glitches as recommended [36,64]. We used the following contrasts as 7 separate sets of neuroimaging features for SST task-fMRI: Incorrect Go vs Incorrect Stop, Incorrect Go vs Correct Go, Correct Stop vs Incorrect Stop, Any Stop vs Correct Go, Incorrect Stop vs Correct Go, Correct Stop vs Correct Go, Correct Go vs Fixation.

Sets of Neuroimaging Features 27-29: Resting-state fMRI (rs-fMRI)

The ABCD study collected rs-fMRI for 20 mins while children were viewing a crosshair. The study described the pre-processing procedure elsewhere[52]. The investigators parcellated cortical surface into 333 regions and subcortical volume into 19 regions using Gordon's[65] and ASEG[60] atlas, respectively. They grouped the cortical-surface regions into 13 predefined large-scale cortical networks[65]. These large-scale cortical networks included auditory, cingulo-opercular, cingulo-parietal, default-mode, dorsal-attention, frontoparietal, none, retrosplenial-temporal, salience, sensorimotor-hand, sensorimotor-mouth, ventral-attention and visual networks. Note that the term 'None' refers to those regions that did not belong to any networks. They then correlated time series from these regions and applied Fisher's z-scoring to the correlations. We included three sets of neuroimaging features for rs-fMRI. The first set was cortical functional connectivity (FC) with 91 features. This set included the mean values of the correlations between pairs of regions within the same large-scale cortical network as well as between large-scale cortical networks. The second set was subcortical-network FC with 247 features. This set included the mean values of the correlations between each of the 19 subcortical regions and each of the 13 large-scale cortical networks. The third

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

set was temporal variance with 352 features (i.e., 333 cortical and 19 subcortical regions). This set was the variance across time, calculated for each of the parcellated regions. Temporal variance reflects the magnitude of low-frequency oscillations[35].

Sets of Neuroimaging Features 30-44: Structural MRI (sMRI)

The ABCD study collected T1-weighted and T2-weighted 3D sMRI images and quantified them into various measures, mainly through FreeSurfer v7.1.1 [35]. Similar to task-fMRI, we used 148 cortical-surface Destrieux [59] and subcortical-volumetric 19 ASEG [60] atlases. We included 15 sets of neuroimaging features for sMRI: cortical thickness, cortical area, cortical volume, sulcal depth, T1 white-matter averaged intensity, T1 grey-matter averaged intensity, T1 normalised intensity, T2 white-matter averaged intensity, T2 grey-matter averaged intensity, T2 normalised intensity, T1 summations, T2 summations, T1 subcortical averaged intensity, T2 subcortical averaged intensity and subcortical volume. Note see Figure 4 for the neuroimaging features including in T1 and T2 summations.

Sets of Neuroimaging Features 45: Diffusion tensor imaging (DTI)

We included fractional anisotropy (FA) derived from DTI as another set of neuroimaging features. FA characterises the directionality of diffusion distribution within white matter tracts, which is thought to indicate the density of fibre packing[66]. The ABCD study used AtlasTrack[52,67] to segment major white matter tracts. These included the corpus callosum, forceps major, forceps minor, cingulate and parahippocampal portions of cingulum, fornix, inferior frontal occipital fasciculus, inferior longitudinal fasciculus, pyramidal/corticospinal tract, superior longitudinal fasciculus, temporal lobe portion of superior longitudinal fasciculus, anterior thalamic radiations and uncinate. Given 10 tracks were separately labelled for each hemisphere, there were 23 features for the set of neuroimaging features for DTI.

Measures of Genetic Risk Profiles

Genetic risk profiles were based on polygenic scores (PGS) of cognitive abilities. The ABCD study gave detailed notes on genotyping elsewhere[68]. Briefly, the study genotyped saliva and whole blood samples using Smokescreen™ Array. The investigators, then, quality-controlled the data using calling signals and variant call rates, applied the Ricopili pipeline and imputed the data with TOPMED (https://topmedimpute.readthedocs.io/). The study also identified problematic plates and data points with a subject-matching issue. We further excluded children with minimal or excessive heterozygosity and excluded Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms (SNPs) based on minor allele frequency (<5%) and violations of Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium ($P < 1E-10$) (see https://github.com/ricanney/stata).

We computed PGS using three definitions from three large-scale genome-wide association studies (GWAS) on cognitive abilities in adults: n=257,84[20], n=300,486[19] and n=269,867[21]. These GWASs focused on participants of European ancestry. Because PGS has a lower predictive ability when target samples (i.e., in our case, ABCD children) do not have the same ancestry as those of the discovery GWAS sample[69], we restricted all analyses involving polygenic scores to 5,786 children of European ancestry. These children were within four standard deviations from the mean of the top four principal components (PCs) of the super-population individuals in the 1000 Genomes Project Consortium Phase 3 reference[70].

We used the Pthreshold approach[71]. Here we defined risk alleles as those associated with cognitive abilities in the three discovery GWASs[19–21] at 10 different PGS thresholds: 0.5, 0.1, 0.05, 0.01, 0.001, 0.0001, 0.00001, 0.000001, 0.0000001, 0.00000001. We then computed PGS as the Z-scored, weighted mean number of linkage-independent risk alleles in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

approximate linkage equilibrium, derived from imputed autosomal SNPs. We selected the best PGS threshold for each of the three definitions by choosing the PGS threshold that demonstrated the strongest correlation between its PGS and cognitive abilities in the ABCD (i.e., the g-factor factor score). Note see below under predictive modelling for strategies we implemented to avoid data leakage due to this selection of PGS threshold and the family structure in the ABCD.

Measures of Socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments

Socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments were based on 44 features. This set of features included (a) 14 features for child social-demographics[72], including bilingual use[73], parental marital status, parental education, parental income, household size, economic insecurities, area deprivation index[74], lead risk[75], crime report[76], neighbourhood safety[77], school environment, involvement and disengagement[78], (b) five features for child social interactions from Patent Monitoring scale[79], Child Report of Behaviour Inventory[80], Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire[81] and Moos Family Environment Scale[82], (c) six features for parental use of alcohol, tobacco and marijuana before and after pregnancy from the Developmental History Questionnaire[83,84], (d) eight features from child's sleep problems based on the Sleep Disturbance scale[85], (e) four features for child's physical activities from Youth Behaviour Survey[86], (f) four features for child screen use[87] and (g) three features for child developmental adversary from developmental History Questionnaire, including prematurity, birth complications and pregnancy complications[83,84].

Predictive modelling

For building predictive, machine-learning models, we implemented a nested leave-one-site-out cross-validation. Specifically, we treated one out of 21 sites as a test set and the rest as a training set for training predictive models. We then repeated the model-building process until every site was a test set once and reported overall predictive performance across all test sites. Within each training set, we applied 10-fold cross-validation to tune the hyperparameters of the predictive models. The nested leave-one-site-out cross-validation allowed us to ensure the generalisability of our predictive models to unseen sites. This is important because different sites involved different MRI machines, experimenters and participants with different demographics[36]. Next, data from children from the same family were collected from the same site. Accordingly, using leave-one-site-out also prevented data leakage due to family structure, which might inflate the predictive performance of the models, particularly those involving polygenic scores.

In order to demonstrate the reliability of the results across two years, we built the predictive models (including hyperparameter tuning) separately for baseline and follow-up data. To prevent data leakage between training and test sets, we separately applied standardisation to the baseline training and test sets, for both the target and features. To ensure similarity in data scale across two time points, we, then, used the mean and standard deviation of the baseline training and test sets to standardise the follow-up training and test sets, respectively. For cognitive abilities, which were used as the target for all predictive models, we applied this standardisation strategy both before CFA (i.e., to the behavioural performance of the six cognitive tasks) and after CFA (i.e., to the g-factor factor scores). Moreover, to ensure that the predictive models of the two-time points had the same target, we only estimated the CFA of cognitive abilities using the baseline training set. We then applied this estimated CFA model to the baseline test set and follow-up training and test sets. We examined the predictive performance of the models via the relationship between predicted and observed cognitive

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

abilities, using Pearson's correlation (*r*), coefficient of determination (R^2, calculated using the sum of square definition), mean-absolute error (MAE) and root mean square error (RMSE).

Predicting cognitive abilities from mental health

We built predictive models to predict cognitive abilities from three sets of mental health features: CBCL, ASR and personality. We separately modelled each of these three sets and also simultaneously modelled the three sets by concatenating them into one set of features, called "mental health". We implemented Partial Least Squares (PLS)[88] as an algorithm for these predictive models. PLS decomposes features into components that not only capture the variance of features but also the variance of the target[88]. PLS has an advantage in dealing with collinear features[89], which are common for mental health issues[90]. We described the PLS algorithm in the Supplementary.

PLS has one hyperparameter, the number of components. In our grid search, we tested the number of components, ranging from one to the total number of features. We selected the number of components based on the drop in root mean square error (RMSE). That is, we kept increasing the number of components until the component did not reduce 0.1% of the total RMSE. We fit PLS using the mixOmics package[91] with the tidymodels package as a wrapper[92].

To understand how PLS made predictions, we examined loadings and the ratio of variance explained. Loadings for each PLS component show how much each feature contributes to each PLS component. The ratio of variance explained shows how much variance each PLS component captures, compared to the total variance. We then compared loadings and the ratio of variance explained with the univariate, Pearson's correlation between each feature and the target. Note, that because we could not guarantee that each training set would result in the same PLS components, we calculated loadings and the ratio of variance explained on the full data without splitting them into training and test sets.

Predicting cognitive abilities from neuroimaging

We built predictive models to predict cognitive abilities from 45 sets of neuroimaging features. To avoid data leakage, we detected the outliers separately in the baseline training, baseline test, follow-up training and follow-up test sets. Similarly, to harmonise neuroimaging features across different sites while avoiding data leakage, we applied ComBat[53–55] to the training set. We, then, applied ComBat to the test set, using the ComBatted training set as a reference batch.

Unlike PLS used above for mental-health predictive modelling, we chose to apply opportunistic stacking[9,27] for neuroimaging predictive modelling. As we showed previously[9], opportunistic stacking allowed us to handle missingness in the neuroimaging data without scarifying predictive performance. Missingness in children's MRI data is common, given high levels of noise (e.g., movement artifact)[93]. For ABCD, if we applied listwise exclusion using the study's exclusion criteria, we would have to exclude around 80% of the children who had their MRI data from any sets of neuroimaging features flagged as outliers[9]. With opportunistic stacking, we only needed to exclude around 5% of the children. Our opportunist stacking method kept 10,872 and 6,339 participants at baseline and follow-up, respectively, while listwise deletion only kept 3,525 and 2,514 participants, respectively.

The opportunistic stacking[9,27] involves two layers of modelling: set-specific and stacking layers. In the set-specific layer, we predicted cognitive abilities, separately from each set of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

neuroimaging features using Elastic Net[94]. While being a linear and non-interactive algorithm, Elastic Net performs relatively well in predicting behaviours from neuroimaging MRI, often on par with, if not better than, other more complicated algorithms[10,29,95]. Moreover, Elastic Net coefficients are readily explainable, enabling us to explain how the models drew information from each neuroimaging feature when making a prediction[95,96].

Elastic Net simultaneously minimises the weighted sum of the features' coefficients. Its loss function can be written as:

$$\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{enet}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)^2}{2n} + \lambda\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\widehat{\beta_j^2} + \alpha\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left|\widehat{\beta_j}\right|\right), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_\mathrm{i}$ is a row vector of all the features in observation i, and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is a column vector of features' coefficient. There are two hyperparameters: (1) the penalty (λ) constraining the magnitude of the coefficients and (2) the mixture (α) deciding whether the model is more of a sum of squared coefficients (known as Ridge) or a sum of absolute values of the coefficients (known as Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator, LASSO). Using grid search, we chose the pair of penalty and mixture based on the lowest root mean square error (RMSE). The penalty was selected from 20 numbers, ranging from 10^{-10} to 10, equally spaced with the log_{10} scale, and the penalty was selected from 11 numbers, ranging from 0 to 1 on a linear scale.

Training the set-specific layer resulted in the predicted values of cognitive abilities, one from each set of neuroimaging features. The stacking layer, then, took these predicted values across 45 sets of neuroimaging features and treated them as features to predict cognitive abilities, thereby drawing information across (as opposed to within) sets of neuroimaging features. Importantly, we used the same training set across both layers, ensuring no data leakage between training and test sets. Opportunistic stacking dealt with missing values from each set of neuroimaging features by, first, duplicating each feature (i.e., each of 45 predicted values from the set-specific layer) into two features, resulting in 90 features. We, then, replaced the missing values in each of the duplicated features either with unrealistically large (1000) or small (-1000) values. Accordingly, we were able to keep the data as long as at least one set of neuroimaging features did not have any missing value. Using these duplicated and imputed features, we predicted cognitive abilities from different sets of neuroimaging features using Random Forest[97]. Ultimately, the stacking layer resulted in a predicted value of cognitive abilities based on 45 sets of neuroimaging features.

Random Forest generates several regression trees by bootstrapping observations and including a random subset of features at each split[97]. To make a prediction, Random Forest aggregates predicted values across bootstrapped trees, known as bagging. We used 500 trees and turned two hyperparameters. First, 'mtry' was the number of features selected at each branch. Second, 'min_n' was the minimum number of observations in a node, needed for the node to be split further. Using a Latin hypercube grid search of 3,000 numbers[98–100], we chose the pair of mtry, ranging from 1 to 90, and min_n, ranging from 2 to 2,000, based on the lowest root mean square error (RMSE).

To understand how opportunistic stacking made predictions, we plotted Elastic Net coefficients for the set-specific layer and SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP)[23] for the stacking layer, averaged across 21 test sites. For the set-specific layer, Elastic Net made a prediction based on the linear summation of its regularised, estimated coefficients, and thus

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

plotting the coefficient of each neuroimaging feature allowed us to understand the contribution of such feature. For the stacking layer, it is difficult to trace the contribution from each feature from Random Forest directly, given the use of bagging. To overcome this, we computed Shapley values instead [101]. Shapley values indicate the weighted differences in a model output when each feature is included versus not included in all possible subsets of features. SHAP[23] is a method to efficiently estimate Shapley values. Thus, SHAP allowed us to visualise the contribution of each set of neuroimaging features to the prediction in the stacking layer. Given that we duplicated the predicted values from each set of neuroimaging features in the stacking layer, we combined the magnitude of SHAP across the duplicates.

We fit Elastic Net and Random Forest using the glmnet[102] and ranger[103] packages, respectively, with the tidymodels[92] package as a wrapper. We approximated the Shapley values[23] using the fastshap package[104]. The brain plots were created via the ggseg, ggsegDesterieux, ggsegJHU and ggsegGordon packages[105].

Predicting cognitive abilities from polygenic scores

We built predictive models to predict cognitive abilities from polygenic scores, as reflected by PGS of cognitive abilities from three definitions[19–21]. We, first, selected the PGS threshold for each of the three definitions that demonstrated the strongest correlation with cognition abilities within the training set. This left three PGSs as features for our predictive models, one for each definition. To control for population stratification in genetics, we regressed each PGS on four genetic principal components, separately for the training and test sets. Later, we treated the residuals of this regression for each PGS as each feature in our predictive models. Similar to the predictive models for the set-specific layer of the neuroimaging features, we used Elastic Net here as an algorithm. Given the genetic data do not change over time, we used the same genetic features for baseline and follow-up predictive models. Note that we selected participants based on ancestry for predictive models involving polygenic scores, leaving us with a much smaller number of children (n=5,786 vs. n=11,876 in the baseline).

Predicting cognitive abilities from socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments

We built predictive models to predict cognitive abilities from socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments, reflected in the 44 features. Similar to the mental health features, we implemented partial least squares (PLS)[88] as an algorithm here. To deal with missing values, we applied the following steps, separately for baseline training, baseline test, follow-up training and follow-up test sets. We, first, imputed categorical features using mode and converted them into dummy variables. We, then, standardised all features and imputed them using K-nearest neighbours with five neighbours. Note in a certain site, the value in a certain feature was at 0 for all of the observations (e.g., site 3 having a crime report at 0 for all children), making it impossible for us to standardise this feature when using this site as a test set. In this case, we kept the value of this feature at 0 and did not standardise it. Note also that the ABCD study only provided the following 22 features in the baseline, but not the follow-up: child social-demographics, parental use of alcohol, tobacco and marijuana before and after pregnancy, child's physical activities, child screen use and child developmental adversary. Accordingly, we treated these baseline features as features in our follow-up predictive models and combined them with the other 22 features that were collected in the follow-up.

Commonality analyses

Following the predictive modelling procedure above, we extracted predicted values from different sets of features at each test site and treated them as proxy measures of cognitive

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

abilities[8]. The out-of-sample relationship between observed and proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on certain features reflects variation in cognitive abilities explained by those features. For instance, the relationship between observed and proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health indicates the variation in cognitive abilities that could be explained by mental health. Capitalising on this variation, we, then, used commonality analyses[22] to demonstrate the extent to which other proxy measures captured similar variance of cognitive abilities as mental health.

First, we applied random-intercept, linear-mixed models[106] to the data from all test sites. In these models, we considered families to be nested within each site, meaning that we allowed each family to have a different intercept within each site and each site to have a different intercept. We treated different proxy measures of cognitive abilities as fixed-effect regressors to explain cognitive abilities. We, then, estimated marginal R^2 from the linear-mixed models, which describes the variance explained by all fixed effects included in the models[107,108] and multiplied the marginal R^2 by 100 to obtain a percentage. By including and excluding each proxy measure in the models, we were able to decompose marginal R^2 into unique (i.e., attributed to the variance, uniquely explained by a particular proxy measure) and common (i.e., attributed to the variance, jointly explained by a group of proxy measures) effects[22]. We focused on the common effects a proxy measure based on mental health had with other proxy measures in four sets of commonality analyses. Note each of the four sets of commonality analyses used different numbers of participants, depending on the availability of data. We fit linear-mixed models using the *lme4* package[109].

Commonality analyses for proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health and neuroimaging

Here, we included proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health and/or neuroimaging. Specifically, for each proxy measure, we added two regressors in the models: the values centred within each site (denoted cws) and the site average (denoted $savg$). For instance, we applied the following lme4 syntax for the models with both proxy measures:

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{x}_{mental\ health(cws)} + \beta_2 \mathbf{x}_{mental\ health(savg)} + \beta_3 \mathbf{x}_{neuroimaging(cws)} + \beta_4 \mathbf{x}_{neuroimaging(savg)} + (1|site{:}\ family), \quad (2)$$

We computed unique and common effects[22] as follows:

$$Unique_{mental\ health} = R^2_{mental\ health,neuroimaging} - R^2_{neuroimaging}$$
$$Unique_{neuroimaging} = R^2_{mental\ health,neuroimaging} - R^2_{mental\ health}$$
$$Common_{mental\ health,neuroimaging} = R^2_{mental\ health,neuroimaging} - Unique_{mental\ health} - Unique_{neuroimaging}, \quad (3)$$

where the subscript of R^2 indicates which proxy measures were included in the model.

In addition to using the proxy measures based on neuroimaging from the stacking layer, we also conducted commonality analyses on proxy measures based on neuroimaging from each set of neuroimaging features. This allows us to demonstrate which of the set of neuroimaging features showed higher common effects with the proxy measures based on mental health. Note to include as many participants in the models as possible, we dropped missing values based on availability of data in each set of neuroimaging features included in the models (i.e., not applying listwise deletion across sets of neuroimaging features).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Commonality analyses for proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health and polygenic scores

Here, we included proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health and/or the polygenic scores. Given that family members had more similar genetics than non-members, we changed our centring strategy to polygenic scores. With the proxy measure based on polygenic scores, we applied 1) centring on two levels: centring its values within each family first and then within each site (denoted cws, cwf) 2) averaging on two levels: averaging of its values within each family first and then within each site (denoted $savg, favg$). Accordingly, we applied the following lme4 syntax for the models with both proxy measures:

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{x}_{mental\ health(cws)} + \beta_2 \mathbf{x}_{mental\ health(savg)} + \beta_3 \mathbf{x}_{PGS(cws,cwf)} + \beta_4 \mathbf{x}_{PGS(savg,favg)} + (1|site{:}\ family), \quad (4)$$

We computed unique and common effects as follows:

$$Unique_{mental\ health} = R^2_{mental\ health,PGS} - R^2_{PGS}$$
$$Unique_{genes} = R^2_{mental\ health,PGS} - R^2_{mental\ health}$$
$$Common_{mental\ health,PGS} = R^2_{mental\ health,PGS} - Unique_{mental\ health} - Unique_{PGS}, \quad (5)$$

Commonality analyses for proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health and socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments

Here, we included proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health and/or socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments. We applied the following lme4 syntax for the models with both proxy measures:

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{x}_{mental\ health(cws)} + \beta_2 \mathbf{x}_{mental\ health(savg)} + \beta_3 \mathbf{x}_{soc\ lif\ dev(cws)} + \beta_4 \mathbf{x}_{soc\ lif\ dev(savg)} + (1|site{:}\ family), \quad (6)$$

where soc lif dev shorts for socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments. We computed unique and common effects [22] as follows:

$$Unique_{mental\ health} = R^2_{mental\ health,soc\ lif\ dev} - R^2_{soc\ lif\ dev}$$
$$Unique_{soc\ lif\ dev} = R^2_{mental\ health,soc\ lif\ dev} - R^2_{mental\ health}$$
$$Common_{mental\ health,soc\ lif\ dev} = R^2_{mental\ health,soc\ lif\ dev} - Unique_{mental\ health} - Unique_{soc\ lif\ dev}, \quad (7)$$

Commonality analyses for proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health, neuroimaging, polygenic scores and socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments

Here, we included proxy measures of cognitive abilities based on mental health, neuroimaging, polygenic scores and/or socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments. We applied the following lme4 syntax for the model with all proxy measures included:

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{x}_{mental\ health(cws)} + \beta_2 \mathbf{x}_{mental\ health(savg)} + \beta_3 \mathbf{x}_{neuroimaging(cws)} + \beta_4 \mathbf{x}_{(savg)} + \beta_5 \mathbf{x}_{PGS(cws,cwf)} + \beta_6 \mathbf{x}_{PGS(savg,favg)} + \beta_7 \mathbf{x}_{soc\ lif\ dev(cws)} + \beta_8 \mathbf{x}_{soc\ lif\ dev(savg)} + (1|site{:}\ family), \quad (8)$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

We computed unique and common effects [22] as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&Unique_{mh} = R^2_{mh,b,s,g} - R^2_{b,s,g} \\
&Unique_{b} = R^2_{mh,b,s,g} - R^2_{mh,s,g} \\
&Unique_{s} = R^2_{mh,b,s,g} - R^2_{mh,b,g} \\
&Unique_{g} = R^2_{mh,b,s,g} - R^2_{mh,b,s} \\
&Common_{mh,b} = -R^2_{s,g} + R^2_{mh,s,g} + R^2_{b,s,g} - R^2_{mh,b,s,g} \\
&Common_{mh,s} = -R^2_{b,g} + R^2_{mh,b,g} + R^2_{b,s,g} - R^2_{mh,b,s,g} \\
&Common_{mh,g} = -R^2_{b,s} + R^2_{mh,b,s} + R^2_{b,s,g} - R^2_{mh,b,s,g} \\
&Common_{b,s} = -R^2_{mh,g} + R^2_{mh,b,g} + R^2_{mh,s,g} - R^2_{mh,b,s,g} \\
&Common_{b,g} = -R^2_{mh,s} + R^2_{mh,b,s} + R^2_{mh,s,g} - R^2_{mh,b,s,g} \\
&Common_{mh,b,s} = -R^2_{g} + R^2_{mh,g} + R^2_{b,g} + R^2_{s,g} - R^2_{mh,b,g} - R^2_{mh,s,g} - R^2_{b,s,g} + R^2_{mh,b,s,g} \\
&Common_{mh,b,g} = -R^2_{s} + R^2_{mh,s} + R^2_{b,s} + R^2_{s,g} - R^2_{mh,b,s} - R^2_{mh,s,g} - R^2_{b,s,g} + R^2_{mh,b,s,g} \\
&Common_{mh,s,g} = -R^2_{b} + R^2_{mh,b} + R^2_{b,s} + R^2_{b,g} - R^2_{mh,b,s} - R^2_{mh,b,g} - R^2_{b,s,g} + R^2_{mh,b,s,g} \\
&Common_{b,s,g} = -R^2_{mh} + R^2_{mh,b} + R^2_{mh,s} + R^2_{mh,g} - R^2_{mh,b,s} - R^2_{mh,b,g} - R^2_{mh,s,g} + R^2_{mh,b,s,g} \\
&Common_{mh,b,s,g} = R^2_{mh} + R^2_{b} + R^2_{s} + R^2_{g} - R^2_{mh,b} - R^2_{mh,s} - R^2_{mh,g} - R^2_{b,s} - R^2_{b,g} - R^2_{s,g} + \\
&R^2_{mh,b,s} + R^2_{mh,b,g} + R^2_{mh,s,g} + R^2_{b,s,g} - R^2_{mh,b,s,g}, \qquad (9)
\end{aligned}
$$

where mh, b, g, and s denote mental health, brain (i.e., neuroimaging), genetic profile (i.e., polygenic scores) and/or socio-demographics, lifestyles and developments, respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Declaration of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Data Sharing

We used publicly available ABCD 4.0 data provided by the ABCD study (https://abcdstudy.org), held in the NIMH Data Archive (https://nda.nih.gov/abcd/). We uploaded the R analysis script and detailed outputs here: https://github.com/HAM-lab-Otago-University/Commonality-analysis-ABCD4.0

Acknowledgements

Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study (https://abcdstudy.org), held in the NIMH Data Archive (NDA). This is a multisite, longitudinal study designed to recruit more than 10,000 children age 9–10 and follow them over 10 years into early adulthood. The ABCD Study is supported by the National Institutes of Health and additional federal partners under award numbers U01DA041022, U01DA041028, U01DA041048, U01DA041089, U01DA041106, U01DA041117, U01DA041120, U01DA041134, U01DA041148, U01DA041156, U01DA041174, U24DA041123, U24DA041147, U01DA041093 and U01DA041025. A full list of supporters is available at https://abcdstudy.org/federal-partners.html. A listing of participating sites and a complete listing of the study investigators can be found at https://abcdstudy.org/scientists/workgroups/. ABCD consortium investigators designed and implemented the study and/or provided data but did not necessarily participate in the analysis or writing of this report. This manuscript reflects the views of the authors and may not reflect the opinions or views of the NIH or ABCD consortium investigators. We thank the ABCD team. The authors wish to acknowledge the use of New Zealand eScience Infrastructure (NeSI) high performance computing facilities, consulting support and/or training services as part of this research. New Zealand's national facilities are provided by NeSI and funded jointly by NeSI's collaborator institutions and through the Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment's Research Infrastructure programme. URL https://www.nesi.org.nz. Yue Wang and Narun Pat were supported by Health Research Council Funding (21/618), by University of Otago and by Neurological Foundation of New Zealand (2350 PRG).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

References

1. Insel, T. *et al.* Research Domain Criteria (RDoC): Toward a New Classification Framework for Research on Mental Disorders. *AJP* **167**, 748–751 (2010).
2. Kendler, K. S. & Solomon, M. Expert consensus v. evidence-based approaches in the revision of the DSM. *Psychological Medicine* **46**, 2255–2262 (2016).
3. Pacheco, J. *et al.* Annual Research Review: The contributions of the RDoC research framework on understanding the neurodevelopmental origins, progression and treatment of mental illnesses. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* (2022) doi:10.1111/jcpp.13543.
4. Cuthbert, B. N. & Insel, T. R. Toward the future of psychiatric diagnosis: the seven pillars of RDoC. *BMC Med* **11**, 126 (2013).
5. Sanislow, C. A. *et al.* Developing constructs for psychopathology research: Research domain criteria. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* **119**, 631–639 (2010).
6. Carter, C. S. & Barch, D. M. Cognitive Neuroscience-Based Approaches to Measuring and Improving Treatment Effects on Cognition in Schizophrenia: The CNTRICS Initiative. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* **33**, 1131–1137 (2007).
7. Morris, S. E. & Cuthbert, B. N. Research Domain Criteria: cognitive systems, neural circuits, and dimensions of behavior. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci* **14**, 29–37 (2012).
8. Dadi, K. *et al.* Population modeling with machine learning can enhance measures of mental health. *GigaScience* **10**, giab071 (2021).
9. Pat, N. *et al.* Longitudinally stable, brain-based predictive models mediate the relationships between childhood cognition and socio-demographic, psychological and genetic factors. *Human Brain Mapping* **43**, 5520–5542 (2022).
10. Vieira, B. H. *et al.* On the prediction of human intelligence from neuroimaging: A systematic review of methods and reporting. *Intelligence* **93**, 101654 (2022).
11. Allegrini, A. G. *et al.* Genomic prediction of cognitive traits in childhood and adolescence. *Mol Psychiatry* **24**, 819–827 (2019).
12. Flynn, J. R. *What Is Intelligence? Beyond the Flynn Effect*. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK□; New York, 2009).
13. Kirlic, N. *et al.* Extracurricular Activities, Screen Media Activity, and Sleep May Be Modifiable Factors Related to Children's Cognitive Functioning: Evidence From the ABCD Study®. *Child Development* (2021) doi:10.1111/cdev.13578.
14. Morris, S. E. *et al.* Revisiting the seven pillars of RDoC. *BMC Medicine* **20**, 220 (2022).
15. Casey, B. J. *et al.* The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study: Imaging acquisition across 21 sites. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience* **32**, 43–54 (2018).
16. Achenbach, T. M., Ivanova, M. Y. & Rescorla, L. A. Empirically based assessment and taxonomy of psychopathology for ages 1½–90+ years: Developmental, multi-informant, and multicultural findings. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* **79**, 4–18 (2017).
17. Johnson, S. L., Turner, R. J. & Iwata, N. BIS/BAS Levels and Psychiatric Disorder: An Epidemiological Study. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment* **25**, 25–36 (2003).
18. Carver, C. S. & Johnson, S. L. Impulsive reactivity to emotion and vulnerability to psychopathology. *American Psychologist* **73**, 1067–1078 (2018).
19. Davies, G. *et al.* Study of 300,486 individuals identifies 148 independent genetic loci influencing general cognitive function. *Nat Commun* **9**, 2098 (2018).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

20. Lee, J. J. *et al.* Gene discovery and polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational attainment in 1.1 million individuals. *Nature Genetics* **50**, 1112–1121 (2018).
21. Savage, J. E. *et al.* Genome-wide association meta-analysis in 269,867 individuals identifies new genetic and functional links to intelligence. *Nat Genet* **50**, 912–919 (2018).
22. Nimon, K., Lewis, M., Kane, R. & Haynes, R. M. An R package to compute commonality coefficients in the multiple regression case: An introduction to the package and a practical example. *Behavior Research Methods* **40**, 457–466 (2008).
23. Lundberg, S. M. & Lee, S.-I. A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions. in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* vol. 30 (Curran Associates, Inc., 2017).
24. Abramovitch, A., Short, T. & Schweiger, A. The C Factor: Cognitive dysfunction as a transdiagnostic dimension in psychopathology. *Clinical Psychology Review* **86**, 102007 (2021).
25. Carver, C. S. & White, T. L. Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **67**, 319–333 (1994).
26. Zapolski, T. C. B., Stairs, A. M., Settles, R. F., Combs, J. L. & Smith, G. T. The Measurement of Dispositions to Rash Action in Children. *Assessment* **17**, 116–125 (2010).
27. Engemann, D. A. *et al.* Combining magnetoencephalography with magnetic resonance imaging enhances learning of surrogate-biomarkers. *Elife* **9**, e54055 (2020).
28. Rasero, J., Sentis, A. I., Yeh, F.-C. & Verstynen, T. Integrating across neuroimaging modalities boosts prediction accuracy of cognitive ability. *PLOS Computational Biology* **17**, e1008347 (2021).
29. Tetereva, A., Li, J., Deng, J. D., Stringaris, A. & Pat, N. Capturing brain□cognition relationship: Integrating task□based fMRI across tasks markedly boosts prediction and test□retest reliability. *NeuroImage* **263**, 119588 (2022).
30. Sripada, C., Angstadt, M., Rutherford, S., Taxali, A. & Shedden, K. Toward a "treadmill test" for cognition: Improved prediction of general cognitive ability from the task activated brain. *Human Brain Mapping* **41**, 3186–3197 (2020).
31. Carver, C. S. & White, T. L. Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **67**, 319–333 (1994).
32. Luciana, M. *et al.* Adolescent neurocognitive development and impacts of substance use: Overview of the adolescent brain cognitive development (ABCD) baseline neurocognition battery. *Dev Cogn Neurosci* **32**, 67–79 (2018).
33. Thompson, W. K. *et al.* The structure of cognition in 9 and 10 year-old children and associations with problem behaviors: Findings from the ABCD study's baseline neurocognitive battery. *Dev Cogn Neurosci* **36**, 100606 (2019).
34. Casey, B. J. *et al.* The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study: Imaging acquisition across 21 sites. *Dev Cogn Neurosci* **32**, 43–54 (2018).
35. Yang, R. & Jernigan, Terry. Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study (ABCD) - Annual Release 4.0. NIMH Data Repositories https://doi.org/10.15154/1523041.
36. Garavan, H. *et al.* Recruiting the ABCD sample: Design considerations and procedures. *Dev Cogn Neurosci* **32**, 16–22 (2018).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

37. Bartsch, H. Release Notes: Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study (ABCD) Data Release 4.0.
38. Snellen, H. *Letterproeven, tot bepaling der gezigtsscherpte*. (J. Greven, 1862).
39. Clark, D. B. *et al.* Biomedical ethics and clinical oversight in multisite observational neuroimaging studies with children and adolescents: The ABCD experience. *Dev Cogn Neurosci* **32**, 143–154 (2018).
40. Gershon, R. C. *et al.* Language measures of the NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc* **20**, 642–651 (2014).
41. Bleck, T. P., Nowinski, C. J., Gershon, R. & Koroshetz, W. J. What is the NIH toolbox, and what will it mean to neurology? *Neurology* **80**, 874–875 (2013).
42. Eriksen, B. A. & Eriksen, C. W. Effects of noise letters upon the identification of a target letter in a nonsearch task. *Perception & Psychophysics* **16**, 143–149 (1974).
43. Carlozzi, N. E., Tulsky, D. S., Kail, R. V. & Beaumont, J. L. VI. NIH TOOLBOX COGNITION BATTERY (CB): MEASURING PROCESSING SPEED. *Monogr Soc Res Child Dev* **78**, 88–102 (2013).
44. Bauer, P. J. *et al.* III. NIH TOOLBOX COGNITION BATTERY (CB): MEASURING EPISODIC MEMORY. *Monogr Soc Res Child Dev* **78**, 34–48 (2013).
45. Daniel, M. H. & Wahlstrom, D. Equivalence of Q-interactive™ and Paper Administrations of Cognitive Tasks: WISC®–V. (2014).
46. Ang, Y.-S., Frontero, N., Belleau, E. & Pizzagalli, D. A. Disentangling vulnerability, state and trait features of neurocognitive impairments in depression. *Brain* **143**, 3865–3877 (2020).
47. Pat, N. *et al.* Motivation and Cognitive Abilities as Mediators Between Polygenic Scores and Psychopathology in Children. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* **61**, 782-795.e3 (2022).
48. Jorgensen, T. D. *et al.* semTools: Useful Tools for Structural Equation Modeling. (2022).
49. Rosseel, Y. lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software* **48**, 1–36 (2012).
50. Epskamp, S. semPlot: Unified Visualizations of Structural Equation Models. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* **22**, 474–483 (2015).
51. Whiteside, S. P. & Lynam, D. R. Understanding the role of impulsivity and externalizing psychopathology in alcohol abuse: Application of the UPPS Impulsive Behavior Scale. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology* **11**, 210–217 (2003).
52. Hagler, D. J. *et al.* Image processing and analysis methods for the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study. *Neuroimage* **202**, 116091 (2019).
53. Fortin, J.-P. *et al.* Harmonization of multi-site diffusion tensor imaging data. *Neuroimage* **161**, 149–170 (2017).
54. Johnson, W. E., Li, C. & Rabinovic, A. Adjusting batch effects in microarray expression data using empirical Bayes methods. *Biostatistics* **8**, 118–127 (2007).
55. Nielson, D. *et al. Detecting and Harmonizing Scanner Differences in the ABCD Study - Annual Release 1.0*. (2018). doi:10.1101/309260.
56. Bolt, T., Nomi, J. S., Yeo, B. T. T. & Uddin, L. Q. Data-Driven Extraction of a Nested Model of Human Brain Function. *J Neurosci* **37**, 7263–7277 (2017).
57. Pat, N., Wang, Y., Bartonicek, A., Candia, J. & Stringaris, A. *Explainable Machine Learning Approach to Predict and Explain the Relationship between Task-Based fMRI and Individual Differences in Cognition*.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.10.21.348367 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.10.21.348367.

58. Dale, A. M., Fischl, B. & Sereno, M. I. Cortical surface-based analysis. I. Segmentation and surface reconstruction. *Neuroimage* **9**, 179–194 (1999).
59. Destrieux, C., Fischl, B., Dale, A. & Halgren, E. Automatic parcellation of human cortical gyri and sulci using standard anatomical nomenclature. *NeuroImage* **53**, 1–15 (2010).
60. Fischl, B. *et al.* Whole brain segmentation: automated labeling of neuroanatomical structures in the human brain. *Neuron* **33**, 341–355 (2002).
61. Barch, D. M. *et al.* Function in the human connectome: task-fMRI and individual differences in behavior. *Neuroimage* **80**, 169–189 (2013).
62. Knutson, B., Westdorp, A., Kaiser, E. & Hommer, D. FMRI visualization of brain activity during a monetary incentive delay task. *Neuroimage* **12**, 20–27 (2000).
63. Whelan, R. *et al.* Adolescent impulsivity phenotypes characterized by distinct brain networks. *Nat Neurosci* **15**, 920–925 (2012).
64. Bissett, P. G., Hagen, M. P., Jones, H. M. & Poldrack, R. A. Design issues and solutions for stop-signal data from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study. *eLife* **10**, e60185 (2021).
65. Gordon, E. M. *et al.* Generation and Evaluation of a Cortical Area Parcellation from Resting-State Correlations. *Cerebral Cortex* **26**, 288–303 (2016).
66. Alexander, A. L., Lee, J. E., Lazar, M. & Field, A. S. Diffusion tensor imaging of the brain. *Neurotherapeutics* **4**, 316–329 (2007).
67. Hagler, D. J. *et al.* Automated white-matter tractography using a probabilistic diffusion tensor atlas: Application to temporal lobe epilepsy. *Hum Brain Mapp* **30**, 1535–1547 (2009).
68. Uban, K. A. *et al.* Biospecimens and the ABCD study: Rationale, methods of collection, measurement and early data. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience* **32**, 97–106 (2018).
69. Duncan, L. *et al.* Analysis of polygenic risk score usage and performance in diverse human populations. *Nat Commun* **10**, 3328 (2019).
70. Auton, A. *et al.* A global reference for human genetic variation. *Nature* **526**, 68–74 (2015).
71. Choi, S. W., Mak, T. S.-H. & O'Reilly, P. F. Tutorial: a guide to performing polygenic risk score analyses. *Nature Protocols* **15**, 2759–2772 (2020).
72. Zucker, R. A. *et al.* Assessment of culture and environment in the Adolescent Brain and Cognitive Development Study: Rationale, description of measures, and early data. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience* **32**, 107–120 (2018).
73. Dick, A. S. *et al.* No evidence for a bilingual executive function advantage in the ABCD study. *Nat Hum Behav* **3**, 692–701 (2019).
74. Kind, A. J. H. *et al.* Neighborhood Socioeconomic Disadvantage and 30-Day Rehospitalization. *Ann Intern Med* **161**, 765–774 (2014).
75. Frostenson, S., April 6, S. K. on, 2016 & ET, 8:50 a m. Where is the lead exposure risk in your community? *Vox.com* http://www.vox.com/a/lead-exposure-risk-map.
76. Federal Bureau Of Investigation. Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, 2010: Version 2. ICPSR - Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR33523.V2 (2012).
77. Echeverria, S. E., Diez-Roux, A. V. & Link, B. G. Reliability of self-reported neighborhood characteristics. *J Urban Health* **81**, 682–701 (2004).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

78. Stover, P. J., Harlan, W. R., Hammond, J. A., Hendershot, T. & Hamilton, C. M. PhenX: a toolkit for interdisciplinary genetics research. *Current Opinion in Lipidology* **21**, 136 (2010).
79. Chilcoat, H. D. & Anthony, J. C. Impact of Parent Monitoring on Initiation of Drug Use through Late Childhood. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry* **35**, 91–100 (1996).
80. Schaefer, E. S. A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology* **29**, 552–557 (1965).
81. Goodman, R., Meltzer, H. & Bailey, V. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a pilot study on the validity of the self-report version. *Int Rev Psychiatry* **15**, 173–177 (2003).
82. Moos, R. H., Insel, P. M. & Humphrey, B. *Preliminary Manual for Family Environment Scale, Work Environment Scale, Group Environment Scale*. (Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo, Alto, Calif., 1974).
83. Kessler, R. C. *et al.* Design and field procedures in the US National Comorbidity Survey Replication Adolescent Supplement (NCS-A). *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* **18**, 69–83 (2009).
84. Merikangas, K. R., Avenevoli, S., Costello, E. J., Koretz, D. & Kessler, R. C. National Comorbidity Survey Replication Adolescent Supplement (NCS-A): I. Background and Measures. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry* **48**, 367–379 (2009).
85. Bruni, O. *et al*. The Sleep Disturbance Scale for Children (SDSC) Construct ion and validation of an instrument to evaluate sleep disturbances in childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Sleep Research* **5**, 251–261 (1996).
86. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS) | CDC. https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/data/yrbs/index.htm (2023).
87. Bagot, K. S. *et al*. Current, future and potential use of mobile and wearable technologies and social media data in the ABCD study to increase understanding of contributors to child health. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience* **32**, 121–129 (2018).
88. Wold, S., Sjöström, M. & Eriksson, L. PLS-regression: a basic tool of chemometrics. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* **58**, 109–130 (2001).
89. Dormann, C. F. *et al.* Collinearity: a review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography* **36**, 27–46 (2013).
90. Caspi, A. & Moffitt, T. E. All for One and One for All: Mental Disorders in One Dimension. *AJP* **175**, 831–844 (2018).
91. Rohart, F., Gautier, B., Singh, A. & Cao, K.-A. L. mixOmics: An R package for 'omics feature selection and multiple data integration. *PLOS Computational Biology* **13**, e1005752 (2017).
92. Kuhn, M. & Wickham, H. tidymodels. tidymodels (2023).
93. Fassbender, C., Mukherjee, P. & Schweitzer, J. B. Minimizing noise in pediatric task-based functional MRI; Adolescents with developmental disabilities and typical development. *NeuroImage* **149**, 338–347 (2017).
94. Zou, H. & Hastie, T. Regularization and Variable Selection via the Elastic Net. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **67**, 301–320 (2005).
95. Pat, N., Wang, Y., Bartonicek, A., Candia, J. & Stringaris, A. Explainable machine learning approach to predict and explain the relationship between task-based fMRI

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.24302602; this version posted April 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

and individual differences in cognition. *Cerebral Cortex* bhac235 (2022) doi:10.1093/cercor/bhac235.

96. Molnar, C. *Interpretable Machine Learning. A Guide for Making Black Box Models Explainable*. (2019).
97. Breiman, L. Random Forests. *Machine Learning* **45**, 5–32 (2001).
98. Dupuy, D., Helbert, C. & Franco, J. DiceDesign and DiceEval: Two R Packages for Design and Analysis of Computer Experiments. *Journal of Statistical Software* **65**, 1–38 (2015).
99. Sacks, J., Welch, W. J., Mitchell, T. J. & Wynn, H. P. Design and Analysis of Computer Experiments. *Statistical Science* **4**, 409–423 (1989).
100. Santner, T. J., Williams, B. J. & Notz, W. I. The Design and Analysis of Computer Experiments.
101. *The Shapley Value: Essays in Honor of Lloyd S. Shapley*. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988). doi:10.1017/CBO9780511528446.
102. Friedman, J., Hastie, T. & Tibshirani, R. Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models via Coordinate Descent. *J Stat Softw* **33**, 1–22 (2010).
103. Wright, M. N. & Ziegler, A. ranger: A Fast Implementation of Random Forests for High Dimensional Data in C++ and R. *Journal of Statistical Software* **77**, 1–17 (2017).
104. Greenwell, B. fastshap: Fast Approximate Shapley Values. (2023).
105. Mowinckel, A. M. & Vidal-Piñeiro, D. Visualization of Brain Statistics With R Packages ggseg and ggseg3d. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science* **3**, 466–483 (2020).
106. Raudenbush, S. W. & Bryk, A. S. *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods*. (Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, 2002).
107. Nakagawa, S. & Schielzeth, H. A general and simple method for obtaining R2 from generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **4**, 133–142 (2013).
108. Vonesh, E. F., Chinchilli, V. M. & Pu, K. Goodness-of-Fit in Generalized Nonlinear Mixed-Effects Models. *Biometrics* **52**, 572–587 (1996).
109. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using **lme4**. *J. Stat. Soft.* **67**, (2015).