Neural Correlates of Non-Suicidal Self-Injury Functions: Neurobiological Vulnerabilities and Psychosocial Risks in Psychiatric Disorders

Mingzhu Li, MMed[1,2 †], Yang Xiao, MSc[1,2 †], Yuqi Ge, MMed[1,2], Huiru Yan, MSn[5], Xueni Li, MD [1,2], Weihua Yue, MD[1,2,3,4], Hao Yan, PhD[1,2*]

[1]Institute of Mental Health, Peking University Sixth Hospital, Beijing 100191, China

[2]NHC Key Laboratory of Mental Health (Peking University), National Clinical Research Center for Mental Disorders (Peking University Sixth Hospital), Beijing 100191, China

[3]PKU-IDG/McGovern Institute for Brain Research, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, China

[4]Research Unit of Diagnosis and Treatment of Mood Cognitive Disorder (2018RU006), Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Beijing 100191, China

[5]Peking University School of Nursing, Beijing 100191, China;

*Correspondence: Hao Yan

Email: hao_y@bjmu.edu.cn

Address: 51 Huayuanbei Road, Haidian District, Beijing 100191, China;

Tel: 010-82805307

† These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Background: Non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI) is common in adolescents and young adults, especially among psychiatric disorders. It arises from neurobiological and psychosocial factors, yet its underlying mechanisms remain unclear.

Methods: A total of 304 inpatients (aged 16–25 years) with NSSI and psychiatric diagnoses (major depressive disorder [MDD], bipolar disorder [BD], and eating disorders [ED]) were assessed using the Ottawa Self-Injury Inventory. Resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging were collected from 163 of them. Functional factors, representing motivations of NSSI, were identified using orthogonal projection non-negative matrix factorization. These factors were then linked to brain functional connections (FC) via canonical correlation analysis and used to classify patients into subtypes through fuzzy C-means clustering. Differences in FC and psychosocial characteristics were analyzed across subtypes.

Results: Two NSSI functional factors were identified: self-related and social-related. Self-related factor was associated with an amygdala-centered cortico-limbic network and prevalent in affective disorders (MDD and BD). Social-related factor correlated with frontoparietal and frontotemporal networks, prominent in ED. Clustering identified three NSSI functional subtypes. Subtype 1 was primarily driven by self-related functions. Subtype 2 was influenced by both self- and social-related functions with greater exposure to psychosocial risks. Subtype 3 remained undifferentiated. No subtype exclusively driven by social-related function was observed.

Conclusion: This study establishes the neural correlates of a "self-social" functional model of NSSI. Self-related functions are underpinned by emotional regulation networks, while social-related functions synergize with psychosocial risks via cognitive-emotional regulation pathways. These findings highlight the need for tailored psychological and neuromodulatory interventions targeting specific functional subtypes.

Introduction

Non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI) refers to the deliberate self-inflicted damage to body tissues without suicidal intent, commonly through methods such as cutting, burning, or hitting (1). NSSI is prevalent among adolescents, with rates ranging from 17% in typically developing adolescents (2) to 67% in psychiatric inpatient settings (3), and higher prevalence among those diagnosed with major depressive disorders (MDD), bipolar disorders (BD), and eating disorders (ED) (4). NSSI typically begins in early to middle adolescence (ages 12–14) and increases markedly by late adolescence, a trend that coincides with the peak onset of various mental disorders (5). The presence of NSSI in early adolescence is associated with the onset of mental health disorders in later adolescence (6,7) . It is also linked to a range of negative outcomes, including impaired social functions (8) and increased risk of suicide (9). Therefore, identifying factors contributing to vulnerability for prevention and intervention is essential.

Previous research has identified a range of psychosocial risk factors associated with NSSI (10), which can be broadly categorized into interpersonal and intrapersonal factors (11). Interpersonal factors include childhood abuse (12), adverse life events (12), limited family and social support (11,12). Intrapersonal factors encompass the diagnosis of depression (13), specific personality traits (13), excessive internet use (14), and other related factors. An integrated theoretical model (15) posits that distal factors, such as early interpersonal factors, can contribute to the development of intra- or interpersonal vulnerabilities, which often manifest as affective or social dysregulation (e.g., high emotion reactivity, poor communication skills).These

vulnerabilities increase the odds of mental disorders and maladaptive coping skills, including self-injury (1,15).

From a neurodevelopmental perspective, distal factors occurring during critical periods of neural maturation can influence proximal biological traits (i.e., changes in brain structure and function) (16,17). Such neural alterations may constitute a necessary, though insufficient, diathesis for the onset and maintenance of NSSI (18), forming the neurobiological vulnerability of this behavior. Neuroimaging studies on NSSI suggest that proximal neural alterations involve both bottom-up and top-down neural circuits, encompassing systems associated with emotion expression and regulation, interpersonal interactions, as well as pain and reward processing (16,17,19). Moreover, studies consistently report an association between NSSI and altered emotional processing in the cortico-limbic neurocircuitry (20–22), which is heavily implicated in emotion regulation (23) and frequently disrupted across various mental disorders (24).

Studies on risk factors and neural alterations of NSSI have provided valuable insights into the development and maintenance of this behavior. However, NSSI behaviors exhibit significant heterogeneity in terms of frequency, methods, severity, and underlying functions (25). The fragmented findings from previous researches, which lack a clear connection to the heterogeneous presentations of self-injurious behavior, have hindered our understanding of the mechanisms underlying this behavior. NSSI functions, defined as the motivations and reasons behind NSSI (26,27), are typically assessed by various specifically designed self-report questionnaires.

Substantial conceptual and empirical evidence support that NSSI serves two primary functions: intrapersonal and interpersonal functions (28,29). Intrapersonal function, particularly emotion regulation, is the most commonly reported (30,31). Interpersonal functions, such as expressing distress, are less prevalent but still significant (32). Different functions are associated with the varying severities of self-injurious behavior (33) and patient outcomes (34,35), with higher suicide risk observed among individuals endorsing the intrapersonal functions compared to interpersonal ones (36). NSSI functions are crucial for understanding the heterogeneity of self-injurious behavior, as they illuminate the underlying psychological processes that contribute to its diverse presentations. Consequently, they provide a valuable tool for uncovering the mechanisms underlying NSSI.

In this study, we aim to bridge the gap between self-injurious behaviors and their vulnerability factors. First, we identified conceptually meaningful and compact factor structures for NSSI functions in hospitalized adolescents with psychiatric disorders. Next, we examined the neural correlates of different factors of NSSI functions. Additionally, we explored the clinical characteristics and risk factors associated with the different functional factors and derived functional subtypes. Subtype-specific neural alterations and psychosocial factors will inform more precise psychological and neuromodulation interventions, while also enhancing our understanding of the cognitive and neurophysiological mechanisms underlying self-injurious behavior.

Methods

2.1 Participants

A total of 304 inpatients at Peking University Sixth Hospital were included in this study, of whom 163 patients completed magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scans. This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Peking University Sixth Hospital.

Inclusion criteria were: (1) aged 16-25 years, of any gender; (2) admission diagnosis meeting the International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision (ICD-10) criteria for depressive episode or recurrent depressive disorder, bipolar disorder, and eating disorders, as assessed by two attending or senior psychiatrists; (3) history of NSSI behavior during the past 12 months; (4) provision of written informed consent by the patient or their guardian.

Exclusion criteria were: (1) individuals exhibiting only suicidal behavior without NSSI; (2) those with mental developmental delay; (3) individuals with severe, unstable physical illnesses; (4) history of epilepsy or febrile seizures; (5) pregnant or lactating women, or those planning pregnancy.

Among the participants, 167 were diagnosed with major depressive disorders, 89 with bipolar disorders, and 48 with eating disorders. This study included patients with varying severities of NSSI behaviors: 178 participants had repeated NSSI behaviors (NSSI behaviors occurred for at least 5 days in the past year, meeting the DSM-5 diagnostic criteria for NSSI disorder), while 126 patients had occasional NSSI behaviors (NSSI behaviors occurred on at least one day but fewer than 5 days). Given

that the focus of this study is on the functions of NSSI behaviors, the functional classifications were applied to both frequent and occasional NSSI behaviors to maintain consistency across varying severities.

2.2 Measurements and Assessments

Basic demographic characteristics, medical history, comorbidities, and clinical information regarding current psychiatric disorders were collected using a self-designed Case Report Form (CRF).

The Ottawa Self-Injury Inventory (OSI) was used to assess the frequency and functions of NSSI behaviors among participants. This scale has demonstrated good reliability and validity in Chinese adolescent samples (37). The study specifically focused on the NSSI functions assessed by the 29 items of the OSI function subscale (OSI-F), which captures various motivations and intentions underlying NSSI behaviors. Responses were rated from 0 (never) to 4 (always), with higher scores indicating stronger functional tendencies.

The Self-Rating Anxiety Scale (SAS) (38) and the Self-Rating Depression Scale (SDS) (38) were used to evaluate anxiety and depressive symptoms, respectively. Additionally, several other scales were utilized to assess individual characteristics and environmental risk factors, including the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEOFFI) (39), the revised Chinese Internet Addiction Scale (CIAS-R) (40), the Adolescent Self-Rating Life Events Check List (ASLEC) (38), the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ) (41), the Family Assessment Device (FAD) (38), and the Social Support Rate Scale (SSRS) (38). Suicidal ideation and suicide attempts within the past year were

also recorded.

2.3 Factor Analysis of NSSI Functions

Orthonormal projective non-negative factorization (OPNMF) (42,43) was employed to identify latent factors underlying the NSSI functional items from the OSI-F (44). The OPNMF is a variant of NMF, which is widely used in recent biomedical studies. This method achieved factorization for given data (here, OSI-F) by yielding a probabilistic parcellation to assign latent factor loadings for each item of NSSI functions (a dictionary matrix containing factors), and these loadings quantified the extent of which each item belongs to a factor. The OPNMF method differs from the traditional NMF in that the value of loadings is invariable for each calculation by applying the inner product of the basis vectors and the input data as the loading coefficients (the projective constraint) for labeling each item according to its highest loading. Based on the projective constraint, the probabilistic parcellation can be converted into more compact and homogeneous factor definitions by adding an additional orthonormality constraint. The advantages of OPNMF enabled us to acquire a sparse, stable and therefore interpretable structure of latent factor of NSSI functions.

To determine the optimal number of factors, we employed a set of sophisticated evaluation strategies based on cross-validation with 10,000 split-half analyses. Specifically, the entire sample used in the current study was divided into two halves, and the OPNMF was conducted separately on each half to derive the dictionary matrices. We subsequently calculated the congruency between item-to-factor

assignments to examine the stability of the factor solutions at various evaluation strategies (describe in the Supplement), including the adjusted Rand index (RI), variation of information (VI), and concordance index (CI) between the dictionaries (44). Additionally, we also assessed the generalizability of the factor model by using the reconstruction error (RE) calculating the absolute differences between the projection of the dictionary from one split-sample data on the other split-sample (44). The internal consistency of the optimal OPNMF model was assessed using the Pearson's correlations with an additional bootstrapping validation procedure in which we conducted 10,000 times resampling and re-calculate the correlation coefficient. The between-items relationships under optimal factor structure were also calculated using the Pearson's correlation.

2.4 Clustering of NSSI Functional Subtypes

Factor loadings from the optimal OPNMF model were used to cluster patients into different NSSI functional subtypes. Considering the extent of differentiation of vulnerability factors related to disorder or symptoms exhibited a certain of heterogeneity in different patients, the soft clustering strategy was applied to assign patients into subtypes with distinct NSSI functions. The fuzzy C-means clustering is a frequently used soft clustering technique, which could determine the memberships likelihood that each patient belongs to a given latent cluster. This method allows us to identify those patients with an explicit inclination to specific NSSI functions and ambiguous subgroups that have not yet been differentiated into specific categories, based on a cutoff threshold.

In this study, the fuzzy C-means clustering (45) was implemented to NSSI factor loadings of all patients to encode the membership likelihood of each patient in any given subtyping clusters, after adjusting for age, gender, years of education, suicidal ideation, and suicide attempts. The fuzzy silhouette index (SI), Xie and Beni index (XB), and partition entropy (PE) were calculated at range of 2 to 6 as internal validity indices to determine the optimal number of clusters (details in Supplement). Higher SI and lower XB and PE indicated better clustering quality. To choose the cutoff to define the optimal membership discrimination, the elbow method was used at range of 70% to 90% by identifying the elbow point, where the rate of decrease in explained variance slows significantly. The elbow point represented a balance between maximizing cluster compactness and minimizing the number of clusters.

2.5 Resting-State Functional Connectivity (rsFC) Network Construction

Resting-state functional MRI data were acquired from 163 participants using the Siemens Prisma 3.0 Tesla MRI scanner. Data preprocessing was conducted using the DPABI (Data Processing Assistant for Resting State fMRI Advanced Edition) (46) software based on the MATLAB (The MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA). Standard processing procedures were followed. The scanning parameters and detailed information for each preprocessing step are available in the Supplement.

This study quantified resting-state functional connectivity (rsFC) based on the spontaneous fluctuations of resting-state bold oxygenation level dependent (BOLD) signals, generating a whole-brain rsFC matrix for each participant. We referred to a previous brain parcellation scheme comprising a total of 210 cortical regions (47) and

14 subcortical regions (48).The average time series signals of each brain region were extracted, and the Pearson's correlation coefficients were computed between the time series signals of each pair of brain regions to determine functional connectivity strength. The Fischer's *r-to-z* transformation was utilized to convert the correlation coefficients into normalized *z*-scores. A 224 × 224 functional connectivity matrix was constructed for each participant.

2.6 Modeling Neural Correlates of NSSI Functions Using rsFC

To better understand the neural correlates of NSSI functions, we trained a machine-learning algorithm based on regularized canonical correlation (RCC) with a hyper-parameterized feature selection space following a previous study (49) (details in Supplement).

Briefly, RCC based on L2 penalty (λ) was used to predict each factor loadings of NSSI functions for all patients. Out-of-sample predictions were obtained using a nested cross-validation scheme using a 90% random selection strategy (10-fold), repeated 100 times. During the training of the model in each fold, we ran a random hyperparameter search consisting of 10 iterations in a 10-fold cross-validation using the grid search and chose the best model for prediction. The optimized number of rsFC features was defined as the top-ranked features based on a bootstrapping scheme with 95% subsampling and 100 replications. The hyperparameter space was defined as follows: N_{features} ranged from 100 to 400 top-ranked rsFC features, and λ ranged from 1 to 10. We evaluated the performance of each model on the entire predicted set using canonical correlation coefficients. Statistical significance of the coefficients was

evaluated using a non-parametric permutation test with 10,000 iterations.

The correlations between the FC scores and each functional factor were using the Pearson correlation analysis. The significant threshold for all statistical analysis was set as $p < 0.001$ adjusted by multiple comparison correction using false discovery rate (FDR) method.

2.7 Statistical Analyses

Pearson's correlation analysis was used to examine the associations between factors loadings and SAS/SDS scores. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with a post-hoc Turkey test was employed to analyze differences in scale scores (e.g., CTQ, ALSE) across different subtypes or diagnostic groups (MDD, BD and ED). For ordinal and categorical variables, such as NSSI frequency and gender, chi-square tests were conducted to assess group differences. All analyses controlled for age, gender, years of education, suicidal ideation, and suicide attempts. A $p < 0.05$ was considered the threshold for statistical significance, multiple comparisons were corrected by FDR method.

Results

3.1 Demographic and Clinical Characteristics

A total of 304 participants were included in this study, with 163 of them also undergoing MRI for subsequent analysis of neural correlates. Statistical comparisons indicated that the MRI subset did not significantly differ from the overall sample in terms of age, gender distribution, level of depression and anxiety, personality traits, and various assessments for the environmental risk factors (Table 1). Despite a high

proportion of participants in both groups reporting suicidal ideation and attempts, no significant differences were observed (Table 1). Regarding the severity of NSSI, no significant differences were found between the two samples in terms of NSSI frequency, age at first episode, or functional scores (Table 1and Table S1).

---------- Insert Table 1 here ----------

3.2 Two Factors of NSSI Functions

A robust two-factor model was obtained using OPNMF based on 304 patients (Figure 2A). The first factor comprised 14 NSSI functional items in OSI-F, it mainly related to self-perception and emotional regulation, and was named as "self-related factor". The second factor comprised 15 items mainly related to interpersonal functioning and was named as "social-related factor". Model evaluation metrics indicated that a two-factor solution provided the highest stability (with the highest adjusted RI and CI values, and the lowest VI value, Figure S1A) and the strongest generalizability (with the lowest out-of-sample increase in RE value, Figure S1A). These results were validated through 1,000 times split-half cross-validation.

The items within the two NSSI functional factors decomposed by OPNMF exhibited higher correlations internally (Figure 2B). A strong negative correlation was observed between the two factors (r = -0.766, Figure S1B). Correlation analysis (Figure 2C) revealed influences of depressive and anxious emotions on the two functional factor-loadings. Although SDS and SAS scores were highly correlated among participants ($r = 0.776$, $p < 0.001$), the two factors effectively captured distinct internal characteristics of the patients. Specifically, the self-related factor-loading

showed a significant positive correlation with SDS scores (r = 0.167, p = 0.004), but no significant correlation with SAS scores (r = 0.075, p = 0.194). However, the social-related factor loading was significantly correlated with SAS scores (r = 0.229, p < 0.001) but not with SDS scores (r = 0.075, p = 0.191). Further analysis based on disease diagnosis revealed that the self-related factor-loading was higher in mood disorders (MDD = BD > ED), whereas the social-related factor showed higher loadings in eating disorders (ED > MDD = BD, Figure 2C).

---------- Insert Figure 2 here ----------

3.3 Subtypes of NSSI Function

Fuzzy C-means clustering applied to the two-factor loadings revealed the optimal solution was to divide patients into two clusters (Figure S2). The core members of each cluster were selected based on their likelihoods derived from the fuzzy C-means algorithm, with a cutoff threshold of 0.80. Consequently, two core subtypes of NSSI functions were defined, with 52 ambiguous patients located near the intersection of the clusters (Figure 3A).

Subtype 1, the largest group, included 154 patients (50.7%) and was characterized by higher loadings on the self-related factor and lower loadings on the social-related factor, leading to its designation as the “self-related” subtype (Figure 3A). Subtype 2, termed the “social-related” subtype, comprised 98 patients (32.2%) and was characterized by higher loadings on the social-related factor and lower loadings on the self-related factor. A total of 52 ambiguous patients, dispersed between subtype 1 and 2, were categorized as subtype 3, the smallest group (17.1%).

No significant differences were found in gender, age, or diagnostic distribution across the three subtypes. Additionally, the subtypes showed similar profiles regarding suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, age of onset, and the frequency and severity of NSSI (Table 2 and Table S2).

Regarding NSSI function, the subtype 2 (social-related) exhibited a significantly higher total function score compared to the other two subtypes (F = 35.553, p < 0.001). Interestingly, in contrast to the factor loadings, subtype 2 showed higher scores on both self-related and social-related OSI-F items (Table 2), with multiple functions being reported (F = 23.930, p < 0.001). These differences were not significant between subtype 1 and the undifferentiated subtype 3.

Levels of anxiety and depression were significantly different across three subtypes (Figure 3B and Table 2; SAS: F = 4.952, p = 0.008; SDS: F = 3.047, p = 0.049). Specifically, post hoc comparisons revealed that SAS scores in subtype 2 were significantly higher than those in subtype 3 (p = 0.02); SDS scores in subtype 1 and subtype 2 were significantly higher compared to subtype 3 (1 vs 3: p = 0.024, 2 vs 3: p = 0.023).

Regarding potential NSSI risk factors, no significant differences were found in the total scores for the FAD, CTQ, and SSRS, which assess family functioning, childhood trauma, and social support, respectively, among the three subtypes. Differences were primarily observed in ASLEC, NEOFFI, and CIAS (Figure 3D and Table 2). Specifically, subtype 2 reported significantly higher scores on several dimensions of the ASLEC (F = 18.227, p < 0.001), including "catch hell," "loss,"

"interpersonal pressure," "learning pressure," and "healthy adaptation" ($p < 0.05$, FDR corrected), suggested a higher level of exposure to life events. Similarly, subtype 2 exhibited significantly higher levels of internet addiction, as measured by the CIAS ($F = 5.212$, $p = 0.006$). In terms of personality traits assessed with NEOFFI, subtype 2 scored significantly higher in neuroticism compared to the other subtypes ($F = 6.355$, $p = 0.002$) and significantly lower in agreeableness ($F = 8.532$, $p < 0.001$).

---------- Insert Figure 3 and Table 2 here ----------

3.4 rsFC Features Related to Functional Factors and Subtypes

We conducted RCCA to investigate the rsFC features that best related to the two-factors of NSSI function using MRI data from 163 participants. To minimize overfitting, we performed a subsampling and cross-validated procedure (see Supplement). This procedure identified two dimensions of rsFC features related to NSSI functions.

The first dimension was significantly positively correlated with loading of self-related factor (Figure 4A, $r = 0.656$, $p = 0.005$), while the second dimension was associated with the loading of social-related factor ($r = 0.602$, $p = 0.012$). We then measured the regional contributions of each dimension (Figure 4A). The top five representative brain regions for the first dimension included the right amygdala (13.5%), left amygdala (6.5%), left caudal cuneus gyrus (4.0%), left ventromedial parietooccipital sulcus (2.6%) and right putamen (2.6%). For the social-related dimension, the top representative brain regions are in the right dorsolateral frontal cortex (Brodmann area, [BA] 6, 5.4%), left ventrolateral frontal cortex (BA8, 4.6%),

left medial parietal area (BA7, 4.4%), left dorsal frontal area (BA9/46, 3.9%) and right amygdala (3.4%).

To better understand how atypical functional connectivity in specific regions and networks relates to the functional factors and subtypes of NSSI, we examined the rsFC correlates of each dimension and the differences between subtypes. The self-related dimension was associated with extensive cortico-subcortical functional connectivity (Figure S6). Specifically, the 23 significant connections, surviving a threshold of $p < 0.001$, highlight rsFC between the amygdala and various cortical regions, including the superior frontal gyrus (SFG), precentral gyrus, superior temporal gyrus (STG), parahippocampal gyrus, postcentral gyrus, insular gyrus, and occipital lobe. Additionally, rsFC between the putamen and the occipital lobe, as well as subcortical connections between the putamen and the amygdala, were observed (Figure 4A, Table S6). Regarding these self-related connections, subtype 1 showed a significantly higher rsFC compared to subtype 2 and 3, with no differences between subtype 2 and 3 (Figure 4B).

In contrast, the social-related dimension demonstrated a more localized set of rsFC, with six significant connections identified. These connections involved rsFC between the fronto-parietal and fronto-temporal network, as well as connections between the inferior temporal gyrus and hippocampus, dorsolateral superior frontal gyrus and insular gyrus (Figure 4A, Table S6). Subtype 2 exhibited elevated rsFC compared to subtype 1, while no significant differences were observed between subtype 2 and 3 or between subtype 1 and 3 (Figure 4B).

---------- Insert Figure 4 here ----------

3.5 Sensitivity Analysis

We conducted an OPNMF on the revised OSI-F (with 7 items deleted) (50) for sensitivity analysis. The results indicated that both the self-related and social-related factors comprised 11 items each, confirming a stable and generalizable two-factor structure (Figure S3A-B). The model maintained good inter-factor independence (Figure S3C, r = -0.715, $p < 0.001$) and high internal factor consistency (r = 0.968, $p < 0.001$). Further imaging verification found that the two factors were still significantly correlated with the previously obtained rsFC characteristics (Figure S3D; self-related: r = 0.689, $p < 0.001$; social-related: r = 0.774, $p < 0.001$). Additionally, whether for patients with repeated NSSI behaviors or those with occasional NSSI behaviors, the two-factor structure was found to be optimal. Despite the presence of some potentially confusing individual items, the model consistently upheld strong inter-factor independence and internal factor consistency in both groups (Figures S4-S5). The correlation with rsFC characteristics were also reliably replicated across these patient groups (Figures S4-S5).

Discussion

This study identified two conceptually meaningful and compact factors underlying the motivations and reasons of NSSI behaviors. The self-related factor was associated with emotional regulation and self-perception, while the social-related factor was linked to interpersonal influence and social interactions. Subtype with high social-related factor scores experienced more adverse life events and interpersonal stress,

highlighting the role of psychosocial risk factors. Neuroimaging analyses indicated that self-related functions linked to the cortico-limbic network involving the amygdala, and social-related functions associated with frontoparietal and frontotemporal networks. These findings provide insight into the neural underpinnings of heterogenous NSSI behaviors, highlighting the synergistic effect of neurobiological diatheses and psychosocial factors.

The self-related and social-related factor structures identified in our study align conceptually to the previously proposed intrapersonal and interpersonal functions, respectively (29,51). The self-related factor emphasizes on reinforcement from the self, including affect regulation, self-punishment, anti-dissociation, anti-suicide, and marking distress. In contrast, the social-related factor focuses on reinforcement from others or the environment, involving interpersonal influence, establishing boundaries and seeking peer bonding. Importantly, the identified subtypes indicate that these functions are not mutually exclusive but rather reflect overlapping motivations, which vary in emphasis across individuals. Specifically, both subtype 1 (self-related) and subtype 2 (social-related) exhibit self-related motivations, while subtype 2 also demonstrates significant interpersonal concerns. NSSI was not found to be independently driven by social-related motivations, indicating that the self-related motivational basis is substantially more dominant (30).

Psychosocial factors further differentiate these subtypes. Subtype 2 showed greater exposure to adverse life events and a higher tendency toward problematic internet use. These findings align with studies showing that social distress can

exacerbate emotional dysregulation, reinforcing both self- and social-related motivations for NSSI (52,53). Subtype 2 also reported significantly higher neuroticism and lower agreeableness compared to other subtypes. These personality traits are consistent with prior studies linking higher neuroticism to emotional dysregulation and vulnerability to mental health disorders (54), while lower agreeableness reflects difficulties in interpersonal relationships (55). These findings suggest that interventions targeting emotional regulation may benefit all NSSI subtypes; however, for individuals in subtype 2, targeting both emotion regulation skills and interpersonal effectiveness, offering a more tailored approach to treatment.

Although the diagnostic distribution of mental disorders did not show significant differences across the subtypes, we observed a notable pattern in the factor loadings. Specifically, the self-related factor loading was higher in mood disorders (MDD and BD), while the social-related factor loading was higher in eating disorders. This suggests that patients with eating disorders may be more likely to engage in NSSI for social-related reasons, such as managing interpersonal relationships or coping with social pressures (56,57). Given the relatively small sample size of eating disorder patients in this study, it is important to replicate these findings in larger cohorts to further explore the potential distinctiveness of social-related NSSI motivations in this population.

The neurobiological underpinnings of the self-related and social-related factors were explored using resting-state functional connectivity (rsFC). Amygdala, the top representative brain regions of the rsFC features related to the self-related factors, is a

central structure in emotion processing and regulation (58,59). The self-functional factor was associated with an amygdala-centered subcortical network, involving regions like the superior frontal gyrus, insular gyrus, and temporal lobes. The fronto-amygdala connection forms a key neural circuit crucial for emotion regulation (58,60,61), and enhanced connectivity within this circuit may contribute to increased rumination and worry (62,63). The amygdala's connectivity with the temporal lobe is crucial for emotional memory (64–66) and processing emotionally charged information (67), which may underlie self-punitive and distress-marking functions. Additionally, connections between the amygdala with temporal and insular lobes are involved in self-referential processing (68) and may facilitate the transmission of negative emotions, contributing to the emotional dysregulation observed in individuals with NSSI (69,70). Furthermore, the insula is central to interoception, emotional self-awareness, decision-making, and cognitive control (71–73). It has been linked to attention modulation and pain perception in NSSI patients (74), as well as deficits in interoceptive awareness and suicidal ideation (75). The amygdala-insula connectivity integrates bodily sensations with emotional states, supporting anti-dissociation and anti-suicide functions in the self-related factor.

For the social-related factor, connectivity was observed within fronto-parietal and fronto-temporal networks, including the inferior temporal gyrus and hippocampus, dorsolateral superior frontal gyrus and insular gyrus. These connections are involved in processing social exclusion, interpersonal influence, and emotional regulation during social interactions. The dorsal frontoparietal network supports top-down

attentional orienting processes (76,77) and is recruited during the relational integration of social information (78). Key regions, such as the medial prefrontal cortex and precuneus (the medial portion of BA7), play pivotal roles in adaptive interpersonal behavior (79) and self-related mental representations (80,81). Therefore, the attention and integration of social information may be mediated through the frontoparietal network. The insula, activated during social rejection (82), shows hyperconnectivity between with prefrontal regions, which is associated with maladaptive introspection (83) and negative emotional processing (84). These neural patterns suggest the vulnerability of NSSI individuals in regulating emotional distress and navigating complex social environments.

The application of fuzzy clustering allowed us to capture the heterogeneity of NSSI behaviors more effectively (44). The identification of an undifferentiated subtype (subtype 3), characterized by lower scores on both self- and social-related motivations, may reflect individuals who have yet to develop a dominant function for NSSI. This subgroup highlights the potential for shifts in motivational bases over time, warranting further longitudinal investigation to track changes in NSSI functions and associated neurobiological profiles.

While our study advances the understanding of the neurobiological underpinnings of NSSI behaviors, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. Firstly, our study uses cross-sectional data, which limits the ability to infer causality or the stability of the identified functional subtypes over time. Longitudinal studies are needed to assess the temporal stability and evolution of NSSI functional subtypes.

Secondly, though we used advanced factor analysis and clustering techniques, the results need to be replicated and validated using independent samples.

Our study uniquely bridging behavioral functions and brain phenotypes—an area less addressed in prior research. By identifying distinct NSSI subtypes with corresponding neurobiological features, our research paves the way for more tailored and effective interventions, enhancing treatment precision for individuals with NSSI.

Acknowledgements

We extend our gratitude to all participants in this study. This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (82071505, 81771443). HY was partly supported by Clinical Medicine Plus X – Young Scholars Project, Peking University the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (PKU2024LCXQ046) and Capital's Funds for Health Improvement and Research (2024-2-4115).

Declaration of Interest

The authors report on biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest.

Reference

1. Nock MK (2010): Self-Injury. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol* 6: 339–363.

2. Swannell SV, Martin GE, Page A, Hasking P, St John NJ (2014): Prevalence of Nonsuicidal Self-Injury in Nonclinical Samples: Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis and Meta-Regression. *Suicide Life Threat Behav* 44: 273–303.

3. Wolff J, Frazier EA, Esposito-Smythers C, Burke T, Sloan E, Spirito A (2013): Cognitive and Social Factors Associated with NSSI and Suicide Attempts in Psychiatrically Hospitalized Adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 41: 1005–1013.

4. Wang S, Kong G, Wu G, Cui H, Qian Z, Xu L, *et al.* (2023): Comparing the efficacies of transcranial magnetic stimulation treatments using different targeting methods in major depressive disorder: protocol for a network meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 13: e075525.

5. McGrath JJ, Al-Hamzawi A, Alonso J, Altwaijri Y, Andrade LH, Bromet EJ, *et al.* (2023): Age of onset and cumulative risk of mental disorders: a cross-national analysis of population surveys from 29 countries. *Lancet Psychiatry* 10: 668–681.

6. Wilkinson PO, Qiu T, Neufeld S, Jones PB, Goodyer IM (2018): Sporadic and recurrent non-suicidal self-injury before age 14 and incident onset of psychiatric disorders by 17 years: prospective cohort study. *Br J Psychiatry* 212: 222–226.

7. Mars B, Heron J, Crane C, Hawton K, Lewis G, Macleod J, *et al.* (2014): Clinical and social outcomes of adolescent self harm: population based birth cohort study. *BMJ* 349: g5954.

8. Tan AC, Rehfuss MC, Suarez EC, Parks-Savage A (2014): Nonsuicidal self-injury in an adolescent population in Singapore. *Clin Child Psychol Psychiatry* 19: 58–76.

9. Ribeiro JD, Franklin JC, Fox KR, Bentley KH, Kleiman EM, Chang BP, Nock MK (2016): Self-injurious thoughts and behaviors as risk factors for future suicide ideation, attempts, and death: a meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychol Med* 46: 225–236.

10. Qu D, Wen X, Liu B, Zhang X, He Y, Chen D, *et al.* (2023): Non-suicidal self-injury in Chinese population: a scoping review of prevalence, method, risk factors and preventive interventions. *The Lancet Regional Health–Western Pacific* 37.

11. Tatnell R, Kelada L, Hasking P, Martin G (2014): Longitudinal Analysis of Adolescent NSSI: The Role of Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Factors. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 42: 885–896.

12. Wang Y-J, Li X, Ng CH, Xu D-W, Hu S, Yuan T-F (2022): Risk factors for non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI) in adolescents: A meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine* 46: 101350.

13. Fox KR, Franklin JC, Ribeiro JD, Kleiman EM, Bentley KH, Nock MK

(2015): Meta-analysis of risk factors for nonsuicidal self-injury. *Clin Psychol Rev* 42: 156–167.

14. Wang L, Liu X, Liu Z-Z, Jia C-X (2020): Digital media use and subsequent self-harm during a 1-year follow-up of Chinese adolescents. *J Affect Disord* 277: 279–286.

15. Nock MK (2009): Why Do People Hurt Themselves? *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 18: 78–83.

16. Auerbach RP, Pagliaccio D, Allison GO, Alqueza KL, Alonso MF (2021): Neural Correlates Associated With Suicide and Nonsuicidal Self-injury in Youth. *Biological Psychiatry* 89: 119–133.

17. Kaess M, Hooley JM, Klimes-Dougan B, Koenig J, Plener PL, Reichl C, *et al.* (2021): Advancing a temporal framework for understanding the biology of nonsuicidal self- injury: An expert review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 130: 228–239.

18. Auerbach RP, Pagliaccio D, Allison GO, Alqueza KL, Alonso MF (2021): Neural Correlates Associated With Suicide and Nonsuicidal Self-injury in Youth. *Biological Psychiatry* 89: 119–133.

19. Brañas MJAA, Croci MS, Ravagnani Salto AB, Doretto VF, Martinho E, Macedo M, *et al.* (2021): Neuroimaging Studies of Nonsuicidal Self-Injury in Youth: A Systematic Review. *Life* 11: 729.

20. Westlund Schreiner M, Klimes-Dougan B, Mueller BA, Eberly LE, Reigstad KM, Carstedt PA, *et al.* (2017): Multi-modal neuroimaging of adolescents with non-suicidal self-injury: Amygdala functional connectivity. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 221: 47–55.

21. Santamarina-Perez P, Romero S, Mendez I, Leslie SM, Packer MM, Sugranyes G, *et al.* (2019): Fronto-Limbic Connectivity as a Predictor of Improvement in Nonsuicidal Self-Injury in Adolescents Following Psychotherapy. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychopharmacology* 29: 456–465.

22. Lai M, Jiang P, Xu J, Luo D, Hao X, Li J (2021): Abnormal brain activity in nonsuicidal self-injury: a coordinate-based activation likelihood meta-analysis of

functional neuroimaging studies. *Psychoradiology* 1: 249–256.

23. Catani M, Dell'acqua F, Thiebaut de Schotten M (2013): A revised limbic system model for memory, emotion and behaviour. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 37: 1724–1737.

24. Kovner R, Oler JA, Kalin NH (2019): Cortico-Limbic Interactions Mediate Adaptive and Maladaptive Responses Relevant to Psychopathology. *Am J Psychiatry* 176: 987–999.

25. Wang Z, Li D, Chen Y, Tao Z, Jiang L, He X, Zhang W (2024): Understanding the subtypes of non-suicidal self-injury: A new conceptual framework based on a systematic review. *Psychiatry Research* 334: 115816.

26. Klonsky ED (2007): The functions of deliberate self-injury: A review of the evidence. *Clinical Psychology Review* 27: 226–239.

27. Nock MK, Prinstein MJ (2004): A Functional Approach to the Assessment of Self-Mutilative Behavior. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 72: 885–890.

28. Nock MK, Prinstein MJ, Nock MK, Prinstein MJ (2004): A Functional Approach to the Assessment of Self-Mutilative Behavior. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 72: 885–890.

29. Klonsky ED, Glenn CR, Styer DM, Olino TM, Washburn JJ (2015): The functions of nonsuicidal self-injury: converging evidence for a two-factor structure. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Ment Health* 9: 44.

30. Taylor PJ, Jomar K, Dhingra K, Forrester R, Shahmalak U, Dickson JM (2018): A meta-analysis of the prevalence of different functions of non-suicidal self-injury. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 227: 759–769.

31. Klonsky ED (2009): The functions of self-injury in young adults who cut themselves: Clarifying the evidence for affect-regulation. *Psychiatry Research* 166: 260–268.

32. Muehlenkamp J, Brausch A, Quigley K, Whitlock J (2013): Interpersonal Features and Functions of Nonsuicidal Self-injury. *Suicide & Life Threat Behav* 43: 67–80.

33. Reinhardt M, Rice KG, Horváth Z (2022): Non-suicidal self-injury motivations in the light of self-harm severity indicators and psychopathology in a clinical adolescent sample. *Front Psychiatry* 13: 1046576.

34. Nock MK, Prinstein MJ (2005): Contextual features and behavioral functions of self-mutilation among adolescents. *Journal of abnormal psychology* 114: 140.

35. Park Y, Qu W, Ammerman BA (2024): Characteristics and Functions of Non-Suicidal Self-Injury That Inform Suicide Risk. *Archives of Suicide Research* 1–14.

36. Victor SE, Styer D, Washburn JJ (2015): Characteristics of nonsuicidal self-injury associated with suicidal ideation: evidence from a clinical sample of youth. *Child and adolescent psychiatry and mental health* 9: 1–8.

37. [CHENG Wen-hong ZF et al, XIAO Ze-ping (2015): Study on reliability and validity of Chinese version of Ottawa self-injury inventory. *Journal of Shanghai Jiao Tong University (Medical Science)* 35: 460-.

38. Xiang Dong Wang, Wang XL, Ma H (1999): *Rating Scales for Mental Health*. Beijing: Chinese Mental Health Journal Press.

39. Huang XT (2003): Handbook of personality: theory and research. *Shanghai: East China Normal University Press, doi* 10: 2093310.

40. Bai Y, Fan F (2005): A Study on the Internet Dependence of College Students: the Revising and Applying of a Measurement. *Psychological Development and Education* 21: 99–104.

41. Zhao X, Zhang Y, Li L, Zhou Y (2005): Evaluation on reliability and validity of Chinese version of childhood trauma questionnaire. *Chinese Journal of Tissue Engineering Research* 209–211.

42. Sotiras A, Resnick SM, Davatzikos C (2015): Finding imaging patterns of structural covariance via Non-Negative Matrix Factorization. *NeuroImage* 108: 1–16.

43. Zhirong Yang, Oja E (2010): Linear and Nonlinear Projective Nonnegative Matrix Factorization. *IEEE Trans Neural Netw* 21: 734–749.

44. Chen J, Patil KR, Weis S, Sim K, Nickl-Jockschat T, Zhou J, *et al.* (2020): Neurobiological Divergence of the Positive and Negative Schizophrenia Subtypes

Identified on a New Factor Structure of Psychopathology Using Non-negative Factorization: An International Machine Learning Study. *Biological Psychiatry* 87: 282–293.

45. Bezdek JC (1981): *Pattern Recognition With Fuzzy Objective Function Algorithms*. Pattern Recognition with Fuzzy Objective Function Algorithms.

46. Yan CG, Wang XD, Zuo XN, Zang YF (2016): DPABI: Data Processing & Analysis for (Resting-State) Brain Imaging. *Neuroinformatics* 14: 339–351.

47. Fan L, Li H, Zhuo J, Zhang Y, Wang J, Chen L, *et al.* (2016): The Human Brainnetome Atlas: A New Brain Atlas Based on Connectional Architecture. *Cereb Cortex* 26: 3508–3526.

48. Desikan RS, Ségonne F, Fischl B, Quinn BT, Dickerson BC, Blacker D, *et al.* (2006): An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *Neuroimage* 31: 968–980.

49. Buch AM, Vértes PE, Seidlitz J, Kim SH, Grosenick L, Liston C (2023): Molecular and network-level mechanisms explaining individual differences in autism spectrum disorder. *Nat Neurosci* 26: 650–663.

50. Chen H, Pan B, Zhang C, Guo Y, Zhou J, Wang X (2022): Revision of the non-suicidal self-injury behavior scale for adolescents with mental disorder. *Zhong Nan Da Xue Xue Bao Yi Xue Ban* 47: 301–308.

51. Klonsky ED, Glenn CR (2009): Assessing the Functions of Non-suicidal Self-injury: Psychometric Properties of the Inventory of Statements About Self-injury (ISAS). *J Psychopathol Behav Assess* 31: 215–219.

52. Tang J, Ma Y, Lewis SP, Chen R, Clifford A, Ammerman BA, *et al.* (2020): Association of Internet Addiction With Nonsuicidal Self-injury Among Adolescents in China. *JAMA Network Open* 3: e206863–e206863.

53. Yen J-Y, Yen C-F, Chen C-S, Wang P-W, Chang Y-H, Ko C-H (2012): Social anxiety in online and real-life interaction and their associated factors. *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw* 15: 7–12.

54. Ormel J, Jeronimus BF, Kotov R, Riese H, Bos EH, Hankin B, *et al.* (2013): Neuroticism and common mental disorders: meaning and utility of a complex

relationship. *Clin Psychol Rev* 33: 686–697.

55. Graziano WG, Jensen-Campbell LA, Hair EC (1996): Perceiving interpersonal conflict and reacting to it: the case for agreeableness. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 70: 820–835.

56. Muehlenkamp JJ, Takakuni S, Brausch AM, Peyerl N (2019): Behavioral functions underlying NSSI and eating disorder behaviors. *J Clin Psychol* 75: 1219–1232.

57. Kiekens G, Claes L (2020): Non-Suicidal Self-Injury and Eating Disordered Behaviors: An Update on What We Do and Do Not Know. *Curr Psychiatry Rep* 22: 68.

58. Morawetz C, Riedel MC, Salo T, Berboth S, Eickhoff SB, Laird AR, Kohn N (2020): Multiple large-scale neural networks underlying emotion regulation. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 116: 382–395.

59. Ochsner KN, Silvers JA, Buhle JT (2012): Functional imaging studies of emotion regulation: a synthetic review and evolving model of the cognitive control of emotion. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1251: E1-24.

60. Ochsner KN, Bunge SA, Gross JJ, Gabrieli JD (2002): Rethinking feelings: an FMRI study of the cognitive regulation of emotion. *Journal of cognitive neuroscience* 14: 1215–1229.

61. Refojo D, Schweizer M, Kuehne C, Ehrenberg S, Thoeringer C, Vogl AM, *et al.* (2011): Glutamatergic and dopaminergic neurons mediate anxiogenic and anxiolytic effects of CRHR1. *Science* 333: 1903–1907.

62. Murphy ER, Barch DM, Pagliaccio D, Luby JL, Belden AC (2016): Functional connectivity of the amygdala and subgenual cingulate during cognitive reappraisal of emotions in children with MDD history is associated with rumination. *Dev Cogn Neurosci* 18: 89–100.

63. Sokołowski A, Kowalski J, Dragan M (2022): Neural functional connectivity during rumination in individuals with adverse childhood experiences. *Eur J Psychotraumatol* 13: 2057700.

64. LaBar KS, Cabeza R (2006): Cognitive neuroscience of emotional memory.

Nat Rev Neurosci 7: 54–64.

65. Smith APR, Stephan KE, Rugg MD, Dolan RJ (2006): Task and content modulate amygdala-hippocampal connectivity in emotional retrieval. *Neuron* 49: 631–638.

66. Kark SM, Slotnick SD, Kensinger EA (2016): Repetition Enhancement of Amygdala and Visual Cortex Functional Connectivity Reflects Nonconscious Memory for Negative Visual Stimuli. *J Cogn Neurosci* 28: 1933–1946.

67. LeDoux JE (n.d.): Emotion Circuits in the Brain.

68. van der Meer L, Costafreda S, Aleman A, David AS (2010): Self-reflection and the brain: a theoretical review and meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies with implications for schizophrenia. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 34: 935–946.

69. Nam G, Moon H, Lee J-H, Hur J-W (2022): Self-referential processing in individuals with nonsuicidal self-injury: An fMRI study. *Neuroimage Clin* 35: 103058.

70. Liao K, Yu R, Chen Y, Chen X, Wu X, Huang X, Liu N (2024): Alterations of regional brain activity and corresponding brain circuits in drug-naïve adolescents with nonsuicidal self-injury. *Sci Rep* 14: 24997.

71. Farb NAS, Segal ZV, Anderson AK (2013): Attentional modulation of primary interoceptive and exteroceptive cortices. *Cereb Cortex* 23: 114–126.

72. Craig ADB (2009): How do you feel--now? The anterior insula and human awareness. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 10: 59–70.

73. Critchley HD (2005): Neural mechanisms of autonomic, affective, and cognitive integration. *J Comp Neurol* 493: 154–166.

74. Krause-Utz A, Frost R, Winter D, Elzinga BM (2017): Dissociation and Alterations in Brain Function and Structure: Implications for Borderline Personality Disorder. *Curr Psychiatry Rep* 19: 1–22.

75. Ho TC, Walker JC, Teresi GI, Kulla A, Kirshenbaum JS, Gifuni AJ, *et al.* (2021): Default mode and salience network alterations in suicidal and non-suicidal self-injurious thoughts and behaviors in adolescents with depression. *Transl Psychiatry* 11: 38.

76. Petersen SE, Posner MI (2012): The attention system of the human brain: 20

years after. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 35: 73–89.

77. Corbetta M, Shulman GL (2002): Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention in the brain. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 3: 201–215.

78. Magis-Weinberg L, Blakemore S-J, Dumontheil I (2017): Social and Nonsocial Relational Reasoning in Adolescence and Adulthood. *J Cogn Neurosci* 29: 1739–1754.

79. Bickart KC, Dickerson BC, Feldman Barrett L (2014): The amygdala as a hub in brain networks that support social life. *Neuropsychologia* 63: 235–248.

80. Quevedo K, Martin J, Scott H, Smyda G, Pfeifer JH (2016): The neurobiology of self-knowledge in depressed and self-injurious youth. *Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging* 254: 145–155.

81. Cavanna AE, Trimble MR (2006): The precuneus: a review of its functional anatomy and behavioural correlates. *Brain* 129: 564–583.

82. Cacioppo S, Frum C, Asp E, Weiss RM, Lewis JW, Cacioppo JT (2013): A Quantitative Meta-Analysis of Functional Imaging Studies of Social Rejection. *Scientific Reports* 3: 2027.

83. Kaiser RH, Whitfield-Gabrieli S, Dillon DG, Goer F, Beltzer M, Minkel J, *et al.* (2016): Dynamic Resting-State Functional Connectivity in Major Depression. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 41: 1822–1830.

84. Kaiser RH, Snyder HR, Goer F, Clegg R, Ironside M, Pizzagalli DA (2018): Attention Bias in Rumination and Depression: Cognitive Mechanisms and Brain Networks. *Clin Psychol Sci* 6: 765–782.

Tables and Figure legends

Table1. Demographic and clinical characteristics

	Total Samples (N = 304)	MRI Samples (N = 163)	T/χ^2	*p*
Sex (M/F)	61/243	33/130	0.002[a]	0.963
Age (year)	18.71 ± 2.39	18.55 ± 2.36	0.67	0.502
Diagnosis (MDD/BD/ED)	167/89/48	89/43/31	0.97[a]	0.615
Suicidal Ideation (Y/N)	244/60	131/32	0.001[a]	0.978
Suicidal Attempt (Y/N)	177/127	89/74	0.568[a]	0.451
NSSI Frequency (R/O)	178/126	94/69	0.034[a]	0.864
Age of onset	15.17 ± 3.21	15.06 ± 3.17	0.322	0.748
Functional scores at onset	42.43 ± 20.12	42.00 ± 18.66	0.295	0.821
Functional scores last month	42.68 ± 22.63	41.16 ± 21.02	0.626	0.532
SAS	60.38 ± 14.65	60.80 ± 14.19	0.30	0.763
SDS	70.68 ± 13.54	71.75 ± 12.59	0.84	0.403
ASLEC	50.83 ± 22.62	50.74 ± 19.89	0.04	0.966
FAD	147.78 ± 22.22	149.77 ± 21.40	0.94	0.350
CTQ	48.24 ± 14.76	47.75 ± 13.86	0.35	0.728
SSRS	29.59 ± 6.60	29.78 ± 6.08	0.31	0.760
CIAS	42.70 ± 11.22	43.51 ± 9.16	0.79	0.430
NEOFFI				
Neuroticism	37.33 ± 6.24	37.52 ± 6.14	0.32	0.749
Extraversion	22.01 ± 6.73	22.25 ± 6.43	0.37	0.711
Openness to Experience	33.79 ± 6.34	34.00 ± 6.53	0.34	0.731
Agreeableness	32.52 ± 5.22	32.71 ± 4.85	0.38	0.702
Conscientiousness	29.22 ± 7.22	28.56 ± 6.95	0.95	0.344

R/O, Repeated/Occasional; Y/N, Yes/No; M/F, Male/Female; MDD, major depressive disorder; BD, bipolar disorder; ED, eating disorders; SAS, Self-Rating Anxiety Scale; SDS, Self-Rating Depression Scale; ASLEC, Adolescent Self-Rating Life Events Checklist; FAD, Family Assessment Device; CTQ, Childhood Trauma Questionnaire; SSRS, Social Support Rating Scale; CIAS, Chinese Internet Addiction Scale; NEOFFI, NEO Five-Factor Inventory.

[a] The χ^2 was obtained by a chi-square test.

Table2. Characteristics and functions of NSSI between three functional subtypes

	Subtype 1 (N = 154, 50.7%)	**Subtype 2 (N = 98, 32.2%)**	**Subtype 3 (N = 52, 17.1%)**	***F*/χ^2**	***p***
Sex (F/M)	31/123	18/80	12/40	0.471[a]	0.79
Age (year)	18.70 ± 2.46	18.36 ± 2.25	18.69 ± 2.49	0.004	0.996
Diagnosis (MDD/BD/ED)	88/47/19	53/26/19	26/16/10	3.109[a]	0.54
Suicidal Ideation (Y/N)	122/32	78/20	44/8	0.755[a]	0.685
Suicidal Attempt (Y/N)	90/64	62/36	27/25	1.83[a]	0.4
NSSI Frequency (R/O)	92/62	57/41	29/23	0.262[a]	0.877
Age of onset	15.31 ± 3.33	15.30 ± 3.39	14.48 ± 2.36	1.329	0.266
Self-related factor scores	29.58 ± 11.73	29.22 ± 12.32	23.75 ± 15.06	4.461	0.012*
Self-related factor loading	0.07 ± 0.02	0.01 ± 0.01	0.03 ± 0.02	329.324	<0.001***
Social-related factor scores	7.88 ± 5.82	23.40 ± 9.58	13.40 ± 7.44	128.48	<0.001***
Social-related factor loading	0.01 ± 0.01	0.08 ± 0.03	0.04 ± 0.02	557.919	<0.001***
Functional scores at onset	37.51 ± 16.26	52.92 ± 20.88	37.25 ± 21.72	35.553	<0.001***
Functional scores last month	37.12 ± 18.25	51.98 ± 25.99	40.78 ± 21.83	15.449	<0.001***
SAS	59.81 ± 14.70	63.43 ± 14.78	55.75 ± 12.99	4.952	0.008**
SDS	71.27 ± 13.41	71.68 ± 13.93	66.40 ± 12.59	3.047	0.049*
ASLEC	46.28 ± 20.02	61.51 ± 23.55	44.09 ± 21.28	18.227	<0.001***
FAD	148.60 ± 23.23	147.89 ± 22.19	145.09 ± 19.18	0.486	0.616
CTQ	47.92 ± 15.13	49.84 ± 14.22	46.19 ± 14.59	1.112	0.33
SSRS	28.84 ± 6.44	29.84 ± 6.77	31.33 ± 6.52	2.886	0.057
CIAS	45.64 ± 14.03	41.50 ± 9.05	40.71 ± 10.15	5.212	0.006**
NEOFFI					
Neuroticism	36.81 ± 6.12	39.04 ± 5.91	35.63 ± 6.55	6.355	0.002**
Extraversion	21.44 ± 6.69	22.27 ± 6.99	23.26 ± 6.27	1.517	0.221
Openness to Experience	33.56 ± 6.91	34.64 ± 6.01	32.87 ± 4.96	1.524	0.219
Agreeableness	33.52 ± 5.34	30.81 ± 5.00	32.73 ± 4.47	8.532	<0.001***
Conscientiousness	29.44 ± 7.29	28.99 ± 7.18	29.02 ± 7.22	0.138	0.871

Note: R/O, Repeated/Occasional; Y/N, Yes/No; M/F, Male/Female; MDD, major depressive disorder; BD, bipolar disorder; ED, eating disorders; SAS, Self-Rating Anxiety Scale; SDS, Self-Rating Depression Scale; ASLEC, Adolescent Self-Rating Life Events Checklist; FAD, Family Assessment Device; CTQ, Childhood Trauma Questionnaire; SSRS, Social Support Rating Scale; CIAS, Chinese Internet Addiction Scale; NEOFFI, NEO Five-Factor Inventory.
*$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

[a] The χ^2 was obtained by a chi-square test.

FIGURE 1

Figure 1. Neurobiological vulnerabilities and psychosocial risks in psychiatric disorders with NSSI**.** A sample of 304 inpatients diagnosed with major depressive disorder (MDD: N = 167), bipolar disorder (BD: N = 89), and eating disorders (ED: N = 48) reported the functions underlying their NSSI behavior. The self-reported functions were analyzed using orthogonal projection non-negative matrix factorization (OPNMF), which identified two primary functional factors: social-related and self-related functions. Functional connectivity (FC) features and corresponding subtypes were determined based on these factors. Subsequent analyses examined differences in FC characteristics and associated risk factors across the subtypes, offering valuable insights into the neurobiological vulnerabilities and psychosocial risks linked to NSSI behavior. MDD, major depressive disorder; BD, bipolar disorder; ED, eating disorders; ASLEC, Adolescent Self-Rating Life Events Checklist; NEOFFI, NEO Five-Factor Inventory.

FIGURE 2

Figure 2. Factorization of 29 NSSI functional items in OSI-F using OPNMF. **(A)** The most stable and generalizable two-factor structure of NSSI functions identified by OPNMF (N = 304), consisting of a self-related factor (14 items) and a social-related factor (15 items) derived from the 29 OSI-F items. **(B)** A heatmap illustrating the correlations between and within the two derived factors. The strength of correlations is represented by color: red indicates positive correlations, blue indicates negative correlations, with darker shades denoting stronger correlations. **(C)** Scatter plots display Pearson's correlations between levels of anxiety and depression and the two factor loadings, adjusted for age, sex, education, SI, and SA. **(D)** One-way ANOVA results comparing the two factor loadings across the three diagnostic groups, controlling for covariates. For each box plot, the box illustrates the Standard Error of the Mean (SEM, centered on the mean), whiskers denote the 5% and 95% values, and the horizontal line signifies the median. SAS, Self-Rating Anxiety Scale; SDS, Self-Rating Depression Scale; MDD, major depressive disorder; BD, bipolar disorder; ED, eating disorders; *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$.

FIGURE 3

Figure 3. Fuzzy C-means clustering results of NSSI subtypes based on the loadings of the generalizable two-factor structure. **(A)** the scatter plot presents a two-dimensional visualization of subtype clustering results. Red points represent subtype 2 (social-related subtype, N = 98), gray points represent subtype 1 (self-related subtype, N = 154), and blue points represent subtype 3 (N = 52). **(B)** Violin plots depict the comparison results of the two-factor loadings, depression, and anxiety levels across the three subtypes. **(C)** The bubble chart shows a comparison of risk factors for NSSI among the three subtypes, incorporating six questionnaires: the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEOFFI), the revised Chinese Internet Addiction Scale (CIAS), the Adolescent Self-Rating Life Events Check List (ASLEC), the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ), the Family Assessment Device (FAD), and the Social Support Rate Scale (SSRS). The horizontal dotted line denotes the significance threshold ($p < 0.05$, FDR corrected), with larger bubbles indicating more significant differences between the groups. **(D)** Results of post hoc tests on risk factors of NSSI among the three subtypes. Violin plots represent means (dot) and 95% confidence intervals (line). $^{*}p < 0.05$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{***}p < 0.001$.

FIGURE 4

Figure 4. Functional connectivity features correlating with functional factors and subtypes. **(A)** RCC revealed two dimensions related to two functional factors (top: self-related factor; bottom: social-related factor). Scatterplots illustrate the association between connectivity scores and the loading of functional factor scores for each RCC dimension across participants. The schematic diagram of the brain depicts the spatial distribution of regional proportions for each dimension. For each dimension linked to one functional factor, the rsFCs significantly contributing to it were extracted, and the regional proportions were calculated, with darker colors indicating greater contributions. The circular diagram on the far right illustrates the rsFCs significantly associated with the raw scores of the two factors ($p < 0.001$, FDR corrected). Blue lines indicate negative correlations, while red lines represent positive correlations. Node colors differentiate the macroscopic brain regions: purple represents the frontal lobe, blue-purple the temporal lobe, yellow the parietal lobe, orange the insular lobe, dark red the limbic lobe, pink the occipital lobe, and magenta the subcortical nuclei. **(B)** Between-subtype differences in factor-related functional connectivity (top: rsFC correlated with the self-related factor; bottom: rsFC correlated with the social-related factor). From left to right, subtype 1 is compared with subtype 2 and subtype 3, followed by comparisons between the latter two. Red lines indicate that the t-value of comparison is greater than 0, while blue lines indicate that the *T*-value is less than 0.


BD
ED
MDD
N = 304
NSSI
Self-report
NSSI Functions
OPNMF
Social-related Function
Self-related Function
Functional Subtypes
Neurobiological Vulnerabilities
Social-related rsFC
PFC
AMG
Self-related rsFC
ALSE
NEOFFI
Psychosocial Risks


A Factor structure of NSSI functions
Item 17: To help me escape from uncomfortable feelings or moods
Item 1: To release unbearable tension
Item 21: To relieve feelings of sadness or feeling "down"
Item 19: To experience physical pain in one area, when the other pain I feel is unbearable
Item 6: To punish myself
Item 25: To produce a sense of being real when I feel numb and ``unreal"
Item 8: To relleve nervousness/fearfuiness
Item 10: To distract me from unpleasant memories
Item 2: To experience a ``high" like a drug high
Item 28: For no reason that I know about - it just happens sometimes
Item 7: To provide a sense of excitement that feels exhilarating
Item 4: To stop feeling alone and empty
Item 23: To stop me from thinking about ideas of killing myself
Item 24: To stop me from acting out ideas to kill myself
Item 18: To satisty voices inside or outside of me telling me to do it
Self-related factor
Item 26: To release frustration
Item 13: To release anger
Item 15: To show others how hurt or damaged I am
Item 5: To get care and attention from other people
Item 27: To get out of doing something that I don't want to do
Item 22: To have control in a situation where no one can influence me
Item 20: To stop people from expecting so much from me
Item 9: To avoid getting in trouble for something I did
Item 3: To stop my parents from being angry at me
Item 29: To prove to myself how much I can take
Item 14: To stop my friends/boyfriend/girlfriend from being anger at me
Item 11: To change my body image and/or appearance
Item 12: To belong to a group
Item16: To show others how strong or though I am
Social-related factor
Coefficients of the loading matrix
1
10
B Correlations between factor items
Item: 1 2 4 6 7 8 10 17 18 19 21 23 24 25 28 3 5 9 11 12 13 14 15 16 20 22 26 27 29
Self-related factor
Social-related factor
Correlations (r)
-0.8
0.8
C Correlations between factor-loading and clinical features
r = 0.167**
p = 0.004
r = 0.075
p = 0.194
Loading of self-related factor
r = 0.075
p = 0.191
r = 0.229***
p < 0.001
Loading of social-related factor
SDS scores
SAS scores
MDD
BD
ED
Diagnosis labels


A Factor structure space for clustering subtypes
Social-related factor
Self-related factor
Subtype 1: NSSI self-related subtype
Subtype 2: NSSI social-related subtype
Non-specific patients diffused between self factor and social factor
N = 98
N = 52
N = 154
B Between-subtypes comparison results
Self-related scores
Soical-related scores
SAS scores
SDS scores
Subtype1
Subtype2
Non-specific
C Between-subtypes comparison results of risk factors
-Log10(q-value)
Interpersonal pressure
Catch hell
Healthy adaptation
Loss
Learning pressure
Neuroticism
Enjoyability
Time management problem
Interpersonal and health problems
abstinence reaction
Tolerance
Compulsive
ASLEC
FAD
NEOFFI
CTQ
SSRS
CIAS
D Significant between-subtypes comparison results of risk factors
ASLEC
NEOFFI
CIAS
Catch hell
Loss
Neuroticism
Enjoyability
Tolerance
Compulsive
Interpersonal pressure
Learning pressure
Healthy adaptation
abstinence reaction
Time management problem
Interpersonal and health problems
Scores


A Dimensional representation of connectivity features related with NSSI-factor
r = 0.656
p_perm = 0.005
Loading of self-related factor
Ventromedial parietooccipital sulcus (L, 2.6%)
Caudal cuneus gyrus (L, 4.0%)
Proportion of connectivity
0
13.5%
Amygdala (L, 6.5%)
Amygdala (R, 13.5%)
Putamen (R, 2.6%)
correlation (r)
-0.3
0.3
r = 0.602
p_perm = 0.012
Loading of social-related factor
Functional connectivity score
Ventrolateral area 8 (L, 4.6%)
Medial area 7 (L, 4.4%)
Dorsolateral area 6 (R, 5.4%)
Dorsal area 9/46 (L, 3.9%)
Proportion of connectivity
0
5.4%
Amygdala (R, 3.4%)
B Between-subtypes difference in factor-related functional connectivity
Subtype 1 vs. Subtype2
Subtype 1 vs. Non-specific
Subtype 2 vs. Non-specific
Self-related factor
Social-related factor
η²
0.2
-0.2
Network
Frontal
Temporal
Parietal
Insular
Limbic
Occipital
Subcortical