The Broad Structure of Psychopathology in the All of Us Research Program

Alireza Ehteshami, MSc, MA & Irwin D. Waldman, PhD
Department of Psychology
Emory University

Corresponding Author: Alireza Ehteshami, MSc, MA, Department of Psychology, Emory University, 36 Eagle Row, Atlanta, GA 30322 (alireza.ehteshami@emory.edu)

Manuscript word count: 4,356

Abstract

Background. The Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP) provides a useful framework for studying psychopathology dimensionally and hierarchically. Despite its empirical basis, the HiTOP model was derived through narrative review. Hence, the model's structure requires further quantitative testing, refinement, extension, and validation. This analysis utilizes electronic health records (EHR) psychiatric diagnoses to directly test the broad structure and validity of higher-order HiTOP dimensions and sets the foundation for downstream biological, behavioral, and environmental research.

Methods. Data were obtained from the All of Us Research Program, a landmark biobank initiative for population-scale health research, using participants' psychiatric diagnoses and sociodemographic correlates as reported in their EHRs. A total of 127,963 participants and 39 primary diagnoses were identified. Factor analyses were used to examine the higher-order structure of psychopathology, to evaluate its validity, and to test hypotheses for the placement of disorders often ambiguously classified in prior research. Competing plausible structures were tested and evaluated according to conventional fit indices as well as alternative indices aimed at identifying robust and meaningful structures.

Results. A structure with six correlated transdiagnostic dimensions outperformed alternative structures (comparative fit index = 0.92, tucker-lewis index = 0.92, root mean square error of approximation = 0.01, and standardized root-mean-square residual = 0.01) and demonstrated strong replicability, reliability, and criterion validity. The median factor loading was 0.62 with a median standard error of 0.01.

Conclusions. These findings strongly support a 6-factor dimensional model of psychopathology that broadly resembles major spectra in the HiTOP framework. By addressing key gaps in the literature, this study advances our understanding of the structure and correlates of mental disorders. The results offer a foundation for more nuanced investigations into the etiology, progression, and treatment of mental health conditions.

Introduction

Psychiatric disorders and related traits (collectively termed psychopathology) are highly prevalent globally (Baumeister & Härter, 2007; Kessler & Wang, 2008), imposing substantial personal, interpersonal, and economic burdens (Insel, 2008). It has become evident that traditional categorical nosologies have hindered progress in gaining insight into the etiology, treatment, and prevention of psychopathology (Hyman, 2010; Kotov et al., 2017, 2021). The utility of categorical diagnoses for assessment, applied research, and clinical practice is significantly limited by factors such as pervasive comorbidity (Plana-Ripoll et al., 2019), excessive heterogeneity, low symptom specificity, poor reliability, and poor diagnostic coverage (Conway, Mansolf, & Reise, 2019; Kotov et al., 2017; Krueger et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2013). Addressing many of these limitations, the Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP; Kotov et al., 2017, 2021) has emerged as a framework that synthesizes most extant research on the structure of psychopathology. HiTOP aims to deliver reliable and valid phenotypes that can be used to better understand the genetic, neurobiological, and environmental causes of psychopathology.

HiTOP organizes mental health symptoms into a dimensional hierarchy, from broad, overarching spectra—such as internalizing, externalizing, detachment, and thought disorder—down to more specific subfactors and individual symptoms. This hierarchical structure is meant to better reflect how different forms of psychopathology naturally co-occur and cluster, providing a more accurate and data-driven alternative to traditional categorical diagnoses. A key benefit of the hierarchical approach is its ability to capture both general and specific aspects of psychopathology simultaneously. By identifying broad dimensions that underlie multiple forms of psychopathology, HiTOP offers a framework for understanding comorbidity not as the co-occurrence of distinct disorders, but as the result of shared underlying liabilities. Higher-order dimensions effectively explain overlapping symptoms across conventional diagnoses by capturing common risk factors, correlates, developmental trajectories, and treatment responses (Barlow et al., 2017; Dalgleish, Black, Johnston, & Bevan, 2020; Mansell, Harvey, Watkins, & Shafran, 2009; Parkes et al., 2021). This offers a more parsimonious explanation for observed diagnostic overlap, without dismissing meaningful distinctions that emerge at more specific levels. By doing so, the HiTOP framework facilitates research into shared and unique etiological mechanisms, while supporting the development of more targeted and transdiagnostic interventions—ultimately enhancing both scientific inquiry and clinical practice.

The HiTOP model was derived from a narrative synthesis of past quantitative studies, an approach that relies on indirect qualitative comparisons and omits detailed statistical data on the strength of associations within the model (Ringwald, Forbes, & Wright, 2023). Consequently, important questions remain about the consistency and magnitude of relationships among disorders and higher order dimensions. Although numerous factor analytic studies support dimensional conceptualizations of psychopathology, the bulk of this work has relied on smaller or specialized samples with limited disorder coverage—particularly for certain diagnoses such as OCD and certain neurodevelopmental disorders. This narrow scope reduces the generalizability of findings and limits the emergence, as well as the interpretability, of higher order dimensions (Kotov et al., 2017). Additionally, many studies examine individual dimensions (e.g., internalizing, externalizing) in isolation, rather than modeling a more comprehensive range of dimensions simultaneously (Kotov et al., 2017, 2021). This impedes our understanding of how dimensions covary and whether they show unique or overlapping associations with external variables of interest such as biological correlates and treatment outcomes. Moreover, prior research typically compares only a limited set of structural models, making it difficult to evaluate

which structures best capture the natural organization of psychopathology (Waldman et al., 2022).

To address these limitations, we utilized psychiatric diagnoses extracted from electronic health records (EHR) in the All of Us Research Program (*All of Us*)—a large and demographically diverse sample representative of the US population (Epstein, 2022; "All of Us" Research Program Investigators et al., 2019). Specifically, we used Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFAs) to elucidate the higher-order psychopathology dimensions underlying psychiatric diagnoses, testing models, informed by the HiTOP framework, with very broad coverage of psychiatric disorders.

We evaluated several a priori questions regarding the structural organization of psychopathology using a series of confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs). *First*, we tested whether Substance Use should be modeled as a distinct dimension from broader Externalizing pathology. This question was motivated by dimensional models of psychopathology that conceptualize conduct disorder (CD), antisocial personality disorder (ASPD), and substance use disorders reflect a shared, genetically mediated liability for externalizing behavior (Krueger et al., 2021; Krueger, Markon, Patrick, Benning, & Kramer, 2007). While many latent variable studies support a unidimensional externalizing construct, others have questioned whether substance use reflects unique etiological and clinical features that warrant separate modeling (Jablensky, 2009; Voorhees et al., 2014). For instance, Verona, Javdani, & Sprague (2011) found that in a sample of adolescents, a three-factor model that distinguished Substance Use from other externalizing behaviors (e.g., conduct problems, ADHD, oppositional defiant disorder) provided superior fit compared to two-factor models, suggesting meaningful differentiation even in youth samples. Similarly, Voorhees et al. (2014), in a sample of adult veterans, identified a three-factor structure comprising Internalizing, Externalizing, and Substance Abuse, reinforcing the possibility that substance use may emerge as a distinct psychopathological dimension across age groups and clinical populations. We were particularly interested in whether the inclusion of a broader and more diverse range of psychopathology indicators might allow a meaningful distinction between substance use and other externalizing disorders to emerge—something that might not be detectable in more constrained models.

Second, we examined whether Distress and Fear should be represented as distinct dimensions rather than as a single overarching Internalizing dimension. This distinction is supported by research indicating that depressive and anxiety-related disorders cluster into separable, though correlated, emotional syndromes, which differ in their patterns of comorbidity, external validators, and developmental trajectories (Kotov et al., 2017; Watson, Clark, Simms, & Kotov, 2022).

Third, building on these specific modeling decisions, we then asked whether a model comprising six higher-order factors—Externalizing, Substance Use, Thought Problems, Distress, Fear, and Neurodevelopmental Disorders—would yield superior fit relative to more parsimonious structures.

Fourth, we assessed whether bifactor models—often favored for their apparent superior statistical fit—would underperform relative to correlated factors models on conventional model fit as well as alternative indices meant to assess the coherence and interpretability of factors. This reflects growing concern that bifactor models may capitalize on idiosyncrasies in the data and produce misleading or unstable factors (Waldman et al., 2022; Watts, Greene, Bonifay, & Fried, 2024).

Finally, we hypothesized that the six dimensions would be meaningfully distinct in their associations with external correlates, supporting their validity as separate constructs within a multidimensional framework of psychopathology.

In addition to these overarching structural hypotheses, we conducted several targeted CFAs and exploratory analyses to address the ambiguous placement of specific disorders within the existing psychopathology literature. These analyses were designed to clarify how certain disorders align with, or deviate from, broader latent dimensions. First, we tested a priori hypothesized correlated residuals among ADHD subtypes to account for any covariation not fully explained by their shared factor loadings. Second, we examined whether ADHD and its subtypes are best conceptualized as part of the Externalizing spectrum, the Neurodevelopmental domain, or both. Third, we investigated whether Eating Disorders reflect underlying Internalizing pathology (particularly Distress) and/or Thought Problems. Fourth, we assessed whether Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD) and Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Disorder (OCPD) load on Neurodevelopmental Disorders, Internalizing, Fear, Distress, and/or Thought Problems, reflecting ongoing debate about their nosological placement. Fifth, we evaluated whether Tics and Tourette's Syndrome align more closely with Neurodevelopmental Disorders or Distress. Sixth, we tested whether Antisocial Personality Disorder (ASPD) is best represented by Externalizing, Substance Use, or both (Verona et al., 2011; Voorhees et al., 2014). Seventh, we explored whether Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD) reflects Distress, Thought Problems, and/or Externalizing, given its complex and multifaceted clinical presentation.

To further evaluate potential model misspecifications, we introduced theoretically and empirically justified correlated residuals between closely related disorders, including ADHD subtypes, OCD with OCPD, Schizophrenia with Schizoaffective Disorder, and Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) with Dysthymia. Finally, in an empirically driven effort to refine model fit, we used Modification Indices (MIs)—which quantify expected model improvement based on the change in χ^2—to guide the addition of correlated residuals and cross-loadings. Importantly, cross-loadings were added only when there was clear theoretical and/or empirical support in the existing literature. Given the known risks of overfitting and capitalization on chance inherent in MI-guided modifications (MacCallum, Roznowski, & Necowitz, 1992), we evaluated all added parameters using alternative fit indices and tested their robustness through split-half replication procedures.

We augmented conventional fit indices with alternative indices to better adjudicate among competing models of psychopathology, assessed the sensitivity of factors to their constituent diagnoses, examined replication in random halves of the sample, and compared the fit of our preferred models to models in which diagnoses were randomly assigned to factors. Finally, we examined the criterion validity of higher-order psychopathology dimensions through their associations with relevant correlates. This project was pre-registered on the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/y5svr/).

Methods

The All of Us Research Program

Participants for this study were drawn from the All of Us Research Program (All of Us), a nationwide, prospective cohort study that aims to investigate the impact of lifestyle, environment, and genomics on health outcomes. Sponsored by the US National Institutes of Health (NIH), All of Us aims to recruit ≥ 1 million adults over the next several years(Epstein, 2022; Investigators et al., 2019). A central focus of the program is to equitably include populations traditionally underrepresented in biomedical research(Investigators et al., 2019; Mapes et al., 2020).

Recruitment primarily occurs through participating healthcare organizations and Federally Qualified Health Centers, although interested individuals can also enroll directly at community-based sites. Participants complete necessary procedures on the All of Us website (https://joinallofus.org), including providing informed consent and completing baseline health surveys. After enrollment, participants may undergo a basic physical examination and biospecimen collection at a partnered healthcare site. Follow-up is conducted actively through periodic surveys and passively through linkage with electronic health records (EHRs).

As of October 2022, over 537,000 individuals aged 16-65 (40% male, 60% female) had joined the program. Of these participants, more than 324,000 shared electronic health records (EHRs), 372,380 completed surveys on overall health, lifestyle, and healthcare access & utilization, 311,300 provided physical measurements, and 320,000 donated at least one biospecimen. This study analyzed data from May 6, 2018, to June 6, 2022 (release 6, N = 372,380) in compliance with the All of Us Code of Conduct.

Measures

We examined EHR lifetime psychiatric diagnoses in our primary analyses. Despite criticisms of their limitations, researchers have recently begun utilizing EHR psychiatric diagnoses in psychopathology research (Chen et al., 2018; Linder, Bastarache, Hughey, & Peterson, 2021; Smoller, 2018; Smoller et al., 2019), including in *All of Us*(Barr, Bigdeli, & Meyers, 2022). To standardize EHR data across various input sources, *All of Us* employs the Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership (OMOP) Common Data Model (Klann, Joss, Embree, & Murphy, 2019). We selected all relevant OMOP codes for psychiatric conditions (listed in **eTable 1 in Supplement 1**). Additionally, we clustered codes for highly similar diagnoses (e.g., autism spectrum disorder, autism, autistic disorder, and Asperger's syndrome; a full list of these clusters can be found in **eTable 2 in Supplement 1**). We used sex assigned at birth, annual household income, education level, and sleep disturbance as external correlates for the psychopathology dimensions identified in our preferred structural models (**eMethods in Supplement 1** contains a full description of the external correlates).

Statistical Analysis

Our approach involved conducting factor analyses of the EHR diagnoses on a continuum ranging from fully confirmatory to more exploratory, within a Confirmatory Factor Analytic framework. In addition to contrasting *a priori* hypothesized models, we used modification indices to search for correlated residuals and cross-loadings that might enhance model fit.

To assess model fit, we employed multiple fit indices given their complementary desirable properties, including: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI; Tucker & Lewis, 1973), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) with its 95% confidence interval (Browne & Cudeck, 1992), and Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR; Bentler, 1995; Loehlin & Beaujean, 2017) (see **eMethods in Supplement 1** for additional details). Researchers have recently documented the limitations of conventional fit indices (e.g., overfitting, differential fit propensity, and bias in tests of certain models) for adjudicating among structural models of psychopathology and have suggested alternative criteria (Bonifay & Cai, 2017; Bonifay, Lane, & Reise, 2017; Forbes et al., 2021; Greene et al., 2019; Morgan, Hodge, Wells, & Watkins, 2015; Murray & Johnson, 2013; Watts, Poore, & Waldman, 2019). Hence, we augmented fit indices with alternative indices allowing us to inspect the magnitude (i.e., mean and median), precision (i.e., standard errors), and variability (i.e.,

standard deviations) of factor loadings and factor correlations across competing models (Waldman et al., 2022). We anticipated that these alternative indices would provide incremental utility beyond conventional fit indices in discriminating between competing models.

We examined the external validity of factors in our preferred model using simple linear (univariate) regressions to characterize similarities and differences among the factors in their associations with the sociodemographic and sleep variables.

We also conducted several sensitivity analyses to assess the replicability and robustness of our preferred models. These included replicating the fit of competing models in randomly split halves of the *All of Us* sample, assessing the sensitivity of factor loadings to each factor's constituent diagnoses, and contrasting the fit indices and alternative indices of the preferred model with models in which diagnoses were randomly assigned to the higher-order factors.

Results

Our analytic sample comprised 127,963 individuals with at least one EHR diagnosis, thus assuring they were assessed for psychopathology. The prevalence of all 39 primary diagnoses is illustrated in **eFigure 1 in Supplement 1**, and the sociodemographic information for the analytic sample is shown in **eTable 3 in Supplement 1**.

Correlations among Psychiatric Diagnoses

The tetrachoric correlations among the 39 psychiatric diagnoses are illustrated in the heatmap in **Figure 1**. On average, correlations were highest among diagnoses within each psychopathology domain. However, appreciable correlations were also observed across domains. This pattern of correlations suggests that several correlated higher-order dimensions might best account for the comorbidity among the 39 psychiatric diagnoses.

Tests of a priori Hypothesized Models

We employed CFAs to test alternative hypothesized models. The main models we contrasted are displayed in **Table 1**, and the complete set in **eTable 4 in Supplement 1** (alternative indices and factor correlations can be found in **in Supplement 2**). Path diagrams for four representative correlated factors models are illustrated in **Figure 2**.

As shown in **Table 1**, all correlated factors models (Models 2-9) demonstrated better fit than the single General factor model (Model 1), except for one model that excluded the Substance Use dimension (Model 8). The most comprehensive model, incorporating six distinct factors (Model 9), achieved the best fit among the alternatives. Specifically, separating Substance Use from Externalizing emerged as a critical distinction (Model 9 vs. Model 8), as reflected by both superior fit indices and alternative indices. This separation was justified by differential associations of the external correlates with distinct Substance Use and Externalizing dimensions, rather than an overarching combined Externalizing dimension (see **eFigure 2a in Supplement 1**).

Models including a broad Internalizing dimension versus distinct Fear and Distress dimensions (Model 5 vs. 9) showed equivalent overall fit but differed in alternative indices (shown in **eTable 5 in Supplement 1**). For Distress diagnoses, factor loadings were comparable across the models (median ≈ .55) though Model 5 had lower standard errors (.007 vs. .015). For Distress diagnoses, median factor loadings and standard deviations of factor loadings were similar between models, though Model 5 had lower standard errors. For Fear

diagnoses, Model 9 showed higher median loadings (.591 vs .535) with slightly increased variability (SD = .298 vs. SD = .268). While Fear and Distress were highly correlated (r = .898), their distinct patterns of association with other dimensions (**eFigure 2b in Supplement 1**) support treating them as separate factors (for more details, see **eResults in Supplement 1**). The six-factor model distinguishing Fear and Distress was therefore selected for analyzing the placement of ambiguously classified disorders.

Comparing correlated factors models to their bifactor equivalents revealed mixed results. While traditional fit indices generally favored bifactor models (**eTable 6 in Supplement 1**), alternative indices strongly supported correlated factors models, which showed more stable factor loadings with lower standard errors (for more details, see **eResults in Supplement 1**). The 6 correlated factors model (shown in **Figure 2**) performed best overall, including on traditional fit indices. These findings demonstrate the importance of using both traditional and alternative indices when evaluating structural models of psychopathology.

Comparisons Among Factors in Their Alternative Indices

We next compared the alternative indices of the six factors from our preferred model (**Model 9.5**) to examine the extent to which the factors were well-represented by their indicators. In the preferred model, average factor loadings for diagnoses ranged from .6 to .7, with lower loadings on the Fear and Distress factors, ranging from .43 to .52. Factor loadings were estimated very precisely across all factors, with standard errors (SEs) ranging from .006 to .028. Diagnoses' factor loadings were fairly homogeneous within factors, with standard deviations ranging from .014 for Distress to .17 for Thought Problems, except for Fear which had a standard deviation of .30. Due to the limited number of diagnoses per factor (5-8), we were unable to statistically compare these alternative indices. Detailed statistics for each factor are presented in **eTable 7 in Supplement 1**.

The Placement of Ambiguously Classified Disorders

We conducted targeted CFAs to determine the optimal placement of disorders with ambiguous classification (**Table 1**; detailed procedures in **eResults in Supplement 1** and full results in **eTable 4**). For several disorders, placement decisions were informed by small differences in model fit and factor loadings. ADHD subtypes were best represented with ADHD-Hyperactive-Impulsive loading on Externalizing and both ADHD-Combined and ADHD-Inattentive loading on Neurodevelopmental Disorders, with correlated residuals between subtypes. Eating disorders showed equivalent support for loading on Distress alone or on both Distress and Thought Problems. OCD and OCPD demonstrated better fit with Fear or Distress rather than Thought Problems, while Antisocial Personality Disorder better reflected Substance Use or both Substance Use and Externalizing rather than Externalizing alone. Model fit improved with Borderline Personality Disorder loading on both Distress and Thought Problems (or Externalizing) versus Thought Problems alone. In the final model, the addition of three theoretically-justified correlated residuals (between schizophrenia and schizoaffective disorder, OCD and OCPD, and MDD and dysthymia) improved model fit while maintaining alternative fit indices.

Replication and Robustness Across Random Sample Halves and Randomly Assigned Diagnoses

We validated our model through split-half replication analyses and comparison with randomly generated alternative models. Split-half analyses demonstrated strong replication of the six-factor model results, with high intra-class correlations (.90-1.0) for most fit indices and minimal differences between halves (all < .01; **eTable 8 in Supplement 1**). Bifactor models showed much less consistency across split halves, with lower intra-class correlations for RMSEA (.79), SRMR (.85), and particularly for the mean (.56) and standard deviation (.52) of factor loadings (**eTables 9-10 in Supplement 1**). To test the specificity of diagnosis-to-factor assignments, we compared our preferred six-factor model to 1,000 random variations of the six-factor model that randomly assigned diagnoses to factors. Our model demonstrated superior fit across alternative indices compared to the random models (**eFigure 3 in Supplement 1**).

The Sensitivity of Factors to Their Constituent Indicators

We examined the sensitivity of the factors to their constituent diagnoses by re-running the CFAs excluding one diagnosis at a time and examining changes in the remaining diagnoses' factor loadings. As shown in **Figure 3**, factor loadings for diagnoses changed only slightly after removing each diagnosis in turn [M = -.0007, Median = .0002, SD = .013, minimum = -.006, maximum = .002].

External Correlates of the Higher-Order Psychopathology Dimensions

All associations with external correlates (i.e., sex at birth, sleep disturbance, education level, and income) significantly differed across dimensions (see **Figure 4;** all $p < 5x10^{-10}$). Males were particularly high in Substance Use and Externalizing dimensions, whereas females were higher in Fear and Distress dimensions. Sleep disturbance showed the strongest positive association with Distress, while Substance Use showed negative associations with both education and income. Consistent with our expectations, the six psychopathology dimensions showed distinct patterns of external correlates, validating their distinction in the model. Specifically, Substance Use was more strongly associated than Externalizing with male sex and lower education and income, and the two factors showed opposite associations with sleep disturbance (positive for Externalizing, negative for Substance Use). Similarly, Distress showed stronger associations than Fear with female sex and sleep disturbance, supporting their distinction. Detailed results are presented in **eTable 11 in Supplement 1**.

Discussion

In this study, we employed both confirmatory and exploratory analyses within a CFA framework to examine the structure of psychopathology in *All of Us*. Our findings support a six-dimensional structure comprising Neurodevelopmental Disorders, Externalizing, Substance Use, Thought Disorder, Distress, and Fear. Correlated factors models outperformed bifactor models across multiple criteria, including replicability and fit indices. Targeted CFAs suggested refinements in the placement of OCD, OCPD, Tics, Tourette's Syndrome, and ASPD, while ADHD subtypes showed associations with both Externalizing and Neurodevelopmental Disorders. The model's robustness was demonstrated through sensitivity analyses and replication across random sample halves. External validity analyses revealed distinct patterns of

association between the six factors and demographic variables, though we did not replicate previous findings regarding educational attainment in Neurodevelopmental Disorders (Kuriyan et al., 2013; Schmengler et al., 2023; Toft et al., 2021) or sleep disturbance in Substance Use Disorders (Ara, Jacobs, Bhat, & McCall, 2016; Conroy & Arnedt, 2014; Roehrs & Roth, 2015).

The present study advances our understanding of the structure of psychopathology by addressing key gaps in the literature. Our study included a more extensive and diverse array of psychopathology indicators (i.e., diagnoses) and tested a broader range of alternative models, utilizing a sample size that surpasses nearly all extant studies in this domain. Our approach supports a hierarchical dimensional representation of psychopathology, as represented in the HiTOP model (Forbes et al., 2020; Kotov et al., 2017, 2021; Ringwald et al., 2023), addressing comorbidity and heterogeneity in categorical diagnoses using higher-order dimensions, while also representing unique variance specific to individual diagnoses. This method allows for a more nuanced characterization of psychopathology, representing both broad, overarching dimensions and specific diagnostic features, thus providing a more accurate reflection of the complex nature of mental health presentations in research and clinical practice (Conway, Forbes, et al., 2019; Conway et al., 2021; DeYoung et al., 2021).

The inclusion of a broad set of diagnoses and large sample size enabled us to test alternative placements for disorders whose classification has traditionally been ambiguous, as well as permitting more rigorous tests of bifactor models. The results of alternative indices and of split-half and random placement analyses argued against a general psychopathology factor (Fried, Greene, & Eaton, 2021; Waldman et al., 2022). Our analyses also underscored the limitations of relying solely on fit indices for model evaluation (Forbes et al., 2021; Greene et al., 2019; Waldman et al., 2022), as placing diagnoses on different factors often made very little difference to traditional fit indices, highlighting the importance of supplementing these with alternative indices. Moreover, factor correlations and external validity results supported distinguishing certain factors (e.g., Fear from Distress) even when fit indices suggested combining them (e.g., within a broader Internalizing factor). These findings demonstrate the value of a multifaceted approach to model adjudication for validly capturing the nuanced structures of psychopathology.

Despite its advantages, our study also had several limitations. Although we analyzed a broad set of diagnoses in a very large sample, definitively placing certain disorders within a hierarchical dimensional model of psychopathology, such as HiTOP, remained challenging. This difficulty may stem in part from our reliance on psychiatric diagnoses, which are the least granular indicators of psychopathology. We anticipate that future studies on the structure of psychopathology in large samples will more successfully resolve the placement of such disorders if they begin by analyzing broad sets of individual symptoms before progressing to higher-order psychopathology dimensions (Forbes et al., 2020; Levin-Aspenson, 2023; Ringwald et al., 2023; Waldman & Poore, 2023). The use of diagnoses extracted from Electronic Health Records (EHRs) also presents several unresolved challenges, including concerns about reliability, validity, and the optimal algorithms for diagnostic classification (Chen et al., 2018; Davis, Sudlow, & Hotopf, 2016; Denny et al., 2013; Hripcsak & Albers, 2012; Linder et al., 2021; Smoller, 2018; Wei et al., 2017, 2016; Wu et al., 2019; Zheutlin et al., 2019). Fortunately, researchers have begun investigating alternative approaches for optimal use of EHR diagnoses, including AI and machine learning methods (An et al., 2023; Dahl et al., 2023; Papini et al., 2023; Weng et al., 2024; Yun et al., 2024). Finally, the structure of psychopathology represented in our preferred model may be influenced in part by our use of lifetime diagnoses. This approach does not account for the potentially time-specific nature of psychopathology or its changes across age and development (Rutter, 2013; Skodol & Bender,

2016). Future studies should endeavor to model dynamic changes in the structure of psychopathology using very large samples.

Hierarchical dimensional models, such as HiTOP, offer a framework that parsimoniously represents patterns of comorbidity at higher levels of the taxonomy while preserving critical distinctions at lower levels. Unlike traditional diagnostic systems like the DSM, which collapse individual differences into broad, heterogenous, highly comorbid categories, this hierarchical dimensional approach explicitly maintains individual differences at multiple levels, enabling analyses of psychopathology at different levels of generality and specificity. The comprehensive model we propose herein leverages these advantages to provide a foundation for more nuanced investigations into the causes and outcomes of both broad, higher-order psychopathology dimensions and specific, lower-order factors. This multi-tiered approach is particularly valuable for examining similarities and differences in psychopathology across diverse ethnicities (Cicero & Ruggero, 2021; Eaton et al., 2013; Forbes et al., 2021; He & Li, 2021; He, Rodriguez-Seijas, Waldman, & Li, 2023; Moriarity, Joyner, Slavich, & Alloy, 2022; Ringwald, Forbes, & Wright, 2022; Rodriguez-Seijas et al., 2023), as well as exploring how genetic and environmental risk factors may influence psychopathology at various levels of the hierarchy across different ancestral backgrounds.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge All of Us participants for their contributions, without whom this research would not have been possible. We also thank the National Institutes of Health's *All of Us* Research Program for making available the participant data examined in this study.

Author Contribution

All authors contributed to and have approved the final manuscript.

Competing Interests

The authors declare none.

Funding Statement

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

References

An, U., Pazokitoroudi, A., Alvarez, M., Huang, L., Bacanu, S., Schork, A. J., … Sankararaman, S. (2023). Deep learning-based phenotype imputation on population-scale biobank data increases genetic discoveries. *Nature Genetics*, *55*(12), 2269–2276. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-023-01558-w

Ara, A., Jacobs, W., Bhat, I. A., & McCall, W. V. (2016). Sleep Disturbances and Substance Use Disorders: A Bi-Directional Relationship. *Psychiatric Annals*, *46*(7), 408–412. https://doi.org/10.3928/00485713-20160512-01

Barlow, D. H., Farchione, T. J., Bullis, J. R., Gallagher, M. W., Murray-Latin, H., Sauer-Zavala, S., … Cassiello-Robbins, C. (2017). The Unified Protocol for Transdiagnostic Treatment of Emotional Disorders Compared With Diagnosis-Specific Protocols for Anxiety Disorders: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *74*(9), 875. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.2164

Barr, P. B., Bigdeli, T. B., & Meyers, J. L. (2022). Prevalence, Comorbidity, and Sociodemographic Correlates of Psychiatric Disorders Reported in the All of Us Research Program. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *79*(6), 622–628. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.0685

Baumeister, H., & Härter, M. (2007). Prevalence of mental disorders based on general population surveys. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *42*(7), 537–546. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-007-0204-1

Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative Fit Indexes in Structural Models. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*(2), 238–246. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238

Bentler, P. M. (1995). *EQS structural equations program manual* (Vol. 6). Multivariate software Encino, CA.

Bonifay, W., & Cai, L. (2017). On the Complexity of Item Response Theory Models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *52*(4), 465–484. https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2017.1309262

Bonifay, W., Lane, S. P., & Reise, S. P. (2017). Three Concerns With Applying a Bifactor Model as a Structure of Psychopathology. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *5*(1), 184–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702616657069

Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternative Ways of Assessing Model Fit. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *21*(2), 230–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124192021002005

Chen, C.-Y., Lee, P. H., Castro, V. M., Minnier, J., Charney, A. W., Stahl, E. A., … Smoller, J. W. (2018). Genetic validation of bipolar disorder identified by automated phenotyping using electronic health records. *Translational Psychiatry*, *8*(1), 86. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-018-0133-7

Cicero, D., & Ruggero, C. (2021). Commentary– Opening a can of worms: the importance of testing the measurement invariance of hierarchical models of psychopathology – a commentary on He and Li (2020). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *62*(3), 299–302. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13353

Conroy, D. A., & Arnedt, J. T. (2014). Sleep and Substance Use Disorders: An Update. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, *16*(10), 487. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-014-0487-3

Conway, C. C., Forbes, M. K., Forbush, K. T., Fried, E. I., Hallquist, M. N., Kotov, R., … Eaton, N. R. (2019). A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology Can Transform Mental Health Research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *14*(3), 419–436. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618810696

Conway, C. C., Krueger, R. F., Board, H. C. E., Cicero, D. C., DeYoung, C. G., Eaton, N. R., … Wright, A. G. C. (2021). Rethinking the Diagnosis of Mental Disorders: Data-Driven Psychological Dimensions, Not Categories, as a Framework for Mental-Health Research, Treatment, and Training. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *30*(2), 151–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721421990353

Conway, C. C., Mansolf, M., & Reise, S. P. (2019). Ecological Validity of a Quantitative Classification System for Mental Illness in Treatment-Seeking Adults. *Psychological Assessment*, *31*(6), 730–740. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000695

Dahl, A., Thompson, M., An, U., Krebs, M., Appadurai, V., Border, R., … Cai, N. (2023). Phenotype integration improves power and preserves specificity in biobank-based genetic studies of major depressive disorder. *Nature Genetics*, *55*(12), 2082–2093. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-023-01559-9

Dalgleish, T., Black, M., Johnston, D., & Bevan, A. (2020). Transdiagnostic Approaches to Mental Health Problems: Current Status and Future Directions. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *88*(3), 179–195. https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000482

Davis, K. A. S., Sudlow, C. L. M., & Hotopf, M. (2016). Can mental health diagnoses in administrative data be used for research? A systematic review of the accuracy of routinely collected diagnoses. *BMC Psychiatry*, *16*(1), 263. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-016-0963-x

Denny, J. C., Bastarache, L., Ritchie, M. D., Carroll, R. J., Zink, R., Mosley, J. D., … Roden, D. M. (2013). Systematic comparison of phenome-wide association study of electronic medical record data and genome-wide association study data. *Nature Biotechnology*, *31*(12), 1102–1111. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2749

DeYoung, C. G., Kotov, R., Krueger, R. F., Cicero, D. C., Conway, C. C., Eaton, N. R., … Wright, A. G. C. (2021). Answering Questions About the Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP): Analogies to Whales and Sharks Miss the Boat. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 216770262110493. https://doi.org/10.1177/21677026211049390

Eaton, N. R., Keyes, K. M., Krueger, R. F., Noordhof, A., Skodol, A. E., Markon, K. E., … Hasin, D. S. (2013). Ethnicity and psychiatric comorbidity in a national sample: evidence for latent comorbidity factor invariance and connections with disorder prevalence. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *48*(5), 701–710. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-012-0595-5

Epstein, H.-A. B. (2022). All of Us: A National Effort to Improve Health. *Journal of Consumer Health on the Internet*, *26*(4), 452–459. https://doi.org/10.1080/15398285.2022.2138058

Forbes, M. K., Greene, A. L., Levin-Aspenson, H. F., Watts, A. L., Hallquist, M., Lahey, B. B., … Krueger, R. F. (2021). Three Recommendations Based on a Comparison of the Reliability and Validity of the Predominant Models Used in Research on the Empirical Structure of Psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *130*(3), 297–317. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000533

Forbes, M. K., Sunderland, M., Rapee, R. M., Batterham, P. J., Calear, A. L., Carragher, N., … Krueger, R. F. (2020). A Detailed Hierarchical Model of Psychopathology: From Individual Symptoms up to the General Factor of Psychopathology. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *9*(2), 139–168. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702620954799

Fried, E. I., Greene, A. L., & Eaton, N. R. (2021). The p factor is the sum of its parts, for now. *World Psychiatry*, *20*(1), 69–70. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20814

Greene, A. L., Eaton, N. R., Li, K., Forbes, M. K., Krueger, R. F., Markon, K. E., … Kotov, R. (2019). Are Fit Indices Used to Test Psychopathology Structure Biased? A Simulation Study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *128*(7), 740–764. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000434

He, Q., & Li, J. J. (2021). Factorial invariance in hierarchical factor models of mental disorders in African American and European American youths. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *62*(3), 289–298. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13243

He, Q., Rodriguez-Seijas, C. A., Waldman, I., & Li, J. J. (2023). *Racial and Ethnic Invariance of HiTOP Dimensions in the Adolescent Brain and Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/aq7ru

Hripcsak, G., & Albers, D. J. (2012). Next-generation phenotyping of electronic health records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *20*(1), 117–121. https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2012-001145

Hyman, S. E. (2010). The Diagnosis of Mental Disorders: The Problem of Reification. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *6*(1), 155–179. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091532

Insel, T. R. (2008). Assessing the Economic Costs of Serious Mental Illness. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *165*(6), 663–665. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2008.08030366

Investigators, A. of U. R. P., Denny, J. C., Rutter, J. L., Goldstein, D. B., Philippakis, A., Smoller, J. W., … Dishman, E. (2019). The "All of Us" Research Program. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *381*(7), 668–676. https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmsr1809937

Jablensky, A. (2009). A meta-commentary on the proposal for a meta-structure for DSM-V and ICD-11. *Psychological Medicine*, *39*(12), 2099–2103. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0033291709991292

Kessler, R. C., & Wang, P. S. (2008). The Descriptive Epidemiology of Commonly Occurring Mental Disorders in the United States*. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *29*(1), 115–129. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.29.020907.090847

Klann, J. G., Joss, M. A. H., Embree, K., & Murphy, S. N. (2019). Data model harmonization for the All Of Us Research Program: Transforming i2b2 data into the OMOP common data model. *PLoS ONE*, *14*(2), e0212463. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0212463

Kotov, R., Krueger, R. F., Watson, D., Achenbach, T. M., Althoff, R. R., Bagby, R. M., … Zimmerman, M. (2017). The Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP): A Dimensional Alternative to Traditional Nosologies. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *126*(4), 454–477. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000258

Kotov, R., Krueger, R. F., Watson, D., Cicero, D. C., Conway, C. C., DeYoung, C. G., … Wright, A. G. C. (2021). The Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP): A Quantitative Nosology Based on Consensus of Evidence. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *17*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-081219-093304

Krueger, R. F., Hobbs, K. A., Conway, C. C., Dick, D. M., Dretsch, M. N., Eaton, N. R., … Workgroup, H. U. (2021). Validity and utility of Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP): II. Externalizing superspectrum. *World Psychiatry*, *20*(2), 171–193. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20844

Krueger, R. F., Kotov, R., Watson, D., Forbes, M. K., Eaton, N. R., Ruggero, C. J., … Zimmermann, J. (2018). Progress in achieving quantitative classification of psychopathology. *World Psychiatry*, *17*(3), 282–293. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20566

Krueger, R. F., Markon, K. E., Patrick, C. J., Benning, S. D., & Kramer, M. D. (2007). Linking Antisocial Behavior, Substance Use, and Personality: An Integrative Quantitative Model of the Adult Externalizing Spectrum. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *116*(4), 645–666. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843x.116.4.645

Kuriyan, A. B., Pelham, W. E., Molina, B. S. G., Waschbusch, D. A., Gnagy, E. M., Sibley, M. H., … Kent, K. M. (2013). Young Adult Educational and Vocational Outcomes of Children Diagnosed with ADHD. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *41*(1), 27–41. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-012-9658-z

Levin-Aspenson, H. F. (2023). To Fully Leverage Fine-Grained Clinical Phenomena, We Have to Think Beyond DSM-Based Concepts and the Presumption of Diagnostic Kinds. *Journal of Psychopathology and Clinical Science*, *132*(7), 881–887. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000876

Linder, J. E., Bastarache, L., Hughey, J. J., & Peterson, J. F. (2021). The Role of Electronic Health Records in Advancing Genomic Medicine. *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics*, *22*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-genom-121120-125204

Loehlin, J. C., & Beaujean, A. A. (2017). *Latent Variable Models, An Introduction to Factor, Path, and Structural Equation Analysis, Fifth Edition*. New York: Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315643199

MacCallum, R. C., Roznowski, M., & Necowitz, L. B. (1992). Model Modifications in Covariance Structure Analysis: The Problem of Capitalization on Chance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*(3), 490–504. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.111.3.490

Mansell, W., Harvey, A., Watkins, E., & Shafran, R. (2009). Conceptual Foundations of the Transdiagnostic Approach to CBT. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, *23*(1), 6–19. https://doi.org/10.1891/0889-8391.23.1.6

Mapes, B. M., Foster, C. S., Kusnoor, S. V., Epelbaum, M. I., AuYoung, M., Jenkins, G., … Program, A. of U. R. (2020). Diversity and inclusion for the All of Us research program: A scoping review. *PLoS ONE*, *15*(7), e0234962. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234962

Morgan, G., Hodge, K., Wells, K., & Watkins, M. (2015). Are Fit Indices Biased in Favor of Bi-Factor Models in Cognitive Ability Research?: A Comparison of Fit in Correlated Factors, Higher-Order, and Bi-Factor Models via Monte Carlo Simulations. *Journal of Intelligence*, *3*(1), 2–20. https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence3010002

Moriarity, D. P., Joyner, K. J., Slavich, G. M., & Alloy, L. B. (2022). Unconsidered issues of measurement noninvariance in biological psychiatry: A focus on biological phenotypes of psychopathology. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-021-01414-5

Murray, A. L., & Johnson, W. (2013). The limitations of model fit in comparing the bi-factor versus higher-order models of human cognitive ability structure. *Intelligence*, *41*(5), 407–422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2013.06.004

Papini, S., Iturralde, E., Lu, Y., Greene, J. D., Barreda, F., Sterling, S. A., & Liu, V. X. (2023). Development and validation of a machine learning model using electronic health records to predict trauma- and stressor-related psychiatric disorders after hospitalization with sepsis. *Translational Psychiatry*, *13*(1), 400. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-023-02699-6

Parkes, L., Moore, T. M., Calkins, M. E., Cook, P. A., Cieslak, M., Roalf, D. R., … Bassett, D. S. (2021). Transdiagnostic dimensions of psychopathology explain individuals' unique deviations from normative neurodevelopment in brain structure. *Translational Psychiatry*, *11*(1), 232. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-021-01342-6

Plana-Ripoll, O., Pedersen, C. B., Holtz, Y., Benros, M. E., Dalsgaard, S., Jonge, P. de, … McGrath, J. J. (2019). Exploring Comorbidity Within Mental Disorders Among a Danish National Population. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *76*(3), 259–270. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.3658

Ringwald, W. R., Forbes, M. K., & Wright, A. G. C. (2022). Meta-Analytic Tests of Measurement Invariance of Internalizing and Externalizing Psychopathology Across Common Methodological Characteristics. *Journal of Psychopathology and Clinical Science*, *131*(8), 847–856. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000785

Ringwald, W. R., Forbes, M. K., & Wright, A. G. C. (2023). Meta-analysis of structural evidence for the Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP) model. *Psychological Medicine*, *53*(2), 533–546. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0033291721001902

Rodriguez-Seijas, C., Li, J. J., Balling, C., Brandes, C., Bernat, E., Boness, C. L., … Eaton, N. R. (2023). Diversity and the Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP). *Nature Reviews Psychology*, *2*(8), 483–495. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-023-00200-0

Roehrs, T. A., & Roth, T. (2015). Sleep Disturbance in Substance Use Disorders. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, *38*(4), 793–803. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psc.2015.07.008

Rutter, M. (2013). Developmental psychopathology: A paradigm shift or just a relabeling? *Development and Psychopathology*, *25*(4pt2), 1201–1213. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579413000564

Schmengler, H., Peeters, M., Stevens, G. W. J. M., Hartman, C. A., Oldehinkel, A. J., & Vollebergh, W. A. M. (2023). ADHD Symptoms and Educational Level in Adolescents: The Role of the Family, Teachers, and Peers. *Research on Child and Adolescent Psychopathology*, *51*(7), 1051–1066. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-023-01047-y

Skodol, A. E., & Bender, D. S. (2016). *Psychiatry*. 487–524. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470515167.ch29

Smoller, J. W. (2018). The use of electronic health records for psychiatric phenotyping and genomics. *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics*, *177*(7), 601–612. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajmg.b.32548

Smoller, J. W., Andreassen, O. A., Edenberg, H. J., Faraone, S. V., Glatt, S. J., & Kendler, K. S. (2019). Psychiatric genetics and the structure of psychopathology. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *24*(3), 409–420. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-017-0010-4

Toft, G., Liu, C., Menon, J., Schendel, D., Loss, G., & Ehrenstein, V. (2021). Assessment of Educational Attainment and Employment Among Individuals With Autism Spectrum Disorder in Denmark. *JAMA Pediatrics*, *175*(6), 601–608. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.0124

Tucker, L. R., & Lewis, C. (1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, *38*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02291170

Verona, E., Javdani, S., & Sprague, J. (2011). Comparing Factor Structures of Adolescent Psychopathology. *Psychological Assessment*, *23*(2), 545–551. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022055

Voorhees, E. E. V., Dennis, P. A., Elbogen, E. B., Clancy, C. P., Hertzberg, M. A., Beckham, J. C., & Calhoun, P. S. (2014). Personality Assessment Inventory internalizing and externalizing structure in veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder: Associations with aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, *40*(6), 582–592. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21554

Waldman, I. D., King, C. D., Poore, H. E., Luningham, J. M., Zinbarg, R. M., Krueger, R. F., … Zald, D. (2022). Recommendations for Adjudicating Among Alternative Structural Models of Psychopathology. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *11*(4), 616–640. https://doi.org/10.1177/21677026221144256

Waldman, I. D., & Poore, H. E. (2023). Evaluating Alternative Models of Youth Externalizing Using Quantitative Genetic Analyses. *Journal of Psychopathology and Clinical Science*, *132*(7), 833–846. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000874

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., Simms, L. J., & Kotov, R. (2022). Classification and assessment of fear and anxiety in personality and psychopathology. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *142*, 104878. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.104878

Watts, A. L., Greene, A. L., Bonifay, W., & Fried, E. I. (2024). A critical evaluation of the p-factor literature. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, *3*(2), 108–122. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-023-00260-2

Watts, A. L., Poore, H. E., & Waldman, I. D. (2019). Riskier Tests of the Validity of the Bifactor Model of Psychopathology. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *7*(6), 1285–1303. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702619855035

Wei, W.-Q., Bastarache, L. A., Carroll, R. J., Marlo, J. E., Osterman, T. J., Gamazon, E. R., … Denny, J. C. (2017). Evaluating phecodes, clinical classification software, and ICD-9-CM codes for phenome-wide association studies in the electronic health record. *PLoS ONE*, *12*(7), e0175508. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175508

Wei, W.-Q., Teixeira, P. L., Mo, H., Cronin, R. M., Warner, J. L., & Denny, J. C. (2016). Combining billing codes, clinical notes, and medications from electronic health records

provides superior phenotyping performance. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *23*(e1), e20–e27. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocv130

Weng, W.-H., Baur, S., Daswani, M., Chen, C., Harrell, L., Kakarmath, S., … Ardila, D. (2024). Predicting cardiovascular disease risk using photoplethysmography and deep learning. *PLOS Global Public Health*, *4*(6), e0003204. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0003204

Wright, A. G. C., Krueger, R. F., Hobbs, M. J., Markon, K. E., Eaton, N. R., & Slade, T. (2013). The Structure of Psychopathology: Toward an Expanded Quantitative Empirical Model. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *122*(1), 281–294. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030133

Wu, P., Gifford, A., Meng, X., Li, X., Campbell, H., Varley, T., … Wei, W.-Q. (2019). Mapping ICD-10 and ICD-10-CM Codes to Phecodes: Workflow Development and Initial Evaluation. *JMIR Medical Informatics*, *7*(4), e14325. https://doi.org/10.2196/14325

Yun, T., Cosentino, J., Behsaz, B., McCaw, Z. R., Hill, D., Luben, R., … Hormozdiari, F. (2024). Unsupervised representation learning on high-dimensional clinical data improves genomic discovery and prediction. *Nature Genetics*, *56*(8), 1604–1613. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-024-01831-6

Zheutlin, A. B., Dennis, J., Linnér, R. K., Moscati, A., Restrepo, N., Straub, P., … Smoller, J. W. (2019). Penetrance and Pleiotropy of Polygenic Risk Scores for Schizophrenia in 106,160 Patients Across Four Health Care Systems. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *176*(10), 846–855. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.18091085

Table 1. *Comparison of Alternative Models of Psychopathology in All of Us*

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	Alternative Indices FL	SD	SE
1. General factor	43,769	702	.807	.797	.022	.127	.493	.167	.014
Correlated factors (I=Internalizing, E=Externalizing, T=Thought problems, S=Substance use, N=Neurodevelopmental disorders, F=Fear, D = Distress)									
2. I, E, T	24,669	591	.890	.883	.018	.123	.556	.182	.015
3. I, E, T, S	18,888	588	.916	.910	.016	.115	.631	.194	.015
4. I, E, T, N	25,128	696	.891	.884	.017	.120	.567	.170	.016
5. I, E, T, S, N	19,187	692	.917	.911	.014	.108	.604	.177	.016
6. F, D, E, T	24,535	588	.891	.883	.018	.123	.572	.182	.015
7. F, D, E, T, S	18,750	584	.917	.910	.016	.114	.644	.192	.016
8. F, D, E, T, N	24,895	690	.892	.884	.017	.119	.587	.278	.020
9. F, D, E, T, S, N	19,050	687	.918	.911	.014	.107	.613	.175	.016
Tests of the placement of ambiguously classified disorders									
ADHD and its three subtypes									
Placement in model 9: ADHD-HI & ADHD-C on E; ADHD-IN on N.									
9.5. Six correlated factors (ADHD-HI on E; ADHD-IN and ADHD-C on N. Correlated residuals between ADHD-HI and ADHD-IN as well as ADHD-HI and ADHD-C)	18,299	685	.921	.915	.014	.102	.616	.176	.017
Tic and Tourette's (TS)									
Placement in model 9.5: Tic and TS on N									
9.5.15. Six correlated factors (TIC and TS on D)	18,548	685	.920	.914	.014	.105	.619	.185	.016
9.5.16. Six correlated factors (TIC and TS on N and D)	18,275	683	.921	.915	.014	.103	.634	.237	.019
Antisocial personality disorder (ASPD)									
Placement in model 9.5: ASPD on S									
9.5.17. Six correlated factors (ASPD on E and S)	17,904	684	.923	.917	.014	.101	.614	.172	.017
Additional Correlated Residuals (~~)									
9.5.26. Six correlated factors (SCZ ~~ SCZAFF; OCD ~~ OCPD; MDD ~~ dysthymia)	15,962	682	.932	.926	.013	.098	.617	.174	.017
Models Based on Modification Indices									
PTSD *- Previous placement in Model 9.5.26: PTSD on D*									
9.5.26.1. Six correlated factors (PTSD on T)	14,537	682	.938	.933	.013	.097	.616	.169	.017
9.5.26.2. Six correlated factors (PTSD on T and D)	13,428	681	.943	.938	.012	.097	.614	.175	.017
OCD *- Previous placement in Model 9.5.26: OCD on D*									
9.5.26.2.1. Six correlated factors (OCD on T and D)	12,147	680	.949	.944	.011	.094	.611	.188	.017
BPD *- Previous placement in Model 9.5.26: BPD on T*									
9.5.26.2.1.1. Six correlated factors (BPD on T and D)	10,858	679	.954	.950	.011	.093	.605	.185	.017
ED *- Previous placement in Model 9.5.26: ED on T*									
9.5.26.2.1.1.1. Six correlated factors (ED on T and D)	9,469	678	.961	.957	.010	.091	.598	.202	.017

Note. CFI – comparative fit index, TLI – tucker-lewis index, RMSEA - root mean square error of approximation, SRMR – standardized root mean squared residual, FL – median factor loading, SD – standard deviation of loadings, SE – mean standard error. ADHD-HI – ADHD hyperactive-impulsive subtype, ADHD-IN – ADHD inattentive subtype, ADHD-C = ADHD combined subtype, SCZ – schizophrenia, SCZAFF – schizoaffective, CD – conduct disorder, ODD – oppositional defiant disorder, PANIC – panic disorder, AGOR – agoraphobia. Model in bold is our preferred best-fitting model.



Figure 1. *Heatmap of the correlations among 39 lifetime psychiatric diagnoses.*
Note. The heatmap is partitioned into six domains representing our most complex hypothesized model of psychopathology, comprising Neurodevelopmental Disorders (N), Substance Use (S), Thought Disorder (T), Externalizing (E), Distress (D), and Fear (F) dimensions.



Figure 2. *Path diagrams for preferred correlated factors model (Model 9.5).*
Note. F = Fear, D = Distress, E = Externalizing, S = Substance Use, T = Thought Problems, N = Neurodevelopmental Disorders.



Figure 3. *Impact of successive removal of each diagnosis on factor loadings*.
Note. Entries above the diagonal indicate the magnitude of changes in factor loadings for each diagnosis shown on the Y-axis as a function of removing each other diagnosis shown on the X-axis in turn, whereas entries below the diagonal indicated the magnitude of changes in the factor loadings for all other diagnoses shown on the Y-axis as a function of removing the diagnosis shown on the X-axis.



Figure 4. *Differences in External Correlates among the higher-order psychopathology dimensions (Model 9.5).*