Differentiating kinds of systemic chronic stressors with relation to psychotic-like experiences in late childhood and early adolescence: the stimulation, discrepancy, and deprivation model of psychosis

Teresa Vargas¹, Katherine S.F. Damme¹, K. Juston Osborne¹, Vijay A. Mittal²

¹ Northwestern University Department of Psychology

² Northwestern University Department of Psychology, Northwestern University Department of Psychiatry, Northwestern University Department of Medical Social Sciences, Northwestern University Institute for Innovations in Developmental Sciences, Northwestern University Institute for Policy Research

Corresponding author:

Teresa Vargas, teresavargas@u.northwestern.edu.

Keywords: chronic stress, deprivation, neighborhood crime, neighborhood population density, psychosis, schizophrenia, psychotic-like experiences, belonging, social exclusion

Abstract.

INTRODUCTION: Chronic stress exposure occurs at the systems level, and is a key etiological factor in the development of psychotic disorders. However, conceptualizations distinguishing the impact of distinct dimensions of stress exposure are lacking; further, the magnitude of effect for differing exposures has yet to be explored.

METHODS: Exploratory factor analysis was conducted to distinguish domains of environmental exposures in a nationally representative sample of 7,446 youth from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study. Environmental exposures were associated to psychotic-like experiences (PLEs). The magnitude of associations was compared among different environmental exposures. As an exploratory aim, objective versus subjective measures of environmental risk exposure were compared.

RESULTS: Six factors were defined, four of which fit theoretically with the Stimulation Discrepancy, and Deprivation (SDD) theory of developmental stress exposure and psychosis. The three domains of *stimulation* (high attentional demands and lack of safety), *discrepancy* (low social capital, social exclusion and lack of belonging), and *deprivation* (lack of developmentally appropriate environmental enrichment) were associated with PLEs, as predicted. Compared to exposures in other domains, exposures in the *deprivation* domain exhibited a significantly stronger association with PLEs. Objective and subjective measures converged in direction of association, though self-report *stimulation* exhibited a significantly stronger association with PLEs compared to objective *stimulation* domain measures.

DISCUSSION: Current results suggest considering distinct environmental exposures as they relate to psychosis liability could inform putative mechanisms and degrees of vulnerability. The approach offers a valuable perspective to health policy efforts aimed at psychopathology prevention and intervention efforts.

Introduction.

Chronic stress has been widely implicated to play a causal role in the etiology of psychosis¹⁻⁵. A wide array of work has examined individual-level chronic stressors and their relation to psychosis risk. More recently, however, the field has looked toward examining systems-level factors, such as neighborhood features. A recent review synthesizing the literature on systemic environmental risk factors for psychotic disorders hypothesized that exposures fall within three domains. These hypothesized environmental risk domains include *stimulation* (lack of safety and high attentional demands), *discrepancy* (lack of belonging and social exclusion) and *deprivation* (lack of needed environmental enrichment). To date, relevant systemic environmental risk literature has primarily focused on adult populations, whereas late childhood and early adolescent periods could represent a highly informative timespan for early detection and prevention efforts⁶⁻¹⁰. Further, while a body of literature supports the important roles for each of these three domains, they have yet to be directly tested together. The present investigation directly tested this theory in two stages. First by examining whether risk factor exposures would separate into the hypothesized domains. Then relating the resulting domains to psychotic-like experiences (PLEs) to assess relevance to psychosis risk. Finally, by comparing the magnitude of effects for observed associations by domain, in order to explore differences in degrees of vulnerability. Examining chronic stress both through an individual and systems level perspective by synthesizing these factors into environmental domains of influence is a critical priority. Despite the considerable research attention dedicated to this class of disorder, the field also lacks a clear understanding of environment x liability interactions, particularly in the pediatric developmental periods. Given the challenging prognosis, a better understanding of causal factors, and individual and systems level prevention efforts are paramount.

Psychotic disorders are chronic in nature, difficult to treat, and highly debilitating, constituting one of the top 15 leading causes of disability worldwide¹¹. After psychotic illness onset, confounds related to factors such as medication use, social and functional decline make it difficult to distill factors driving illness onset. As such, assessment of associated symptoms or experiences on the psychosis spectrum, such as PLEs provides a promising alternative for identifying factors relating to psychosis etiology¹². PLEs, including experiences such as unusual beliefs, suspiciousness, and perceptual abnormalities, have been associated with pathogenic factors implicated in formal psychosis⁶⁻¹⁰. Further, PLEs are experienced by 13-15% of children^{13,14}, and childhood experiences of PLEs have been shown to increase later risk for psychotic disorder onset¹⁴⁻¹⁶. Investigating PLEs in childhood provides an opportunity to understand environmental risk factors early in development, prior to illness related confounds. PLEs may also be of key importance during a critical developmental period in which prevention could be particularly effective.

Chronic stress exposure is a central contributing factor in the development of psychotic disorders^{17,18}. Robust and varied evidence suggests a wide host of stressors can cumulatively contribute to psychosis risk¹⁻⁵. In the neural diathesis stress model, for example, posits that the accumulation of stressors can comprise “multiple hits” which acting on a vulnerable system can increase likelihood of developing a psychotic disorder^{4,19}. Although this theory highlights the importance of conceptualizing stressors collectively, isolating qualitatively distinct stressors could also be uniquely informative to psychosis etiology. Work on trauma exposure, for instance, has illuminated differing neurodevelopmental consequences depending on the type of trauma²⁰⁻²². Beyond trauma, distinct domains of chronic stressors could contribute to risk for developing a psychotic disorder. Additionally, these domains could aid in the understanding the complex and

multifaceted nature of the illness. Isolating the impacts of differing dimensions of experience could be informative to psychotic disorder etiology. Indeed the non-psychiatric literature has successfully spearheaded conceptualizing neurodevelopment in this manner²². Despite this fact, the psychotic disorder literature has largely conceptualized chronic stressors collectively, with less attention given to understanding specific kinds of exposures.

As individuals we operate within a larger environmental, social and cultural context (i.e. structural factors); as such, chronic stress can occur at the systems level^{23,24}. Local structural characteristics (such as neighborhood socioeconomic status or cultural integration) could systematically affect well-being and risk for psychopathology. Increasing understanding of structural barriers to mental health has strong potential to inform health policy initiatives, along with prevention and intervention efforts at the societal level. To this end, our group has developed a literature-backed theoretical model of different types of structural exposures, along with distinct intermediary mechanisms of impact and proposed relevant neural systems²⁵—the Stimulation Discrepancy Deprivation (SDD) model of psychosis. The *stimulation* domain includes crime exposure at the neighborhood level²⁶, along with population density^{27,28}, with intermediary mechanisms of lack of safety^{28,29} and high attentional demands^{30,31}. The *discrepancy* domain, on the other hand, includes environmental and cultural characteristics conferring a lack of belonging and social exclusion³²⁻³⁹. Lastly, the *deprivation* domain constitutes environments lacking socioeconomic, educational, or material resources⁴⁰⁻⁴³, with intermediary mechanisms of lack of necessary environmental enrichment^{44,45}. Each domain was theorized to relate to psychosis risk through both common (consistent with the diathesis stress model) and distinct mechanisms. While each domain benefits from support from the psychosis literature, the distinctiveness of the domains has yet to be tested as they relate to the psychosis

continuum. The degree to which each domain contributes to psychosis risk is unclear.

Understanding each domain as it relates to degrees of risk for psychopathology could be immensely useful in identifying and prioritizing treatment targets. Conceptualizing degrees of risk could also inform etiological models of psychotic disorders. Further, existing evidence in support of each domain has often honed in on adolescent or young adult populations.

Determining whether structural environmental risk exposures are also impactful earlier in development (during childhood and early adolescence), and with regards to sub-threshold psychotic symptoms, would lend granularity to our understanding of environmental risk exposure across developmental periods.

The current investigation utilized a large nationally representative sample of youth aged 9 to 11 years old to further understand exposure to environmental chronic stressors in relation to PLEs. The first aim was to directly test the SDD theory by exploring whether relevant items would load into factors consistent with the 3 hypothesized domains. The second aim was to determine whether the environmental chronic stress domains would relate to PLEs, consistent with the SDD theory. The third aim was to then compare relative strengths of existing associations between environmental exposures and PLEs (in order to see whether certain exposures would show greater associations with psychosis risk than others). A final exploratory aim sought to determine whether associations between objective, Census derived neighborhood metrics of environmental exposures and self-report measures indexing the same exposure would exhibit relations similar in magnitude.

Methods.

Participants. The ABCD dataset includes a large representative sample of children aged 9-11 years old across 21 centers in the United States^{46,47}. All centers obtained the parents' informed

consent as well as the children's assent. Research procedures followed ethical guidelines laid out by respective Institutional Review Boards (doi: 10.15154/1519171). The current sample used baseline data, and constituted 7446 participants (who had available data for items in the final factor solution, as well as PLE data). A subset of 7,385 were used for the EFA, since they had available data on all self-report items that were initially considered for factor analysis, and a subset of 6994 also had available data on "objective" neighborhood measures, PLEs, and self-report items used in the factor analysis.

PLEs. The Prodromal Questionnaire-Brief Child version was used to assess psychotic-like experiences⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰. The 21-item self-report questionnaire has been previously validated in the ABCD study sample⁴⁸. The questionnaire asked participants about specific PLEs that were endorsed with a binary response (yes/no). Participants also indicated whether there was distress related to endorsed symptoms on a visual response 5-item Likert scale. Consistent with prior research, distress scores were calculated whereby the total number of endorsed symptoms were weighed by level of distress (0 indicates zero endorsement, 1 indicates endorsement without distress, and 2-6 indicate endorsement with incremental distress levels)^{48,49}.

Self-report questionnaires. Self-report scales relevant to theoretical interest in three domains of deprivation, discrepancy, and stimulation were chosen across numerous administered scales²⁵. These included the ABCD Parent Multi-Group Ethnic Identity-Revised Survey (MEIM)⁵¹, which separates into "ethnic identity search" and "affirmation, belonging and commitment"⁵¹. The ABCD Parent Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA)—Short Survey⁵²; which subdivides into "heritage" and "American" subscores⁵². Other scales administered included the ABCD Youth Neighborhood Safety/Crime Survey Modified from PhenX (NSC), ABCD Parent neighborhood safety/crime survey modified from PhenX (NSC)^{53,54}, ABCD Parent

Acculturation Survey Modified from PhenX (ACC), ABCD Youth Acculturation Survey Modified from PhenX (ACC)^{55,56}, and the ABCD Parents Demographics survey,. Primary guardians/parents of the youth completed the ABCD Parent MEIM, ABCD Parent neighborhood safety/crime survey modified from PhenX (NSC), ABCD Parent VIA, and ABCD Parent ACC. Youth completed the ABCD Youth NSC, as well as the ABCD Youth ACC.

Objective neighborhood features. Residential history was collected through addresses where participants had lived across their lifetime. Addresses were used to determine Census tracts corresponding to each location. Each tract represents Census-delineated neighborhoods. Census and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) data was used to calculate neighborhood population density, total crimes occurring in certain neighborhood, and the area deprivation index (ADI). The ADI metric has been successfully adapted to measure neighborhood deprivation; it is calculated based on the American Community Survey 2015 5-year summary⁵⁷. Since these metrics are compiled based on government data, they will be referred to as “objective neighborhood features,” drawing a contrast from neighborhood features of interest that are also assessed through self-report (such as the youth and adult NSC).

Exploratory factor analysis. To determine whether environmental risk factors would fall within hypothesized domains²⁵, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the self-report scales with the minimum residuals method⁵⁸ using the “psych” package in R⁵⁹. Given the theoretical expectation that some factors would correlate, an oblimin rotation was chosen. Number of factors were decided based on inspection of the scree plot, as well as based on theoretical consistency and interpretability. A cut-off value of 0.4 was chosen for factor loadings; items falling beneath this threshold were excluded⁶⁰.

Associations between self-report factors, neighborhood features and PLEs. To determine whether PLEs and self-report factors related to each other, Spearman correlations were conducted adjusting for age and sex. Spearman correlations adjusting for age and sex were also conducted to test the association between PLEs and objective neighborhood features. A central aim was to compare the strength of associations between psychotic like experiences and self-report items, as well as between objective neighborhood features and psychotic-like experiences. Differences between correlations between PLEs, self-report and objective neighborhood features indexing the same construct were also tested (i.e. self-report neighborhood safety and total number of crimes in neighborhood, neighborhood deprivation index and self-reported lack of resources). To test whether associations were significantly different, correlation coefficients were converted into a z-score using Fisher's r-to-z transformation⁶¹. Then, the asymptotic covariance of the estimates were computed, and used in an asymptotic z-test to determine whether one correlation was significantly greater than the other^{62,63}. All analyses were Bonferroni corrected by dividing $\alpha = 0.05$ by the number of tests conducted^{64,65}.

Results.

Exploratory factor analysis for self-report items. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test of sphericity indicated the data was appropriate to analyze. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy was 0.89⁶⁶⁻⁶⁸. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(465) = 137060.4$, $p < 0.05$ ⁶⁹. The six-factor solution explained 51% of the variance, and was chosen (a) after inspection of the screeplot, as well as (b) based on previous theoretical support, and (c) considering that seven and eight factor solutions were difficult to interpret and had an insufficient number of primary loadings. Five items were eliminated from the original variable set due to failure to meet minimum criteria of having a primary factor loading of 0.4 or above,

with 3 of the items also not contributing to the factor structure. The self-report items completed by the youth did not load onto the factor structure (“How well do you speak English?” and “My neighborhood is safe from crime”). One parent reported item did not load onto the factor structure (“Besides English, do you speak or understand another language or dialect?”). Two items (parent reported “How well do you speak English?” and “In the past 12 months, were evicted from your home for not paying the rent or mortgage”) did not meet the requirement of having a factor loading of 0.4 or above.

After removing these five items, the six-factor solution exploratory factor analysis solution using minimum residuals with an oblimin rotation explained 58% of the variance. All items in the analysis had primary loadings over 0.4 (Table 2). With regards to reliability, across the entire dataset, $\omega_{\text{total}} = 0.94$ ⁷⁰. Reliability was adequate across factors as well (factor 1, $\omega_{\text{total}} = 0.91$; factor 2, $\omega_{\text{total}} = 0.85$; factor 3, $\omega_{\text{total}} = 0.90$; factor 4, $\omega_{\text{total}} = 0.89$; factor 5, $\omega_{\text{total}} = 0.75$; factor 6, $\omega_{\text{total}} = 0.75$).

Factor loadings were largely consistent with theoretical predictions. Factor 5 was theoretically consistent with the *deprivation* domain. Factor 3, in turn, was theoretically consistent with the *stimulation* domain. The *discrepancy* domain comprised the remaining 4 factors. Factors 1 and 4 index participation in heritage and American culture respectively. Factors 2 and 6, in turn, index wish to understand and/or maintain ethnic group and American cultural practices respectively. Factors were named according to corresponding items and theoretical hypotheses. Factor 1 was named “heritage culture participation”; Factor 2 was deemed “Sense of belonging with ethnic group”; Factor 3 was named “Neighborhood safety”; Factor 4 was deemed “American culture participation”; Factor 5 was deemed “Deprivation”; Factor 6 was named “Maintain American cultural practice.”

Associations between self-report factors and PLEs. Greater endorsement of the “deprivation” factor/*deprivation* domain related to greater PLEs ($r = 0.12$). Similarly, endorsement of safer neighborhoods/*stimulation* domain related to less PLEs ($r = -0.09$), consistent with predictions. The “heritage cultural participation” and “maintain American cultural practice factors were not found to significantly relate to PLEs. Consistent with predictions, the two factors most relevant to the *discrepancy* domain (“sense of belonging with ethnic group” and “American culture participation”) related to PLES such that greater sense of belonging with ethnic group ($r = -0.05$) and greater American culture participation ($r = -0.05$) predicted less PLEs (Table 4). The strength of the correlations was subsequently compared to gauge the relative strength of observed associations; the “deprivation” factor association with PLEs was significantly greater than that of the *discrepancy* domain “American culture participation” and “sense of belonging with ethnic group” factors, which survived Bonferroni correction (Table 5).

Associations between objective neighborhood features and PLEs. With regards to objective neighborhood measures, increased *stimulation* domain neighborhood population density ($r = 0.04$) and total crimes ($r = 0.04$), along with *deprivation* domain neighborhood deprivation ($r = 0.12$) all related to increased experience of PLEs (Table 4). The strength of the correlations was compared; *stimulation* domain neighborhood population density and total crimes did not significantly differ in strength of the association with PLEs. However, the association between *deprivation* domain neighborhood deprivation and PLEs was significantly stronger than the associations observed for both *stimulation* domain total crimes and population density (Table 5).

Exploratory comparison of objective and self-report measures. Finally, as an exploratory aim self-report measures and their corresponding objective measures were compared in terms of strength of the association observed. For the *deprivation* domain, the self-reported “deprivation factor”-PLE association did not significantly differ in strength from the neighborhood deprivation-PLE association. However, for the *stimulation* domain, the self-reported “neighborhood safety”-PLE association was significantly stronger than the association observed between neighborhood total crimes and PLEs.

Discussion.

The current study used a large representative sample to examine whether environmental exposures could be distinguished as theorized in the SDD model of psychosis. Further, environmental stressor exposures (self-report and objective) were explored in relation to PLEs. Although we expected three factors to emerge, the EFA of self-report data identified 6 factors, corresponding to heritage culture participation, sense of belonging with ethnic group, American culture participation, neighborhood safety, deprivation, and maintaining American cultural practice. Though more factors were fit than anticipated, these factors did largely fit within the SDD model. Sense of belonging with ethnic group and American culture participation were most consistent with the *discrepancy* domain, which comprises exposures conferring feelings of social exclusion and lack of belonging. Neighborhood safety was theoretically consistent with the *stimulation* domain (along with objective neighborhood total crimes and population density), concerning itself with exposures related to lack of safety and large attentional demands. Lastly, deprivation was consistent with the SDD’s *deprivation* domain (along with objective neighborhood deprivation), constituting exposures related to lack of developmentally appropriate environmental enrichment. Critically, the present investigation is among the first to compare

relative strength of the association between these distinct domains of environmental exposure to chronic stress and psychosis risk. Environmental exposure to chronic stress across the three domains related to PLEs: the “deprivation” factor association with PLEs was significantly greater than that of the “American culture participation” and “sense of belonging with ethnic group” factors, suggesting deprivation exposures could relate more strongly to psychosis risk. Consistent with this interpretation, in terms of objective neighborhood measures, the association of neighborhood deprivation and PLEs was also significantly stronger than the association for neighborhood population density or neighborhood crime. Taken together, results lend support to the SDD theory of psychosis, possibly informing etiological models and public policy conceptualizations of prevention and intervention.

EFA was utilized for self-report scales measuring constructs applicable to the SDD theory. As expected, items taken from the NSC survey loaded onto a “Neighborhood safety” factor⁵³. These items reflected feelings of safety in one’s living environment, consistent with the *stimulation* SDD domain. Items inquiring about income/resource availability, indexing degrees of environmental enrichment, as consistent with the *deprivation* domain, loaded onto a “deprivation” factor. Lastly, Items related to culture separated into factors relating to “heritage culture participation”, “American culture participation,” “maintain American cultural practice,” and “sense of belonging with ethnic group”. Of these factors, “sense of belonging with ethnic group” and “American/heritage culture participation” are conceptually most consistent with the *discrepancy* domain, as they index current feelings of belonging and participation (as opposed to wish to maintain or participate in American cultural values, as the “maintain American cultural practice” factor captures). Both self-report measures and objective neighborhood features were examined to enrich our conceptualization of the 3 domains and their relation to psychosis risk.

Neighborhood total crimes and population density were part of the *stimulation* domain along with the “Neighborhood safety” self-report factor discussed above. Neighborhood deprivation formed part of the *deprivation* domain, as did the self-report “deprivation” factor.

Self-report and objective environmental exposures were associated with PLEs. Decreased reports of neighborhood safety (along with greater neighborhood total crimes and higher neighborhood population density) predicted greater PLE endorsement. Results are consistent with previous investigations on adolescents and adults finding *stimulation* exposures to relate to increased risk for developing a psychotic disorder^{26-29,31,41}. Further, results suggest that the relation between these environmental exposures and psychosis spectrum symptoms extends to non-clinical psychosis, and is evident as early as late childhood to late adolescence. Mechanisms through which these exposures could be impactful include high attentional demands and feelings of lack of safety—future investigations testing these mechanisms will be crucial.

Increased reporting of deprivation and higher objective neighborhood deprivation predicted greater endorsement of PLEs. Collectively, findings show that both objective and subjective levels of *stimulation* and *deprivation* contribute to the occurrence of PLEs. Reporting greater personal exposure to deprivation showed an association, as did exposure to deprivation in the broader, neighborhood environment. Findings are consistent with a strong body of literature which suggests that exposure to both individual and neighborhood deprivation can confer risk for psychosis^{27,41,71-74}, along with adversely affecting physical health and functional outcomes^{44,45,75-84}. Future investigations honing in on windows of exposure and differential effects on neurodevelopment will further enrich this line of work.

Of the self-report factors relevant to the *discrepancy* domain, increased “sense of belonging with ethnic group” and “American culture participation” related to less endorsement

of PLEs. Observed associations are congruent with evidence that high ethnic density⁸⁵⁻⁸⁷ and social cohesion⁸⁸ can serve as protective factors. Results extend the existing literature by providing evidence that exposures conferring social exclusion and lack of belonging could relate to PLEs as early as late childhood to early adolescence^{72,85-91}. “Heritage culture participation” and “maintain American cultural practice” factors, on the other hand, were not associated with PLEs. The lack of significant association between “heritage culture participation” and PLEs could be due to insufficient factor specificity with regards to feelings of belonging. That is, one could participate in one’s heritage culture, and yet not feel a sense of belonging with their surroundings more broadly, or with the majority culture. Psychosis environmental risk factors theorized by the SDD theory *discrepancy* domain include intermediary mechanisms conferring lack of belonging or social exclusion, as well as psychosis risk, such as ethnic minority status^{72,86}, low ethnic density^{85,87}, and social fragmentation⁸⁹⁻⁹¹. Perhaps the “heritage culture participation” factor does not fully capture these experiences of social exclusion or lack of belonging. “American culture participation,” on the other hand, did relate to PLEs. The association makes sense as American culture in the United States would comprise the “majority” culture. Given the vast evidence of low ethnic density and minority status conferring psychosis risk^{72,85-87}, perhaps “American culture participation” indexes comfortability within the majority culture, which could directly impact overall social capital and sense of social cohesion, effecting psychosis risk through this mechanism^{32,33,88,92}. The factor “Maintain American cultural practice,” on the other hand, reflects a wish to maintain the cultural practice, not necessarily indexing current participation. Given that it does not index current participation in American culture, this aids interpretation of why the association with PLEs was not observed with this factor. Future investigations assessing other environmental exposures theorized to fall under the

discrepancy domain and further establishing specificity could aid in offering more nuance to current results.

The literature thus far has been limited in comparing the magnitude of associations between distinct environmental exposures and psychosis risk. The three domains showed differential associations the PLEs, demonstrating their relative contribution could be informative to consider, as well as highlighting the impact of individual domains. In the current sample, observed associations between *deprivation* (objective and self-report) exposures and PLEs were significantly stronger than associations between PLEs and *discrepancy* exposures, with effect sizes for *deprivation* being twice as large. The observed difference is consistent with animal and human literature suggesting that lack of neurodevelopmentally appropriate enrichment can have widespread consequences, impacting a host of key systems necessary for general functioning, as well as overall health and well-being^{44,45,75-84}. Future investigations will be necessary in order to clarify possible mechanisms through which *deprivation* exposures could be particularly relevant for psychosis risk. Further understanding mechanisms for each domain would aid in clarifying and interpreting the extent of their associations with psychosis vulnerability. PLEs are complex, with a multitude of putative contributing factors, and so observed effects, though small, are meaningful when considered in context⁹³.

An exploratory aim sought to compare the magnitude of PLE associations between self-report versus objective environmental exposures. The PLE association with self-report deprivation was not significantly different in magnitude than the PLE association with objective neighborhood deprivation. However, this was not the case with *stimulation* exposures. While the PLE association between neighborhood total crimes and population density did not significantly differ in magnitude, the PLE association between neighborhood total crimes and self-report

“neighborhood safety” did. Indeed, the PLE association with “neighborhood safety” was more than twice as large as the PLE association with neighborhood total crimes. While preliminary, results suggest that perhaps the association between PLEs and crime exposure is at least partially contingent on conscious awareness: in this case, self-reported lack of safety could represent heightened awareness of the “objective” circumstances, or it could represent inaccurate reporting due to heightened vigilance. Future investigations are needed in order to parse out these possibilities.

Current results are informative for models of psychosis etiology, and emphasize the value of targeting specific environmental factors in preventive health policy efforts for psychotic disorders. Findings aid in refining the SDD theory moving forward. However, these findings must be contextualized within certain limitations. Future investigations may benefit from more fully incorporating other facets of environmental chronic stress exposure, and integrating them within the SDD conceptual framework. Further, future investigations would benefit from exploring neural and biological mechanisms that could underlie the associations observed between environmental exposures and psychosis risk. Collecting information on precise timing of exposure would further add richness to neurodevelopmental conceptualizations of risk and resilience. Lastly, longitudinal investigations would aid our ability to predict directionality of the associations, and account for confounds such as social drift.

Acknowledgments.

Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study (<https://abcdstudy.org>), held in the NIMH Data Archive (NDA). This is a multisite, longitudinal study designed to recruit more than 10,000 children age 9-10 and follow them over 10 years into early adulthood. The ABCD Study is supported by the National Institutes of Health and additional federal partners under award numbers U01DA041022, U01DA041028, U01DA041048, U01DA041089, U01DA041106, U01DA041117, U01DA041120, U01DA041134, U01DA041148, U01DA041156, U01DA041174, U24DA041123, U24DA041147, U01DA041093, and U01DA041025. A full list of supporters is available at <https://abcdstudy.org/federal-partners.html>. A listing of participating sites and a complete listing of the study investigators can be found at https://abcdstudy.org/Consortium_Members.pdf. ABCD consortium investigators designed and implemented the study and/or provided data but did not necessarily participate in analysis or writing of this report. This manuscript reflects the views of the authors and may not reflect the opinions or views of the NIH or ABCD consortium investigators. The ABCD data repository grows and changes over time. The ABCD data used in this report came from [NIMH Data Archive Digital Object Identifier (DOI) 10.15154/1506121]. DOIs can be found at <https://nda.nih.gov/general-query.html?q=query=studies%20~and~%20orderBy=id%20~and~%20orderDirection=Ascending>.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics.

	Entire sample	
	M	SD
Age (months)	118.94	7.49
PPS symptom endorsement ¹	2.66	3.60
PPS symptom distress endorsement ²	1.34	2.33
	n	%
Family history of psychosis ³	760	10.3
Family history of depression ⁴	3777	51.1
Family history of seeking mental health treatment ⁵	4435	60
Family history of mental health related hospitalizations ⁶	2123	28.7
Sex		
Female	3542	48
Male	3841	52
Race ⁷	n	%
White	3443	46.6
Western European	124	1.7
Eastern European	49	0.7
Latino/Hispanic	1446	19.6
Black/African American	1342	18.2
Afro-Caribbean/Indo-Caribbean/West Indian	32	0.4
East Asian	202	2.7
South Asian	55	0.7
Southeast Asian	109	1.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	63	0.9
Middle Eastern	27	0.4
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	24	0.3
Other ⁸	424	5.7

¹ABCD Prodromal Psychosis Scale total symptoms endorsed

²ABCD Prodromal Psychosis Scale total symptoms with endorsed distress, accounting for distress magnitude

³Parent responses to the question, “Has ANY blood relative of your child ever had a period lasting six months when they saw visions or heard voices or thought people were spying on them or plotting against them?”

⁴Parent responses to the question, “Has ANY blood relative of your child ever suffered from depression, that is, have they felt so low for a period of at least two weeks that they hardly ate or slept or couldn't work or do whatever they usually do?”

⁵Parent responses to the question, “Has ANY blood relative of your child ever been to a doctor or a counselor about any emotional or mental problems, or problems with alcohol or drugs?”

⁶Parent responses to the question, “Has ANY blood relative of your child ever been hospitalized because of emotional or mental problems, or drug or alcohol problems?”

Vargas et al.

⁷Self-reported ethnicity.

⁸Those with missing data or that reported “other” ethnicity, unknown ethnicity, or declined to respond.

Table 2. Exploratory factor analysis loadings.

Item	Factor	MR1	MR2	MR3	MR4	MR5	MR6
I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group such as its history, traditions and customs	MR2	0.06	0.7	-0.01	0	-0.01	0.01
I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group	MR2	-0.08	0.72	-0.03	-0.04	0.03	0.01
I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me	MR2	-0.02	0.68	-0.01	-0.08	0.03	0.02
I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better	MR2	0.03	0.88	0.01	0.03	0	0
I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group	MR2	0.04	0.86	0.02	0.04	-0.03	0.01
I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group	MR2	-0.1	0.75	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0
I often participate in my heritage cultural traditions	MR1	0.68	-0.13	0	-0.06	-0.04	0.03
I often participate in mainstream American cultural traditions	MR4	0.04	-0.07	0.09	0.42	-0.09	0.25
I enjoy social activities with people from the same heritage culture as myself	MR1	0.71	-0.05	-0.01	0.19	-0.02	-0.1
I enjoy social activities with typical American people	MR4	0	-0.04	0.03	0.69	-0.04	0.2
I am comfortable interacting with people of the same heritage culture as myself	MR4	0.44	0.01	0.01	0.58	-0.03	-0.21
I am comfortable interacting with typical American people	MR4	-0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.92	-0.01	0.01
I enjoy entertainment (e.g. movies music) from my heritage culture	MR1	0.68	0	-0.03	0.2	0.05	-0.23
I enjoy typical American entertainment (e.g. movies, music)	MR4	-0.03	-0.01	-0.01	0.77	0	0.12
I often behave in ways that are typical of my heritage culture	MR1	0.74	0.05	0.04	-0.02	-0.02	0.03
I often behave in ways that are typically American	MR4	-0.06	-0.01	0.05	0.48	-0.02	0.41
It is important for me to maintain or develop the practices of my heritage culture	MR1	0.86	-0.07	0.01	-0.15	-0.01	0.14
It is important for me to maintain or develop American mainstream cultural practices	MR6	0.2	-0.05	0.01	0.13	-0.02	0.67
I believe in the values of my heritage culture	MR1	0.81	-0.02	0	-0.04	-0.01	0.12
I believe in mainstream American values	MR6	0.13	0.01	0.01	0.23	-0.01	0.61
I am interested in having friends from my heritage culture	MR1	0.77	-0.02	-0.01	0.04	0.03	0.08
I am interested in having typical American friends	MR6	0.24	-0.02	0.01	0.35	0.02	0.41
I feel safe walking in my neighborhood day or night	MR3	-0.01	-0.01	0.8	0.02	0.02	-0.03
Violence is not a problem in my neighborhood	MR3	0	0.01	0.9	0.01	-0.01	-0.02
My neighborhood is safe from crime	MR3	0.01	0.01	0.85	-0.04	-0.01	0.02
In past 12 months, needed food but could not afford to buy it or could not afford to go out to get it	MR5	0.01	0	0	0	0.68	0.03

Vargas et al.

in past 12 months, were without telephone service because you could not afford it	MR5	0.02	0.02	0	-0.01	0.62	-0.01
in past 12 months, did not pay the full amount of the rent or mortgage because you could not afford it	MR5	0	-0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.63	0
in past 12 months, had services turned off by the gas or electric company or the oil company would not deliver oil because payments were not made	MR5	-0.01	-0.01	0.03	0.01	0.57	-0.01
in past 12 months, had someone who needed to see a doctor or go to the hospital but did not go because you could not afford it	MR5	-0.01	-0.02	0.04	0.01	0.48	0.01
in past 12 months, had someone who needed a dentist but could not go because you could not afford it	MR5	0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.5	0.01

Table 3. Exploratory factor analysis uniqueness and communality metrics.

Item	h^2	u^2	communality
I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group such as its history, traditions and customs	0.46	0.54	1
I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group	0.58	0.42	1
I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me	0.49	0.51	1
I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better	0.75	0.25	1
I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group	0.71	0.29	1
I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group	0.65	0.35	1
I often participate in my heritage cultural traditions	0.54	0.46	1
I often participate in mainstream American cultural traditions	0.41	0.59	2
I enjoy social activities with people from the same heritage culture as myself	0.64	0.36	1.2
I enjoy social activities with typical American people	0.65	0.35	1.2
I am comfortable interacting with people of the same heritage culture as myself	0.66	0.34	2.2
I am comfortable interacting with typical American people	0.84	0.16	1
I enjoy entertainment (e.g. movies music) from my heritage culture	0.55	0.45	1.4
I enjoy typical American entertainment (e.g. movies, music)	0.65	0.35	1.1
I often behave in ways that are typical of my heritage culture	0.52	0.48	1
I often behave in ways that are typically American	0.53	0.47	2
It is important for me to maintain or develop the practices of my heritage culture	0.78	0.22	1.1
It is important for me to maintain or develop American mainstream cultural practices	0.7	0.3	1.3
I believe in the values of my heritage culture	0.71	0.29	1.1
I believe in mainstream American values	0.61	0.39	1.4
I am interested in having friends from my heritage culture	0.67	0.33	1
I am interested in having typical American friends	0.6	0.4	2.6
I feel safe walking in my neighborhood day or night	0.62	0.38	1
Violence is not a problem in my neighborhood	0.82	0.18	1
My neighborhood is safe from crime	0.72	0.28	1
In past 12 months, needed food but could not afford to buy it or could not afford to go out to get it	0.45	0.55	1
In past 12 months, were without telephone service because you could not afford it	0.38	0.62	1
In past 12 months, did not pay the full amount of the rent or mortgage because you could not afford it	0.4	0.6	1
In past 12 months, had services turned off by the gas or electric company or the oil company would not deliver oil because payments were not made	0.31	0.69	1
In past 12 months, had someone who needed to see a doctor or go to the hospital but did not go because you could not afford it	0.22	0.78	1
In past 12 months, had someone who needed a dentist but could not go because you could not afford it	0.26	0.74	1

Table 4. Spearman partial correlations for self-report and objective measures controlling for sex and age. MR3 (neighborhood safety), neighborhood population density and crime are part of the *stimulation* domain. MR2 (sense of belonging with ethnic group) and MR4 (American culture participation) comprise the *discrepancy* domain. MR5 (deprivation) and neighborhood deprivation constitute the *deprivation* domain.

	<i>r</i>	<i>P_{uncorrected}</i>	Survived bonferroni correction? ^a
Self-report			
MR1 heritage culture participation	-0.012	0.309	No
MR2 sense of belonging with ethnic group	-0.052	0.000006	Yes
MR3 neighborhood safety	-0.091	3.0378E-15	Yes
MR4 American culture participation	-0.052	0.000006	Yes
MR5 deprivation	0.121	1.0533E-25	Yes
MR6 maintain American cultural practice	-0.004	0.709	No
Objective neighborhood characteristics			
Neighborhood population density	0.042	0.000471	Yes
Neighborhood crime	0.039	0.001	Yes
Neighborhood deprivation	0.12	1.5629E-23	Yes

^a Whether the association survived correction for multiple comparisons. The threshold was determined by dividing the alpha level (0.05) by the number of comparisons (9). The threshold value is 0.00555556.

Table 5. Comparison of strength of association. MR3 (neighborhood safety), neighborhood population density and crime are part of the *stimulation* domain. MR2 (sense of belonging with ethnic group) and MR4 (American culture participation) comprise the *discrepancy* domain. MR5 (deprivation) and neighborhood deprivation constitute the *deprivation* domain.

Comparisons	Z score	$P_{uncorrected}$	Survived bonferroni correction? ^a
Self-report comparison			
MR2/MR3	2.446	0.01445	No
MR4/MR3	2.636	0.00839	No
MR5/MR3	2.12	0.03363	No
MR2/MR4	0	1	No
MR2/MR5	4.376	0.00001	Yes
MR4/MR5	4.517	0.000006	Yes
Self-report/objective measure comparison			
MR5/ neighborhood deprivation	0.071	0.94318	No
MR3/ crime	3.55	0.00038	Yes
Objective measure comparison			
Pop density/ crime	0.236	0.81	No
Pop density/ neighborhood deprivation	4.776	0.000002	Yes
Crime/ neighborhood deprivation	5.344	<0.000001	Yes

^a For self-report comparisons, the bonferroni-corrected threshold was 0.00833. For self-report/objective measure comparisons, the bonferroni-corrected threshold was 0.025. For objective measure comparisons, the bonferroni-corrected threshold was 0.01667.

Figure 1. Exploratory factor analysis of self-report items. “Neighborhood safety” is part of the *stimulation* domain. “Sense of belonging with ethnic group” and “American culture participation” comprise the *discrepancy* domain. “Deprivation” constitutes the *deprivation* domain. “Heritage culture participation” and “maintain American cultural practice” did not relate to PLEs and are not included within the three SDD domains.

Vargas et al.

27

Figure 2. Item endorsement per factor. “Neighborhood safety” is part of the *stimulation* domain. “Sense of belonging with ethnic group” and “American culture participation” comprise the *discrepancy* domain. “Deprivation” constitutes the *deprivation* domain. “Heritage culture participation” and “maintain American cultural practice” did not relate to PLEs and are not included within the three SDD domains.

Vargas et al.

28

Figure 3. Associations between self-report factors and PLEs.

Figure 4. Associations between objective neighborhood characteristics and PLEs.

Supplementary Table 1. Key including full item prompts.

Item	Item full prompt
CHILDaccult_phenx_q1	How well do you speak English?
meim_1_p	I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs. He pasado tiempo intentando saber m [√] s sobre mi grupo [√] ©tnico, como su historia, tradiciones y costumbres.
meim_2_p	I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group. Tengo un fuerte sentido de pertenecer con mi propio grupo [√] ©tnico.
meim_3_p	I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me. Entiendo bastante bien lo que significa para m [√] ≠ pertenecer a mi grupo [√] ©tnico.
meim_4_p	I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better. Muchas veces he hecho cosas que me ayudar [√] °n a comprender mejor a mi grupo [√] ©tnico.
meim_5_p	I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group. Con frecuencia he hablado con otras personas para aprender m [√] s sobre mi

	grupo $\sqrt{\text{étnico}}$.
meim_6_p	I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group. Siento una fuerte conexión hacia mi propio grupo $\sqrt{\text{étnico}}$.
via_accult_q2_p	I often participate in my heritage cultural traditions. Con frecuencia participo en las tradiciones de mi propia cultura.
via_accult_q3_p	I often participate in mainstream American cultural traditions. Con frecuencia participo en las tradiciones americanas/estadounidenses populares.
via_accult_q4_p	I enjoy social activities with people from the same heritage culture as myself. Yo disfruto de actividades sociales con personas de mi misma cultura.
via_accult_q5_p	I enjoy social activities with typical American people. Yo disfruto de actividades sociales con personas americanas/estadounidenses.
via_accult_q6_p	I am comfortable interacting with people of the same heritage culture as myself. Me siento cómodo interactuando con personas de mi misma cultura.
via_accult_q7_p	I am comfortable interacting with typical American people. Me siento cómodo interactuando con personas

	americanas/ estadounidenses.
via_accult_q8_p	I enjoy entertainment (e.g. movies, music) from my heritage culture. Disfruto del entretenimiento (Ej., películas, música) de mi propia cultura.
via_accult_q9_p	I enjoy typical American entertainment (e.g. movies, music). Disfruto del entretenimiento (Ej., películas, música) americanas/ estadounidense.
via_accult_q10_p	I often behave in ways that are typical of my heritage culture. Frecuentemente me comporto de acuerdo a las tradiciones de mi propia cultura.
via_accult_q11_p	I often behave in ways that are typically American. Frecuentemente me comporto de forma típica americana/ estadounidense.
via_accult_q12_p	It is important for me to maintain or develop the practices of my heritage culture. Para mí es importante involucrarme en las actividades de mi propia cultura.
via_accult_q13_p	It is important for me to maintain or develop American mainstream cultural practices. Para mí es importante involucrarme en actividades americanas/ estadounidenses.
via_accult_q14_p	I believe in the values of my heritage culture. Comparto

	los valores de mi propia cultura.
via_accult_q15_p	I believe in mainstream American values. Comparto los valores populares de la cultura americana/ estadounidense.
via_accult_q16_p	I am interested in having friends from my heritage culture. Me gusta tener amigos de mi misma cultura.
via_accult_q17_p	I am interested in having typical American friends. Me gusta tener amigos americanos/estadounidenses.
via_accult_q1_other_p	Your "other" heritage culture is: Su "otra" cultura de patrimonio es:
CHILDneighb_phenx	My neighborhood is safe from crime.
neighborhood1r_p	I feel safe walking in my neighborhood, day or night. Me siento seguro(a) caminando por mi vecindario, de día o de noche.
neighborhood2r_p	Violence is not a problem in my neighborhood./ La violencia no es un problema en mi vecindario.
neighborhood3r_p	My neighborhood is safe from crime. Mi vecindario está a salvo de la delincuencia.
demo_fam_exp1_v2b	In the past 12 months, has there been a time when you and your immediate family experienced any of the following: Needed food but couldn't afford to buy it or couldn't afford to go out to

	get it? ¬∅Necesitaban comida pero no les alcanzaba el dinero para comprarla o para salir a comprarla?
demo_fam_exp2_v2b	In the past 12 months, has there been a time when you and your immediate family experienced any of the following: Were without telephone service because you could not afford it? ¬∅Estuvieron sin servicio telef√nico porque no les alcanzaba el dinero?
demo_fam_exp3_v2b	In the past 12 months, has there been a time when you and your immediate family experienced any of the following: Didn't pay the full amount of the rent or mortgage because you could not afford it? ¬∅No pagaron el monto total de la renta o hipoteca porque no les alcanzaba el dinero?
demo_fam_exp4_v2b	In the past 12 months, has there been a time when you and your immediate family experienced any of the following: Were evicted from your home for not paying the rent or mortgage? ¬∅Los desalojaron de su casa por no pagar la renta o hipoteca?
demo_fam_exp5_v2b	In the past 12 months, has there been a time when you and your immediate family experienced any of the following: Had services

	turned off by the gas or electric company, or the oil company wouldn't deliver oil because payments were not made? $\neg\phi$ Les suspendieron el servicio de gas o electricidad, o la compa $\sqrt{\pm\sqrt{\neq}}$ a de petr $\sqrt{\geq}$ leo se neg $\sqrt{\geq}$ a abastecerles por falta de pago?
demo_fam_exp6_v2b	In the past 12 months, has there been a time when you and your immediate family experienced any of the following: Had someone who needed to see a doctor or go to the hospital but didn't go because you could not afford it? $\neg\phi$ Tuvieron a alguien quien necesitaba ir al m $\sqrt{\odot}$ dico o al hospital, pero no fueron porque no les alcanzaba el dinero?
demo_fam_exp7_v2b	In the past 12 months, has there been a time when you and your immediate family experienced any of the following: Had someone who needed a dentist but couldn't go because you could not afford it? $\neg\phi$ Tuvieron a alguien quien necesitaba ir al dentista, pero no pudieron ir porque no les alcanzaba el dinero?

Supplementary Table 2. Correlation matrix of self-report items initially considered for exploratory factor analysis.

CHILDAccult_phenx_q1	meim_1_p	meim_2_p	meim_3_p	meim_4_p	meim_5_p	meim_6_p	via_accult_q2_p	via_accult_q3_p	via_accult_q4_p	via_accult_q5_p	via_accult_q6_p	via_accult_q7_p	CHILDAccult_phenx_q1
CHILDAccult_phenx_q1	1.000000000	-0.011002646	-0.0007464390	-0.005008877	0.006032258	0.003262581	0.012814419	-0.011472262	0.04747324	-0.021048309	0.04524531	0.004540749	0.03873855
meim_1_p	-0.011002646	1.000000000	0.4647487239	0.372239437	0.658318079	0.660545210	0.451363104	-0.266626442	-0.16116808	-0.201526425	-0.08233068	-0.096021892	-0.05322153
meim_2_p	-0.000746439	0.464748724	1.000000000	0.675232125	0.559336719	0.527035212	0.724846107	-0.355050792	-0.17150301	-0.333556122	-0.16116753	-0.247939374	-0.14786197
meim_3_p	-0.005008877	0.372239437	0.6752321254	1.000000000	0.555118023	0.497491243	0.643576256	-0.298622579	-0.14764279	-0.285936187	-0.16555664	-0.230491971	-0.15664529
meim_4_p	0.006032258	0.658318079	0.5593367189	0.555118023	1.000000000	0.813806312	0.632277436	-0.338952918	-0.11655363	-0.267303203	-0.09537678	-0.147064068	-0.05849280
meim_5_p	0.003262581	0.660545210	0.5270352124	0.497491243	0.813806312	1.000000000	0.633825196	-0.322669011	-0.10405851	-0.260321585	-0.08606632	-0.117601357	-0.04312185
meim_6_p	0.012814419	0.451363104	0.7248461066	0.643576256	0.632277436	0.633825196	1.000000000	-0.365415807	-0.12211730	-0.354643148	-0.16276646	-0.244308854	-0.13741080
via_accult_q2_p	-0.011472262	-0.266626442	-0.3550507922	-0.298622579	-0.338952918	-0.322669011	-0.365415807	1.000000000	0.35829828	0.626853938	0.29020332	0.386693655	0.22598054
via_accult_q3_p	0.047473244	-0.161168085	-0.1715030141	-0.147642788	-0.116553631	-0.104058506	-0.122117302	0.358298277	1.000000000	0.372955382	0.62454629	0.368307283	0.49094531
via_accult_q4_p	-0.021048309	-0.201526425	-0.3335561219	-0.285936187	-0.267303203	-0.260321585	-0.354643148	0.626853938	0.37295538	1.000000000	0.46494944	0.571768672	0.37063530
via_accult_q5_p	0.045245313	-0.082330679	-0.1611675264	-0.165556642	-0.095376782	-0.086066325	-0.162766460	0.290203317	0.62454629	0.464949440	1.000000000	0.486282520	0.71957935
via_accult_q6_p	0.004540749	-0.096021892	-0.2479393745	-0.230491971	-0.147064068	-0.117601357	-0.244308854	0.386693655	0.36830728	0.571768672	0.48628252	1.000000000	0.65859499
via_accult_q7_p	0.038738555	-0.053221535	-0.1478619668	-0.156645286	-0.058492802	-0.043121852	-0.137410804	0.225980542	0.49094531	0.370635301	0.71957935	0.658594992	1.000000000
via_accult_q8_p	-0.018730697	-0.158074423	-0.2525916614	-0.217802318	-0.234750603	-0.224244422	-0.277925159	0.454128120	0.14980931	0.583198152	0.25542094	0.560339005	0.33791626
via_accult_q9_p	0.030611380	-0.049105577	-0.1372603032	-0.142668676	-0.060170033	-0.055638261	-0.143583748	0.191682982	0.45192446	0.330969785	0.61898191	0.524824667	0.74841780
via_accult_q10_p	-0.025567729	-0.135157774	-0.2726884584	-0.221768982	-0.196694405	-0.176496076	-0.266465336	0.527137997	0.25924387	0.544882931	0.24551557	0.463218098	0.27021987
via_accult_q11_p	0.065869497	-0.057496012	-0.1331571558	-0.120578344	-0.051517849	-0.042020297	-0.110911335	0.158378866	0.49683161	0.230373882	0.55390882	0.357234149	0.57514306
via_accult_q12_p	-0.004502026	-0.266203672	-0.3894637210	-0.328289019	-0.352311013	-0.337088362	-0.417521342	0.689705444	0.27960013	0.643460630	0.29125883	0.456708553	0.28268661
via_accult_q13_p	0.017393277	-0.136763377	-0.2445624080	-0.216017522	-0.196119766	-0.181892657	-0.252801616	0.345765092	0.46042356	0.363753178	0.49278997	0.341235206	0.44579332
via_accult_q14_p	-0.007439623	-0.204607551	-0.3504744488	-0.315363245	-0.294703809	-0.269662585	-0.393134367	0.599570468	0.27531890	0.615938907	0.32218020	0.507319962	0.33411207
via_accult_q15_p	0.017620157	-0.067097638	-0.1813930991	-0.170054075	-0.131873195	-0.101738163	-0.199907346	0.244861572	0.39282018	0.294600929	0.48098000	0.349425225	0.47010168
via_accult_q16_p	-0.010124920	-0.207455919	-0.3309227818	-0.276322117	-0.290941668	-0.283513299	-0.375918289	0.537849859	0.26872612	0.645229285	0.33320233	0.524503057	0.33914623
via_accult_q17_p	0.016057317	-0.106184979	-0.2269644606	-0.202222999	-0.167667630	-0.146263928	-0.259623434	0.319608036	0.41087327	0.408392616	0.57654244	0.446467641	0.57214018
CHILDAccult_phenx	0.087271724	0.017341040	0.0104959356	0.012361565	0.064904489	0.066155175	0.042807824	-0.002430258	0.12130663	0.002154773	0.09059342	0.037405112	0.07944047
neighborhood1r_p	0.033491340	0.016295394	-0.0077173826	-0.011100763	0.040364342	0.058359901	0.030574365	-0.005611832	0.14760271	0.018347011	0.13296092	0.083977251	0.14225483
neighborhood2r_p	0.025565036	0.028952619	0.0002939570	0.012786602	0.066660902	0.089211106	0.051828669	-0.003472487	0.19284635	0.013418876	0.14118136	0.088025221	0.15701770
neighborhood3r_p	0.024047679	0.030903337	-0.0005947208	0.012218278	0.055426073	0.064699916	0.037825508	0.001612959	0.14463217	0.015418603	0.12794352	0.064647232	0.12868281
via_accult_q8_p	via_accult_q9_p	via_accult_q10_p	via_accult_q11_p	via_accult_q12_p	via_accult_q13_p	via_accult_q14_p	via_accult_q15_p	via_accult_q16_p	via_accult_q17_p	CHILDAccult_phenx			
CHILDAccult_phenx_q1	-0.018730697	0.03061138	-0.025567729	0.06586950	-0.004502026	0.01739328	-0.007439623	0.01762016	-0.0101249204	0.01605732	0.087271724		
meim_1_p	-0.158074423	-0.04910558	-0.135157774	-0.05749601	-0.266203672	-0.13676338	-0.204607551	-0.06709764	-0.2074559191	-0.10618498	0.017341040		
meim_2_p	-0.252591661	-0.13726030	-0.272688458	-0.13315716	-0.389463721	-0.24456241	-0.350474449	-0.18139310	-0.3309227818	-0.22696446	0.010495936		

meim_3_p	-0.217802318	-0.14266868	-0.221768982	-0.12057834	-0.328289019	-0.21601752	-0.315363245	-0.17005407	-0.2763221167	-0.20222300	0.012361565
meim_4_p	-0.234750603	-0.06017003	-0.196694405	-0.05151785	-0.352311013	-0.19611977	-0.294703809	-0.13187319	-0.2909416681	-0.16766763	0.064904489
meim_5_p	-0.224244422	-0.05563826	-0.176496076	-0.04202030	-0.337088362	-0.18189266	-0.269662585	-0.10173816	-0.2835132989	-0.14626393	0.066155175
meim_6_p	-0.277925159	-0.14358375	-0.266465336	-0.11091134	-0.417521342	-0.25280162	-0.393134367	-0.19990735	-0.3759182893	-0.25962343	0.042807824
via_accult_q2_p	0.454128120	0.19168298	0.527137997	0.15837887	0.689705444	0.34576509	0.599570468	0.24486157	0.5378498587	0.31960804	-0.002430258
via_accult_q3_p	0.149809309	0.45192446	0.259243869	0.49683161	0.279600135	0.46042356	0.275318895	0.39282018	0.2687261208	0.41087327	0.121306634
via_accult_q4_p	0.583198152	0.33096979	0.544882931	0.23037388	0.643460630	0.36375318	0.615938907	0.29460093	0.6452292851	0.40839262	0.002154773
via_accult_q5_p	0.255420936	0.61898191	0.245515569	0.55390882	0.291258828	0.49278997	0.322180200	0.48098000	0.3332023331	0.57654244	0.090593418
via_accult_q6_p	0.560339005	0.52482467	0.463218098	0.35723415	0.456708553	0.34123521	0.507319962	0.34942522	0.5245030568	0.44646764	0.037405112
via_accult_q7_p	0.337916264	0.74841780	0.270219869	0.57514306	0.282686612	0.44579332	0.334112070	0.47010168	0.3391462298	0.57214018	0.079440474
via_accult_q8_p	1.000000000	0.35193698	0.532634612	0.13593504	0.548734891	0.24724711	0.547708572	0.24578517	0.5822860544	0.32150569	-0.040502326
via_accult_q9_p	0.351936980	1.000000000	0.223304244	0.55182589	0.244888495	0.45781824	0.300784345	0.48732232	0.3177456014	0.54275070	0.053675937
via_accult_q10_p	0.532634612	0.22330424	1.000000000	0.33394644	0.653649931	0.34914877	0.596814440	0.27620992	0.5517247976	0.31923351	0.020294413
via_accult_q11_p	0.135935037	0.55182589	0.333946445	1.000000000	0.238285847	0.53847784	0.228942990	0.52111385	0.2302381801	0.49225809	0.093641150
via_accult_q12_p	0.548734891	0.24488849	0.653649931	0.23828585	1.000000000	0.51450932	0.736204036	0.32033878	0.6880250468	0.41663321	-0.004456229
via_accult_q13_p	0.247247113	0.45781824	0.349148772	0.53847784	0.514509319	1.000000000	0.408301336	0.68073346	0.3946484739	0.58684289	0.044199813
via_accult_q14_p	0.547708572	0.30078435	0.596814440	0.22894299	0.736204036	0.40830134	1.000000000	0.45319401	0.7317784230	0.48947538	-0.019136223
via_accult_q15_p	0.245785166	0.48732232	0.276209923	0.52111385	0.320338784	0.68073346	0.453194014	1.000000000	0.3829052985	0.62566747	0.030773763
via_accult_q16_p	0.582286054	0.31774560	0.551724798	0.23023818	0.688025047	0.39464847	0.731778423	0.38290530	1.0000000000	0.60946955	-0.017433057
via_accult_q17_p	0.321505687	0.54275070	0.319233514	0.49225809	0.416633211	0.58684289	0.489475375	0.62566747	0.6094695526	1.000000000	0.018741467
CHILDneighb_phenx	-0.040502326	0.05367594	0.020294413	0.09364115	-0.004456229	0.04419981	-0.019136223	0.03077376	-0.0174330573	0.01874147	1.000000000
neighborhood1r_p	-0.022597832	0.09658681	0.036662938	0.12787679	0.009811167	0.07194921	0.013360337	0.07825860	0.0012866299	0.07522291	0.242311544
neighborhood2r_p	-0.034856036	0.10812286	0.055174185	0.15525360	-0.002266645	0.08095448	0.005734680	0.08794932	-0.0035465931	0.08865650	0.284084733
neighborhood3r_p	-0.023313943	0.09165758	0.045733023	0.13668415	0.007092906	0.09890086	0.011440012	0.10984776	0.0006826366	0.09311509	0.269763085
neighborhood1r_p neighborhood2r_p neighborhood3r_p accult_q1_p accult_q2_p demo_fam_exp1_v2b demo_fam_exp2_v2b demo_fam_exp3_v2b demo_fam_exp4_v2b demo_fam_exp5_v2b demo_fam_exp6_v2b											
CHILDaccult_phenx_q1	0.033491340	0.025565036	0.0240476794	0.164185132	-0.053357520	0.0024136824	-0.019672923	-0.0134960893	0.001692829	-0.020987698	-0.0134419985
meim_1_p	0.016295394	0.028952619	0.0309033372	-0.010597080	-0.071365967	-0.0330161340	-0.020362787	-0.0367069356	0.001607033	-0.019985220	-0.0437082468
meim_2_p	-0.007717383	0.000293957	-0.0005947208	0.036003532	-0.115408190	-0.0003464124	0.022670402	-0.0171630955	0.007035214	0.001458606	-0.0123735608
meim_3_p	-0.011100763	0.012786602	0.0122182778	0.034541392	-0.124998732	0.0092001336	0.027215408	-0.0182572594	0.005486157	-0.008580429	-0.0039493288
meim_4_p	0.040364342	0.066660902	0.0554260727	0.042618986	-0.108714118	-0.0470405551	-0.022133468	-0.0488261059	-0.005395454	-0.026176733	-0.0478634197
meim_5_p	0.058359901	0.089211106	0.0646999162	0.027395854	-0.089380961	-0.0646879453	-0.045707747	-0.0750836343	-0.006041842	-0.050978095	-0.0517203620
meim_6_p	0.030574365	0.051828669	0.0378255078	0.073850134	-0.115794225	-0.0382742367	-0.024777544	-0.0565978649	0.004530125	-0.030816149	-0.0217733597

Vargas et al.

via_accult_q2_p	-0.005611832	-0.003472487	0.0016129588	-0.086953885	0.164785127	-0.0168816404	-0.024228294	-0.0205713180	-0.013075619	-0.026092022	-0.0172964221
via_accult_q3_p	0.147602712	0.192846354	0.1446321691	0.120698656	0.060801250	-0.0976422357	-0.130650011	-0.1147472817	-0.094478002	-0.103306904	-0.0519305096
via_accult_q4_p	0.018347011	0.013418876	0.0154186032	-0.087396804	0.158703549	-0.0344964497	-0.030941750	-0.0284791737	-0.053389290	-0.044071517	-0.0265527309
via_accult_q5_p	0.132960924	0.141181362	0.1279435223	0.133533368	0.024264633	-0.0815996471	-0.091181059	-0.0797994346	-0.083657386	-0.080848185	-0.0556798583
via_accult_q6_p	0.083977251	0.088025221	0.0646472315	-0.017740725	0.073499993	-0.0779010915	-0.072747778	-0.0522590243	-0.046787603	-0.066643399	-0.0412974542
via_accult_q7_p	0.142254828	0.157017699	0.1286828130	0.156129913	0.020876504	-0.0791022155	-0.089891880	-0.0755154596	-0.068053165	-0.081323904	-0.0557118688
via_accult_q8_p	-0.022597832	-0.034856036	-0.0233139429	-0.119134586	0.088208850	0.0130030770	0.011183922	0.0284972602	-0.002832004	0.015197804	0.0061848583
via_accult_q9_p	0.096586806	0.108122865	0.0916575817	0.100876208	0.027729728	-0.0556043057	-0.077110932	-0.0509034014	-0.048817568	-0.053992930	-0.0401413185
via_accult_q10_p	0.036662938	0.055174185	0.0457330226	-0.120733449	0.138313139	-0.0241954446	-0.047318806	-0.0355394087	-0.020967852	-0.041961043	-0.0123510619
via_accult_q11_p	0.127876792	0.155253596	0.1366841509	0.220465853	-0.028641414	-0.0598700727	-0.100871307	-0.0697551437	-0.063424927	-0.058621848	-0.0248596560
via_accult_q12_p	0.009811167	-0.002266645	0.0070929056	-0.102458694	0.179944864	-0.0029024668	-0.010732133	-0.0055191324	-0.024001767	-0.031820076	-0.0024738602
via_accult_q13_p	0.071949209	0.080954483	0.0989008649	-0.043404478	0.084607422	-0.0318042473	-0.060140522	-0.0428071459	-0.051097564	-0.050997272	-0.0332267623
via_accult_q14_p	0.013360337	0.005734680	0.0114400124	-0.127713706	0.159346069	-0.0146035667	-0.019945232	-0.0088501662	-0.027780481	-0.029588701	-0.0132555053
via_accult_q15_p	0.078258598	0.087949321	0.1098477566	-0.039109472	0.063104004	-0.0419306201	-0.062796657	-0.0393727318	-0.045441337	-0.052502537	-0.0317539046
via_accult_q16_p	0.001286630	-0.003546593	0.0006826366	-0.138217085	0.158726238	0.0018993416	-0.005620562	0.0009731253	-0.015388241	-0.011507462	-0.0003487246
via_accult_q17_p	0.075222908	0.088656503	0.0931150945	-0.028222891	0.066269230	-0.0338653742	-0.042873079	-0.0360384916	-0.050408104	-0.037366030	-0.0308692824
CHILDeighnb_phenx	0.242311544	0.284084733	0.2697630854	0.072004570	0.008772950	-0.1214907275	-0.128555677	-0.1356530200	-0.041746630	-0.102882089	-0.0624164039
neighborhood1r_p	1.000000000	0.709663041	0.6700319451	0.113001754	-0.008307733	-0.1544855786	-0.128945575	-0.1462865274	-0.070401038	-0.104599309	-0.0881918159
neighborhood2r_p	0.709663041	1.000000000	0.7648530363	0.098595633	0.020598310	-0.1897428538	-0.189814860	-0.2059582976	-0.100125801	-0.135306095	-0.0919748608
neighborhood3r_p	0.670031945	0.764853036	1.000000000	0.076816707	0.034268080	-0.1749268233	-0.161397605	-0.1916243168	-0.096692539	-0.132188953	-0.1002224886
demo_fam_exp7_v2b											
CHILDaccult_phenx_q1	-0.024328664										
meim_1_p	-0.034716439										
meim_2_p	-0.015053122										
meim_3_p	-0.012993647										
meim_4_p	-0.039065638										
meim_5_p	-0.051097073										
meim_6_p	-0.034588914										
via_accult_q2_p	-0.007943976										
via_accult_q3_p	-0.068367300										
via_accult_q4_p	-0.005308555										
via_accult_q5_p	-0.069533735										

Vargas et al.

via_accult_q6_p	-0.057251366
via_accult_q7_p	-0.075078946
via_accult_q8_p	0.018977590
via_accult_q9_p	-0.045866153
via_accult_q10_p	-0.006674723
via_accult_q11_p	-0.061876635
via_accult_q12_p	0.002558608
via_accult_q13_p	-0.029616613
via_accult_q14_p	-0.014116004
via_accult_q15_p	-0.039811721
via_accult_q16_p	0.016885685
via_accult_q17_p	-0.025812053
CHILDneighb_phenx	-0.076871341
neighborhood1r_p	-0.140451777
neighborhood2r_p	-0.148731630
neighborhood3r_p	-0.152929314

Supplementary Table 3. Exploratory factor analysis factor correlations.

	MR1	MR2	MR4	MR3	MR5	MR6
MR1	1	-0.43	0.43	0.02	-0.04	0.28
MR2	-0.43	1	-0.12	0.05	-0.05	-0.16
MR4	0.43	-0.12	1	0.16	-0.14	0.39
MR3	0.02	0.05	0.16	1	-0.31	0.11
MR5	-0.04	-0.05	-0.14	-0.31	1	-0.07
MR6	0.28	-0.16	0.39	0.11	-0.07	1

Supplementary Table 4. Exploratory factor analysis factor loadings and proportion of variance explained.

	MR1	MR2	MR4	MR3	MR5	MR6
SS loadings	4.66	3.72	3.45	2.2	2.07	1.8
Proportion Var	0.15	0.12	0.11	0.07	0.07	0.06
Cumulative Var	0.15	0.27	0.38	0.45	0.52	0.58
Proportion explained	0.26	0.21	0.19	0.12	0.12	0.1
Cumulative proportion	0.26	0.47	0.66	0.78	0.9	1

References

1. Mittal VA, Walker EF. Advances in the neurobiology of stress and psychosis. *Schizophrenia Research*. 2019;213:1-5.
2. Shah JL, Malla AK. Much ado about much: stress, dynamic biomarkers and HPA axis dysregulation along the trajectory to psychosis. *Schizophrenia research*. 2015;162(1-3):253-260.
3. Mayo D, Corey S, Kelly LH, et al. The role of trauma and stressful life events among individuals at clinical high risk for psychosis: a review. *Frontiers in psychiatry*. 2017;8:55.
4. Pruessner M, Cullen AE, Aas M, Walker EF. The neural diathesis-stress model of schizophrenia revisited: an update on recent findings considering illness stage and neurobiological and methodological complexities. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2017;73:191-218.
5. McEwen BS. Protection and damage from acute and chronic stress: allostasis and allostatic overload and relevance to the pathophysiology of psychiatric disorders. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 2004;1032(1):1-7.
6. Gupta T, Dean DJ, Kelley NJ, Bernard JA, Ristanovic I, Mittal VA. Cerebellar transcranial direct current stimulation improves procedural learning in nonclinical psychosis: a double-blind crossover study. *Schizophrenia bulletin*. 2018;44(6):1373-1380.
7. Mittal VA, Smolen A, Dean DJ, Pelletier AL, Lunsford-Avery J, Smith A. BDNF Val66Met and spontaneous dyskinesias in non-clinical psychosis. *Schizophrenia research*. 2012;140(1-3):65-70.
8. Mittal VA, Dean DJ, Pelletier A. Dermatoglyphic asymmetries and fronto-striatal dysfunction in young adults reporting non-clinical psychosis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 2012;126(4):290-297.
9. Orr JM, Turner JA, Mittal VA. Widespread brain dysconnectivity associated with psychotic-like experiences in the general population. *NeuroImage: Clinical*. 2014;4:343-351.
10. Ristanovic I, Osborne KJ, Vargas T, Gupta T, Mittal VA. Postural Control and Verbal and Visual Working Memory Correlates in Nonclinical Psychosis. *Neuropsychobiology*. 2020;79(4):291-298.
11. Vos T, Abajobir AA, Abate KH, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The Lancet*. 2017;390(10100):1211-1259.
12. Van Os J, Linscott RJ, Myin-Germeys I, Delespaul P, Krabbendam L. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the psychosis continuum: evidence for a psychosis proneness-persistence-impairment model of psychotic disorder. *Psychological medicine*. 2009;39(2):179.
13. Laurens KR, Hodgins S, Maughan B, Murray RM, Rutter ML, Taylor EA. Community screening for psychotic-like experiences and other putative antecedents of schizophrenia in children aged 9–12 years. *Schizophrenia research*. 2007;90(1-3):130-146.
14. Poulton R, Caspi A, Moffitt TE, Cannon M, Murray R, Harrington H. Children's self-reported psychotic symptoms and adult schizophreniform disorder: a 15-year longitudinal study. *Archives of general psychiatry*. 2000;57(11):1053-1058.

15. Kline E, Thompson E, Bussell K, Pitts SC, Reeves G, Schiffman J. Psychosis-like experiences and distress among adolescents using mental health services. *Schizophrenia research*. 2014;152(2-3):498-502.
16. Welham J, Scott J, Williams G, et al. Emotional and behavioural antecedents of young adults who screen positive for non-affective psychosis: a 21-year birth cohort study. *Psychological medicine*. 2009;39(4):625.
17. Green JG, McLaughlin KA, Berglund PA, et al. Childhood adversities and adult psychiatric disorders in the national comorbidity survey replication I: associations with first onset of DSM-IV disorders. *Archives of general psychiatry*. 2010;67(2):113-123.
18. McLaughlin KA, Green JG, Gruber MJ, Sampson NA, Zaslavsky AM, Kessler RC. Childhood adversities and first onset of psychiatric disorders in a national sample of US adolescents. *Archives of general psychiatry*. 2012;69(11):1151-1160.
19. Walker E, Mittal V, Tessner K. Stress and the hypothalamic pituitary adrenal axis in the developmental course of schizophrenia. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol*. 2008;4:189-216.
20. Gibson LE, Alloy LB, Ellman LM. Trauma and the psychosis spectrum: a review of symptom specificity and explanatory mechanisms. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2016;49:92-105.
21. McGrath JJ, Saha S, Lim CC, et al. Trauma and psychotic experiences: transnational data from the World Mental Health Survey. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2017;211(6):373-380.
22. McLaughlin KA, Sheridan MA, Lambert HK. Childhood adversity and neural development: deprivation and threat as distinct dimensions of early experience. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2014;47:578-591.
23. Bronfenbrenner U. Ecological models of human development. *Readings on the development of children*. 1994;2(1):37-43.
24. Glass TA, McAtee MJ. Behavioral science at the crossroads in public health: extending horizons, envisioning the future. *Social science & medicine*. 2006;62(7):1650-1671.
25. Vargas T, Conley RE, Mittal VA. Chronic stress, structural exposures and neurobiological mechanisms: A stimulation, discrepancy and deprivation model of psychosis. *Stress and Brain Health: In Clinical Conditions*. 2020;152:41.
26. Newbury J, Arseneault L, Caspi A, Moffitt TE, Odgers CL, Fisher HL. Cumulative effects of neighborhood social adversity and personal crime victimization on adolescent psychotic experiences. *Schizophrenia bulletin*. 2018;44(2):348-358.
27. Kirkbride JB, Jones PB, Ullrich S, Coid JW. Social deprivation, inequality, and the neighborhood-level incidence of psychotic syndromes in East London. *Schizophrenia bulletin*. 2012;40(1):169-180.
28. Freeman D, Emsley R, Dunn G, et al. The stress of the street for patients with persecutory delusions: a test of the symptomatic and psychological effects of going outside into a busy urban area. *Schizophrenia bulletin*. 2015;41(4):971-979.
29. Wilson-Genderson M, Pruchno R. Effects of neighborhood violence and perceptions of neighborhood safety on depressive symptoms of older adults. *Social science & medicine*. 2013;85:43-49.
30. Weich S, Blanchard M, Prince M, Burton E, Erens B, Sproston K. Mental health and the built environment: Cross-sectional survey of individual and contextual risk factors for depression. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2002;180(5):428-433.

31. Gong Y, Palmer S, Gallacher J, Marsden T, Fone D. A systematic review of the relationship between objective measurements of the urban environment and psychological distress. *Environment international*. 2016;96:48-57.
32. Butler R, Muir K. Young people's education biographies: Family relationships, social capital and belonging. *Journal of Youth Studies*. 2017;20(3):316-331.
33. Schellenberg G, Lu C, Schimmele C, Hou F. The correlates of self-assessed community belonging in Canada: Social capital, neighbourhood characteristics, and rootedness. *Social Indicators Research*. 2018;140(2):597-618.
34. Elgar FJ, Davis CG, Wohl MJ, Trites SJ, Zelenski JM, Martin MS. Social capital, health and life satisfaction in 50 countries. *Health & place*. 2011;17(5):1044-1053.
35. Oliver V, Cheff R. The social network: Homeless young women, social capital, and the health implications of belonging outside the nuclear family. *Youth & Society*. 2014;46(5):642-662.
36. Eliacin J. Social capital, narratives of fragmentation, and schizophrenia: an ethnographic exploration of factors shaping African-Caribbeans' social capital and mental health in a North London community. *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry*. 2013;37(3):465-487.
37. Yang T-C, Lei L, Kurtulus A. Neighborhood ethnic density and self-rated health: Investigating the mechanisms through social capital and health behaviors. *Health & place*. 2018;53:193-202.
38. Emerson SD, Minh A, Guhn M. Ethnic density of regions and psychiatric disorders among ethnic minority individuals. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*. 2018;64(2):130-144.
39. Pan SW, Carpiano RM. Immigrant density, sense of community belonging, and suicidal ideation among racial minority and white immigrants in Canada. *Journal of immigrant and minority health*. 2013;15(1):34-42.
40. Vargas T, Damme KS, Mittal VA. Neighborhood deprivation, prefrontal morphology and neurocognition in late childhood to early adolescence. *NeuroImage*. 2020:117086.
41. Bhavsar V, Boydell J, Murray R, Power P. Identifying aspects of neighbourhood deprivation associated with increased incidence of schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia research*. 2014;156(1):115-121.
42. Forsberg P-O, Ohlsson H, Sundquist K. Causal nature of neighborhood deprivation on individual risk of coronary heart disease or ischemic stroke: A prospective national Swedish co-relative control study in men and women. *Health & place*. 2018;50:1-5.
43. Singh GK. Area deprivation and widening inequalities in US mortality, 1969–1998. *American journal of public health*. 2003;93(7):1137-1143.
44. Mackes NK, Golm D, Sarkar S, et al. Early childhood deprivation is associated with alterations in adult brain structure despite subsequent environmental enrichment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2020;117(1):641-649.
45. McLaughlin KA, Sheridan MA, Winter W, Fox NA, Zeanah CH, Nelson CA. Widespread reductions in cortical thickness following severe early-life deprivation: a neurodevelopmental pathway to attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Biological psychiatry*. 2014;76(8):629-638.
46. Barch DM, Albaugh MD, Avenevoli S, et al. Demographic, physical and mental health assessments in the adolescent brain and cognitive development study: Rationale and description. *Developmental cognitive neuroscience*. 2018;32:55-66.

47. Garavan H, Bartsch H, Conway K, et al. Recruiting the ABCD sample: design considerations and procedures. *Developmental cognitive neuroscience*. 2018;32:16-22.
48. Karcher NR, Barch DM, Avenevoli S, et al. Assessment of the Prodromal Questionnaire–Brief Child Version for measurement of self-reported psychoticlike experiences in childhood. *JAMA psychiatry*. 2018;75(8):853-861.
49. Loewy RL, Pearson R, Vinogradov S, Bearden CE, Cannon TD. Psychosis risk screening with the Prodromal Questionnaire—brief version (PQ-B). *Schizophrenia research*. 2011;129(1):42-46.
50. Cicero DC, Krieg A, Martin EA. Measurement invariance of the Prodromal Questionnaire–Brief among White, Asian, Hispanic, and multiracial populations. *Assessment*. 2019;26(2):294-304.
51. Phinney JS, Ong AD. Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of counseling Psychology*. 2007;54(3):271.
52. Ryder AG, Alden LE, Paulhus DL. Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 2000;79(1):49.
53. Echeverria SE, Diez-Roux AV, Link BG. Reliability of self-reported neighborhood characteristics. *Journal of Urban Health*. 2004;81(4):682-701.
54. Mujahid MS, Diez Roux AV, Morenoff JD, Raghunathan T. Assessing the measurement properties of neighborhood scales: from psychometrics to econometrics. *American journal of epidemiology*. 2007;165(8):858-867.
55. Alegria M, Takeuchi D, Canino G, et al. Considering context, place and culture: the National Latino and Asian American Study. *International journal of methods in psychiatric research*. 2004;13(4):208-220.
56. Marin G, Sabogal F, Marin BV, Otero-Sabogal R, Perez-Stable EJ. Development of a short acculturation scale for Hispanics. *Hispanic journal of behavioral sciences*. 1987;9(2):183-205.
57. Kind AJ, Jencks S, Brock J, et al. Neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage and 30 day rehospitalizations: an analysis of Medicare data. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2014;161(11):765.
58. Comrey AL. The minimum residual method of factor analysis. *Psychological Reports*. 1962;11(1):15-18.
59. Revelle W. How to: Use the psych package for factor analysis and data reduction. *Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, Department of Psychology*. 2016.
60. Peterson RA. A meta-analysis of variance accounted for and factor loadings in exploratory factor analysis. *Marketing letters*. 2000;11(3):261-275.
61. Meng X-L, Rosenthal R, Rubin DB. Comparing correlated correlation coefficients. *Psychological bulletin*. 1992;111(1):172.
62. Steiger JH. Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological bulletin*. 1980;87(2):245.
63. Lee I, Preacher K. Calculation for the test of the difference between two dependent correlations with one variable in common [Computer software]. In:2013.
64. Shaffer JP. Multiple hypothesis testing. *Annual review of psychology*. 1995;46(1):561-584.
65. Bonferroni CE. Il calcolo delle assicurazioni su gruppi di teste. *Studi in onore del professore salvatore ortu carboni*. 1935:13-60.

66. Kaiser HF. A second generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika*. 1970;35(4):401-415.
67. Kaiser HF, Rice J. Little jiffy, mark IV. *Educational and psychological measurement*. 1974;34(1):111-117.
68. Kaiser HF. An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*. 1974;39(1):31-36.
69. Bartlett MS. The effect of standardization on a χ^2 approximation in factor analysis. *Biometrika*. 1951;38(3/4):337-344.
70. Revelle W, Zinbarg RE. Coefficients alpha, beta, omega, and the glb: Comments on Sijtsma. *Psychometrika*. 2009;74(1):145.
71. Bhavsar V, Fusar-Poli P, McGuire P. Neighbourhood deprivation is positively associated with detection of the ultra-high risk (UHR) state for psychosis in South East London. *Schizophrenia research*. 2018;192:371-376.
72. Lasalvia A, Bonetto C, Tosato S, et al. First-contact incidence of psychosis in north-eastern Italy: influence of age, gender, immigration and socioeconomic deprivation. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2014;205(2):127-134.
73. Omer S, Kirkbride JB, Pringle DG, Russell V, O'Callaghan E, Waddington JL. Neighbourhood-level socio-environmental factors and incidence of first episode psychosis by place at onset in rural Ireland: The Cavan–Monaghan First Episode Psychosis Study [CAMFEPS]. *Schizophrenia research*. 2014;152(1):152-157.
74. O'Donoghue B, Yung AR, Wood S, et al. Neighbourhood characteristics and the rate of identification of young people at ultra-high risk for psychosis. *Schizophrenia research*. 2015;169(1-3):214-216.
75. Lang IA, Hubbard RE, Andrew MK, Llewellyn DJ, Melzer D, Rockwood K. Neighborhood deprivation, individual socioeconomic status, and frailty in older adults. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2009;57(10):1776-1780.
76. Gee DG, Gabard-Durnam LJ, Flannery J, et al. Early developmental emergence of human amygdala–prefrontal connectivity after maternal deprivation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2013;110(39):15638-15643.
77. Richards JL, Chapple-McGruder T, Williams BL, Kramer MR. Does neighborhood deprivation modify the effect of preterm birth on children's first grade academic performance? *Social Science & Medicine*. 2015;132:122-131.
78. Beckett C, Maughan B, Rutter M, et al. Do the effects of early severe deprivation on cognition persist into early adolescence? Findings from the English and Romanian adoptees study. *Child development*. 2006;77(3):696-711.
79. Mensah F, Hobcraft J. Childhood deprivation, health and development: associations with adult health in the 1958 and 1970 British prospective birth cohort studies. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*. 2008;62(7):599-606.
80. Kobayashi LC, Glymour MM, Kahn K, et al. Childhood deprivation and later-life cognitive function in a population-based study of older rural South Africans. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2017;190:20-28.
81. Wiesel TN, Hubel DH. Extent of recovery from the effects of visual deprivation in kittens. *Journal of neurophysiology*. 1965;28(6):1060-1072.
82. Uysal N, Ozdemir D, Dayi A, Yalaz G, Baltaci AK, Bediz CS. Effects of maternal deprivation on melatonin production and cognition in adolescent male and female rats. *Neuroendocrinology Letters*. 2005;26(5):555-560.

83. Akman C, Zhao Q, Liu X, Holmes GL. Effect of food deprivation during early development on cognition and neurogenesis in the rat. *Epilepsy & Behavior*. 2004;5(4):446-454.
84. McCann A, McNulty H, Rigby J, et al. Effect of area-level socioeconomic deprivation on risk of cognitive dysfunction in older adults. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2018;66(7):1269-1275.
85. Schofield P, Thygesen M, Das-Munshi J, et al. Ethnic density, urbanicity and psychosis risk for migrant groups—A population cohort study. *Schizophrenia research*. 2017;190:82-87.
86. Termorshuizen F, Smeets HM, Braam AW, Veling W. Neighborhood ethnic density and psychotic disorders among ethnic minority groups in Utrecht City. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*. 2014;49(7):1093-1102.
87. Veling W, Susser E, Van Os J, Mackenbach JP, Selten J-P, Hoek HW. Ethnic density of neighborhoods and incidence of psychotic disorders among immigrants. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2008;165(1):66-73.
88. Crush E, Arseneault L, Jaffee SR, Danese A, Fisher HL. Protective factors for psychotic symptoms among poly-victimized children. *Schizophrenia bulletin*. 2018;44(3):691-700.
89. Allardyce J, Gilmour H, Atkinson J, Rapson T, Bishop J, McCreadie R. Social fragmentation, deprivation and urbanicity: relation to first-admission rates for psychoses. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2005;187(5):401-406.
90. Van Os J, Driessen G, Gunther N, Delespaul P. Neighbourhood variation in incidence of schizophrenia: evidence for person-environment interaction. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2000;176(3):243-248.
91. Silver E, Mulvey EP, Swanson JW. Neighborhood structural characteristics and mental disorder: Faris and Dunham revisited. *Social science & medicine*. 2002;55(8):1457-1470.
92. Verhaeghe P-P, Tampubolon G. Individual social capital, neighbourhood deprivation, and self-rated health in England. *Social science & medicine*. 2012;75(2):349-357.
93. Funder DC, Ozer DJ. Evaluating effect size in psychological research: Sense and nonsense. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*. 2019;2(2):156-168.