

Hair Test Risk Algorithm

As noted in the primary document, a significant challenge for toxicology testing in the ABCD Study is the cost to test each participant. As such, acute toxicology testing (i.e., urine, breath, saliva) was reserved for those who reported use and randomization procedures for an additional percentage of youth (see Lisdahl et al., 2018).

Regarding hair sampling in particular, hair was collected from all youth who were willing to allow sample collection and whose hair was long enough to sample (>1cm in length). All samples are securely stored in temperature-controlled rooms and locked cabinets at the data collection site. Samples were collected from approximately 70% of participants each year; however, the cost of analyzing the samples is high and was not possible for all samples. Thus, members of the ABCD Substance Use Work Group (SFT, KML, FH) and an outside consultant toxicology expert (MAH) used the existing substance use risk literature to devise an algorithm to prioritize analysis of samples for those most likely to have substance intake. This approach relied on prior studies (e.g., (Gorka et al., 2014; Heron et al., 2013; Maggs et al., 2015)) and reviews (e.g., Clark & Winters, 2002; Donovan & Molina, 2011) of risk factors in youth who transition to substance use. Weights were assigned based on study aims (e.g., identifying cannabis use onset in particular and its sequelae). Variables collected in the ABCD Study populated the algorithm (see Supplemental Table 1).

Biannually, the Data Analytics, Informatics, and Resource Center (DAIRC) of the ABCD Study calculates the hair test risk score for each participant with hair samples available. Samples from those with higher scores on the algorithm, more recent hair collections, participants who previously tested positive, and participants who tested positive on acute toxicological assessment are prioritized. Data collection sites are requested to ship the selected samples to the Psychomedics laboratory for analysis. Psychomedics analyzes the samples as described in the full paper, with screen, confirmation, and quantified analyte results provided back to the DAIRC for upload to the NDA data release.

Supplemental Table 1. Sample prioritization algorithm variables and scoring.

Variable	Source Questionnaire	Points Conferred
Lifetime Substance Use	Timeline Follow-Back	Up to 15 pts (1 pt per endorsed variable)
Specific lifetime use of cannabis	Timeline Follow-Back	10 pts
Positive saliva toxicology	Draeger DrugTest 5000	10 pts
Intention to use cannabis soon	PATH Questionnaire	Up to 5 pts
Curiosity about using cannabis	PATH Questionnaire	Up to 4 pts
How many peers use cannabis	Peer Substance Use	Up to 4 pts
Elevated externalizing t-score	Achenbach's Childhood Behavior Checklist	3 pts
Parental drug use	Achenbach's Adult Self Report	Up to 2 pts
Parental drinking too much	Achenbach's Adult Self Report	Up to 2 pts
Parental tobacco use	Achenbach's Adult Self Report	1 pt
Any biological relative with history of Alcohol Use Disorder	Family History	1 pt
Any biological relative with history of drug use disorder	Family History	1 pt
Drinks alcohol without parent's approval	Achenbach's Childhood Behavior Checklist	Up to 2 pts

Smokes, chews, or sniffs tobacco	Achenbach's Childhood Behavior Checklist	2 pts
Uses drugs recreationally	Achenbach's Childhood Behavior Checklist	2 pts
Medical use of CBD	Medication Form	5 pts
Positive breathalyzer screen	Breathalyzer Toxicology Report	5 pts
Prior positive	Psychemedics Hair Sample Report	Automatically identified for sending
		Maximum: 76 pts

Notes: Details on specific question items and measures can be reviewed in Lisdahl et al., 2018. Variables with multiple possible options have different scores for each corresponding response, with the highest score reflecting the highest risk response; these items are denoted as being scored as "up to ___ points".

- Clark, D. B., & Winters, K. C. (2002). Measuring risks and outcomes in substance use disorders prevention research. *J Consult Clin Psychol*, 70(6), 1207-1223. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-006x.70.6.1207>
- Donovan, J. E., & Molina, B. S. G. (2011). Childhood Risk Factors for Early-Onset Drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 72(5), 741-751. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2011.72.741>
- Gorka, S. M., Shankman, S. A., Olino, T. M., Seeley, J. R., Kosty, D. B., & Lewinsohn, P. M. (2014). Anxiety disorders and risk for alcohol use disorders: the moderating effect of parental support. *Drug Alcohol Depend*, 140, 191-197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2014.04.021>
- Heron, J., Maughan, B., Dick, D. M., Kendler, K. S., Lewis, G., Macleod, J., Munafò, M., & Hickman, M. (2013). Conduct problem trajectories and alcohol use and misuse in mid to late adolescence. *Drug Alcohol Depend*, 133(1), 100-107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2013.05.025>
- Lisdahl, K. M., Sher, K. J., Conway, K. P., Gonzalez, R., Feldstein Ewing, S. W., Nixon, S. J., Tapert, S., Bartsch, H., Goldstein, R. Z., & Heitzeg, M. (2018). Adolescent brain cognitive development (ABCD) study: Overview of substance use assessment methods. *Dev Cogn Neurosci*, 32, 80-96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.02.007>
- Maggs, J. L., Staff, J., Patrick, M. E., Wray-Lake, L., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2015). Alcohol use at the cusp of adolescence: a prospective national birth cohort study of prevalence and risk factors. *J Adolesc Health*, 56(6), 639-645. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.02.010>