Identifying Prepubertal Children with Risk for Suicide Using Deep Neural Network Trained on Multimodal Brain Imaging-Derived Phenotypes

Bo-Gyeom Kim^{1*}, Gun Ahn^{2*}, Sooyoung Kim^{3*}, Kakyeong Kim³, Hyeonjin Kim¹, Eunji Lee¹, Woo-Young Ahn^{1,3,5}, Jae-Won Kim⁴, Jiook Cha^{1,3,5}

1. Department of Psychology, College of Social Sciences, Seoul National University

2. Interdisciplinary Program in Bioengineering, College of Engineering, Seoul National University

3. Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, College of Natural Sciences, Seoul National University

4. Division of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Seoul National University Hospital

5. AI Institute, Seoul National University

* denotes equal contribution.

Correspondence to:

Jiook Cha, PhD

Gwanak-ro 1, Building #16, Suite M512

Gwanak-gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea

connectome@snu.ac.kr

Abstract

Suicide is among the leading causes of death in youth worldwide. Early identification of children with high risk for suicide is key to effective screening and prevention strategies. Brain imaging can show functional or structural abnormalities related to youth suicidality, but literature is scarce. Here we tested the extent to which brain imaging is useful in predicting suicidal risk in children. In the largest to date, multi-site, multi-ethnic, epidemiological developmental samples in the US (N = 6,172; the ABCD study), we trained and validated machine learning models and deep neural networks on the multimodal brain imaging derived phenotypes (morphometry, white matter connectivity, functional activation, and connectivity) along with behavioral and self-reported psychological questionnaire data. The model trained on diffusion white matter connectomes showed the best performance (test AUC-ROC = 74.82) with a one percentage increase compared with the baseline model trained on behavioral and psychological data (test AUC-ROC = 74.16). Models trained on other MRI modalities showed similar but slightly lower performances. Model interpretation showed the important brain features involved in attention, emotion regulation, and motor coordination, such as the anterior cingulate cortex, temporal gyrus, and precentral gyrus. It further showed that the interaction of brain features with depression and impulsivity measures contributed to the optimal prediction of youth suicidality. This study demonstrates the potential utility of a multimodal brain imaging approach to youth suicidality prediction and uncovers the relationships of the psychological and multi-dimensional and multi-modal neural features to youth suicidality.

41 Introduction

42 Suicide is a major public health problem, with more than 25 million suicide attempts
 43 occurring each year worldwide. In youth, suicide is among the leading causes of death. Most
 44 suicide research focuses on the adult population ¹, and the literature on youth suicidality has
 45 been scarce. Identifying the neural underpinnings of youth suicidality will advance research
 46 by allowing brain-based markers and targets for prediction, monitoring and prevention ². Also,
 47 early detection of youth suicidality may not only prevent death by suicide among children but
 48 also reduce the risk of psychopathology later in life.

49 Prior brain imaging literature suggests a link between youth suicidality and abnormally
 50 delayed neurocognitive development. Children with suicidal ideation showed a reduced brain
 51 response to reward ³ or decreased cognitive capacity ⁴. As abnormal neurocognitive
 52 development may cause long-term sequelae, young children with prior suicide ideation are
 53 more likely prone to the risk for suicide in their later life.

54 Based on recent findings of brain abnormalities linked to suicidality, several studies
 55 applied machine learning to brain imaging data in small samples. Gosnell et al. classified
 56 suicidal psychiatric inpatients and non-suicidal inpatients with resting-state functional
 57 connectivity and structural neuroimaging^{5,6}. Just et al. demonstrated that the functional
 58 coupling of the brain regions like the superior medial frontal and anterior cingulate regions,
 59 during death-related and life-related concepts, could identify youth with suicidal ideation ⁷.
 60 Although previous studies show promise, the practical utility of neuroimaging-based prediction
 61 of youth suicidality remains untested rigorously in sufficiently large, representative samples
 62 using rigorous predictive modeling approaches.

63 Multimodal data integration may help predict. Combining the brain's structural and
 64 functional aspects, multimodal brain imaging may better account for complex and dimensional
 65 brain abnormalities related to suicidality compared with a single modality approach ⁸. No

66 literature in suicidality research, however, has provided information of what combinations of
67 imaging modalities would optimally explain brain abnormalities related to youth suicidality.

68 Here, we aim to identify youth with suicidal ideation using deep learning trained on the
69 brain structural, functional, and connectivity data, as well as behavioral and psychological
70 measures. Beyond prediction, using interpretable deep learning, we aim to identify brain circuit
71 features and psychological measures of which nonlinear interactions may contribute to
72 prediction. Leveraging large, representative, epidemiological, multi-site, and developmental
73 study in the US, we test the generalizability and practicality of the prediction models. We also
74 test the utility of advanced computational learning strategies, such as stacking ensembles for
75 data integration and GANs for data augmentation in psychiatric research.

Methods

Study Sample

The Adolescent Brain and Cognitive Development (ABCD) study recruited a nationally representative cohort of 9- and 10-year-old children from 21 research sites across the US ⁴. For the current analysis, we used minimally preprocessed data from the curated ABCD annual release 2.0.1 and selected ABCD participants based on the availability of non-imaging measures and neuroimaging data. The number of participants was different in each dataset: sMRI, dMRI, and rs-fMRI dataset included 5,878 participants (783 cases and 5044 controls for suicidal ideation; 48 cases and 5779 controls for suicidal attempt). SST fMRI, N-back fMRI, and MID fMRI included (592 cases and 4035 controls for suicidal ideation; 34 cases and 4596 controls for suicidal attempt). Thus, total participants consisted of 6,172 children (837 cases and 5,335 controls).

Non-imaging features

Clinical Outcomes

Suicidal ideation and attempts were assessed from the computerized version of Kiddie Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia (KSADS-COMP) reported by children or caregivers ⁹. Validity of the computerized version of KSADS has been shown elsewhere⁹. Suicidal ideation was constructed to measure both passive suicidal ideation and active suicidal ideation¹⁰. Among the reports from children and parents, we used ones reporting more severe symptoms. In this study, we used suicide ideation as the main outcome and suicide attempt as the secondary target, given the data availability (fewer numbers of participants with suicide

attempts than ones with suicide ideation) and the consideration that suicide ideation precedes suicide attempt.

Psychosocial features

To estimate the feasibility of a brain-based prediction model, we constructed a psychosocial model as a benchmark model. The benchmark model consisted of demographic, psychological health, mental health, cognition, and environmental variables, which reported associations with suicidality in the literature.

Sociodemographic variables we considered were age, sex, race, highest parental education, family income, and parental marriage status. Physical health variables included anthropometric variables (height, weight, BMI, and brain volume) and sleep function assessed by Sleep Disturbances Scale for Children ¹¹. For mental health, we measured dimensional psychopathology (the Child Behavior Checklist ¹²), impulsivity (UPPS-P ¹³), mania symptoms (Parent General Behavior Inventory¹⁴), psychosis (ABCD prodromal psychosis scales ¹⁵), and behavioral inhibition/approach system (PhenX modified version ¹⁶). Cognitive ability was measured using NIH toolbox ¹⁷. Environmental variables contained the measures of family conflict, early life stress (ELS), and friendship. Family conflict consisted of nine measures, which were assessed by ABCD Youth Family Environment Scale-Family Conflict Subscale Modified from PhenX. The ELS measures were composite variables based on child exposure domains in the ABCD study including household challenges, neglect, and abuse as main categories. Subcategories of ELS data contained parental separation or divorce, criminal household member, household substance abuse, mental illness in household, mother treated violently in household challenges, emotional neglect, physical neglect in neglect, physical abuse, and sexual abuse in abuse. The items of each subscale were derived from various instruments rated by children themselves or parents: ABCD Youth Family Environment Scale-Family Conflict Subscale Modified from PhenX, ABCD Diagnostic Interview for DSM-5

Traumatic Events, ABCD Family History Assessment, ABCD Parent Demographic Survey, ABCD Children's Report of Parental Behavioral Inventory, and ABCD Parental Monitoring Survey. We assigned 0 to those who have never had ELS and 1 to those who have at least one type. For three main categories, a child has 1 if at least one subcategory is 1. Missing values were imputed with Bayesian approach and then z-normalization was performed.

Brain imaging analysis

Brain imaging included in this study are as follows: structural MRI (sMRI), diffusion MRI (dMRI), resting-state functional MRI (rs-fMRI), and task-based functional MRI. For task-based functional MRI, participants performed three types of tasks including stop signal task (SST), the emotional version of N-back (N-back), and the monetary incentive delay task (MID).

MRI scanning was performed using a 3T scanner (Siemens Prisma, General Electric (GE) 750 and Philips). Image processing and quality assessment for the brain imaging datasets were performed at the ABCD Data Analysis and Informatics Center (DAIC). The ABCD MRI quality assessment consists of three parts: protocol compliance checking, automated quality metrics, manual review of data quality¹⁸. Firstly, protocol compliance checking examined whether key imaging parameters matched expected values of a given scanner, such as voxel size or repetition time. Secondly, quality control metrics were obtained for sMRI and fMRI. Mean motion and the number of slices and frames affected by slice dropout by head motion were controlled. Thirdly, the data quality was manually assessed by trained investigators as binary (0 = reject and 1 = accept) considering the image quality and the severity of the artifact (motion, intensity inhomogeneity, white matter underestimation, pial overestimation, magnetic susceptibility artifact). Images that failed to pass the quality assessment were excluded from the analysis.

We acquired multi-shell diffusion MRI from an ABCD study using the following protocol

¹⁹. The ABCD Data Analysis and Informatics Center (DAIC) preprocessed diffusion MRI including distortion and motion correction. B0 distortion and gradient nonlinearity distortion were corrected ^{20,21}. We used individualized connectome data to estimate brain imaging phenotypes. Using MRtrix3, we preprocessed diffusion MRI (dMRI), estimated whole-brain white matter tracts, and generated an individualized connectome ²². To estimate connectivity, we used streamline counts which represent the fiber connection strength associated with fiber integrity ^{23,24}. After decreasing the noise, we performed bias correction with the N4 algorithm of the Advanced Normalization Tools (ANTs) pipeline ²⁵. Of the target 20 million streamline counts, we filtered out preliminary tractograms with spherical-deconvolution for a 2:1 ratio. Finally, we generated an 84 x 84 whole-brain connectome matrix for each participant with 10 million streamline counts using T1-based parcellation and segmentation from FreeSurfer. All the computation was carried out by supercomputers at the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility Theta and Texas Advanced Computing Center Stampede 2.

For resting-state functional MRI acquisition, participants completed four 5-minutes resting-state blood oxygen level-dependent scans, with their eyes open and fixated on a crosshair. Participants were also scanned during cognitive tasks. Resting-state functional MRI and task-based functional MRI data were processed and analyzed according to standardized ABCD protocols ¹⁹. Because of post-processing problems on resting-state and task-based functional MRI data collected on the Philips scanners, all data from the Philips scanner were removed from the current analysis following the ABCD data analysis center's advice. For functional brain features, we used functional connectivity measures from resting-state fMRI and pairwise correlation coefficients between each region of interest (ROI) from task-based fMRI. The pairwise correlations were examined for ROIs within functionally defined parcellations (i.e., Gordon networks) and subcortical ROIs, and applied Fisher's r to z -transformation.

Deep Neural Network

Firstly, we split the data into discovery and replication sets. Within the discovery set, we trained, optimized, and validated models with stratified 5 fold cross validation. Secondly, we tested the generalizability of the optimized models on the balanced (down-sampled) replication set and then measured model performance with sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC-AUC), and area under the precision recall curve (AUPRC). These metrics were estimated using the pROC package v. 1.16.2 in the R programming language and the sklearn package for average precision scores.

The benchmark model contained existing non-imaging variables about suicidality. These variables were also included in all neuroimaging models, since one of our research goals was to test whether neuroimaging data would be useful for suicide prediction.

For multimodal interpretable neuroimaging models for identifying youth suicidality, we used TabNet and further implemented stacking ensemble, GAN-based data augmentation, and dimension reduction methods. TabNet has been developed for tabular data enabling rigorous end-to-end deep learning with built-in interpretability²⁶. This neural network is based on a sequential attention mechanism that gently selects features to infer at each decision step and then accumulates processed information to make final prediction decisions. By using sequential attention mechanisms, selecting sparse features, the model could learn efficiently at each decision-making stage. Therefore, the model with fully related variables shows high performance by taking advantage of related variables. This sparsity could allow for more interpretable decision-making through visualization of variable selection masks²⁶. In this study, given the large feature space of the multimodal brain imaging data, TabNet would enable effective learning of latent representations of the complex data as well as interpretation of the models. Running a single TabNet experiment took around 18 hours on three V100 GPU cards. Hyper-parameter tuning was done by grid search. We changed the width of the attention embedding for each mask, coefficient for feature reuse in the masks, number of steps,

learning rate and weight decay. Thus, we used 32-dimension hyper-parameter spaces and found the best hyper-parameter dimension for each dataset.

Stacking Ensemble Modeling

Stacking ensemble algorithm, widely used ensemble methods along with voting and bagging, is a two-level classification consisting of base classifier level and meta-classifier level²⁷. Previous studies showed that a multimodal stacked ensemble algorithm yielded better representation than single modal algorithms^{28,29}. Therefore, we aimed to test the effects of stacking ensembles on multimodal neuroimaging data, and whether stacking ensemble methods take advantage of learning higher-level feature representation.

We generated stacking ensemble models whose output types of base learners are continuous probability values. Trained models of single neuroimaging data with TabNet are base learners. Train data and test data used at the meta-classifier level were concatenated with predicted results from cross-validation and testing in base learners. Logistic regression, xgboost, and random forest were used as meta-learners. The best results from the three meta-learners were reported.

Data Augmentation

For imbalance between case and controls in suicide prediction that might constrain representation learning, we implemented GAN-based data augmentation approaches through conditional tabular GAN³⁰. Given the fact that youth suicidal ideation and attempts are rare events at the population level, we observed a highly imbalanced distribution between youth at risk for suicidality. Thus, augmented suicidality samples with synthesized data. We generated as many as samples until generated samples showed acceptable CTGAN metrics³⁰:

logistic_detection (Logistic Regression classifier to detect whether each row is real or synthetic, the returned score is 1 - ROC-AUC score obtained by the classifier): 0.99, svc_detection(Support Vector Classifier to detect whether each row is real or synthetic): 0.92 in rs-fMRI + sMRI + dMRI dataset and logistic_detection: 0.99, svc_detection: 0.99 in rs-fMRI + SST fMRI + N-back fMRI + MID fMRI dataset. As a result, the augmented discovery set was less imbalanced with a ratio of 1: 2.5.

Dimension reduction

We utilized TabNet and principal component analysis (PCA) to reduce dimensionality by selecting important features for modeling. For feature selection, we chose the top 50 features (in TabNet) or components (in PCA) in each neuroimaging modality estimated in validation sets. This number was based on our observation that the rate of the increase in explainability slowed for more than 50 features (**Supplementary Figure 1**). For PCA, the full Singular Value Decomposition method was used ³¹.

Results

Demographics

We used data from the ABCD study, a nationwide multisite prospective, longitudinal study. The enrolled samples consisted of 9 and 10-year-old children in the US across 21 sites. Total participants used in this analysis included 837 children with suicidality (i.e., Suicidal ideation or Suicidal attempt) and 5,335 controls (**Table 1**).

Identification of children with suicidal ideation using neuroimaging data

Our neuroimaging models for classification of suicidal ideation showed varied performances ranging from test ROC-AUCs of 48.26 to 61.22 (AURPCs: 47.85—60.06; **Table 2**). Among the models trained on neuroimaging features only, the structural MRI, the diffusion MRI and the resting-state fMRI models (ROC-AUCs: 61.22—57.18, AURPCs: 52.74—60.06) provided higher performances than task fMRI models (ROC-AUCs: 48.26—53.42, AURPCs: 47.85—50.87), which exceeded at chance level. All the neuroimaging models fell short of the classification performance of the psychosocial model, which yielded a moderate accuracy in classifying children with suicidal ideation and controls (ROC-AUC = 74.16, AUPRC: 70.18).

Combining psychosocial and imaging-based data showed improvements in identifying children with suicidality.

When combining behavioral and brain imaging-derived phenotypes, models showed moderately accurate performance in classifying children with suicidal ideation, ranging from

ROC-AUC 69.54% to ROC-AUC 74.16% (AUPRC: 64.79—67.85; **Table 2**). Moreover, to address problems brought from the large feature space of multimodal neuroimaging data, we implemented dimension reduction and data augmentation strategies to further optimize the suicide prediction models. We found that deep neural net-based feature selection led to marginal improvement of ROC-AUC in the combined models of structural MRI, diffusion MRI, SST fMRI, and MID fMRI. Of note, the diffusion MRI model outperformed the benchmark model by a small margin (diffusion MRI: 74.82 ROC-AUC, 70 AUPRC).

Integration of multimodal neuroimaging data

We further investigated whether fusing psychosocial and multimodal neuroimaging data could improve the identification of suicidal ideation. While most multimodal neuroimaging models failed to show better classification than the benchmark model, two models (i.e., dMRI + rs-fMRI, rs-fMRI + sMRI + dMRI) showed comparable ROC-AUCs to that of the benchmark model (**Table 3**). These models were based on feature selection and ensemble methods.

Also, the combined model of sMRI and dMRI, which represents brain morphology and structural connectivity of white matter, offered higher ROC-AUC compared with the single modal performances of sMRI and dMRI, respectively. We also found that integrating functional MRIs slightly exceeded the performance of each single modality model: e.g., rs-fMRI + SST fMRI: 73.58 ROC-AUC, rs-fMRI + N-back fMRI: 73.82 ROC-AUC.

Compared with the same multimodal models trained on original features, the feature selected models provided slightly higher performances. In ensemble models, while the connectivity models (i.e., sMRI, dMRI, rs-fMRI) showed slight improvements in test ROC-AUCs, the models trained on task fMRI-derived activation estimates showed a sharp decrease to 53.94—56.71 ROC-AUCs.

285

286 **Model Interpretation**

287 Across modalities, the feature importance plots of our models included brain derived
 288 features related to anterior cingulate cortex, temporal gyrus, and precentral gyrus (**Figure 1**).
 289 Common psychological features were observed including Internalizing-externalizing
 290 comorbidity, Prodromal psychosis, Anxiety, Depression, and Family conflict. These
 291 multimodal features showed patterns in predicting the risk for suicidal ideation across
 292 modalities: top 2~17% features accounted for 90% performances. These important features
 293 consisted of small numbers of psychological features (9~17%) and large amounts of
 294 neuroimaging derived features (83~90%). Complete feature importance details are in
 295 **Supplementary Figure 2.**

296

297 Discussion

298 We tested deep neural networks trained on the largest youth brain multimodal MRI
 299 data, as well as parent-reported psychosocial questionnaires, to predict youth with suicidal
 300 thoughts. Our deep neural networks showed both feasibility and limitations of the brain-based
 301 risk prediction of youth suicidality. Throughout our systematic model comparison, the one
 302 trained on white matter connectivity and psychological data performed the best. Models
 303 trained on multimodal brain imaging-derived data alone, including white matter connectivity,
 304 morphometry, functional connectivity, and task reactivity, showed above-chance performance
 305 yet were poorer compared with the baseline psychological model. Model interpretation showed
 306 the cortical regions and connections of which structural or functional metrics contributed to the
 307 prediction of youth suicidality, including the inferior frontal, temporal, precentral gyri, insula,
 308 and anterior cingulate cortex. These results from large, multi-site, epidemiological samples
 309 show the feasibility of the data-driven computational learning approach to multimodal brain
 310 MRI for prediction, as well as scientific discovery of youth suicidality.

311 The brain alone models showed statistically meaningful classification performance with
 312 the maximum ROC-AUC of 61.22 in resting-state fMRI-functional connectivity and similarly in
 313 structural and diffusion MRI-derived estimates. Prior studies with small sample sizes (e.g., N
 314 < 160) in adults report moderate accuracy in predicting suicidal ideation or attempts based on
 315 structural and functional brain imaging (with ROC-AUC ranging from 0.72 to 0.94; some results
 316 from only cross-validation but not from held-out test set)^{6,7,32,33}. Conversely, literature in
 317 children has been extremely rare. To our knowledge, this is the first study reporting the
 318 machine learning application to neuroimaging data to identify youth with suicidality.

319 Our neural networks permit delineating the brain correlates of youth suicidality. Our
 320 integrative models combining the psychosocial and white matter connectivity showed a slight
 321 increase in model performance (with a 1% ROC-AUC) compared with the baseline
 322 psychosocial model. Important features in this model include white matter connectivity,

morphometry, and functional connectivity within the distributed brain network, primarily the neocortex, including the inferior frontal gyrus, insula, and anterior cingulate cortex. The inferior frontal gyrus plays a role in emotional regulation, sustained attention, and language processing³⁴, of which abnormalities were associated with suicidality in adolescents³⁵. The insula and anterior cingulate cortex, as part of the salience network, are involved in the detection and integration of emotional and sensory stimuli³⁶. These features selected by the deep neural network with the sequential attention mechanism, are largely overlapped with those selected in the linear mass-univariate analysis in a prior study³⁷ (note that this prior study did not include diffusion MRI). Despite neither the mass-univariate nor machine learning approach can present the causal brain circuitry underlying suicide, the brain circuit correlates found in this study may help future research in youth suicidality.

Considering the previous univariate statistical analysis of the same data reporting the low classification accuracy (with area under precision-recall less than 0.10) for youth suicidality using brain imaging (cf. without diffusion data)³⁷, our results of the maximum ROC-AUC of 0.75 (area under precision-recall of 0.70) in held-out test samples show the importance of nonlinear multimodal modeling with machine learning in individualized prediction. Then, a more highly parameterized, end-to-end learning model trained on 3D and 4D brain MRI would improve accuracy to the level of practicality. Despite that a recent study shows a poorer scalability of the end-to-end deep learning models than linear models with the size of 10,000 samples³⁸, which was based on the tasks to predict common biological phenotypes (e.g., age and sex), we believe it is necessary to test the very scalability of this approach in the task of youth suicidality prediction. Moreover, even if the brain imaging itself contributes to the prediction with a limited degree, integrating the multi-modal data, not limited to the brain imaging, but extending to genetics, microbiome, life-log data, SNS and speech data may help us build a better predictive model with the practical utility in clinical or school settings.

Our deep neural networks trained on psychological and multimodal neuroimaging data may reflect the interplay between psychological variables and brain circuits related to risk for

youth suicidality. This is based on our observations of model interpretation across modalities: About 20% of features accounted for more than a 90% variance. Of those, besides several psychological features (e.g., internalizing symptoms) the multimodal brain phenotypes constitute the majority. Although the performance boost owing to the brain data was limited with up to a 1% ROC-AUC increase, we find this observation may reflect the interaction between the internalizing symptoms and the distributed brain system contributing to youth suicidality.

Our models include common psychosocial features as important attributes (e.g., internalizing and depressive behaviors, prodromal psychosis, and family conflict). This result is consistent with previous suicidality literature and recent findings from the ABCD study^{2,10,39}.

We tested two different methods of dimensionality reduction to overcome the sample complexity problem, i.e., the large feature space compared with the sample size. Overall, performance improvements were trivial. TabNet-based feature selection significantly improved performance compared to the models trained on original features, while PCA showed no improvements. Since TabNet's sequential attention mechanism accounts for the nonlinearity of the relationships among the features, which PCA cannot do so, this result implies the importance of non-linear modeling of the brain data in predicting suicidality in children.

Our stacking ensemble approach showed no benefits of integrating multi-modal brain imaging data. We believe that the stacking approach may have failed to account for complementary characteristics across the modalities. For better multi-modal integration, a principled approach that can utilize multitude representations as well as the brain network organization might be tested in the future. A recent breakthrough in computational chemistry may be a good example. A graph neural network accurately predicts protein folding structures and interactions by learning rich representations about proteins from multimodal and multidimensional data⁴⁰.

Likewise, in our experiment, performance increases by GAN-based data augmentation were not meaningful in the replication set (while it significantly improved performance in the validation set). This may be due to different distributions between the discovery and replication set⁴¹. In the future, since the benefits of the dimensionality reduction were observed in this study (e.g., TabNet's sequential attention mechanism), it will be interesting to test the data augmentation method in reduced numbers of the brain features.

There are some limitations to be considered in future studies. Firstly, suicidality (which includes suicidal ideation and attempt) does not always lead to suicidal commitment⁴². This might result from the difficulty not only of collecting data on who committed suicide but also of obtaining sufficient samples of suicide attempts from prepubertal children. Secondly, this study used a cross-sectional design. This limits us to testing the causal relationship between brain data and suicidality, or predictability of future outcomes. Given that the brain organizations of prepubertal children mature throughout adolescence, future research should test prospective predictions of suicidal risk using longitudinal data.

In sum, this study demonstrates the potential utility of a deep neural network approach using both psychosocial variables and neuroimaging to identify prepubertal children at risk for suicide in large, representative, and multi-site samples.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the New Faculty Startup Fund from Seoul National University (Cha); the BK21 FOUR Program (5199990314123) through the National Research Foundation of Korea (Cha and Ahn); National IT Promotion Agency GPU award (Cha); Intel PRTI award (Cha).

396

397 **Data and code availability**

398 The ABCD data can be accessed via the NIMH Data Archive (<https://nda.nih.gov/>). Our

399 codes used in this study are freely accessible: for the Tabnet implementation

400 (<https://colab.research.google.com/drive/1y5l89AxrfGYAlJmW2jnYk42OOIDfP8Zz?usp=share>

401 [ing](#)) and for the ensemble modeling

402 (https://colab.research.google.com/drive/1IR1Y5BBEuGtxQfDDYZ2RL9EtL_h_Jxf?usp=sharing)

References

1. Beautrais, A. L. Suicide and serious suicide attempts in youth: a multiple-group comparison study. *Am. J. Psychiatry* 160, 1093–1099 (2003).
2. DeVille, D. C. et al. Prevalence and Family-Related Factors Associated With Suicidal Ideation, Suicide Attempts, and Self-injury in Children Aged 9 to 10 Years. *JAMA Netw Open* 3, e1920956 (2020).
3. Tsypes, A., Owens, M. & Gibb, B. E. Blunted Neural Reward Responsiveness in Children with Recent Suicidal Ideation. *Clin. Psychol. Sci.* 7, 958–968 (2019).
4. Huber, R. S., Sheth, C., Renshaw, P. F., Yurgelun-Todd, D. A. & McGlade, E. C. Suicide Ideation and Neurocognition Among 9- and 10-Year Old Children in the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study. *Arch. Suicide Res.* 1–15 (2020).
5. Chen, K., Azeez, A., Chen, D. Y. & Biswal, B. B. Resting-State Functional Connectivity: Signal Origins and Analytic Methods. *Neuroimaging Clinics of North America* vol. 30 15–23 (2020).
6. Gosnell, S. N., Fowler, J. C. & Salas, R. Classifying suicidal behavior with resting-state functional connectivity and structural neuroimaging. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* vol. 140 20–29 (2019).
7. Just, M. A. et al. Machine learning of neural representations of suicide and emotion concepts identifies suicidal youth. *Nature Human Behaviour* vol. 1 911–919 (2017).
8. Calhoun, V. D. & Sui, J. Multimodal Fusion of Brain Imaging Data: A Key to Finding the Missing Link(s) in Complex Mental Illness. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging* vol. 1 230–244 (2016).
9. Townsend, L. et al. Development of Three Web-Based Computerized Versions of the Kiddie Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia Child Psychiatric Diagnostic Interview: Preliminary Validity Data. *J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 59, 309–325 (2020).
10. Harman, G. et al. Prediction of suicidal ideation and attempt in 9 and 10 year-old

- children using transdiagnostic risk features. PLoS One 16, e0252114 (2021).
11. Bruni, O. et al. The Sleep Disturbance Scale for Children (SDSC). Construction and validation of an instrument to evaluate sleep disturbances in childhood and adolescence. J. Sleep Res. 5, 251–261 (1996).
12. Watts, A. L., Smith, G. T., Barch, D. M. & Sher, K. J. Factor structure, measurement and structural invariance, and external validity of an abbreviated youth version of the UPPS-P Impulsive Behavior Scale. Psychol. Assess. 32, 336–347 (2020).
13. Karcher, N. R. et al. Assessment of the Prodromal Questionnaire-Brief Child Version for Measurement of Self-reported Psychoticlike Experiences in Childhood. JAMA Psychiatry 75, 853–861 (2018).
14. Pagliaccio, D. et al. Revising the BIS/BAS Scale to study development: Measurement invariance and normative effects of age and sex from childhood through adulthood. Psychol. Assess. 28, 429–442 (2016).
15. Akshoomoff, N. et al. VIII. NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery (CB): composite scores of crystallized, fluid, and overall cognition. Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Dev. 78, 119–132 (2013).
16. Hagler, D. J., Jr et al. Automated white-matter tractography using a probabilistic diffusion tensor atlas: Application to temporal lobe epilepsy. Hum. Brain Mapp. 30, 1535–1547 (2009).
17. Hagler, D. J., Jr et al. Image processing and analysis methods for the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study. Neuroimage 202, 116091 (2019).
18. Holland, D., Kuperman, J. M. & Dale, A. M. Efficient correction of inhomogeneous static magnetic field-induced distortion in Echo Planar Imaging. Neuroimage 50, 175–183 (2010).
19. Wells, W. M., 3rd, Viola, P., Atsumi, H., Nakajima, S. & Kikinis, R. Multi-modal volume registration by maximization of mutual information. Med. Image Anal. 1, 35–51 (1996).
20. Tournier, J.-D. et al. MRtrix3: A fast, flexible and open software framework for medical image processing and visualisation. Neuroimage 202, 116137 (2019).

21. Cha, J. et al. Abnormal reward circuitry in anorexia nervosa: A longitudinal, multimodal MRI study. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 37, 3835–3846 (2016).
22. Cha, J. et al. Neural Correlates of Aggression in Medication-Naive Children with ADHD: Multivariate Analysis of Morphometry and Tractography. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 40, 1717–1725 (2015).
23. Tustison, N. J. et al. N4ITK: improved N3 bias correction. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging* 29, 1310–1320 (2010).
24. Shunmugapriya, P. & Kanmani, S. Optimization of stacking ensemble configurations through Artificial Bee Colony algorithm. *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* vol. 12 24–32 (2013).
25. Yang, Y. et al. Classification of Parkinson’s disease based on multi-modal features and stacking ensemble learning. *J. Neurosci. Methods* 350, 109019 (2021).
26. Chaurasia, V. & Pal, S. Stacking-Based Ensemble Framework and Feature Selection Technique for the Detection of Breast Cancer. *SN Computer Science* vol. 2 (2021).
27. Lei Xu (S. Synthesizing Tabular Data Using Conditional GAN. (2020).
28. Halko, N., Martinsson, P. G. & Tropp, J. A. Finding Structure with Randomness: Probabilistic Algorithms for Constructing Approximate Matrix Decompositions. *SIAM Review* vol. 53 217–288 (2011).
29. Hong, S. et al. Identification of suicidality in adolescent major depressive disorder patients using sMRI: A machine learning approach. *J. Affect. Disord.* 280, 72–76 (2021).
30. Weng, J.-C. et al. An Autoencoder and Machine Learning Model to Predict Suicidal Ideation with Brain Structural Imaging. *J. Clin. Med. Res.* 9, (2020).
31. Greenlee, J. D. W. et al. Functional connections within the human inferior frontal gyrus. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology* vol. 503 550–559 (2007).
32. Ordaz, S. J., Goyer, M. S., Ho, T. C., Singh, M. K. & Gotlib, I. H. Network basis of suicidal ideation in depressed adolescents. *J. Affect. Disord.* 226, 92–99 (2018).
33. White, T. P., Joseph, V., Francis, S. T. & Liddle, P. F. Aberrant salience network (bilateral insula and anterior cingulate cortex) connectivity during information processing

- in schizophrenia. Schizophrenia Research vol. 123 105–115 (2010).
34. Vidal-Ribas, P. et al. Multimodal neuroimaging and suicidality in a US population-based sample of school-aged children. doi:10.1101/19013193.
35. Schulz, M.-A. et al. Different scaling of linear models and deep learning in UKBiobank brain images versus machine-learning datasets. Nat. Commun. 11, 4238 (2020).
36. Janiri, D. et al. Risk and protective factors for childhood suicidality: a US population-based study. Lancet Psychiatry 7, 317–326 (2020).
37. Vidal-Ribas, P., Janiri, D., Doucet, G. E., Pornpattananangkul, N., Nielson, D. M., Frangou, S., & Stringaris, A. (2020). Multimodal neuroimaging and suicidality in a US population-based sample of school-aged children. *medRxiv*, 19013193.
38. Jain, V. & Chatterjee, J. M. Machine Learning with Health Care Perspective: Machine Learning and Healthcare. (Springer Nature, 2020).
39. Fridley, B. L. Data augmentation for the handling of censored spatial data. doi:10.31274/rtd-180813-12076.
40. Chen, J., Chun, D., Patel, M., Chiang, E. & James, J. The validity of synthetic clinical data: a validation study of a leading synthetic data generator (Synthea) using clinical quality measures. BMC Med. Inform. Decis. Mak. 19, 44 (2019).
41. Baur, C., Albarqouni, S. & Navab, N. Generating Highly Realistic Images of Skin Lesions with GANs. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 260–267 (2018) doi:10.1007/978-3-030-01201-4_28.
42. Sigfusdottir, I. D., Asgeirsdottir, B. B., Gudjonsson, G. H. & Sigurdsson, J. F. Suicidal ideations and attempts among adolescents subjected to childhood sexual abuse and family conflict/violence: the mediating role of anger and depressed mood. J. Adolesc. 36, 1227–1236 (2013).

510 Tables

511 **Table 1. Sociodemographics of the study participants (n=6,172).**

	Controls		SI		SA		Statistics	p-value
N	5335		782		55			
Suicidal ideation					51			
Age	119 ± 7.4		119 ± 7.42		121 ± 6.08		F = 2.295	0.101
Sex								
Male	2704	50.68	465	59.46	36	65.45	Chisq = 25.123	p<.001
Female	2631	49.32	317	40.54	19	34.55		
Race / Ethnicity								
White	2994	56.12	426	54.48	20	36.36	Chisq = 32.56	p<.001
Black	482	9.03	69	8.82	13	23.64		
Hispanic	1183	22.17	157	20.08	18	32.73		
Asian	120	2.25	20	2.56	1	1.82		
Other	551	10.33	110	14.07	3	5.45		
Parents married	3858	72.31	517	66.11	26	47.27	Chisq = 28.489	p<.001
Income level	7.42 ± 2.26		7.22 ± 2.29		5.66 ± 2.6		F = 18.551	p<.05

512

Table 2. Classification performances of psychosocial, imaging-based, and combined deep neural networks identifying suicidal ideation. Deep neural network (TabNet) and additional methods for dimensionality reduction (feature selection, PCA) and data augmentation (CTGAN) were tested.

Model	Replication set				
	ROC-AUC	AUPRC	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity
Psychosocial model	74.16	70.18	70.66	72.78	68.55
Structural MRI					
Neuroimaging model	57.18	52.74	57.53	43.81	70.18
Combined model	71.44	67.95	67.82	84.18	51.57
Neural net based feature selected	72.55 [†]	69.05	69.72	75.32	64.15
PCA based dimension reduced	67.44	63.18	65.93	71.52	60.38
GAN based data augmented	69.74	65.08	67.51	78.48	56.60
Diffusion MRI					
Neuroimaging model	58.15	53.48	58.9	64.76	53.51
Combined model	69.54	64.79	66.88	74.68	59.12
Neural net based feature selected	74.82 [*]	70.06	72.24	75.95	68.55
PCA based dimension reduced	69.1	65.31	66.56	75.95	57.23
GAN based data augmented	68.74	64.09	65.93	73.42	58.49
Resting state fMRI					
Neuroimaging model	61.22	60.06	59.82	82.86	38.6
Combined model	73.74	67.58	70.34	86.07	54.71
Neural net based feature selected	73.43	70.86 [*]	69.72	72.78	66.67
PCA based dimension reduced	69.95	62.02	67.51	81.01	54.09
GAN based data augmented	71.26	66.92	67.51	81.65	53.46
Stop signal task fMRI					
Neuroimaging model	53.42	50.87	54.79	55.24	54.39
Combined model	71.37	67.6	67.51	65.79	69.11
Neural net based feature selected	72.52 [†]	68.41	67.93	62.28	73.17
PCA based dimension reduced	66.61	61.22	66.24	65.79	66.67
GAN based data augmented	70.24	65.05	66.24	71.05	61.79
N-back task fMRI					
Neuroimaging model	50.43	47.85	53.88	50.48	57.02
Combined model	72.69	66.73	70.04	81.58	59.35
Neural net based feature selected	72.09	68.71	68.78	75.44	62.60

PCA based dimension reduced	68.29	61.99	65.82	54.39	76.42
GAN based data augmented	68.78	62.29	66.67	85.09	49.59
Monetary incentive delay task fMRI					
Neuroimaging model	48.26	49.47	54.79	64.76	45.61
Combined model	71.22	66.19	65.82	65.79	65.85
Neural net based feature selected	72.28 [†]	68.89	70.04	71.93	68.29
PCA based dimension reduced	64.58	60.86	64.14	62.28	65.85
GAN based data augmented	68.23	63.39	66.67	73.68	60.16

517 Note: Combined models included imaging derived and psychosocial features. * indicates
518 higher performance than the benchmark result in TabNet and † indicates higher performances
519 than TabNet results in the same dataset.

520

521

Table 3. Classification performances (ROC AUC) of psychosocial and multimodal neuroimaging data for identification of suicide ideation on balanced replication datasets.

	Model	TabNet	TabNet - Feature selection	Ensemble
Morphometry and connectivity	sMRI + dMRI	73.81 [‡]	72.3	73.91 [†]
	sMRI + rs-fMRI	72.43	72.71 [†]	73.77 [†]
	dMRI + rs-fMRI	72.86	73.28	74.7*
	rs-fMRI + sMRI + dMRI	68.47	74.43 *	74.41*
Functional connectivity and activation	rs-fMRI + SST fMRI	73.58 [‡]	72.23	54.97
	rs-fMRI + Nback fMRI	73.82 [‡]	72.31	56.22
	SST fMRI + Nback fMRI	71	72.48 [†]	56.71
	SST fMRI + Nback fMRI + MID fMRI	71	72.74 [†]	53.94
	rs-fMRI + SST fMRI+ Nback fMRI + MID fMRI	70.43	69.91	56.51
All modalities	sMRI + dMRI + rs-fMRI + SST fMRI + Nback fMRI + MID fMRI	65.9	69.76 [†]	54.95

* represents higher performances than the psychosocial model with ROC AUC of 74.16. † denotes higher performances than TabNet results in the same dataset. ‡ denotes higher performances than the combined model trained on single neuroimaging data.

Figure 1. Important neuroimaging features contributing to the identification of suicidal ideation in combined models with selected features. A. dMRI-derived White Matter Connectivity. B. Structure MRI-Derived Morphometry. C. RS-FMRI-Derived Functional Connectivity. D. Task FMRI-Derived Activation Estimates (Stop signal task, emotional N-back task, monetary incentive delay task). The size of the node and edge represents the relative importance.

dMRI-derived White Matter Connectivity L.BSTS: Left Banks of Superior Temporal Sulcus, L.PA: Left-Pallidum. R.AC: Right-Accumbens-area, R.HI: Right-Hippocampus, R.ITG: gray matter of right inferior temporal gyrus, R.TTG: gray matter of right transverse temporal gyrus./ **Structure MRI-Derived Morphometry** caudalMFG: caudal middle frontal, frontal pole: frontal pole, fusiform-G: fusiform gyrus, Insula: superior segment of the circular sulcus of the insula, lingual-gyrus: lingual-gyrus, occipital-pole: occipital pole, rostral-ACC: rostral anterior cingulate, subcallosal-G: subcallosal gyrus/ **RS-FMRI-Derived Functional Connectivity** N.VAT: Network ventral attention, NAc: nucleus accumbens, RSC: retrosplenial temporal cortex, S.VAT: Subcort ventral attention, / **Task FMRI-Derived Activation Estimates** aINS: vertical ramus of the anterior segment of the lateral sulcus, aINS: vertical ramus of the anterior segment of the lateral sulcus, AOS: anterior occipital sulcus and preoccipital notch, ATCS: anterior transverse collateral sulcus, IN: superior segment of the circular sulcus of the insula, IOG: inferior occipital gyrus and sulcus, LOS: lateral orbital sulcus, MTG: middle temporal gyrus, PCG: postcentral gyrus, PHG:

545 parahippocampal gyrus, SFG: superior frontal gyrus, SFS: superior frontal sulcus, SPS: subparietal sulcus

Figure 2. Feature importance plot of diffusion MRI combined model. Important 20 features are indicated. Top 5% features (N=180) exceed 95% of cumulative importance.

AnxDep.CBCL: Anxious/depressed behavior, Attention.CBCL: Attention problems, con_R.LOG_R.IN_count: connectivity between right lateral occipital gyrus and right insula, con_L.PA_L.HI_count: connectivity between left pallidum and left hippocampus, con_L.RMFG_R.FP_count: connectivity between left rostral middle frontal gyrus and right frontal pole, con_L.PaCG_L.SPG_count: connectivity between left parahippocampal gyrus and right subparietal gyrus, con_R.BSTS_R.PCAL_count: connectivity between right bankssts and right pericalcarine, con_L.STG_L.TTG_count: connectivity between left superior temporal gyrus and left transverse temporal gyrus, , con_L.CU_R.CACG_count: connectivity between left cuneus and right caudal anterior cingulate, con_L.SPG_R.TH_count: connectivity between left superior parietal gyrus and right thalamus, con_L.PCAL_L.TTG_count: connectivity between left pericalcarine and right transverse temporal gyrus, con_L.BSTS_L.MOFG_count: connectivity between left bankssts and right medial orbitofrontal gyrus, con_L.CU_L.ITG_count: connectivity between left cuneus and gray matter of left inferior temporal gyrus, con_L.CER_R.PaCG_count: connectivity between left Cerebellum-Cortex and right paracentral gyrus, Conduct.CBCL: Conduct problems, conflict_openly angry, fes_q1_1: Family_frequent fights, fes_q2_1: Family, Internal.CBCL: Internalizing behavior, Obsessive.Compulsive.Problems..OCD..CBCL: OCD problems, WithDep.CBCL: Withdrawn/depressed behavior

Identifying Prepubertal Children with Risk for Suicide Using Deep Neural Network Trained on Multimodal Brain Imaging-Derived Phenotypes

**Bo-Gyeom Kim, Gun Ahn, Sooyoung Kim, Ka-Kyeong Kim, Hyeonjin Kim, Eunji Lee,
Woo-Young Ahn, Jae-Won Kim, Jiook Cha**

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Table 1-4

Supplementary Figure 1-2

Supplementary Table 1. Classification performances in predicting youth suicidality attempt. Deep neural networks (TabNet) and additional methods of dimensionality reduction and data augmentation were tested.

Model	TabNet	TabNet - Feature selection	TabNet - PCA	TabNet - CTGAN
Psychosocial	83.33 [‡]	69.44	-	69.44
Structural MRI	60.68	75 [†]	75 [†]	75 [†]
Diffusion MRI	72.22 [‡]	79.17 [†]	72.2	79.17 [†]
Resting state fMRI	80.56 [‡]	80.56	84.72 *	80.56
Stop signal task fMRI	78.1 [‡]	76.91	64.29	76.91
N-back task fMRI	69.05	78.57 [†]	76.19 [†]	78.57 [†]
Monetary incentive delay task fMRI	54.76	54.76	78.57	54.76

Note: All single modality models except psychosocial model included psychosocial by default. * denotes higher performance than the benchmark result in TabNet and † denotes higher performances than TabNet results in the same dataset. ‡ denotes higher performances than the results in suicidality ideation using TabNet.

On the single modal neuroimaging data, the neural networks, TabNet showed a wider range of accurate performances in classifying children with suicidal attempts, ranging from ROC-AUC 54.76% to ROC-AUC 83.33%.

When we apply feature selection to TabNet, in structural and diffusion MRI, additional methods including feature selection, PCA and CTGAN showed higher performance than just TabNet model. Although there isn't any higher result than benchmark in both MRI data, we found that dimensionality reduction explains suicidality ideation and attempt better than the other ways.

599 **Supplementary Table 2.** Summed contribution of top 50 important features of the
 600 combined models to identify children at risk for suicidal ideation using TabNet.

Model	Psychosocial variable	Neuroimaging variables
Structural MRI	0.343	0.334
Diffusion MRI	0.296	0.359
Resting state fMRI	0.585	0.133
Stop signal task fMRI	0.382	0.343
N-back fMRI	0.435	0.245
Monetary incentive delay fMRI	0.456	0.252

601

Supplementary Table 3. Summed contribution of top 50 important features of suicidal

attempt prediction models using TabNet

Model	Psychosocial variable	Neuroimaging variables
Structural MRI	0.218	0.307
Diffusion MRI	0.329	0.143
Resting state fMRI	0.129	0.411
Stop signal task fMRI	0.0966	0.453
N-back fMRI	0.105	0.396
Monetary incentive delay fMRI	0.0321	0.414

In the suicide attempt prediction task, we observed that most neuroimaging variables outweighed psychosocial variables in several neuroimaging models (structural MRI, resting-state fMRI, stop signal task fMRI, N-back task fMRI and monetary incentive delay task fMRI models). However, only diffusion MRI derived features outperformed psychosocial variables among the top 50 features.

Supplementary Table 4. Top 10 features predictive of suicidal ideation. The models

were trained on brain imaging-derived phenotypes and psychosocial data

Psychosocial		Structural MRI		Diffusion MRI		Resting state fMRI	
Feature	Importance	Feature	Importance	Feature	Importance	Feature	Importance
Internalizing-externalizing comorbidity	15.15	Anxiety / Depression	10.18	Internalizing-externalizing comorbidity	12.8	Depression	6.02
Prodromal psychosis_frequency	7.37	Prodromal psychosis_distress	6	Prodromal psychosis_frequency	7	Prodromal psychosis_frequency	5.33
Prodromal psychosis_distress	6.68	Family temper	3.71	Prodromal psychosis_distress	6.05	Withdrawn / Depressed	3.18
Family conflict	5.53	Family anger	3.22	Family anger	3.45	Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder(OCD)	2.56
Anxiety / Depression	3.38	Oppositional Defiant Disorder	3.07	Behavioral inhibition system	3.23	Weight	2.44
Depression	3.01	Externalizing disorder	3.05	Rash tendency in extreme	2.72	Internal comorbidity	2.39
Family angry	2.65	ADHD	2.68	Connectivity_Right-Hippocampus_Gray matter of right transverse temporal gyrus	2.65	Social Problems	2.11
Family peace	2.57	Sex	2.54	Depression	2.61	Married	2.1
Income	2.35	Internal comorbidity	2.52	Aggressive behavior	2.56	Family Angry	1.97
Internal comorbidity	2.2	Total Problem	2.46	Family temper	2.12	Connectivity_retrosplenialtemporal_dorsalattention	1.92
		Stop signal task fMRI		N-back task fMRI		Monetary incentive delayed task fMRI	
		Feature	Importance	Feature	Importance	Feature	Importance
		Depression	9.19	Prodromal psychosis_frequency	10.77	Prodromal psychosis_frequency	9.75
		Prodromal psychosis_frequency	6.41	Anxiety / Depression	6.12	Aggressive Behavior	7.35
		Externalizing disorder	5.74	Externalizing disorder	5.37	Prodromal psychosis_distress	7.04
		Prodromal psychosis_distress	5.55	Aggressive behavior	3.71	Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder(OCD)	6.4
		Internal comorbidity	5.3	Rule breaking behavior	3.4	Depression	5.51
		Family anger	3.27	Depression	3.1	Internalizing-externalizing comorbidity	4.76
		Anxiety / Depression	2.75	Internalizing-externalizing comorbidity	2.8	superior frontal gyrus (L)	2.74
		Internalizing-externalizing comorbidity	2.53	Family conflict	2.47	Externalizing disorder	2.64
		Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder(OCD)	2.39	Conduct disorder	2.43	Family temper	2.16
		Race	1.85	Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder(OCD)	2.41	middle temporal gyrus (L)	9.75

613 **Supplementary Figure 1. Explainability of the resting-state fMRI combined model**
 614 **as an increase of the number of features.** Top 50 features contain explainability of 91.6%.

615

616 **Supplementary Figure 2. Feature importance plots of combined models.** Top 20 features
617 are denoted.

618 (A) Structural MRI

619

Aggressive.CBCL	Aggressive behavior
AnxDep.CBCL	Anxious/Depressed behavior
AnxDisord.CBCL	Anxious behavior
Attention.CBCL	Attention problems
Conduct.CBCL	Conduct problems
cuneus_area	Cuneus area
External.CBCL	Externalizing behavior
fes_q4_1	Family conflict_losing tempers
fes_q5_1	Family conflict_criticizing
fes_q7_1	Family_reconciliation attempt
G_cingul.Post.dorsal_area	Posterior-dorsal part of the cingulate gyrus
G_oc.temp_med.Lingual_thickness	Lingual gyrus thickness
inferiorparietal_meancurv	Inferior-parietal mean curve
Internal.CBCL	Internalizing behaviour
isthmuscingulate_area	Isthmus cingulate area
Opposit.CBCL	OCD problem
PPSP_distress	Prodromal psychosis_distress
PPSP_frequency	Prodromal psychosis_frequency

Social.CBCL	Social problems
TotProb.CBCL	Total behavioral problems

(B) Resting state functional MRI

AnxDep.CBCL	Anxious/Depressed behavior
Aggressive.CBCL	Aggressive behavior
cinguloparietal	Cingulo parietal
Conduct.CBCL	Conduct problems
cor_network	Correlation between two networks
dorsalattn	Dorsal attention
fes_q2_1	Family conflict_openly angry
fes_q5_1	Family conflict_criticism
Internal.and.External.Comorbidity	Internalizing and Externalizing behavior
Internal.CBCL	Internalizing behaviour
PPSP_distress	Prodromal psychosis_frequency
PPSP_frequency	Prodromal psychosis_distress
race.ethnicity	Race/ethnicity

smmouth	Somatomotor cortex to the mouth
TotProb.CBCL	Total behavioral problems
ventralattn	Ventral attention
ventraldc	Ventral DC
WithDep.CBCL	Withdrawn/Depressed behavior

(C) Stop signal task functional MRI

Aggressive.CBCL	Aggressive problem
AnxDep.CBCL	Anxious/depressed behavior
fes_q2_1	Family conflict_openly angry
fes_q3_1	Family conflict_throwing things
fes_q4_1	Family conflict_losing tempers
g.and.s.cingul.mid.post	Middle-posterior part of the cingulate gyrus and sulcus
s.central	Central sulcus
g.cingul.post.dorsal	Posterior-dorsal part of the cingulate gyrus

Internal.and.External.Comorbidity	Internalizing and Externalizing behavior
Internal.CBCL	Internalizing behaviour
married	Never married
Obsessive.Compulsive.Problems..OCD..CBCL	OCD problems
PPSP_frequency	Prodromal psychosis_distress
RuleBreak.CBCL	Rule breaking problem
s.intrapariet.and.p.trans	Intraparietal sulcus and transverse parietal sulci
s.oc.temp.med.and.lingual	Medial occipito-temporal sulcus and lingual sulcus
s.orbital.lateral	Lateral orbital sulcus
s.temporal.sup	Superior temporal sulcus
Stress.CBCL	Stress problems
TotProb.CBCL	Total behavioral problem

631

632 (D) Emotional N-back functional MRI

633

tfMRI	Task functional MRI
nback	Emotional N-back functional MRI
Aggressive.CBCL	Aggressive problem
AnxDep.CBCL	Anxious/depressed behavior
Depress.CBCL	Depression problems
fes_q1_1	Family_frequent fights
fes_q2_1	Family conflict_openly angry

g.insular.short	short insular gyri
g.oc.temp.lat.fusifor	lateral occipito-temporal gyrus
g.oc.temp.med.parahip	parahippocampal gyrus
g.temp.sup.g.t.transv	anterior transverse temporal gyrus
g.temp.sup.lateral	lateral aspect of the superior temporal gyrus
Internal.and.External.Comobidity	Internalizing and Externalizing behavior
Obsessive.Compulsive.Problems..OCD..CBCL	OCD problems
PPSP_distress	Prodromal psychosis_distress
s.circular.insula.inf	Inferior segment of the circular sulcus of the insula
s.collat.transv.post	Posterior transverse collateral sulcus
s.front.middle	Middle frontal sulcus
s.oc.sup.and.transversal	Superior occipital sulcus and transverse occipital sulcus
Social.CBCL	Social problems
s.orbital.lateral.rh	Lateral orbital sulcus (right hemisphere)
TotProb.CBCL	Total behavioral problems

634

635 (E) Monetary incentive delay functional MRI

636

AnxDisord.CBCL	Anxious behavior
Conduct.CBCL	Conduct problems
External.CBCL	Externalizing behavior
fes_q1_1	Family_frequent fights
fes_q4_1	Family conflict_losing tempers
g.and.s.subcentral.rh	Subcentral gyrus and sulci (right hemisphere)

g.front.inf.triangu.lh	Triangular part of the inferior frontal gyrus (left hemisphere)
g.front.sup.lh	Superior frontal gyrus (left hemisphere)
g.orbital.rh	Orbital gyri (right hemisphere)
g.rectus.lh	Gyrus rectus (left hemisphere)
g.temporal.inf.rh	Inferior temporal gyrus (right hemisphere)
g.temp.sup.lateral.lh	Lateral aspect of the superior temporal gyrus (left hemisphere)
Internal.and.External.Comorbidity	Internalizing and Externalizing behavior
Obsessive.Compulsive.Problems..OCD..CBCL	OCD problems
PPSP_frequency	Prodromal psychosis_distress
s.circular.insula.inf.rh	Inferior segment of the circular sulcus of the insula (right hemisphere)
s.occipital.ant.rh	Anterior occipital sulcus and preoccipital notch (right hemisphere)
s.postcentral.lh	Postcentral sulcus (left hemisphere)
s.temporal.inf.lh	Inferior temporal sulcus (left hemisphere)