

Supplementary Tables

Authors: Anil P. S. Ori, Martijn Wieling, Lifelines Corona Research Initiative, Hanna M. van Loo

Table S1. Questionnaire items

Language	MINI questionnaire Item	Answer	Symptom	Module
Dutch	1. Hebt u zich tijdens de afgelopen 7/14 dagen voortdurend somber of depressief gevoeld gedurende het grootste gedeelte van de dag, en dit bijna elke dag?	Ja/nee	Somberheid	MD
English	1. In the last 7/14 days have you felt low or depressed for much of the day, every day?	Yes/no	Depressed	
Dutch	2. Hebt u tijdens de afgelopen 7/14 dagen voortdurend het gevoel gehad nergens meer zin in te hebben of geen interesse meer te hebben voor dingen die u normaal wel interesseren?	Ja/nee	Anhedonie	MD
English	2. In the last 7/14 days have you had the feeling that you've lost interest in or the will to do things you are normally interested in?	Yes/no	Anhedonia	
Dutch	3. In de afgelopen 7/14 dagen, was uw eetlust merkbaar veranderd, of is uw gewicht toegenomen of afgenomen, zonder dat dit de bedoeling was?	Ja/nee	Eetlust/gewicht	MD
English	3. In the last 7/14 days, did your appetite change noticeably, or did your weight increase or decrease without this being intended?	Yes/no	Appetite/weight	
Dutch	4. In de afgelopen 7/14 dagen, hebt u bijna elke nacht slaapproblemen gehad (moeilijk inslapen, wakker worden tijdens de nacht of te vroeg in de ochtend, of juist te veel slapen)?	Ja/nee	Slaapproblemen	MD & GAD
English	4. In the last 7/14 days, have you had problems sleeping almost every night (difficulty falling asleep, waking up in the night or too early in the morning, or actually sleeping too much)?	Yes/no	Difficulty sleeping	
Dutch	5. In de afgelopen 7/14 dagen, praatte of bewoog u trager dan gewoonlijk, of voelde u zich juist rusteloos, gejaagd en kon u moeilijk stil blijven zitten? Bijna elke dag?	Ja/nee	Rusteloosheid	MD
English	5. In the last 7/14 days, did you speak or move more slowly than normal? Or did you feel restless, jittery and could barely sit still? Nearly every day?	Yes/no	Restlessness	
Dutch	6. In de afgelopen 7/14 dagen, voelde u zich bijna elke dag waardeloos of schuldig?	Ja/nee	Waardeloosheid	MD
English	6. In the last 7/14 days, did you feel worthless or guilty almost every day?	Yes/no	Worthlessness	
Dutch	7. In de afgelopen 7/14 dagen, kon u zich bijna elke dag moeilijk concentreren of moeilijk beslissingen nemen?	Ja/nee	Concentratieproblemen	MD & GAD
English	7. In the last 7/14 days, was it difficult to concentrate or make decisions almost every day?	Yes/no	Difficulty concentrating	
Dutch	8. In de afgelopen 7/14 dagen, hebt u overwogen zichzelf iets aan te doen, wenste u dat u dood was, of had u zelfmoordgedachten?	Ja/nee	Zelfmoordgedachten	MD

English	8. In the last 7/14 days, have you considered hurting yourself, wished you were dead, or had suicidal thoughts?	Yes/no	Suicidal ideation	
Dutch	9. In de afgelopen 14 dagen, voelde u zich bijna elke dag moe of futloos?	Ja/nee	Vermoeidheid	MD & GAD
English	9. In the last 14 days, did you feel tired or without energy almost every day?	Yes/no	Feelings of fatigue	
Dutch	10. Hebt u in de afgelopen 7/14 dagen buitensporig gepiekerd en zich zorgen gemaakt over meerdere problemen van het dagelijks leven, op het werk, thuis, in uw naaste omgeving?	Ja/nee	Buitensporig piekeren	GAD
English	10. In the last 7/14 days, have you been worrying excessively and worrying about multiple problems of every day life, at work, at home, in your immediate environment?	Yes/no	Excessive worrying	
Dutch	11. Zijn deze zorgen bijna elke dag aanwezig in de afgelopen 7/14 dagen?	Ja/nee	-	GAD
English	11. Were these worries present almost every day in the last 7/14 days?	Yes/no	-	
Dutch	12. Vindt u het moeilijk om deze bezorgdheid in de hand te houden of belemmert dit u om zich te concentreren de afgelopen 7/14 dagen?	Ja/nee	-	GAD
English	12. In the last 7/14 days did you find it hard to set these worries aside or did they prevent you from concentrating?	Yes/no	-	
Dutch	13. U zich rusteloos, geladen of zenuwachtig voelde? / Gebeurde het in de afgelopen 7 dagen vaak dat	Ja/nee	Rusteloosheid/ nervousheid	GAD
English	14. You felt restless, jittery or nervous? / In the last 7/14 days did it often happen that	Yes/no	Restlessness/nervousness	
Dutch	15. U zich gespannen voelde? / Gebeurde het in de afgelopen 7/14 dagen vaak dat	Ja/nee	Gespannenheid	GAD
English	15. You felt tense? / In the last 7/14 days did it often happen that	Yes/no	Feeling tense	
Dutch	16. U bijzonder prikkelbaar was? / Gebeurde het in de afgelopen 7/14 dagen vaak dat	Ja/nee	Prikkelbaar	GAD
English	16. You were particularly irritable? / In the last 7/14 days did it often happen that	Yes/no	Irritable	

	Full sample	Selected sample	Random 5K sample	Youngest 5K sample
Number of participants	76,016	36,106	5,000	5,000
Age	53.7 (SD=13.0)	57.4 (SD=11.9)	57.5 (SD=11.8)	36.6 (SD=6.3)
18-30 years	3,884 (5.1%)	875 (2.4%)	114 (2.3%)	875 (17.5%)
31-67 years	60,617 (79.7%)	27,394 (75.9%)	3,806 (76.1%)	4,125 (82.5%)
>68 years	11,515 (15.1%)	7,837 (21.7%)	1,080 (21.6%)	-
Female (%)	46,253 (60.8%)	22,339 (61.9%)	3,067 (61.3%)	3,508 (70.2)
Total questionnaires	823,478	629,811	87,076	78,054
Median questionnaire/person (IQR 25%-75%)	10 (3-20)	20 (15-22)	20 (15-22)	18 (12-22)
Lifetime MDD (%)	17,814 (23.4%)	7,917 (21.9%)	1,095 (21.9%)	1,468 (29.4%)
Lifetime GAD (%)	7,011 (9.2%)	2,997 (8.3%)	399 (8.0%)	547 (10.9%)
Number of MDD cases	6,555	3,675	489	753
Average MDD prevalence	2.2%	1.9%	1.7%	3.2%
Average MDD symptom score	0.54 (SD=1.19)	0.50 (SD=1.14)	0.49 (SD=1.11)	0.71 (SD=1.40)
Number of GAD cases	8,004	4,625	642	970
Average GAD prevalence	2.6%	2.3%	2.2%	3.9%
Average GAD symptom score	0.67 (SD=1.34)	0.63 (SD=1.29)	0.61 (SD=1.26)	0.99 (SD=1.61)
Number of suicidal ideation cases	3,150	2,007	279	394
Average suicidal ideation prevalence	0.78%	0.71%	0.70%	1.19%

Table S2. Demographics and characteristics of the full cohort and different sample subsets. Shown are the number of participants and their characteristics for the full cohort, our selected sample, the random sample, and the youngest 5K sample. Number of MDD/GAD and suicidal ideation cases are presented as the number of participants who met the DSM-IV criteria during at least one questionnaire. The MDD/GAD prevalence and average symptom scores are presented by the mean and spread of their per-questionnaire average based on the imputed data.

Table S3. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories in the main sample and full cohort over time. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for both the analyses performed in the main sample (left columns) as well as the full cohort (right columns). The prevalence was modeled using a single smooth term of time (in days) as predictor without adjusting for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooth of the time variable with corresponding test statistics. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Main analysis sample (N=36K)				Full sample (N=76K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Chi.sq	P
(Intercept)	-3.90	0.01	-390.6	<2e-16	-3.79	0.01	-430.26	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	8.15	9.95	350.86	<2e-16	9.42	11.36	268.26	<2e-16
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.68	0.00	-197.61	<2e-16	-0.61	0.00	-195.58	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	15.10	16.95	93.63	<2e-16	15.47	17.24	101.33	<2e-16
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.90	0.02	-314.36	<2e-16	-4.81	0.01	-349.65	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	97.05	<2e-16	1.00	1.00	89.64	<2e-16
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.73	0.01	-407.06	<2e-16	-3.63	0.01	-442.57	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	7.11	8.75	197.04	<2e-16	9.28	11.2	205.28	<2e-16
GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.45	0.00	-133.07	<2e-16	-0.40	0.00	-128.64	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	16.30	17.89	78.61	<2e-16	16.31	17.88	113.38	<2e-16

Table S4. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories by time and age in the main sample and full cohort. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for both the analyses performed in the main sample (left columns) as well as the full cohort (right columns). The prevalence was modeled using a single smooth term of time (in days), a single smooth term of age (in years), and a tensor product interaction smooth term between time and age as predictors without adjusting for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooths for each term in the model. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Main analysis sample (N=36K)				Full sample (N=76K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.79	0.03	-119.60	<2e-16	-3.72	0.04	-91.81	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	8.09	9.88	355.04	<2e-16	9.13	11.04	270.47	<2e-16
s(Age)	15.54	17.15	1631.81	<2e-16	13.45	15.43	2113.77	<2e-16
ti(Time, Age)	3.56	4.43	8.19	1.00	4.59	5.72	20.27	0.04
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.59	0.01	-57.69	<2e-16	-0.54	0.01	-38.24	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	15.25	17.08	92.56	<2e-16	15.51	17.27	45.17	<2e-16
s(Age)	15.12	16.82	443.95	<2e-16	14.79	16.47	564.46	<2e-16
ti(Time, Age)	4.18	5.20	6.34	9.42e-05	20.05	29.89	1.91	0.04
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.87	0.05	-93.36	<2e-16	-4.76	0.06	-82.57	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	12.57	7.88e-03	1.00	1.00	4.80	0.03
s(Age)	10.34	12.48	741.24	<2e-16	10.92	13.07	970.91	<2e-16
ti(Time, Age)	5.59	7.42	27.00	9.72e-03	6.11	8.56	26.19	0.04
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.79	0.04	-93.48	<2e-16	-3.77	0.05	-70.84	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	7.12	8.76	125.19	<2e-16	9.23	11.15	125.1	<2e-16
s(Age)	13.84	15.73	2265.94	<2e-16	13.81	15.62	2726.16	<2e-16
ti(Time, Age)	1.70	2.18	0.70	1.00	11.66	16.81	31.67	0.32
GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.4	0.01	-40.9	<2e-16	-0.37	0.01	-25.67	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	16.39	17.95	76.70	<2e-16	16.33	17.9	60.18	<2e-16
s(Age)	14.44	16.29	697.65	<2e-16	14.78	16.44	842.48	<2e-16
ti(Time, Age)	3.23	4.03	2.75	0.51	19.87	29.32	1.84	0.07

Table S5. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories by time and sex in the main sample and full cohort. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for both the analyses performed in the main sample (left columns) as well as the full cohort (right columns). The prevalence was modeled using an ordered factor difference smooth of sex across time (in days) as predictor without adjusting for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooths for each term in the model. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Main analysis sample (N=36K)				Full sample (N=76K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.11	0.02	-236.93	<2e-16	-4.00	0.02	-262.87	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.32	0.02	15.46	<2e-16	0.34	0.02	18.56	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	8.06	9.84	160.33	<2e-16	9.4	11.33	162.69	<2e-16
s(Time):sex - women	2.32	2.86	5.72	1.00	2.15	2.66	7.86	0.75
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.97	0.01	-177.45	<2e-16	-0.90	0.00	-182.01	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.43	0.01	67.37	<2e-16	0.43	0.01	73.78	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	15.25	17.07	49.85	<2e-16	15.59	17.33	59.24	<2e-16
s(Time):sex - women	4.20	5.22	2.67	0.44	4.05	5.03	2.72	0.38
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.94	0.03	-193.67	<2e-16	-4.86	0.02	-215.94	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.06	0.03	1.77	0.08	0.08	0.03	2.69	7.18e-03
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	52.15	<2e-16	1.00	1.00	61.47	<2e-16
s(Time):sex - women	1.00	1.00	2.37	1.00	1.00	1.00	6.86	0.18
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.99	0.02	-243.99	<2e-16	-3.9	0.01	-267.44	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.40	0.02	20.71	<2e-16	0.41	0.02	24.04	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	7.13	8.77	103.58	<2e-16	9.32	11.25	136.95	<2e-16
s(Time):sex - women	1.79	2.21	2.28	1.00	1.98	2.45	4.19	1.00
GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.76	0.01	-144.85	<2e-16	-0.69	0.00	-147.13	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.45	0.01	74.78	<2e-16	0.45	0.01	81.44	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	16.38	17.94	73.23	<2e-16	16.36	17.92	115.57	<2e-16
s(Time):sex - women	1.01	1.01	1.40	1.00	1.02	1.03	0.21	1.00

Table S6. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories by time and lifetime history of MD/GAD in the main sample and full cohort. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for both the analyses performed in the main sample (left columns) as well as the full cohort (right columns). The prevalence was modeled using an ordered factor difference smooth of MDD or GAD lifetime history (LT) across time (in days) as predictor without adjusting for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fixed effect of MDD/GAD LT as well as the fitted smooth of the time variable and the ordered factor difference smooth of MDD/GAD LT with corresponding test statistics. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Main analysis sample (N=36K)				Full sample (N=76K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.69	0.02	-292.21	<2e-16	-4.56	0.01	-322.04	<2e-16
MDD_LT - yes	1.93	0.02	96.34	<2e-16	1.90	0.02	107.07	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	8.04	9.81	213.8	<2e-16	9.26	11.17	166.95	<2e-16
s(Time):MDD_LT-yes	1.94	2.40	4.56	1.00	3.31	4.11	11.04	0.62
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-1.02	0.00	-265.21	<2e-16	-0.96	0	-272.03	<2e-16
MDD_LT - yes	1.06	0.01	162.69	<2e-16	1.06	0.01	177.56	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	15.14	16.98	89.22	<2e-16	15.59	17.33	101.59	<2e-16
s(Time):MDD_LT-yes	4.68	5.81	5.04	1.40e-03	6.71	8.26	9.09	<2e-16
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-5.70	0.03	-217.75	<2e-16	-5.63	0.02	-241.08	<2e-16
MDD_LT - yes	1.93	0.03	58.94	<2e-16	1.94	0.03	66.95	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	20.84	1.17e-04	1.00	1.00	23.07	4.28e-05
s(Time):MDD_LT-yes	1.00	1.00	2.88	1.00	1.00	1.01	1.86	1.00
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.07	0.01	-364.5	<2e-16	-3.99	0.01	-398.1	<2e-16
GAD_LT - yes	1.89	0.02	97.5	<2e-16	1.9	0.02	110.48	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	7.19	8.83	174.88	<2e-16	9.19	11.1	185.49	<2e-16
s(Time):GAD_LT-yes	2.95	3.67	9.47	1.00	3.20	3.97	11.57	0.45
GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.6	0.00	-172.21	<2e-16	-0.55	0.00	-173.14	<2e-16
GAD_LT - yes	1.10	0.01	116.88	<2e-16	1.09	0.01	129.10	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	16.51	18.03	86.75	<2e-16	16.55	18.05	124.58	<2e-16
s(Time):GAD_LT-yes	4.55	5.66	4.74	3.42e-03	6.26	7.74	6.46	<2e-16

Table S7. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories with and without correction for within-subject and family dependencies. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for analyses performed in a random sample of 5,000 study participants selected from the main analyses sample of 36,106 individuals. The prevalence was modeled using a single smooth term of time (in days) as predictor without (left columns) and with (right columns) correction for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooth of the time variable with corresponding test statistics. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	No correction for subject and family dependencies (N=5K)				With correction for subject and family dependencies (N=5K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.04	0.03	-142.68	<2e-16	-5.04	0.05	-93.92	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	4.89	6.06	63.33	<2e-16	5.52	6.84	52.62	8.46e-08
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	927.80	5000	5835.33	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	365.79	4609	1466.89	5.31e-03
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	201.46	4999	838.56	8.62e-15
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.05	4608	0.05	0.50
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.71	0.01	-83.46	<2e-16	-1.67	0.03	-65.01	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.22	12.23	18.08	<2e-16	12.41	14.4	19.69	<2e-16
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3186.49	5000	99.5	3.48e-12
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	688.67	4609	16.69	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1873.56	4999	25.3	1.00E-10
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.02	4608	0	0.786
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.90	0.04	-117.25	<2e-16	-5.66	0.07	-86.68	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	19.85	1.78e-04	1.00	1.00	0.02	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	665.82	5000	3391.99	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.02	4609	0.02	0.54
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	177.25	4999	677.88	<2e-16
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.02	4608	0.02	0.50
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.78	0.02	-152.56	<2e-16	-4.75	0.05	-98.00	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	2.37	2.93	14.03	0.08	2.26	2.79	6.34	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1472.61	5000	7988.08	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.06	4609	0.06	0.53
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	296.05	4999	1420.35	<2e-16
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.03	4608	0.03	0.55
GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.49	0.01	-59.71	<2e-16	-1.52	0.03	-57.33	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.02	12.01	16.20	<2e-16	12.65	14.63	30.00	<2e-16
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3616.56	5000	105.47	<2e-16

s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	417.65	4609	8.09	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1985.19	4999	34.03	5.93e-09
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.70	4608	0.00	1.00

Table S8. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories by time and age and without correction for within-subject and -family dependencies. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for analyses performed in a random sample of 5,000 study participants selected from the main analyses sample of 36,106 individuals. The prevalence was modeled using a single smooth term of time (in days), a single smooth term of age (in years), and a tensor product interaction smooth term between time and age as predictors without (left columns) and with (right columns) correction for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooths for each term in the model. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq = chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Sub sample without correction for subject and family dependencies (N=5K)				Sub sample with correction for subject and family dependencies (N=5K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.71	0.33	-14.17	<2e-16	-4.97	0.05	-92.26	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	4.87	6.04	62.37	<2e-16	5.51	6.82	51.73	1.25e-07
s(Age)	15.07	16.4	334.72	<2e-16	1.00	1.00	50.6	2.28e-11
ti(Time, Age)	1.00	1.00	6.06	0.28	1.00	1.00	2.19	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	986.59	5000	6178.22	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	278.01	4609	947.54	0.04
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	200.04	4999	817.16	1.38e-14
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.08	4608	0.08	0.50
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.64	0.02	-27.94	<2e-16	-4.9	0.05	-99.82	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.57	12.59	10.91	<2e-16	4.67	5.79	9.53	1.18e-08
s(Age)	16.59	17.98	66.91	<2e-16	1.00	1.00	53.29	5.78e-12
ti(Time, Age)	15.25	21.92	1.73	0.34	1.00	1.00	3.69	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	924.82	5000	1.52	3.5e-08
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	306.75	4609	0.31	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	23.62	4999	0.01	0.94
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.03	4608	0.00	0.50
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.83	0.04	-115.32	<2e-16	-5.61	0.07	-85.31	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	20.44	1.41e-04	1.00	1.00	0.01	1.00
s(Age)	1.00	1.00	62.00	<2e-16	1.00	1.00	24.79	1.29e-05
ti(Time, Age)	1.98	2.47	3.44	1.00	2.13	2.69	3.53	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	651.77	5000	3299.7	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.02	4609	0.02	0.55
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	177.34	4999	672.04	5.44e-11
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.03	4608	0.03	0.50
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.00	0.14	-27.64	<2e-16	-4.73	0.10	-47.71	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	2.20	2.72	13.54	1.00	2.17	2.67	5.23	1.00
s(Age)	13.76	15.64	400.12	<2e-16	5.08	5.85	90.16	<2e-16
ti(Time, Age)	1.01	1.01	1.07	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.20	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1418.27	5000	7514.83	<2e-16

s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.04	4609	0.04	0.56
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	294.24	4999	1363.86	5.22e-19
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.02	4608	0.02	0.57
<hr/>								
GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.50	0.02	-20.37	<2e-16	-1.41	0.05	-26.91	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.40	12.41	15.11	<2e-16	12.56	14.53	19.35	<2e-16
s(Age)	14.97	16.80	101.51	<2e-16	5.94	6.16	46.04	<2e-16
ti(Time, Age)	2.88	3.58	1.34	1.00	7.06	10.55	1.26	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3527.38	5000	96.8	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	454.4	4609	8.09	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1982.6	4999	31.2	9.63e-10
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	1.24	4608	0.00	1.00

Table S9. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories by time and sex and without correction for within-subject and -family dependencies. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for analyses performed in a random sample of 5,000 study participants selected from the main analyses sample of 36,106 individuals. The prevalence was modeled using an ordered factor difference smooth of sex across time (in days) as predictor without (left columns) and with (right columns) correction for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooths for each term in the model. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Sub sample without correction for subject and family dependencies (N=5K)				Sub sample with correction for subject and family dependencies (N=5K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.16	0.05	-88.31	<2e-16	-5.21	0.09	-57.66	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.18	0.06	3.14	1.67e-03	0.27	0.11	2.39	0.02
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	4.17	5.18	35.41	4.66e-05	4.82	5.97	25.56	4.82e-03
s(Time):sex - women	3.29	4.08	11.03	0.55	3.85	4.78	11.43	0.86
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	972.36	5000	6132.87	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	318.56	4609	1169.36	0.020
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	195.42	4998	789.86	2.68e-14
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.05	4608	0.05	0.50
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.96	0.01	-68.91	<2e-16	-2.05	0.04	-48.96	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.39	0.02	22.61	<2e-16	0.61	0.05	11.74	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.29	12.29	12.72	<2e-16	12.29	14.25	12.97	<2e-16
s(Time):sex - women	3.16	3.92	2.65	0.52	5.35	6.6	2.61	0.21
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3218.60	5000	96.71	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	628.54	4609	13.63	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1872.01	4998	24.57	4.51e-11
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.03	4608	0.00	0.79
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.84	0.07	-74.22	<2e-16	-5.65	0.10	-53.82	<2e-16
Sex - women	-0.10	0.08	-1.17	0.24	-0.01	0.13	-0.10	0.92
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	6.93	0.17	1.00	1.00	0.32	1.00
s(Time):sex - women	1.00	1.00	0.08	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.37	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	665.17	5000	3364.39	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.02	4609	0.02	0.54
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	177.82	4998	679.27	5.21e-11
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.02	4608	0.02	0.50
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.10	0.05	-89.58	<2e-16	-5.15	0.09	-58.4	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.48	0.05	8.78	<2e-16	0.60	0.11	5.63	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.92	2.35	9.74	0.30	1.48	1.75	0.34	1.00
s(Time):sex - women	1.62	1.95	2.74	1.00	1.86	2.27	2.82	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1451.65	5000	7925.70	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.04	4609	0.04	0.53

s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	295.05	4998	1417	<2e-16
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.03	4608	0.03	0.56

GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.76	0.01	-57.36	<2e-16	-1.94	0.04	-44.87	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.42	0.02	25.61	<2e-16	0.67	0.05	12.53	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.08	12.07	17.26	<2e-16	12.65	14.63	27.01	<2e-16
s(Time):sex - women	1.00	1.00	6.90	0.17	1.25	1.45	0.14	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3567.51	5000	104.92	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	437.01	4609	8.45	1
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1984.12	4998	33.09	3.44e-09
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	1.36	4608	0.00	1

Table S10. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories by time and lifetime history of MD/GAD and without correction for within-subject and -family dependencies. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for analyses performed in a random sample of 5,000 study participants selected from the main analyses sample of 36,106 individuals. The prevalence was modeled using an ordered factor difference smooth of MD/GAD lifetime history (LT) across time (in days) as predictor without (left columns) and with (right columns) correction for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooths for each term in the model. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Sub sample without correction for subject and family dependencies (N=5K)				Sub sample with correction for subject and family dependencies (N=5K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.85	0.05	-105.84	<2e-16	-5.52	0.07	-82.62	<2e-16
MDD_LT - yes	1.97	0.06	34.45	<2e-16	1.53	0.09	16.84	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	4.96	6.15	59.28	<2e-16	5.48	6.78	53.49	5.66e-08
s(Time):MDD_LT=yes	1.35	1.61	6.94	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.36	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	982.34	5000	5593.33	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	179.90	4609	473.01	0.10
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	198.57	4999	749.49	2.02e-14
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.08	4608	0.08	0.50
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-1.03	0.01	-106.98	<2e-16	-1.73	0.03	-67.72	<2e-16
MDD_LT - yes	1.04	0.02	59.75	<2e-16	0.31	0.02	15.06	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.59	12.62	18.08	<2e-16	12.44	14.42	17.89	<2e-16
s(Time):MDD_LT=yes	1.74	2.16	0.50	1.00	4.01	4.98	2.41	0.74
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3169.21	5000	78.58	8.98e-09
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	670.95	4609	12.91	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1867.88	4999	23.87	1.85e-11
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.04	4608	0.00	0.81
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-5.68	0.07	-82.59	<2e-16	-6.12	0.09	-70.42	<2e-16
MDD_LT - yes	1.92	0.09	22.06	<2e-16	1.41	0.12	11.45	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	14.66	2.58e-03	1	1	0.84	1.00
s(Time):MDD_LT=yes	1.00	1.00	1.87	1.00	1	1	1.96	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	564.34	5000	2482.57	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.01	4609	0.01	0.53
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	193.61	4999	742.95	5.09e-14
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.02	4608	0.02	0.50
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.14	0.03	-135.87	<2e-16	-4.89	0.05	-96.17	<2e-16
GAD_LT - yes	1.96	0.05	36.87	<2e-16	1.37	0.10	13.76	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	2.33	2.89	13.06	0.12	2.25	2.78	5.07	1.00
s(Time):GAD_LT=yes	1.00	1.00	0.33	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.79	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1379.07	5000	6899.30	<2e-16

s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.02	4609	0.02	0.56
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	292.2	4999	1285.02	<2e-16
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.01	4608	0.01	0.57
<hr/>								
GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.64	0.01	-75.77	<2e-16	-1.53	0.03	-58.39	<2e-16
GAD_LT - yes	1.14	0.03	45.04	<2e-16	0.25	0.02	10.99	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.46	12.48	18.18	<2e-16	12.71	14.68	30.43	<2e-16
s(Time):GAD_LT=yes	2.13	2.63	0.75	1.00	4.95	6.13	4.44	3.02e-03
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3609.81	5000	93.03	<2e-16
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	411.53	4609	7.06	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1980.36	4999	32.65	5.84e-09
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	1.02	4608	0.00	1.00

Table S11. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories with and without correction for within-subject and family dependencies in the youngest 5K participants. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for analyses performed in the youngest 5,000 study participants selected from the main analyses sample of 36,106 individuals. The prevalence was modeled using a single smooth term of time (in days) as predictor without (left columns) and with (right columns) correction for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooth of the time variable with corresponding test statistics. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Sub sample without correction for subject and family dependencies (N= youngest 5K)				Sub sample with correction for subject and family dependencies (N= youngest 5K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.38	0.02	-152.56	<2e-16	-4.41	0.05	-92.36	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	5.43	6.73	74.56	<2e-16	5.51	6.82	43.54	5.10e-06
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1080.56	5000	7063.6	3.17e-21
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	602.76	4501	3153.57	0.02
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	392.57	4999	2400.45	4.35e-25
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.01	4500	0.01	0.60
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.34	0.01	-41.28	<2e-16	-1.19	0.02	-49.64	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.14	12.15	21.00	<2e-16	12.40	14.42	30.18	2.50e-81
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3248.67	5000	117.83	7.95e-11
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	770.69	4501	25.53	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	2073.28	4999	33.76	9.73e-05
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	126.57	4500	0.33	1.00
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.37	0.03	-126.66	<2e-16	-5.16	0.06	-90.12	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	17.63	5.50e-04	1.00	1.00	0.08	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	451.19	5000	2073.37	2.04e-14
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	441.17	4501	2019.64	1.56e-13
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	210.28	4999	819.62	6.35e-12
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.03	4500	0.03	0.51
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.19	0.02	-158	<2e-16	-4.12	0.04	-94.82	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	4.20	5.23	28.84	6.92e-04	4.28	5.31	21.38	1.92e-02
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1304.61	5000	9009.46	7.94e-44
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	576.66	4501	2872.96	0.02
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	129.06	4999	357.58	2.35e-08
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	298.66	4500	1490.15	5.48e-17
GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.01	0.01	-1.79	0.074	-0.80	0.02	-34.39	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.89	12.94	24.09	<2e-16	14.50	16.39	42.10	3.32e-133
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3341.76	5000	127.72	0.02

s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	886.26	4501	34.90	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	2391.08	4999	45.37	1.95e-25
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.91	4500	0.00	1.00

Table S12. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories by time and age and without correction for within-subject and -family dependencies in the youngest 5K participants. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for analyses performed in the youngest 5,000 study participants selected from the main analyses sample of 36,106 individuals. The prevalence was modeled using a single smooth term of time (in days), a single smooth term of age (in years), and a tensor product interaction smooth term between time and age as predictors without (left columns) and with (right columns) correction for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooths for each term in the model. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Sub sample without correction for subject and family dependencies (N= youngest 5K)				Sub sample with correction for subject and family dependencies (N= youngest 5K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.22	0.03	-122.91	<2e-16	-4.23	0.06	-72.18	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	5.39	6.68	73.89	<2e-16	5.50	6.8	47.14	5.15e-08
s(Age)	17.20	18.54	279.34	<2e-16	2.25	2.53	24.98	1.20e-05
ti(Time, Age)	2.58	3.24	6.23	1.00	3.59	4.87	9.21	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1048.88	5000	6759.44	2.00e-19
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	624.27	4501	3330.17	4.80e-03
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	385.5	4999	2324.37	3.61e-25
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.02	4500	0.02	0.57
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.24	0.01	-22.91	<2e-16	-4.17	0.05	-80.99	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.27	12.29	20.22	<2e-16	4.82	5.97	7.48	5.48e-08
s(Age)	17.54	18.67	19.8	<2e-16	2.25	2.55	10.22	7.37e-06
ti(Time, Age)	1.00	1.01	0.02	1.00	2.67	3.24	2.44	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	999.19	5000	1.61	0.11
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	619.97	4501	0.92	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	136.02	4999	0.12	0.77
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.01	4500	0.00	0.56
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.20	0.04	-104.11	<2e-16	-4.99	0.07	-76	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	31.24	<2e-16	1.00	1.00	4.04	0.04
s(Age)	12.33	14.75	138.59	<2e-16	1.00	1.00	24.61	7.03e-07
ti(Time, Age)	1.00	1.00	17.91	4.74e-04	1.00	1.00	18.03	4.38e-04
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	440.28	5000	1983.97	1.06e-13
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	454.67	4501	2096.8	2.63e-14
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	167.64	4999	565.44	2.07e-08
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	25.44	4500	36.15	0.03
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.13	0.03	-124.71	<2e-16	-4.04	0.05	-75.43	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	4.21	5.23	28.75	3.55e-05	4.29	5.32	18.40	3.38e-03
s(Age)	3.03	3.79	20.97	3.11e-04	1.00	1.01	6.85	9.04e-04
ti(Time, Age)	7.88	11.52	16.31	1.00	9.80	14.22	19.66	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1279.81	5000	8793.19	7.62e-41

s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	598.49	4501	3039.99	8.68e-03
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	110.29	4999	278.44	9.14e-08
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	312.79	4500	1612.3	1.03e-18

GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	0.05	0.01	5.18	2.17e-07	-0.7	0.03	-23.98	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.99	13.05	22.43	<2e-16	14.46	16.36	26.44	6.21e-81
s(Age)	17.19	18.51	11.94	<2e-16	1.00	1.00	32.94	9.44e-09
ti(Time, Age)	4.61	6.75	0.67	1.00	25.83	37.81	1.62	0.18
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3347.06	5000	125.48	6.89e-03
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	876.19	4501	33.45	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	2381.56	4999	43.39	2.24e-23
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	5.19	4500	0.00	1.00

Table S13. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories by time and sex and without correction for within-subject and -family dependencies in youngest 5K participants. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for analyses performed in the youngest 5,000 study participants selected from the main analyses sample of 36,106 individuals. The prevalence was modeled using an ordered factor difference smooth of sex across time (in days) as predictor without (left columns) and with (right columns) correction for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooths for each term in the model. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Sub sample without correction for subject and family dependencies (N= youngest 5K)				Sub sample with correction for subject and family dependencies (N= youngest 5K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.57	0.04	-83.70	<2e-16	-4.60	0.09	-50.76	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.25	0.05	5.14	2.73e-07	0.28	0.11	2.62	8.84e-03
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	5.43	6.73	59.60	<2e-16	5.51	6.82	43.48	2.63e-07
s(Time):sex - women	1.00	1.00	2.52	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.58	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1107.73	5000	7289.81	3.39e-24
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	571.71	4501	2907.70	0.03
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	391.22	4998	2376.81	6.99e-25
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.01	4500	0.01	0.60
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.58	0.02	-37.96	<2e-16	-1.55	0.04	-35.11	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.33	0.02	18.44	<2e-16	0.51	0.05	9.90	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.13	12.12	14.03	<2e-16	12.33	14.32	17.63	4.41e-45
s(Time):sex - women	3.73	4.62	3.36	0.12	4.86	5.99	4.68	1.84e-03
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3288.22	5000	115.53	2.99e-14
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	713.73	4501	21.87	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	2069.7	4998	32.9	1.12e-04
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	128.45	4500	0.34	1.00
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.48	0.07	-67.8	<2e-16	-5.21	0.11	-49.19	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.14	0.08	1.86	0.06	0.07	0.12	0.55	0.58
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	8.72	3.16e-03	1.00	1.00	0.14	0.71
s(Time):sex - women	1.00	1.00	0.81	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.38	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	461.8	5000	2144.90	2.31e-15
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	429.82	4501	1937.38	4.81e-13
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	210.37	4998	818.89	3.93e-12
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.05	4500	0.05	0.51
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.35	0.04	-86.56	<2e-16	-4.35	0.08	-52.47	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.22	0.04	4.89	1.02e-06	0.31	0.1	3.22	1.20e-03
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	4.20	5.22	33.28	4.33e-06	4.28	5.31	21.76	8.22e-04
s(Time):sex - women	1.00	1.01	6.21	0.26	1.00	1.00	5.36	0.41
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1351.71	5000	9351.96	1.62e-52
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	523.4	4501	2461.65	0.07

s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	113.4	4998	290.63	9.83e-08
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	310.8	4500	1588.18	3.09e-18
GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.23	0.01	-17.30	<2e-16	-1.17	0.04	-27.47	<2e-16
Sex - women	0.30	0.02	19.19	<2e-16	0.52	0.05	10.46	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.81	12.86	24.81	<2e-16	14.45	16.34	20.71	1.54e-61
s(Time):sex - women	1.00	1.00	7.35	0.13	3.96	4.91	1.88	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3352.9	5000	125.62	1.16e-03
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	857.55	4501	32.72	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	2390.3	4998	44.33	5.16e-26
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.65	4500	0.00	1.00

Table S14. GAM estimates of MD and GAD outcome trajectories by time and lifetime history of MD/GAD and without correction for within-subject and -family dependencies in youngest 5K participants. Shown are the statistical output of the GAMs for each of the five outcome variables for analyses performed in the youngest 5,000 study participants selected from the main analyses sample of 36,106 individuals. The prevalence was modeled using an ordered factor difference smooth of MD/GAD lifetime history (LT) across time (in days) as predictor without (left columns) and with (right columns) correction for dependencies within subject and family. Shown are the estimate and standard error (SE) of the intercept and the fitted smooths for each term in the model. The effective degree of freedom (edf) is a proxy for the degree of non-linearity of the smooth. An edf of 1.0 indicates a linear relationship, while an edf > 1.0 indicates non-linearity. P-values of the smooth terms of interest are adjusted by Bonferroni correction. Edf.df = reference degree of freedom, Z = z-score, Chi.sq= chi-square, P = p-value, t = t-value, F = F-value.

	Sub sample without correction for subject and family dependencies (N= youngest 5K)				Sub sample with correction for subject and family dependencies (N= youngest 5K)			
MDD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-4.16	0.04	-113.2	<2e-16	-4.87	0.06	-82.7	<2e-16
MDD_LT - yes	1.68	0.05	37.26	<2e-16	1.26	0.07	17.25	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	5.21	6.46	54.09	<2e-16	5.36	6.63	41.2	6.49e-07
s(Time):MDD_LT=yes	1.00	1.00	1.18	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.80	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1010.6	5000	6151.53	1.39e-24
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	547.81	4501	2633.37	4.00e-03
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	379.76	4999	2089.65	2.3e-25
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.01	4500	0.01	0.61
MDD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.72	0.01	-73.44	<2e-16	-1.28	0.02	-53.47	<2e-16
MDD_LT - yes	0.97	0.02	61.02	<2e-16	0.33	0.02	19.63	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	10.33	12.35	18.92	<2e-16	12.45	14.46	24.66	2.68e-66
s(Time):MDD_LT=yes	2.00	2.48	1.20	1.00	4.10	5.08	3.79	0.04
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3245.58	5000	95.01	2.74e-09
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	733.92	4501	19.58	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	2044.07	4999	30.35	4.49e-04
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	136.52	4500	0.35	1.00
Suicidal ideation	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-5.21	0.06	-84.66	<2e-16	-5.74	0.08	-69.5	<2e-16
MDD_LT - yes	1.75	0.07	23.5	<2e-16	1.40	0.11	13.27	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	1.00	1.00	5.23	0.02	1.00	1.00	0.06	0.80
s(Time):MDD_LT=yes	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.01	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	341.9	5000	1369.14	7.35e-12
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	443.22	4501	2025.99	8.41e-19
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	215.68	4999	825.53	7.09e-14
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.01	4500	0.01	0.54
GAD	Estimate	SE	Z	P	Estimate	SE	Z	P
(Intercept)	-3.52	0.02	-142.29	<2e-16	-4.28	0.05	-94.1	<2e-16
GAD_LT - yes	1.60	0.04	36.76	<2e-16	1.15	0.08	15.04	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P	edf	edf.df	Chi.sq	P
s(Time)	4.44	5.51	34.94	3.31e-06	4.40	5.46	22.69	6.36e-04
s(Time):GAD_LT=yes	2.54	3.14	7.88	1.00	1.96	2.42	5.65	1.00
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	1216.94	5000	7784.15	7.01e-43

s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	575.49	4501	2729.19	1.43e-03
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	168.56	4999	513.79	1.41e-10
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	251.91	4500	1028.49	5.05e-14
<hr/>								
GAD score	Estimate	SE	t	P	Estimate	SE	t	P
(Intercept)	-0.16	0.01	-20.94	<2e-16	-0.82	0.02	-35.8	<2e-16
GAD_LT - yes	0.91	0.02	44.92	<2e-16	0.24	0.02	14.45	<2e-16
Smooth terms	edf	edf.df	F	P	edf	edf.df	F	P
s(Time)	11.36	13.43	27.5	<2e-16	14.51	16.4	42.38	1.52e-135
s(Time):GAD_LT=yes	3.78	4.7	2.87	0.36	5.34	6.61	6.05	2.18e-05
s(Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	3340.57	5000	112.87	0.11
s(Family.id)	-	-	-	-	874.28	4501	30.45	1.00
s(Time, Subject.id)	-	-	-	-	2381.12	4999	42.84	4.63e-24
s(Time, Family.id)	-	-	-	-	0.65	4500	0.00	1.00