Traces of pubertal brain development and health revealed through domain adapted brain network fusion

Dominik Kraft¹, Dag Alnæs^{2, 3}, Tobias Kaufmann^{1, 2, 4}

¹ Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Tübingen Center for Mental Health, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

² Norwegian Centre for Mental Disorders Research, University of Oslo and Oslo

University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

³ Kristiania University College, Oslo, Norway

⁴ German Center for Mental Health (DZPG), Germany

Address for correspondence:

Dominik Kraft, Dr. Dominik.Kraft@med.uni-tuebingen.de

Tobias Kaufmann, Prof. Dr. Tobias.Kaufmann@med.uni-tuebingen.de

Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Tübingen Center for Mental Health University of Tübingen Tübingen, Germany

____ Major changes marked in green color

Supporting Information

Supplementary Figures:

Supplementary Fig. 1: Correlation between raw features and first brain embedding for HBN

Supplementary Fig. 2: Associations between brain embeddings and puberty, both in cross-sectional and longitudinal data of the ABCD cohort

Supplementary Fig. 3: Distribution of Δ brain embedding in the ABCD sample stratified for sex and pubertal categories derived from caregivers` reports at 1 year follow-up.

Supplementary Fig. 4: Associations between brain embeddings and dimensional psychopathology, both in cross-sectional and longitudinal data of the ABCD cohort

Supplementary Fig. 5: Distribution of puberty ratings in the ABCD sample stratified for sex, timepoints, and respondent

Supplementary Fig. 6: Distribution of psychopathology measures in the HBN sample as total counts and percentages stratified for sex

Supplementary Tables:

Supplementary Table 1: Association results for ABCD models

Supplementary Table 2: Association results for HBN models

Supplementary Table 3: Pubertal category conversion scheme

Supplementary Table 4: Frequencies of pubertal categories in the ABCD sample.

Supplementary Table 5: Frequencies of psychopathology measures in the HBN sample.

Supplementary Figures



Supplementary Fig. 1: Correlation between raw brain features and first brain embedding. Correlation values indicate Pearson correlation coefficients. Visualization was performed with ggseg (version 1.6.5 ¹) in R (version 4.2.3). Since algebraic signs of the embeddings might be positive or negative (i.e., akin to an eigenvector), we multiplied negative correlations by (-1) to derive at comparable patterns across cohorts. Spin permutation testing with 5000 iterations indicated significant correlations between brain maps of the ABCD and HBN dataset (all r > 0.64, all p < 0.0004). Permutations were performed using the ENIGMA Toolbox (version 2.0.3, ²).



predicted embedding

Supplementary Fig. 2: Associations between brain embeddings and puberty, both in cross-sectional and longitudinal data of the ABCD cohort. First two columns in A) and B) refer to associations between predicted brain embeddings and the respective pubertal score (PDS mean) per timepoint. Δ refers to the association between the Δ brain embedding and the Δ PDS mean score. Annotations refer to effect sizes from the linear models and highlighted cells with dashed lines indicate significant results. Linear models were performed in similar vein to the puberty models in the main manuscript but were expanded with Body Mass Index (BMI), Socioeconomic Status (SES), and race/ethnicity as covariates: we ran two cross-sectional models with age, SES, BMI, and race/ethnicity as covariates. Of note for SES there was only baseline data available. Additionally, we ran a longitudinal model in which the delta measures of the brain embedding, the change PDS score and the age and BMI difference between both timepoints were integrated. Moreover, baseline SES and race/ethnicity was added as covariate without a change score. BMI= (height (lb) / height (in)) x 703. Height and weight measures were averaged across two measurements. BMI smaller than 10 or higher than 50 were excluded after manual inspection. Race/ethnicity (ABCD variable acspsw03) refers to 5 different levels: White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, other. Other includes individuals identifying as multiracial and/or belonging to a race/ethnicity with too few members in the sample. For SES variables (i.e., parental education and total family income), "refuse to answer" and "don't know" where encoded as "NaN". SES variables were transformed via rank-based inverse normal transformation and averaged resulting in a single SES status variable. Exact p-values and effect sizes can be found in Supplementary Table 1.



Supplementary Fig. 3: Distribution of Δ brain embedding in the ABCD sample stratified for sex and pubertal categories derived from caregivers` reports at 1 year follow-up. The figure shows the same pattern as Figure 3 (youth report), except that it was based on data from the caregivers` report. Vertical dashed lines indicate the mean Δ brain embedding per group. Note that for the caregiver report there were not enough males in the 'postpubertal' category to allow for density plotting.



predicted embedding

Supplementary Fig. 4: Associations between brain embeddings and dimensional psychopathology, both in cross-sectional and longitudinal data of the ABCD cohort. First two columns refer to associations between predicted embeddings and the respective psychopathology (CBCL Total) per timepoint. Δ refers to the association between the Δ embedding and the Δ CBCL score. Annotations refer to effect sizes from linear models and hashed cells indicate non-significant results. Linear models were performed in similar vein to the puberty analyses in the main manuscript: cross-sectional models were calculated with age and site as covariate and the longitudinal model was complemented with site and Δ age between both timepoints. Exact p-values and effect sizes can be found in Supplementary Table 1.



Supplementary Fig. 5: Distribution of puberty ratings in the ABCD sample stratified for sex, timepoints, and respondent (Panel A-D). Solid lines indicate caregiver and dashed line indicate youth reports. Higher correlation values between puberty ratings at follow-up indicate better alignment between reports from different sources. Panel E and F refer to changes in puberty scores (i.e., Δ PDS) for males and females. All plots only show data from participants for which data from both timepoints was available. r= Pearson correlation coefficient.



Supplementary Fig. 6: Distribution of psychopathology measures in the HBN sample as total counts and percentages stratified for sex. Diagnoses were grouped into six distinct categories following ³. ADHD= Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, ASD= Autism Spectrum Disorder, ND= Neurodevelopmental Disorder

Supplementary Tables

	sex	IV	b	р	η²			
Puberty								
cross-sectional								
embedding _{baseline} ~ PDS + age + site								
caregiver	female	PDS	-0.342	6.88 x 10 ⁻¹⁶	0.021			
		age	0.001	0.623	7.00 x 10 ⁻⁵			
	male	PDS	-0.358	5.53 x 10 ⁻¹⁰	0.011			
		age	-0.007	0.010	0.002			

Supplementary Table 1: Association results for ABCD models.

youth	female	PDS	-0.173	0.005	0.006
		age	-0.003	0.435	0.0004
	male	PDS	-0.057	0.338	0.0005
		age	-0.012	0.0005	0.006
embedding _{2y}	ears ~ PDS + a	ge + site	·	·	·
caregiver	female	PDS	-0.270	1.94 x 10 ⁻¹⁵	0.025
		age	-0.003	0.234	0.0004
	male	PDS	-0.169	1.39 x 10 ⁻⁵	0.008
		age	-0.006	0.029	0.001
youth	female	PDS	-0.202	2.66 x 10 ⁻⁹	0.015
		age	-0.004	0.161	0.0006
	male	PDS	-0.141	0.0003	0.006
		age	-0.008	0.004	0.002
longitudinal					
∆embedding	~ <i>∆PDS</i> + ∆ад	ge + site			
caregiver	female	ΔPDS	-0.058	2.37 x 10 ⁻¹⁰	0.017
		∆age	-0.015	6.36 x 10 ⁻¹¹	0.014
	male	ΔPDS	0.012	0.191	0.0002
		∆age	-0.009	1.31 x 10 ⁻⁵	0.005
youth	female	∆PDS	-0.083	3.79 x 10 ⁻¹¹	0.038
		∆age	-0.012	0.0004	0.009
	males	ΔPDS	0.009	0.358	0.0003

		∆age	-0.006	0.021	0.002			
∆embedding	Δ embedding ~ Δ PDS + PDS _{baseline} + Δ age + site							
caregiver	females	ΔPDS	-0.083	7.88 x 10 ⁻²⁰	0.018			
		PDSbaseline	-0.138	1.10 x 10 ⁻⁴⁶	0.065			
		∆age	-0.014	6.77 x 10 ⁻¹¹	0.014			
	males	∆PDS	0.010	0.289	0.0002			
		PDS _{baseline}	-0.015	0.238	0.0004			
		∆age	-0.009	1.26 x 10 ⁻⁵	0.005			
youth	females	∆PDS	-0.113	2.38 x 10 ⁻¹⁸	0.039			
		PDS _{baseline}	-0.120	1.15 x 10 ⁻¹⁴	0.045			
		∆age	-0.010	0.001	0.008			
	males	∆PDS	0.010	0.368	0.0003			
		PDS _{baseline}	0.003	0.837	2.00 x 10 ⁻⁵			
		∆age	-0.006	0.021	0.002			
Puberty covar	ying for race/ethnicity	, BMI, SES						
Cross-sectio	nal							
embedding _{ba}	seline ~ PDS + a	age + site + Bl	MI + SES + rac	e/ethnicity				
caregiver	females	PDS	-0.10	0.02	0.002			
		SES	0.19	4.81 x 10 ⁻¹²	0.03			
		BMI	0.009	0.10	0.0			
		age	-0.004	0.20	0.001			
	males	PDS	-0.01	0.84	1 x 10 ⁻⁵			
		SES	0.23	1.65 x 10 ⁻¹⁶	0.02			
		BMI	0.007	0.16	5 x 10 ⁻⁵			
		age	-0.009	0.001	0.003			
youth	females	PDS	-0.03	0.58	0.0002			
		SES	0.19	5.72 x 10 ⁻⁶	0.015			

		BMI	0.01	0.15	0.0004
		age	-0.007	0.09	0.002
	males	PDS	0.03	0.62	0.0001
		SES	0.17	1.47 x 10 ⁻⁶	0.01
		BMI	0.009	0.22	0.0002
		age	-0.01	9.45 x 10 ⁻⁵	0.007
embedding _{2y}	rears ~ PDS + a	ge + site + BM	ll + SES + race	e/ethnicity	
caregiver	females	PDS	-0.09	0.02	0.002
		SES	0.20	2.28 x 10 ⁻¹¹	0.02
		BMI	-0.002	0.73	0.002
		age	-0.008	0.01	0.006
	males	PDS	-0.006	0.89	1 x 10 ⁻⁵
		SES	0.21	5.42 x 10 ⁻¹²	0.01
		BMI	0.0009	0.84	0.0002
		age	-0.01	0.0005	0.004
youth	females	PDS	-0.07	0.059	0.001
		SES	0.18	1.08 x 10 ⁻⁸	0.01
		BMI	-0.006	0.20	0.003
		age	-0.007	0.032	0.004
	males	PDS	0.001	0.98	0.0
		SES	0.20	2.28 x 10 ⁻¹¹	0.01
		BMI	0.001	0.77	0.0001
		age	-0.01	2.35 x 10 ⁻⁵	0.005
longitudinal		·		·	·
∆embedding	~ ⊿PDS + ∆аg	ge + site ∆BMI	+ SES + race	/ethnicity	
caregiver	females	∆PDS	-0.06	2.51 x 10 ⁻⁹	0.014
		SES	0.01	0.21	0.0004
		ΔBMI	0.002	0.51	0.0
		∆age	-0.02	1.31 x 10 ⁻⁷	0.012
	males	ΔPDS	0.01	0.38	0.0002

		SES	-0.006	0.43	0.0002
		ΔΒΜΙ	-0.003	0.19	0.0005
		∆age	-0.01	0.001	0.004
youth	females	ΔPDS	-0.08	4.02 x 10 ⁻⁸	0.03
		SES	0.005	0.72	0.0
		ΔΒΜΙ	-0.005	0.15	0.003
		∆age	-0.01	0.02	0.008
	males	ΔPDS	0.004	0.71	8 x10 ⁻⁵
		SES	0.006	0.52	0.0002
		ΔΒΜΙ	0.0003	0.90	0.0
		∆age	-0.01	0.009	0.004
∆embedding	і ~ ∆PDS + ∆а <u>о</u>	ge + site ∆BMI	+ BMI _{baseline} +	SES + race/et	hnicity
caregiver	females	ΔPDS	-0.06	9.60 x 10 ⁻⁹	0.013
		SES	0.005	0.56	4 x 10 ⁻⁵
		∆BMI	0.003	0.26	0.0001
		BMI	-0.01	1.70 x 10 ⁻⁷	0.012
		∆age	-0.02	4.75 x 10 ⁻⁸	0.012
	males	∆PDS	0.01	0.21	0.0005
		SES	-0.009	0.23	0.0004
		ΔBMI	-0.002	0.23	0.0004
		BMI	-0.005	0.0003	0.0039
		∆age	-0.01	0.001	0.0036
youth	females	ΔPDS	-0.08	1.18 x 10 ⁻⁷	0.026
		SES	-0.001	0.93	0.0002
		∆BMI	-0.004	0.22	0.002
		BMI	-0.007	0.002	0.012
		∆age	-0.01	0.02	0.008
	males	ΔPDS	0.009	0.37	0.0004
		SES	0.002	0.85	2 x 10 ⁻⁵
		ΔΒΜΙ	0.001	0.64	0.0001

		BMI	-0.007	1.67 x 10 ⁻⁵	0.01
		∆age	-0.01	0.008	0.004
∆embedding ~	$\sim \Delta PDS + PDS_{ba}$	$a_{aseline} + \Delta age + s$	ite ⊿BMI + BMI _t	_{paseline} + SES + r	ace/ethnicity
caregiver	females	ΔPDS	-0.08	1.49 x 10 ⁻¹⁵	0.024
		PDS	-0.13	2.06 x 10 ⁻²⁵	0.030
		SES	-0.004	0.63	4 x 10 ⁻⁵
		∆BMI	0.006	0.008	0.0001
		BMI	-0.002	0.29	0.012
		∆age	-0.02	1.61 x 10 ⁻⁷	0.013
	males	∆PDS	0.01	0.24	0.0005
		PDS	-0.004	0.78	0.0001
		SES	-0.009	0.23	0.0004
		ΔΒΜΙ	-0.002	0.23	0.0004
		BMI	-0.004	0.0004	0.004
		∆age	-0.01	0.0007	0.004
youth	females	∆PDS	-0.10	3.78 x 10 ⁻¹¹	0.04
		PDS	-0.09	1.66 x 10- ⁶	0.007
		SES	-0.006	0.65	0.0002
		ΔBMI	-0.003	0.49	0.0025
		BMI	-0.003	0.15	0.013
		∆age	-0-01	0.04	0.0086
	males	ΔPDS	0.01	0.24	0.0008
		PDS	0.01	0.41	3 x 10 ⁻⁵
		SES	0.002	0.83	2 x 10 ⁻⁵
		ΔΒΜΙ	0.001	0.63	0.0001
		BMI	-0.008	1.20 x 10 ⁻⁵	0.01
		∆age	-0.01	0.008	0.0038
psychopath	ology				
embedding _{ba}	seline ~ CBCL_	Total + age + s	site		
caregiver	females	CBCL	-0.005	2.86 x 10 ⁻⁵	0.005

		age	-0.004	0.10	0.0008		
	males	CBCL	-0.007	8.42 x 10 ⁻⁸	0.01		
		age	-0.009	0.001	0.003		
Embedding2	years ~ CBCL <u></u>	_Total + age +	site				
caregiver	females	CBCL	-0.004	0.002	0.004		
		age	-0.001	0.002	0.003		
	males	CBCL	-0.006	2.34 x 10 ⁻⁶	0.006		
		age	-0.009	0.002	0.003		
Δ embedding ~ Δ CBCL + Δ age + site							
caregiver	females	ΔCBCL	-0.002	0.50	0.0002		
		∆age	-0.17	1.73 x 10 ⁻⁹	0.01		
	males	∆CBCL	-0.001	0.005	0.002		
		∆age	-0.01	0.0001	0.004		

Note: All models included scan site as covariate of no interest, thus site is not included in the table above for clarity. Additionally race/ethnicity is also not included for clarity. Bonferroni-corrected $\alpha_{puberty}$: 0.05 / 12 = 0.004, $\alpha_{psychopathology}$: 0.05 / 6 = 0.008. IV = independent variable, η^2 = partial eta squared, CBCL= Child Behavior Check List.

 Δ refers to differences in the respective variable between baseline and 2-years follow up.

Supplementary Table 2: Association results for HBN models.

	sex	IV	b	р	η²			
psychopathology sum of diagnoses								
embedding ~ sum of diagnoses + age + site								
	female	diagnoses _{sum}	.07	.007	.007			
		age	02	.08	.004			
	male	diagnoses _{sum}	.04	.05	.001			
		age	051	1.04 x 10 ⁻⁸	.022			

embedding ~ sum of diagnoses + PDS + age + site							
	female	diagnoses _{sum}	.074	.01	.010		
		PDS	.166	.07	3.00 x 10 ⁻⁵		
		age	057	.012	.011		
	male	diagnoses _{sum}	.037	.101	.002		
		PDS	.051	.499	.010		
		age	061	.0008	.010		
embedding ~	sum of diagn	oses + PDS + c	liag:PDS + ag	e + site			
	females	diagnoses _{sum}	.10	.19	.010		
		PDS	.19	.13	3.00 x 10 ⁻⁵		
		diag:PDS	01	.75	.0005		
		age	056	.014	.010		
	male	diagnoses _{sum}	.012	.819	.002		
		PDS	.012	.912	.010		
		diag:PDS	.013	.598	.0003		
		age	061	.0008	.010		
psychopathology CBCL Total Score							
embedding ~	CBCL_Total	+ age + site					
	female	CBCL	0.004	0.008	0.01		
		age	-0.007	0.59	0.0005		
	male	CBCL	0.002	0.06	0.004		
		age	-0.05	5.98 x 10 ⁻⁷	0.02		

	-	1	1	1	1		
embedding ~	- CBCL_Total	+ PDS + age +	site				
	female	CBCL	0.005	0.002	0.02		
		PDS	0.22	0.04	0.001		
		age	-0.06	0.04	0.01		
	male	CBCL	0.001	0.39	0.001		
		PDS	-0.01	0.88	0.01		
		age	-0.05	0.014	0.006		
embedding ~ CBCL_Total + PDS + CBCL:PDS + age + site							
	female	CBCL	0.008	0.08	0.02		
		PDS	0.27	0.05	0.001		
		CBCL:PDS	-0.001	0.57	0.0009		
		age	-0.06	0.04	0.001		
	male	CBCL	0.004	0.32	0.001		
		PDS	0.04	0.71	0.01		
		CBCL:PDS	-0.001	0.49	0.0004		
		age	-0.05	0.01	0.007		
puberty age restricted sample* matching ABCD age range at baseline and follow-up							
*baseline: n=141 females, n=300 males, age: 8.92 – 11.08 years							
embedding ~	- PDS + agebas	seline-matched + Site	e				
	female	PDS	0.33	0.07	0.02		
		age	-0.05	0.76	0.0007		

	male	PDS	0.07	0.68	0.003		
		age	0.20	0.07	0.01		
embedding ~ PDS + agefollow-up-matched + site							
	female	PDS	-0.01	0.95	0.0018		
		age	0.11	0.26	0.01		
	male	PDS	-0.12	0.37	0.015		
		age	-0.17	0.07	0.013		

Note: All models included scan site as covariate of no interest, thus site is not included in the table above for clarity. Bonferroni-corrected α : 0.05 / 2 = 0.025, IV = independent variable, η^2 = partial eta squared. CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist. Diag/CBCL:PDS refers to interaction term between diagnosis_{sum} / CBCL and PDS.

Supplementary	Table 3: Pubertal	category c	onversion scheme
---------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

sex	conversion scheme	pubertal category	
female	premenarcheal + pubertal score = 2	prepubertal	
	premenarcheal + pubertal score = 3	early pubertal	
	premenarcheal + pubertal score >= 3	mid pubertal	
	postmenarcheal + pubertal score <= 7	late pubertal	
	postmenarcheal + pubertal score = 8	postpubertal	
male	pubertal score = 3	prepubertal	
	pubertal score >= 4 and <=5	early pubertal	
	pubertal score >= 6 and <=8	mid pubertal	
	pubertal score >= 9 and <=11	late pubertal	

		puberta	l score = 12		postpuber	tal
Note: Pu	bertal sco	re refers to	the Pubertal C	ategory Score, whi	ich depicts	the sum of
three/two	PDS item	s for male a	and female, res	pectively. Male: pul	bic + facial ł	nair growth
+ voice	deepening	J. Female:	pubic hair gro	wth + breast deve	elopment. C	Conversion
follows	the	ABCD	variables	ʻpds_p_ss_fema	ale_categor	y' and
ʻpds p s	s male c	ategorv'.				

Pubertal Category **Caregiver Report** Youth Report baseline visit female female male male (N= 4045) (N= 3487) (N= 2562) (N= 3761) prepubertal n= 2907 n= 1129 n= 1134 n= 679 (71,9%) (32,4%) (30,2%) (26,5%) early pubertal n= 932 1783 697 n= 818 n= n= (23.0%) (23,5%)(47,4%) (27,2%) mid pubertal n= 184 n= 779 n= 1097 n= (4.5%) 1441(41,3%) (20,7%) (42,8%) n= 57 (1,5%) n= 82 (3%) late pubertal n=20 (<1%) n= 86 (2%) n= 2 (<1%) n= 7 (<1%) postpubertal n= 4 (<1%) n= 8 (<1%) 2 years follow up visit female male female male (N=3970) (N= 3378) (N= 4095) (N= 3299)

Supplementary Table 4: Frequencies of pubertal categories in the ABCD sample.

prepubertal	n=	1448	n=	147	n=	878	n= 162 (4	4,9%)
	(36,5%	.)	(4,4%)		(21,4%)			
early pubertal	n=	1490	n=	323	n=	1715	n=	360
	(37,5%	.)	(9,5%)		(41,9%)		(10,9%)	
mid pubertal	n=	834	n=	1601	n=	1342	n=	1563
	(21%)		(47,4%	.)	(32,8%)		(47,4%)	
late pubertal	n=	194	n=	1249	n= 155 (3,8%)	n=	1166
	(4,9%)		(37%)				(35,3%)	
postpubertal	n= 4 (<	:1%)	n= 58 (1,7%)	n= 5 (<1	%)	n= 48 (1,	5%)

Supplementary Table 5: Frequencies of psychopathology measures in the HBN sample.

	male (N=1487)	female (N=784)
Number of diagnoses		
1	n= 384 (25,8%)	n= 202 (25,8%)
2	n= 420 (28,2%)	n= 231 (27,2%)
3	n= 300 (20,2%)	n= 163 (20,8%)
4	n= 175 (11,8%)	n= 98 (12,5%)
5	n= 107 (7,2%)	n= 58 (7,4%)
6	n= 56 (3,8%)	n= 31 (4,0%)
7	n= 31 (2,1%)	n= 16 (2,0%)
8	n= 7 (< 1%)	n= 3 (< 1%)
9	n= 3 (< 1%)	-
10	n= 4 (< 1%)	-
mean (SD)	2.71 (1.62)	2.71 (1.55)
Primary Diagnosis		
ADHD	n= 787 (52,9%)	n= 305 (38,9%)

ASD	n= 144 (9,7%)	n= 25 (3,2%)
Anxiety	n= 190 (12,8%)	n= 196 (25,0%)
Mood	n= 48 (3,2%)	n= 62 (7,9%)
Other Disorder	n= 68 (4,6%)	n= 33 (4,2%)
Other ND	n= 250 (16,8%)	n= 163 (20,8%)
CBCL Total	n= 1269	n= 635
mean (SD)	43,93 (25,99)	42,60 (25,39)

Note: ADHD= Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, ASD= Autism Spectrum Disorder, ND= Neurodevelopmental Disorder; SD = standard deviation.

Supplementary References

- Mowinckel, A. M. & Vidal-Piñeiro, D. Visualization of Brain Statistics With R Packages ggseg and ggseg3d. Adv. Methods Pract. Psychol. Sci. 3, 466–483 (2020).
- 2. Larivière, S. *et al.* The ENIGMA Toolbox: multiscale neural contextualization of multisite neuroimaging datasets. *Nat. Methods* 18, 698–700 (2021).
- Voldsbekk, I. *et al. Delineating disorder-general and disorder-specific dimensions of psychopathology from functional brain networks in a developmental clinical sample.* http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2023.03.31.23288009 (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.03.31.23288009.