

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Contents

Appendix A – Measures

Appendix B – Measurement Model invariance testing

Appendix C – Missing Data

Appendix D – Growth Model Fit Statistics

Appendix E – Mixture Model Fit Statistics

Appendix A – Social Determinants Measures

Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. In our ALSPAC analytic sample, Cronbach's alpha values across time were low-to-adequate for both the emotional problems subscale (α from .55-.71) and the peer difficulties subscale (α from .48-.65), generally increasing with age for both scales.

Short Mood and Feelings Questionnaire (SMFQ). Internal consistency reliability in our analytic sample at each of these time-points was excellent (α ranging from .85-.88).

Social predictors of trajectory class membership. We examined the role of five social factors as predictors of trajectory class membership:

Maternal education level was used as an indicator of socioeconomic position and the home learning/educational environment (Pettersen & Albers, 2001). Maternal education level was assessed during the maternal interview at 32 weeks gestation, and scores were entered on a multinomial ordinal scale ranging from: 1=less than O-level, 2= O-level, 3= A-level, and 4= university degree, where university degree was the highest education attained.

Maternal psychopathology was assessed at child ages 8 months, 1.75 years, and 2.75 years using two well-known, highly valid, and reliable measures: (1) the Crown-Crisp Experiential Index (CCEI) Score, which includes separate subscales for anxiety and depression (Crown & Crisp, 1979; Birtchnell, Evans, & Kennard, 1988); and (2) the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS; Cox, Holden, & Sagovsky, 1987). In addition, reports on maternal suicide attempts were collected via mailed questionnaire when the child was 8 months, 1.75 years, and 2.75 years through an item asking the mother to indicate whether or not she had attempted suicide within the past 1-1.5 years. Consistent with prior ALSPAC studies (Enoch et

al., 2010; Dunn et al., 2017; Dunn et al. 2019), we coded the child as being exposed to maternal psychopathology if at least one of the following criteria occurred at any time point: (1) mother reported a suicide attempt; (2) mother had a CCEI depression score greater than 9 (Crown & Crisp, 1979); (3) mother had a CCEI anxiety score greater than 10 (Crown & Crisp, 1979); or (4) mother had an EPDS score greater than 12 (Cox, Holden, & Sagovsky, 1987).

Caregiver physical and emotional cruelty. Children were coded as exposed to caregiver physical cruelty if at the 3.5 years timepoint either the mother or the mother's partner responded "yes" to any of the following items via mailed questionnaire: (1) Your partner was physically cruel to your children; (2) You were physically cruel to your children; (3) Your partner was emotionally cruel to your children; or (4) You were emotionally cruel to your children.

Single parent household. Number of adults in the household was recorded via mailed questionnaire, and a binary variable was generated indicating whether or not the child lived with a single parent during at least one of the following timepoints: 8 months, 2.75 years, or 3.9 years.

Neighborhood disadvantage was measured at 1.75 and 2.75 years. Via mailed questionnaire, mothers indicated the degree to which the following were problems in their neighborhood: (1) noise from other homes; (2) noise from the street; (3) garbage on the street; (4) dog dirt; (5) vandalism; (6) worry about burglary; (7) mugging; and (8) disturbance from youth. Response options to each item were: 2=serious problem, 1=minor problem, 0=not a problem or no opinion. Consistent with a study by Dunn and colleagues (2017; 2019), items were summed, and children with scores of eight or greater during at least one time point were classified as exposed to neighborhood disadvantage.

Appendix B

Measurement Model and Invariance Testing

Item-Level Analyses

Because the SMFQ included 13 items with a greater range of symptoms, full, item-level invariance analyses were conducted. Factors were modeled with a latent response variable specification (Muthen, 1983), where items were ordinal indicators of an underlying continuous variable. This parameterization was chosen because items had relatively few response points (3 levels of responses; see Rhemtulla, Brosseau-Liard, & Savalei, 2012). The SMFQ consisted of 3 response levels, *not true*, *sometimes*, and *true*. Thresholds refer to the probability, expressed as a logit, that an item would be endorsed after controlling for the level of the latent variable. Scalar invariance signifies that changes in item endorsement over time are driven entirely by the level of the latent variable. If items measuring a latent variable are treated as scalar invariant when it does not hold, scores of the latent variable are distorted by changes in the items unrelated to the latent variable. If scalar noninvariance was found, results from these item-level models would be used to construct parcels with longitudinally similar patterns of noninvariance.

Although the model demonstrated good global fit, the full scalar model was a significantly worse fit by both the chi-square difference test, $\chi^2(74) = 1677.55, p < .0001$, as well as Cheung & Rensvold's (2002) more relaxed criterion that changes in the CFI should be $\leq .002$. To conduct partial invariance testing, a minimum of 1 threshold per wave had to be constrained equal to the neighboring wave in order to produce a connected graph and identify the partial scalar model. The initial constraints are depicted by black circles in Figure B1. Results of invariance tests are shown in Table B1 and the constraints for each test are depicted in Figure B1.

Parcel #1 consisted of items where scalar invariance held across both levels of responses across all 3 waves. That is, after controlling for the level of the latent depression variable, the response for a particular item was equally likely across all 3 waves. Parcel #1 had full scalar invariance across all waves of items and consisted of items 5, 8, 10, and 12 and broadly reflected negative self-evaluation. Parcel #2 consisted of items 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7, which were mostly emotional symptoms (feeling miserable or unhappy, tired, restless, crying). For these items, *after controlling for the level of depression*, the higher threshold response, *true*, functioned similarly across ages, but the lower threshold response, *sometimes*, was more readily endorsed at 198 months than 140 and 157 months, indicating that mothers reported their children experiencing moderate levels of negative emotions more frequently at 198 months than they did at younger ages. Parcel #3 consisted of items 2, 9, 11, and 13. Scalar invariance held across 140 and 157 months, but average symptom levels, after controlling for the latent depression variable, were higher at 198 months. These items did not appear to have thematic similarity.

Parcels required a minimum of 3 items. Because the SDQ subscales each had only 5 items, each subscale was used to form 1 parcel. Item-level analyses on subscales indicated acceptable fit for scalar invariance models for the SDQ-emotions (FIT) and SDQ-peer difficulties (FIT).

Construction of the Measurement Model.

The two SDQ subscales and three SMFQ parcels were included together in the same model and subjected to full invariance testing. Latent means were centered at zero and latent variances were fixed at one in the first wave. A maximum likelihood estimator with robust standard errors was used so that inferences on the measurement model would accommodate

nonnormality. The Satorra-Bentler adjustment was used to compare nested models (Satorra & Bentler, 2010).

Preliminary models examining just the waves where all measures were present indicated that a bifactor model provided the best fit to the data. Moreover, given the heterogeneous range of symptoms assessed and desire for one latent construct that unified them, it also provided the substantive interpretation that most cleanly mapped to theory. This measurement model consisted of one general factor underlying all the items, referred to as “depression,” and method factors for the SMFQ and each SDQ subscale.

Results indicated full scalar invariance for the SDQ-emotions subscale, and partial scalar invariance for the peer difficulties subscale, where the intercepts of the first 3 waves (47 months, 81 months, and 97 months) were freely estimated. As expected following the item-level analyses, the two SMFQ parcels constructed from noninvariant items were themselves scalar noninvariant. Nested model comparisons for the configural, metric, full scalar, and partial scalar models can be found in the Table B2; for path diagram, see Figure S1). Despite a significant chi-square statistic ($\chi^2(165) = 657.02, p < .0001$), which is common in models with large samples and many parameters, the fit of the final model with partial scalar invariance was excellent (CFI = .999, TLI = .998, RMSEA = .015) and superior to the fit of the model with full scalar invariance ($\chi^2_{\text{diff}}(5) = 970.50, p < .0001$), indicating that some symptoms changed over time in ways that were unrelated to the latent depression variable. Examination of the size and distribution of residuals indicated that local fit was also acceptable.

Factor score distributions had moderate levels of skew and kurtosis. Because mixture models on variables with such skew and kurtosis may extract latent classes that characterize properties of the distribution rather than true population-wide heterogeneity (Curran & Bauer,

2003), log-transformed factor scores were used. The resulting estimated factor score distributions were acceptable, with an approximate normal shape and skew and kurtosis values all $< |1.0|$.

Table B1. Nested Model Comparisons for Item-Level SMFQ Partial Scalar Invariance Models


Model	df	c²	D c²	difftest	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
Full Invariance Models							
Configural/Metric invariance	684	3001.17	---	0.0003	0.983	0.982	0.020
Threshold Invariance	734	3986.29	1677.55	< .0001	0.976	0.976	0.023
Partial Scalar Invariance Models							
Baseline=Model 2-Metric Invariance	684	3001.17	---	---	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 0	686	3004.75	2.59	0.27	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 1	688	3010.76	6.64	0.036	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 2	691	3017.01	5.43	0.143	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 3	692	3024.30	10.56	0.001	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 4	693	3029.76	19.13	0.0001	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 5	697	3050.20	35.58	< .0001	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 6	698	3053.87	5.56	0.018	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 7	700	3056.18	0.27	0.875	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 8	702	3059.05	3.47	0.176	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 9	704	3062.09	1.74	0.418	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 10	708	3078.98	24.33	0.0001	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 11	710	3081.97	0.59	0.744	0.983	0.982	0.020
Partial 12	712	3118.91	76.7	< .0001	0.982	0.982	0.020
Partial 13	714	3124.26	6.02	0.049	0.982	0.982	0.020

Note. This table is interpreted in conjunction with Figure B1, which shows the constraints tested by each model. Chi-square differences between successive models do not equal exact chi-square differences because they were calculated using the Satorra-Bentler adjustment.


Table B2. Fit Statistics for Parcel-Level Partial Scalar Invariance Models

Model	df	χ^2	χ^2 p-value	Satorra-Bentler χ^2 diff	Adjusted χ^2 difference p-value	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	BIC
<i>Waves with all three measures (140 months, 157 months, 198 months)</i>									
Configural	60	263.38	< .0001	---	---	.994	.989	.020	-4,611
Metric	68	328.94	< .0001	58.52	< .0001	.992	.988	.021	-4,567
<i>All waves</i>									
Metric	158	596.74	< .0001	---	---	.999	.998	.015	75,441
Partial Scalar	165	657.03	< .0001	71.43	< .0001	.998	.998	.016	75,448
Full Scalar	170	1353.91	< .0001	989.11	< .0001	.997	.995	.024	76,332


Figure B1. Constraints on Item-Level SMFQ Partial Invariance Models




Item 4




Item 10




Item 5




Item 11




Item 6




Item 12





Note. Black circles represent constraints that were used to identify the minimal scalar invariant model (i.e., produce the necessary connected graph for further analysis). Solid circles indicate constraints that were accepted and included in subsequent models. Broken circles represent constraints that were rejected and not imposed for subsequent models.

Figure B2. Path Diagram for Parcel-Level Confirmatory Factor Model



Note. Factor loadings are constrained equal for each parcel across waves. Factor variances were scaled to 1 for the first time point and freely estimated at subsequent timepoints.

Note
omni

APPENDIX C

Missing Data

A number of baseline demographics and variables representing exposure to adversity were examined (see **Table C1** for a complete list) and included as saturated correlates (Collins, Schafer, & Kam, 2001) if they correlated $\geq |0.05|$ with either (1) any parcel score or, (2) with a dummy variable indicating that a parcel was missing. This procedure resulted in the inclusion of 34 auxiliary variables as saturated correlates.

Table C1. List of auxiliary variables examined and included in CFA model used to generate factor scores.

Predictor	Number of Relations with Outcome Variables (max = 23)	Included	VariableType
Parent SES	23	yes	factor ordered
Mother's education at gestation	23	yes	category
Parents are home-owners	23	yes	binary ordered
Marital status	23	yes	category
Maternal psychopathology (8 months)	23	yes	binary
Maternal psychopathology (21 months)	23	yes	binary
Maternal psychopathology (33 months)	23	yes	binary
One adult in the household (47 months)	23	yes	binary
Neighborhood housing quality (21 months)	23	yes	binary
Neighborhood housing quality (33 months)	23	yes	binary
Financial score (8 months)	23	yes	binary
Financial score (21 months)	23	yes	binary
Financial score (33 months)	23	yes	binary
Partner cruelty (33 months)	23	yes	binary ordered
ppregnum	22	yes	category
One adult in the household (21 months)	22	yes	binary
One adult in the household (33 months)	22	yes	binary
Partner cruelty (47 months)	22	yes	binary ordered
Mother's age at birth	21	yes	category
One adult in the household (8 months)	21	yes	binary
Partner cruelty (21 months)	21	yes	binary
Either parent in trouble with law enforcement (21 months)	20	yes	binary
Male	14	yes	binary
Partner cruelty (8 months)	10	yes	binary
Child psychological or emotional abuse (42 months)	9	yes	binary
Child psychological or emotional abuse (30 months)	8	yes	binary
Race = White	7	yes	binary
Family instability (42 months)	7	yes	binary

Either parent in trouble with law enforcement (33 months)	5	yes	binary
Either parent in trouble with law enforcement (47 months)	4	yes	binary
preg_size	2	yes	binary
Either parent in trouble with law enforcement (8 months)	2	yes	binary
Family instability (18 months)	2	yes	binary
Family instability (30 months)	2	yes	binary
Child psychological or emotional abuse (18 months)	0	no	binary

Note. Auxiliary variables were included when correlation with at least 1 $r \geq |.05|$.

APPENDIX D

Table D1. *Fit Statistics for Growth Models*

Model	df	χ^2	p	Satorra-Bentler Chi-square difference (k vs. k-1)	chi-square difference test	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	BIC	AIC
1. Linear Growth Model	28	11,334.80	< .0001	---	---	.815	.862	.186	-16,349	-16,401
2. Quadratic Growth Model	24	6196.57	< .0001	5278.72	< .0001	.899	.912	.149	-22,883	-22,964
3. Cubic Growth Model	19	3582.70	< .0001	2622.75	< .0001	.942	.936	.127	-26,214	-26,331
4. Quartic Growth Model	18	3543.09	< .0001	13.67	.0001	.942	.933	.130	-26,219	-26,344
5. Quartic Growth Model with Structured Residuals	17	3422.53	< .0001	156.78	< .0001	.944	.931	.131	-26,482	-26,714

Note. All quartic models constrained the quartic variance to zero because otherwise, the model was underidentified. The final model is bolded.

APPENDIX E

Table E1. *Fit Statistics for Growth Mixture Models*

Model	free parameters	Loglikelihood	BIC	aBIC	AIC	CAIC	AWE	adjusted LRT (k vs k-1)	cmPk	cmPA
Baseline Model ^a	18	13,375	-26,581	-26,638	-26,713	-26,563	-26,358	---	---	---
<i>Mixture Models</i>										
all growth factor variances fixed to zero, AR varies across classes										
2 class	15	11,587	-23,033	-23,081	-23,143	-23,018	-22,847	< .0001	0.00	---
3 class	22	12,449	-24,691	-24,761	-24,853	-24,669	-24,419	< .0001	0.00	---
4 class	29	12,819	-25,367	-25,459	-25,580	-25,338	-25,008	< .0001	0.00	---
5 class	36	13,201	-26,065	-26,179	-26,330	-26,029	-25,620	.0022	0.00	---
6 class	43	13,568	-26,734	-26,871	-27,051	-26,691	-26,203	< .0001	0.00	---
7 class	50	13,802	-27,135	-27,294	-27,503	-27,085	-26,517	.0022	0.00	---
8 class	57	14,031	-27,528	-27,709	-27,947	-27,471	-26,823	.022	1.00	0.00
Invariant variances, diagonal covariance, linear slope variance, AR varies across classes										
2 class	17	13,044	-25,929	-25,983	-26,054	-25,912	-25,719	< .0001	0.00	---
3 class	24	13,461	-26,697	-26,773	-26,874	-26,673	-26,400	.0004	0.00	---
4 class	31	13,886	-27,482	-27,580	-27,710	-27,451	-27,099	< .0001	0.00	---
5 class	38	14,293	-28,231	-28,351	-28,510	-28,193	-27,761	.0044	0.00	---
6 class	45	14,739	-29,056	-29,199	-29,388	-29,011	-28,500	< .0001	0.00	1.00
7 class	52	15,086	-29,684	-29,849	-30,067	-29,632	-29,041	.175	0.00	---
8 class	59	15,409	-30,265	-30,452	-30,699	-30,206	-29,535	.035	1.00	---

Invariant variances, non-diagonal covariance, linear slope variance, AR varies across classes

2 class	18	13150	-26,132	-26,189	-26,265	-26,114	-25,910	.0001	0.00	---
3 class	25	13594	-26,954	-27,033	-27,138	-26,929	-26,645	.0087	0.00	---
4 class	32	14025	-27,751	-27,853	-27,987	-27,719	-27,356	0.216	0.00	---
5 class	39	14497	-28,629	-28,753	-28,916	-28,590	-28,147	0.002	0.00	0.00
6 class	46	14814	-29,197	-29,343	-29,535	-29,151	-28,628	0.316	0.00	---
7 class	53	15167	-29,839	-30,007	-30,229	-29,786	-29,183	0.145	0.00	---
8 class	60	15487	-30,412	-30,603	-30,854	-30,352	-29,671	0.006	1.00	---

Invariant variances, diagonal covariance, linear slope variance, AR invariant across classes

2 class	16	13,001	-25,851	-25,902	-25,969	-25,835	-25,654	< .0001	0.00	---
3 class	22	13,331	-26,456	-26,526	-26,618	-26,434	-26,184	< .0001	0.00	---
4 class	28	13,660	-27,059	-27,148	-27,265	-27,031	-26,713	.0008	0.00	---
5 class	34	14,103	-27,887	-27,995	-28,137	-27,853	-27,466	.0028	0.00	---
6 class	40	14,368	-28,362	-28,489	-28,656	-28,322	-27,867	.127	0.00	0.00
7 class	46	14,646	-28,861	-29,008	-29,200	-28,815	-28,293	.036	0.00	---
8 class	52	14,888	-29,289	-29,454	-29,671	-29,237	-28,646	.004	1.00	---

Note. The final model selection is bolded. Boxes denote models selected by fit statistics within-class. The Bayes Factor was excluded because it was not informative in model selection (e.g., all values for k vs k+1 class models were 0). Mixture models with variances for quadratic slopes yielded unacceptable models (non-positive definite psi matrices) and were consequently excluded from the table.


a = The baseline model was parameterized in the following way: 1 class, quartic polynomial, with random linear and quadratic variances, higher order variances fixed to zero, 3 phantom variables, time-invariant autoregressive structured residual, residual variances constrained equal within 2 separate pieces: 47-128 months, 140-198 months.

AR = autoregressive parameter for structured residuals.

APPENDIX F

Figure F1. Latent class trajectories using a traditional growth mixture model without structured residuals

A. 6-Class Growth Mixture Model with Structured Residuals



B. 6-Class Traditional Growth Mixture Model

