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# Supplementary methods

## Supplementary information about phenotypic data

Measures were selected for the analyses on the basis of being a) instruments designed to capture aspects of childhood psychopathology; and either b) available in the same form across at least three waves of data collection (for the developmental component of the analyses); or c) available at the 8-year wave of data collection (for the p factor modelling component of the analyses). The decision to restrict the p factor analyses to measures from the 8-year questionnaire reflects the fact that it is the first MoBa measurement occasion at which psychopathology is measured with sufficient breadth to support the models.

In our study, the CBCL internalizing domain comprised 5 items assessing the extent to which children are emotionally reactive, anxious/depressed, have somatic complaints and are withdrawn. The CBCL externalizing domain comprised 10 items assessing the extent of attention problems and aggressive behaviour. For both domains, mothers responded to items on a 3-point scale ranging from “Not true” to “often true”. Scale scores were computed by taking the mean of all available individual items for each domain and multiplying by the number of items in the domain. This was done on a per-individual basis and only for those individuals with more than 50% of the items in each scale present. Raw scale scores were used to maximise the interpretability of the growth modelling results. Ordinal cronbach’s alphas for the internalizing/externalizing sub-scales are shown below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| pheno | age | ord\_alpha |
| int | 18m | 0.662 |
| int | 3yr | 0.685 |
| int | 5yr | 0.730 |
| ext | 18m | 0.695 |
| ext | 3yr | 0.771 |
| ext | 5yr | 0.813 |

sTable 1 Ordinal Cronbach’s alphas for consistent items of the CBCL internalizing and externalizing sub-scales

We opted to retain the separation between hyperactivity and inattention in the RS-DBD (even though they could be combined to index ADHD symptoms as a single domain) because of our particular interest in the specificity of effects. Mothers responded to items on the SMFQ and SCARED using a 3-point scale ranging from “Not true” to “True” to describe their children’s symptoms of, respectively, depression and anxiety. The response set for the RS-DBD items was “Never/rarely”, “Sometimes”, “Often”, and “Very often” as mothers rated the regularity with which their children engaged in various behaviours. Internal consistency for the SCARED, sMFQ, and RS-DBD sub-scales was as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| pheno | ord\_alpha |
| anx | 0.761 |
| dep | 0.920 |
| hyp | 0.914 |
| inatt | 0.920 |
| od | 0.914 |
| cd | 0.880 |

sTable 2 Ordinal Cronbach’s alphas for SCARED, sMFQ, and RS-DBD sub-scales measured at 8 years

## Supplementary information about genetic data (including quality control)

MoBa genetic data generation and quality controlApproximately 17,000 trios from the Norwegian Mother, Father and Child cohort were genotyped in three batches. Genotypes were called using GenomeStudio (Illumina, San Diego, USA) and converted to PLINK format files. The first batch, comprising 20,664 individuals and 542,585 SNPs was genotyped at the Genomics Core Facility (Iceland) using the Illumina HumanCoreExome (Illumina, San Diego, USA) genotyping array, version 12 1.1.The second batch, comprising 12,874 individuals and 547,644 SNPs was genotyped at the Genomics Core Facility (Iceland) using the Illumina HumanCoreExome (Illumina, San Diego, USA) genotyping array, version24 1.0. The third batch, comprising 17,949 individuals and 692,367 SNPs, was genotyped at ERASMUS MC (the Netherlands) using the Illumina GlobalScreening Array (Illumina, San Diego, USA) version 24 1.

PLINK version 1.90 beta 3.36 (<http://pngu.mgh.harvard.edu/purcell/plink/>) was used to conduct the quality control, which has previously been described by Helgeland et al (2019). Known problematic SNPs previously reported by the Cohorts for Heart and Aging Research in Genomic Epidemiology (CHARGE) consortium and Psychiatric Genomics Consortium (PGC) were excluded from each batch. Duplicate samples were removed, and each genotyping batch was split into parents and offspring. Quality control was then conducted by genotyping array in parents and offspring separately.

Individuals were excluded if they had a genotyping call rate below 95% or autosomal heterozygosity greater than four standard deviations from the sample mean. SNPs were excluded if they were ambiguous (A / T and C / G), had a genotyping call rate below 98%, minor allele frequency of less than 1%, or Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium P-value less than 1 × 10-6. Population stratification was assessed, using the HapMap phase 3 release 3 as a reference, by principal component analysis using EIGENSTRAT version 6.1.4. Visual inspection identified a homogenous population of European ethnicity and individuals of non-European ethnicity were removed. Individuals with a genotyping call rate below 98% or autosomal heterozygosity greater than four standard deviations from the sample mean were then removed. A sex check was done by assessing the sex declared in the pedigree with the genetic sex, which was imputed based on the heterozygosity of chromosome X. When sex discrepancies were identified, the individual was flagged. Relatedness was assessed by flagging one individual from each pairwise comparison of identity-by-descent with a pi-hat greater than 0.1.

The parents and offspring datasets were then merged into one dataset per genotyping batch;keeping only the SNPs that passed quality control in both datasets. All individuals passing the genotyping call rate and autosomal heterozygosity measures were included in the merged datasets. Therefore, the merged datasets included individuals previously excluded orflagged as a duplicate, ethnic outlier, having a sex discrepancy, or high level of relatedness. Concordance checks were then conducted on validated duplicates. Duplicate, tri-allelic and discordant (any discordance between the validated duplicates) SNPs were excluded. Individuals and SNPs with a genotyping call rate below 98% in the merged datasets were excluded. The duplicate sample that was removed before the start of the quality control was then excluded. Mendelian errors identified by the assessment of duos and trios were then recoded to missing. Insertions and deletions were also excluded.

After QC the Human Core Exome 12 batch comprised 20,231 individuals and 384,855 SNPs,the Human Core Exome 24 batch comprised 12,757 individuals and 396,189 SNPs, and the Global Screening Array batch comprised 17,742 individuals and 568,275 SNPs. Phasing wasconducted using Shapeit 2 release 837 and the duoHMM approach was used to account for the pedigree structure. Imputation was conducted using the Haplotype reference consortium (HRC) release 1-1 as the genetic reference panel. The Sanger Imputation Server was used to perform the imputation with the Positional Burrows-Wheeler Transform (PBWT). The phasing and imputation were conducted separately for each genotyping batch.

Post imputation quality control was performed by initially converting the dosages to best-guess genotypes. Individuals were removed if they had a genotyping call rate less than 99% or were of non-European ethnicity. SNPs with an imputation INFO quality score less than 0.8, genotyping call rate less than 98%, minor allele frequency less than 1%, or a Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium P-value less than 1 × 10-6 were removed. Mendelian errors were set to missing. Relatedness, which was accounted for within generation and genotyping batch during pre-imputation QC as described above, was assessed intergenerationally and across batches by flagging one individual from each pairwise comparison of identity-by-descent witha pi-hat greater than 0.15 (excepting known parent-offspring relationships). Individuals were flagged for removal only if the other member of their pair would otherwise be included in the same analysis. One individual from each pair was flagged at random, except when retaining one individual in a pair would keep more duo/trio data intact than the other, in which case theother member was dropped. After quality control, a core homogeneous sample of European ethnicity (based on PCA of markers overlapping with available HapMap markers) individuals across all batches and arrays were available for use in analysis (totals prior to analysis-specific exclusions for relatedness: Nchildren = 15,208; Nmothers = 14,804; Nfathers = 15,198).
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## Supplementary information about polygenic scoring

Polygenic scores were calculated using the following parameters (set via the relevant flags in the PRSice software):

\*Clumping parameters: window size = 500kb; p-value threshold = 1; r2 threshold= 0.10

\*INFO score threshold (for SNPs in schizophrenia GWAS): 0.8

\*Minor allele frequency threshold (for SNPs in target sample): 0.05

\*Minor allele frequency threshold (for SNPs in schizophrenia GWAS): 0.05

\*Exclusion of MHC region specified at chr6:25000000-34000000

The table shows the number of SNPs included in the polygenic score at each threshold.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PRS Threshold | Num\_SNP |
| 0.001 | 3250 |
| 0.01 | 10524 |
| 0.05 | 25321 |
| 0.1 | 36837 |
| 0.5 | 83668 |
| 1 | 104461 |

sTable 3 NSNPs at thresholds

## Developmental model-fitting and comparison strategy

For each PRS and each CBCL sub-scale, we ran models and comparisons testing the following:

1. PRS effect on age-specific residual variance
2. PRS effect on intercept and slope factors vs. model i (1 degrees-of-freedom [DF] X2 difference test)
3. PRS effect on intercept only vs. model i (1 DF X2 test)
4. No PRS effect vs. model iii (1 DF X2 test)
5. PRS effect on slope only vs. model i (1 DF X2 test)
6. No PRS effect vs. model v (1 DF X2 test)
7. PRS effect on slope only (model v) vs. PRS effect on intercept only (model iii) – no formal test
8. No PRS effect vs. model ii (2 DF X2 test)

Formal model fit comparison tests allowed us to assess the best-fitting of several nested models, but could not be used to identify the better fitting of the PRS effect on intercept only and PRS effect on slope only models (comparison vii in the list above), as these are non-nested. Therefore, unless the tests outlined above indicated that the effect on one of the slope or intercept factors could be constrained to zero without a loss of fit, but not the other, we accepted model ii in cases where it provided an improvement on model i, and model viii resulted in a worsening of fit.

## Supplementary information about general modelling approach

For the longitudinal models, a full information maximum likelihood (FIML) estimator was used. For the domain-specificity analyses using ordinal, item-level data (for which FIML is not available in the lavaan package), we used lavaan’s WLSMV estimator, which uses diagonally weighted least squares to estimate the model parameters and the full weight matrix to compute robust standard errors. For the LPA, Mplus’s MLR estimator for maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors was used.

#

# Supplementary results

## Selection effects and selective attrition

We tested for potential selection bias from two sources in our study data. First, attrition that is related to study variables can bias results (‘selective atrrition’). We quantified this in our sample by comparing 1) schizophrenia PRS among those who did, and did not, have data available at each wave and 2) comparing 18-month CBCL scores among those who did and did not have data available at the 5yr wave (representing the end of the CBCL growth process that is modelled in the developmental analyses). The results are presented below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| outcome | wave | mean\_data | mean\_nodata | tstatistic | diff | lci | uci |
| PRS | 18m | -0.01 | 0.05 | -3.17 | -0.06 | -0.10 | -0.02 |
| PRS | 3yr | -0.02 | 0.04 | -3.50 | -0.06 | -0.09 | -0.03 |
| PRS | 5yr | -0.02 | 0.02 | -2.38 | -0.04 | -0.07 | -0.01 |
| PRS | 8yr | -0.02 | 0.02 | -2.55 | -0.04 | -0.07 | -0.01 |
| cbclint18m | 5yr | 1.24 | 1.27 | -1.49 | -0.03 | -0.08 | 0.01 |
| cbclext18m | 5yr | 3.76 | 4.02 | -6.09 | -0.26 | -0.34 | -0.17 |

sTable 4 Results of testing for selective attrition

Attrition did not appear to be associated with schizophrenia PRS, as the difference in PRS scores for those with and without data at each wave did not increase over time. There was evidence of selective attrition for the CBCL variables, as those with no data at the 5-year wave had slightly higher baseline (18-month) internalizing and externalizing scores. The differences amounted to 2.79% and 11.49% of a SD respectively, and so are considered to reflect low level selective attrition with limited scope to bias the results.

The second potential source of selection bias was selection into genotyping within the MoBa sample. We quantified this by comparing scores on all main study variables in those who did and did not have genotype data currently evailable. The results are presented in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| outcome | mean\_geno | mean\_rest | tstatistic | diff | lci | uci | Diff%SD |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth\_18m | 3.87 | 3.96 | -3.73 | -0.08 | -0.13 | -0.04 | 3.80 |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth\_3yr | 3.78 | 3.89 | -4.28 | -0.12 | -0.17 | -0.06 | 4.82 |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth\_5yr | 2.42 | 2.52 | -3.44 | -0.10 | -0.16 | -0.04 | 4.48 |
| cbcl\_int\_growth\_18m | 1.26 | 1.34 | -7.06 | -0.09 | -0.11 | -0.06 | 7.28 |
| cbcl\_int\_growth\_3yr | 1.33 | 1.42 | -5.71 | -0.09 | -0.12 | -0.06 | 6.51 |
| cbcl\_int\_growth\_5yr | 1.03 | 1.09 | -3.29 | -0.05 | -0.09 | -0.02 | 4.29 |
| mfq\_8yr | 1.78 | 1.89 | -3.76 | -0.12 | -0.18 | -0.06 | 4.85 |
| rsdbd\_cd\_8yr | 0.75 | 0.78 | -1.71 | -0.03 | -0.07 | 0.00 | 2.20 |
| rsdbd\_hyp\_8yr | 3.46 | 3.59 | -2.52 | -0.12 | -0.22 | -0.03 | 3.23 |
| rsdbd\_innat\_8yr | 4.82 | 5.01 | -3.77 | -0.20 | -0.30 | -0.09 | 4.86 |
| rsdbd\_od\_8yr | 3.40 | 3.43 | -0.77 | -0.03 | -0.11 | 0.05 | 1.00 |
| scared\_8yr | 1.01 | 1.03 | -1.18 | -0.02 | -0.05 | 0.01 | 1.51 |

sTable 5 Results of testing for selection effects acting upon genotyped sub-sample

Significant selection effects driving likelihood of inclusion in the analytic (i.e., currently genotyped) sample were observed for all CBCL variables, as well as for the measures of depressive symptoms (sMFQ), hyperactivity, and inattention (RS-DBD). In no instances did the selection effects exceed one tenth of a standard deviation of the measure in the analytic sample. Therefore, we again consider this to be low-level selection and to conferring limited additional risk of bias to the analyses.

## Developmental analyses

The fit statistics for the latent growth models applied to CBCL data collected across three waves in early childhood are presented in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| scale | cfi | tli | aic | bic | rmsea | rmsea.ci.lower | rmsea.ci.upper |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | 0.981 | 0.887 | 122345.98 | 122427.84 | 0.078 | 0.064 | 0.093 |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | 0.996 | 0.976 | 90227.72 | 90309.58 | 0.029 | 0.016 | 0.045 |

sTable 6 Model-fitting results from the developmental analyses

The results show that the linear latent growth model specified fit the internalizing data very well, and the externalizing data acceptably.

The next table shows fit statistics for the same models with schizophrenia PRS at different thresholds included as having (variously): an effect on the age-specific residuals; an effect on both latent growth factors; an effect on the latent intercept only; an effect on the latent slope only; and no effect (but being included in the model nonetheless). In addition, Chi-square test values and results are presented for all formal model comparisons (i.e., those comparisons including nested models), the the best-fitting model is indicated (where the best-fitting model was one of two non-nested models, the one with the lower AIC was preferred).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| scale | PRS Threshold | comparison | Df | AIC | Chisq.diff | pval | best |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 122345.92 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 122345.17 | 1.254 | 0.263 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122345.39 | 2.221 | 0.136 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 122345.98 | 2.586 | 0.108 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122343.54 | 0.369 | 0.544 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 122345.98 | 4.437 | 0.035 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 122345.98 | 4.806 | 0.090 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 122347.88 | NA | NA | no\_prs\_effect |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 122346.62 | 0.741 | 0.389 | no\_prs\_effect |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122345.96 | 1.348 | 0.246 | no\_prs\_effect |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 122345.98 | 2.014 | 0.156 | no\_prs\_effect |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122344.99 | 0.378 | 0.539 | no\_prs\_effect |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 122345.98 | 2.984 | 0.084 | no\_prs\_effect |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 122345.98 | 3.362 | 0.186 | no\_prs\_effect |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 122346.01 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 122344.98 | 0.967 | 0.325 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122346.03 | 3.053 | 0.081 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 122345.98 | 1.947 | 0.163 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122343.06 | 0.084 | 0.773 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 122345.98 | 4.917 | 0.027 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 122345.98 | 5.000 | 0.082 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 122345.71 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 122345.16 | 1.449 | 0.229 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122346.80 | 3.642 | 0.056 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 122345.98 | 1.174 | 0.279 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122343.17 | 0.004 | 0.951 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 122345.98 | 4.812 | 0.028 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 122345.98 | 4.816 | 0.090 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 122345.70 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 122344.43 | 0.727 | 0.394 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122346.18 | 3.755 | 0.053 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 122345.98 | 1.794 | 0.180 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122342.45 | 0.019 | 0.890 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 122345.98 | 5.530 | 0.019 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 122345.98 | 5.549 | 0.062 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 122345.36 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 122343.68 | 0.319 | 0.572 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122346.57 | 4.889 | 0.027 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 122345.98 | 1.414 | 0.234 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122341.69 | 0.017 | 0.896 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 122345.98 | 6.286 | 0.012 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 122345.98 | 6.303 | 0.043 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<1 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 122345.23 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<1 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 122343.62 | 0.386 | 0.534 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<1 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122346.56 | 4.945 | 0.026 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 122345.98 | 1.419 | 0.234 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<1 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 122341.63 | 0.018 | 0.892 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 122345.98 | 6.345 | 0.012 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_ext\_growth | p<1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 122345.98 | 6.364 | 0.042 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 90228.67 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_incpt |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 90226.70 | 0.026 | 0.871 | prs\_on\_incpt |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90225.25 | 0.548 | 0.459 | prs\_on\_incpt |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 90227.72 | 4.470 | 0.034 | prs\_on\_incpt |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90226.71 | 2.016 | 0.156 | prs\_on\_incpt |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 90227.72 | 3.001 | 0.083 | prs\_on\_incpt |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.001 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 90227.72 | 5.018 | 0.081 | prs\_on\_incpt |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 90227.52 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 90225.68 | 0.162 | 0.687 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90224.69 | 1.009 | 0.315 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 90227.72 | 5.023 | 0.025 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90225.62 | 1.931 | 0.165 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 90227.72 | 4.101 | 0.043 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.01 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 90227.72 | 6.032 | 0.049 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 90225.81 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 90223.83 | 0.020 | 0.888 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90223.85 | 2.025 | 0.155 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 90227.72 | 5.865 | 0.015 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90223.58 | 1.750 | 0.186 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 90227.72 | 6.140 | 0.013 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.05 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 90227.72 | 7.890 | 0.019 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 90224.89 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 90223.27 | 0.379 | 0.538 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90222.95 | 1.683 | 0.195 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 90227.72 | 6.764 | 0.009 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90223.64 | 2.374 | 0.123 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 90227.72 | 6.073 | 0.014 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 90227.72 | 8.447 | 0.015 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 90226.29 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 90224.64 | 0.353 | 0.552 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90224.07 | 1.432 | 0.231 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 90227.72 | 5.640 | 0.018 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90224.60 | 1.953 | 0.162 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 90227.72 | 5.120 | 0.024 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.2 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 90227.72 | 7.073 | 0.029 | prs\_on\_growth\_cannot\_dist\_SI |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 90228.64 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 90226.80 | 0.158 | 0.691 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90226.15 | 1.354 | 0.245 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 90227.72 | 3.566 | 0.059 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90225.80 | 1.002 | 0.317 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 90227.72 | 3.917 | 0.048 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<0.5 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 90227.72 | 4.920 | 0.085 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<1 | prs\_on\_resid | 1 | 90228.60 | NA | NA | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<1 | prs\_on\_growth\_vs\_resid | 2 | 90226.74 | 0.142 | 0.706 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<1 | prs\_on\_incpt\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90226.81 | 2.076 | 0.150 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_incpt | 4 | 90227.72 | 2.902 | 0.088 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<1 | prs\_on\_slope\_vs\_resid | 3 | 90225.23 | 0.489 | 0.484 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_slope | 4 | 90227.72 | 4.490 | 0.034 | prs\_on\_slope |
| cbcl\_int\_growth | p<1 | prs\_no\_eff\_vs\_growth | 4 | 90227.72 | 4.979 | 0.083 | prs\_on\_slope |

sTable 7 Genetic model-fitting results from the developmental analyses

Finally, we present a plot showing the PRS-effect parameter estimates and 95% CIs from the growth, intercept only, and slope only models at each of the PRS thresholds. Across PRS thresholds, within the best fitting models at those thresholds, the one that maximises the variance explained in either slope, intercept, or both, is highlighted and selected for interpretation in the main text.



**sFigure 1** Estimates from growth models incorporating PRS as predictors (all thresholds)

## “p” factor analyses

In the main text, we present estimates for the most often preferred model in the “p” factor anaylses: where the schizophrenia PRS was allowed to influence symptom-specific residuals. The model fit statistics underpinning the selection of the best-fitting model at each threshold is presented below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| score | specific\_model | Df | Df.diff | Chisq.diff | Chisq | p value |
| p<0.001\_resid | prs\_on\_resids | 1222 | NA | NA | 14016.69 | NA |
| p<0.001\_resid | prs\_on\_scalefs | 1268 | 46 | 50.928 | 14053.64 | 0.286 |
| p<0.001\_resid | prs\_on\_pfact | 1273 | 51 | 47.421 | 14055.04 | 0.617 |
| p<0.001\_resid | no\_prs\_effect | 1274 | 52 | 73.901 | 14106.23 | 0.025 |
| p<0.01\_resid | prs\_on\_resids | 1222 | NA | NA | 14006.99 | NA |
| p<0.01\_resid | prs\_on\_scalefs | 1268 | 46 | 48.935 | 14042.38 | 0.356 |
| p<0.01\_resid | prs\_on\_pfact | 1273 | 51 | 59.585 | 14057.07 | 0.192 |
| p<0.01\_resid | no\_prs\_effect | 1274 | 52 | 70.549 | 14090.80 | 0.044 |
| p<0.05\_resid | prs\_on\_resids | 1222 | NA | NA | 14002.28 | NA |
| p<0.05\_resid | prs\_on\_scalefs | 1268 | 46 | 63.461 | 14049.00 | 0.045 |
| p<0.05\_resid | prs\_on\_pfact | 1273 | 51 | 75.030 | 14067.29 | 0.016 |
| p<0.05\_resid | no\_prs\_effect | 1274 | 52 | 94.109 | 14126.49 | 0.000 |
| p<0.1\_resid | prs\_on\_resids | 1222 | NA | NA | 14000.10 | NA |
| p<0.1\_resid | prs\_on\_scalefs | 1268 | 46 | 59.438 | 14043.67 | 0.088 |
| p<0.1\_resid | prs\_on\_pfact | 1273 | 51 | 69.564 | 14059.83 | 0.043 |
| p<0.1\_resid | no\_prs\_effect | 1274 | 52 | 86.789 | 14111.74 | 0.002 |
| p<0.2\_resid | prs\_on\_resids | 1222 | NA | NA | 14002.43 | NA |
| p<0.2\_resid | prs\_on\_scalefs | 1268 | 46 | 63.354 | 14049.07 | 0.046 |
| p<0.2\_resid | prs\_on\_pfact | 1273 | 51 | 70.932 | 14063.50 | 0.034 |
| p<0.2\_resid | no\_prs\_effect | 1274 | 52 | 101.951 | 14140.04 | 0.000 |
| p<0.5\_resid | prs\_on\_resids | 1222 | NA | NA | 13991.57 | NA |
| p<0.5\_resid | prs\_on\_scalefs | 1268 | 46 | 67.711 | 14041.60 | 0.020 |
| p<0.5\_resid | prs\_on\_pfact | 1273 | 51 | 81.221 | 14062.57 | 0.005 |
| p<0.5\_resid | no\_prs\_effect | 1274 | 52 | 111.041 | 14144.75 | 0.000 |
| p<1\_resid | prs\_on\_resids | 1222 | NA | NA | 13992.24 | NA |
| p<1\_resid | prs\_on\_scalefs | 1268 | 46 | 67.603 | 14042.19 | 0.021 |
| p<1\_resid | prs\_on\_pfact | 1273 | 51 | 81.293 | 14063.31 | 0.004 |
| p<1\_resid | no\_prs\_effect | 1274 | 52 | 109.435 | 14142.67 | 0.000 |

**sTable 8** Model fitting results for P factor modelling analyses

The prs\_on\_resids model at the p<1 PRS threshold is selected for presentation in the main text because it is the best-fitting model at the threshold at which the maximum amount of variance in the outcomes (on average) is explained. Below, we show parameter estimates from alternate models selected for PRS at other p-value thresholds. First, a model with the effect of PRS on psychopathology mediated via a latent general “p” factor (preferred for PRS created using SNPs at p<0.001 and p<0.01):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PRS | effect\_on\_pfact | ci.lower | ci.upper |
| p<0.001\_resid | 0.031 | 0.004 | 0.058 |
| p<0.01\_resid | 0.025 | -0.003 | 0.052 |

**sTable 9** Parameter estimates for PRS effect on p factor at PRS threshold p <0.001

Second, the results from a model with the effect of PRS on psychoaphology mediated via latent domain-specific factors (preferred for PRS created using SNPs at p<0.1):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| measure | prs\_effect | ci.lower | ci.upper |
| anx | 0.017 | -0.019 | 0.053 |
| cd | 0.075 | 0.029 | 0.122 |
| dep | 0.039 | -0.004 | 0.082 |
| hyp | 0.015 | -0.028 | 0.057 |
| innat | 0.029 | -0.012 | 0.069 |
| odd | 0.052 | 0.010 | 0.095 |

**sTable 10** Parameter estimates for PRS effect on p factor at PRS threshold p <0.1

## Latent profile analyses

The model fit statistics for the latent profile analyses are provided below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Parameters | LL | AIC | Entropy | VLMR\_2LL\_Diff | VLMR\_test\_p\_value |
| 2 profile | 71 | -195484.7 | 391111.4 | 0.849 | 4215.375 | 0.002 |
| 3 profile | 83 | -194244.3 | 388654.5 | 0.794 | 2480.905 | 0.024 |
| 4 profile | 95 | -193175.6 | 386541.1 | 0.786 | 2137.424 | 0.000 |
| 5 profile | 107 | -192304.8 | 384823.5 | 0.802 | 1741.572 | 0.330 |
| 6 profile | 119 | -191693.7 | 383625.5 | 0.783 | 1462.369 | 0.207 |

**sTable 11** Model fit statistics for latent profile analysis

A 4-profile model was selected based on the VLMR test indicating that the 5 profile model offerred no improvement in fit. The table below shows the numbers of indidividuals classified, and probabilities of classification per profile, for each profile in the selected 4 profile model:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| profile | count | proportion | prob\_profile1 | prob\_profile2 | prob\_profile3 | prob\_profile4 |
| 1 | 714 | 0.057 | 0.819 | 0.031 | 0.130 | 0.020 |
| 2 | 995 | 0.079 | 0.009 | 0.873 | 0.099 | 0.020 |
| 3 | 10675 | 0.847 | 0.028 | 0.063 | 0.900 | 0.009 |
| 4 | 223 | 0.018 | 0.023 | 0.074 | 0.030 | 0.873 |

**sTable 12** Classification information from the 4 profile model (profile 3 is the normative profile, and profile 4 the schizophrenia PRS associated profile)

In the main text, Figure 5 shows the odds ratios for the PRS prediction of profile membership (for the specific profile that was associated with PRS (profile 4) versus the normative profile (profile 3)) from the selected 4 profile model, for PRS at all thresholds. Here, we present further results by showing odds ratios a) for all profiles (at all thresholds) relative to the normative profile (profile 4); and b) for all profiles (at all thresholds) relative to the SCZ PRS associated profile (profile 3):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PRS threshold | Reference | Comparison | est | lci | uci |
| p<0.0001 | Profile 4 | Profile 1 | 0.858 | 0.726 | 1.014 |
| p<0.0001 | Profile 4 | Profile 2 | 0.859 | 0.735 | 1.004 |
| p<0.0001 | Profile 4 | Profile 3 | 0.877 | 0.764 | 1.008 |
| p<0.0001 | Profile 3 | Profile 1 | 0.978 | 0.889 | 1.076 |
| p<0.0001 | Profile 3 | Profile 2 | 0.979 | 0.911 | 1.053 |
| p<0.0001 | Profile 3 | Profile 4 | 1.140 | 0.992 | 1.309 |
| p<0.001 | Profile 4 | Profile 1 | 0.847 | 0.709 | 1.013 |
| p<0.001 | Profile 4 | Profile 2 | 0.843 | 0.710 | 1.002 |
| p<0.001 | Profile 4 | Profile 3 | 0.834 | 0.714 | 0.973 |
| p<0.001 | Profile 3 | Profile 1 | 1.016 | 0.929 | 1.112 |
| p<0.001 | Profile 3 | Profile 2 | 1.011 | 0.939 | 1.089 |
| p<0.001 | Profile 3 | Profile 4 | 1.199 | 1.027 | 1.400 |
| p<0.01 | Profile 4 | Profile 1 | 0.820 | 0.679 | 0.991 |
| p<0.01 | Profile 4 | Profile 2 | 0.813 | 0.677 | 0.976 |
| p<0.01 | Profile 4 | Profile 3 | 0.796 | 0.675 | 0.939 |
| p<0.01 | Profile 3 | Profile 1 | 1.030 | 0.940 | 1.129 |
| p<0.01 | Profile 3 | Profile 2 | 1.021 | 0.948 | 1.100 |
| p<0.01 | Profile 3 | Profile 4 | 1.256 | 1.065 | 1.481 |
| p<0.05 | Profile 4 | Profile 1 | 0.789 | 0.659 | 0.944 |
| p<0.05 | Profile 4 | Profile 2 | 0.790 | 0.665 | 0.940 |
| p<0.05 | Profile 4 | Profile 3 | 0.765 | 0.654 | 0.894 |
| p<0.05 | Profile 3 | Profile 1 | 1.031 | 0.943 | 1.129 |
| p<0.05 | Profile 3 | Profile 2 | 1.034 | 0.959 | 1.114 |
| p<0.05 | Profile 3 | Profile 4 | 1.308 | 1.119 | 1.528 |
| p<0.10 | Profile 4 | Profile 1 | 0.811 | 0.679 | 0.969 |
| p<0.10 | Profile 4 | Profile 2 | 0.823 | 0.694 | 0.976 |
| p<0.10 | Profile 4 | Profile 3 | 0.788 | 0.676 | 0.919 |
| p<0.10 | Profile 3 | Profile 1 | 1.029 | 0.939 | 1.127 |
| p<0.10 | Profile 3 | Profile 2 | 1.044 | 0.970 | 1.124 |
| p<0.10 | Profile 3 | Profile 4 | 1.268 | 1.088 | 1.478 |
| p<0.20 | Profile 4 | Profile 1 | 0.811 | 0.683 | 0.965 |
| p<0.20 | Profile 4 | Profile 2 | 0.839 | 0.710 | 0.992 |
| p<0.20 | Profile 4 | Profile 3 | 0.794 | 0.684 | 0.922 |
| p<0.20 | Profile 3 | Profile 1 | 1.022 | 0.935 | 1.117 |
| p<0.20 | Profile 3 | Profile 2 | 1.057 | 0.981 | 1.138 |
| p<0.20 | Profile 3 | Profile 4 | 1.259 | 1.085 | 1.462 |
| p<0.50 | Profile 4 | Profile 1 | 0.811 | 0.683 | 0.964 |
| p<0.50 | Profile 4 | Profile 2 | 0.850 | 0.719 | 1.004 |
| p<0.50 | Profile 4 | Profile 3 | 0.798 | 0.688 | 0.926 |
| p<0.50 | Profile 3 | Profile 1 | 1.016 | 0.930 | 1.111 |
| p<0.50 | Profile 3 | Profile 2 | 1.064 | 0.987 | 1.148 |
| p<0.50 | Profile 3 | Profile 4 | 1.253 | 1.079 | 1.453 |
| p<1 | Profile 4 | Profile 1 | 0.811 | 0.682 | 0.964 |
| p<1 | Profile 4 | Profile 2 | 0.854 | 0.723 | 1.009 |
| p<1 | Profile 4 | Profile 3 | 0.800 | 0.689 | 0.928 |
| p<1 | Profile 3 | Profile 1 | 1.014 | 0.927 | 1.109 |
| p<1 | Profile 3 | Profile 2 | 1.067 | 0.990 | 1.150 |
| p<1 | Profile 3 | Profile 4 | 1.250 | 1.077 | 1.450 |

**sTable 13** Odds ratios for the PRS effect on profile membership at for scores created based on SNPs at different p-value thresholds

These additional results indicate that higher schizophrenia PRS is also associated with reduced odds of classification into any profile group other than profile 4 (not just classification in the normative profile).