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Electronic Supplementary Material 3: Examining the functioning of items assessing risk of suicide/self-harm and symptom impact and duration.

Adolescent-report
a) Rank-ordered item-discrimination indices for the suicidal ideation items

| Item name | Item | Item-depression diagnosis correlation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Controlled <br> for Gender | Controlled <br> for age |
| MFQ19_T | I thought about killing myself. | $.39^{*}$ | $.39^{*}$ | $.40^{*}$ |
| MFQ16_T | I thought that life wasn't worth living. | $.36^{*}$ | $.35^{*}$ | $.35^{*}$ |
| MFQ17_T | I thought about death or dying. | $.32^{*}$ | $.32^{*}$ | $.33^{*}$ |
| MFQ18_T | I thought my family would be better off without <br> me. | $.18^{*}$ | $.17^{*}$ | $.21^{*}$ |

Note. MFQ-P16-19_T $=$ transformed MFQ items, ${ }^{*} p<.01$.
b) ROC curve analyses for 5 RCADS depression items with different combinations of suicidal ideation items

|  | Total |  | Boys |  |  | Girls |  | Older adolescents |  | Younger adolescents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AUC (total) | Cutoff | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Sens/ } \\ & \text { Spec } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Cutoff | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Sens/ } \\ & \text { Spec } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Cutoff | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Sens/ } \\ & \text { Spec } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Cutoff | Sens/ Spec | Cutoff | Sens |
| 5 Depression items | . 87 | 8.5 | $.82 /$ | 7.5 | $.88 /$ | 8.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .82 / \\ & .71 \end{aligned}$ | 8.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .79 / \\ & \hline .70 \end{aligned}$ | 8.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .90 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ |
| 5 Depression items <br> + MFQ 19_T, MFQ <br> 16 T, MFQ 17 T | . 88 | 11.25 | $\begin{aligned} & .83 / \\ & .76 \end{aligned}$ | 10.3 | $\begin{aligned} & .92 / \\ & .82 \end{aligned}$ | 11.25 | $\begin{aligned} & .83 / \\ & .72 \end{aligned}$ | 11.75 | $\begin{aligned} & .80 / \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 11.25 | $\begin{aligned} & .82 / \\ & .78 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \text { Depression items } \\ & + \text { MFQ 19_T, MFQ } \\ & 16 \_T \end{aligned}$ | . 89 | 10.75 | $\begin{aligned} & .80 / \\ & \hline 79 \end{aligned}$ | 10.25 | $\begin{aligned} & .92 / \\ & .86 \end{aligned}$ | 10.25 | $\begin{aligned} & .83 / \\ & .73 \end{aligned}$ | 10.75 | $\begin{aligned} & .80 / \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 10.75 | $\begin{aligned} & .82 / \\ & .81 \end{aligned}$ |
| 5 Depression items + MFQ 19 T | . 89 | 9.25 | $\begin{aligned} & .83 / \\ & .79 \end{aligned}$ | 8.8 | $\begin{aligned} & .92 / \\ & .85 \end{aligned}$ | 9.25 | $\begin{aligned} & .83 / \\ & .76 \end{aligned}$ | 9.25 | $\begin{aligned} & .80 / \\ & .78 \end{aligned}$ | 9.25 | $\begin{aligned} & .91 / f \\ & \hline .80 \end{aligned}$ |

Note. Sens/Spec = Sensitivity/Specificity. MFQ-P16-19_T = transformed MFQ-C items.
c) Summary of binary logistic regression for 5 RCADS depression items with and without suicidal ideation item

| Model | $b$ (SE) | Wald $z$ value | OR (95\% CI) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { McFadden's } \\ R^{2} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Model fit change ( $\chi^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -5.73 (.58) | -9.83* |  | . 34 | 143.81** |
| RCADS 5 depression items - A | . 51 (.06) | 8.55* | 1.66 |  |  |
| Model 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -5.98 (.77) | -7.81* |  | . 41 | $\begin{gathered} 6.23 \\ (p=.013) \end{gathered}$ |
| RCADS 5 depression items - A | . 45 (.08) | 5.55* | 1.56 [1.35-1.85] |  |  |
| MFQ19_T | . 45 (.18) | $\begin{gathered} 2.50 \\ (p=.012) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.56 [1.10-2.23] |  |  |

Note. MFQ-19_T = transformed MFQ-C item, A = adolescent-report, ${ }^{*} p<.01$.
d) Rank-ordered item-discrimination indices for the symptom impact and duration items

| Item name | Item | Item-any anxiety/depressive disorder diagnosis correlation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Controlled for Gender | Controlled for age |
| Impact - Family and Friends ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | How much of an impact do these difficulties have on your family and friends? | .53* | .51* | .52* |
| Impact - Distress | How much do these difficulties upset or distress you? | .52* | .49* | .52* |
| Impact - School | How much do these difficulties get in the way of your everyday life in these areas (School) | .52* | .50* | .50* |
| Impact - Outside the school | How much do these difficulties get in the way of your everyday life in these areas (Outside the school) | .44* | .42* | .42* |
| Impact - Friends | How much do these difficulties get in the way of your everyday life in these areas (Friends) | .40* | .37* | .38* |
| Impact -Time | How long have you had these difficulties for? | .34* | .31* | .30* |
| Impact - Home | How much do these difficulties get in the way of your everyday life in these areas (Home) | .30* | .27* | . 30 * |

Note. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Item with a high ( $>10 \%$ ) proportion of missing responses, ${ }^{*} p<.01$.
e) ROC curve analyses for 11 RCADS items with different combinations of symptom impact and duration items

|  | Total |  |  | Boys |  | Girls |  | Older adolescents |  | Younger adolescents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { AUC } \\ & \text { (total) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cut- } \\ & \text { off } \end{aligned}$ | Sens Spec | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cut- } \\ & \text { off } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Sens/ } \\ & \text { Spec } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Cutoff | Sens/ Spec | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cut- } \\ \text { off } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Sens/ } \\ & \text { Spec } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cut- } \\ & \text { off } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Sens/ } \\ & \text { Spec } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| RCADS 11-item | . 82 | 12.5 | .80/ | 8.5 | .84/ | 14.5 | .72/ | 14.5 | .80/ | 11.5 | .78/ |
| Total |  |  | . 71 |  | . 70 |  | . 68 |  | . 76 |  | . 66 |
| RCADS 11-item |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total + 5 Impact items | . 84 | 22.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .82 / \\ & .74 \end{aligned}$ | 18.0 | $\begin{aligned} & .88 / \\ & .78 \end{aligned}$ | 24.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .75 / \\ & .70 \end{aligned}$ | 24.5 | $\text { . } 84 /$ | 21.5 |  |
| RCADS 11-item |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total + 4 Impact | . 85 | 19.5 | .83/ | 16.5 | .83/ | 21.5 | .77/ | 22.5 | .80/ | 18.5 | .76/ |
| items |  |  | . 73 |  | . 78 |  | . 71 |  | . 79 |  | 70 |
| RCADS 11-item |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total + 3 Impact | . 84 | 18.5 | .81/ | 14.5 | .88/ | 20.5 | .75/ | 20.5 | .84/ | 17.5 | . $74 /$ |
| items |  |  | . 73 |  | . 80 |  | . 70 |  | . 79 |  |  |
| RCADS 11-item |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total + 2 | . 84 | 16.5 | .84/ | 13.5 | .88/ | 18.5 | .76/ | 18.6 | .86/ | 16.5 | .74/ |
| Impact items |  |  | . 72 |  | . 78 |  | . 66 |  | . 74 |  |  |
| RCADS 11-item |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total + 1 Impact |  |  | .83/ |  | .89/ |  | . $72 /$ |  | .79/ |  | .73/ |
|  | . 83 | 14.5 | . 71 | 10.5 | . 71 | 17.5 | . 70 | 17.5 | . 79 | 14.5 | . 73 |

Note. Sens/Spec $=$ Sensitivity/Specificity.
f) Summary of binary logistic regression for total scale with and without symptom impact items (adolescent-report)

| Model |  | $b(S E)$ | Wald $z$-value | OR (95\% CI) | McFadden's <br> $R^{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model 1 |  | Model fit <br> change $\left(\chi^{2}\right)$ |  |  |  |
|  | Constant | $-2.44(.28)$ | $-8.81^{*}$ |  | .28 |
| RCADS 11 item Total - A | $.19(.02)$ | $10.02^{*}$ | $1.21[1.64$, | $1.25]$ |  |
| Model 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Constant | $-3.97(.44)$ | $-9.00^{*}$ |  | .41 |


|  |  |  | $1.12[1.07$, |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RCADS 11 item Total - A | $.11(.03)$ | $4.37 *$ | $1.18]$ |
|  |  |  | $1.85[1.46$, |
| Impact items - A | $.62(.13)$ | $4.90^{*}$ | $2.40]$ |

Note. A = adolescent-report, ${ }^{*} p<.01$.

Parent-report
a) Rank-ordered item-discrimination indices for the suicidal ideation items

| Item name | Item | Item-depression diagnosis correlation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Controlled <br> for Gender | Controlled <br> for age |
| MFQ-P16_T | My child thought that life wasn't worth living | $.33^{*}$ | $.33^{*}$ | $.33^{*}$ |
| MFQ-P17_T | My child thought about death or dying | $.22^{*}$ | $.22^{*}$ | $.25^{*}$ |
| MFQ-P19_T | My child thought about killing himself/herself | $.21^{*}$ | $.21^{*}$ | $.22^{*}$ |
| MFQ-P18_T | My child thought my family would be better off <br> without him/her | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.08 |

Note. MFQ-P16-19_T $=$ transformed MFQ-P item, ${ }^{*} p<.01$.
b) ROC curve analyses for 5 RCADS items plus different combinations of suicidal ideation items

|  | Total |  |  | Boys |  | Girls |  | Older adolescents |  | Younger adolescents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AUC (total) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cut- } \\ & \text { off } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Sens/ Spec | Cutoff | Sens/ Spec | Cutoff | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Sens/ } \\ & \text { Spec } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Cutoff | Sens/ Spec | Cutoff | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Sens/ } \\ & \text { Spec } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 5 Depression items | . 86 | 6.5 | $.84 /$ | 5.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .93 / \\ & .75 \end{aligned}$ | 6.5 | .85/ | 6.5 | $.82 /$ .74 | 6.5 | $.90 /$ .76 |
| 5 Depression items <br> + MFQ-P16_T ${ }^{1}$ | . 87 | 6.75 | $\begin{aligned} & .90 / \\ & .77 \end{aligned}$ | 6.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .90 \\ & .84 \end{aligned}$ | 6.75 | .90/ | 6.5 | .86/ | 7.25 | . $90 /$ |
| 5 Depression items |  |  | .92/ |  | .90/ |  | .79/ |  | .90/ |  | .90/ |
| + MFQ-P19_T | . 87 | 6.75 | . 76 | 6.5 | . 84 | 7.25 | . 78 | 6.5 | 75 | 7.25 | . 82 |

Note. Sens/Spec = Sensitivity/Specificity, MFQ-P16-19_T = transformed MFQ-P item.
c) Summary of binary logistic regression for 5 RCADS depression items with and without suicidal ideation item

| Model | $b$ (SE) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wald } z \text { - } \\ \text { value } \\ (\mathrm{p} \text {-value) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | OR (95\% CI) | McFadden's $R^{2}$ | Model fit change ( $\chi^{2}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -4.41 (.43) | -10.36* |  | . 32 | 111.16* |
| RCADS 5 depression items P | . 43 (.05) | 8.42* | 1.66 [1.49, 1.89] |  |  |
| Model 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | -4.92 (.57) | -8.58* |  | . 61 | $\begin{gathered} .451 \\ (p=.502) \end{gathered}$ |
| RCADS 5 depression items - | . 45 (.07) | 6.43* | 1.56 [1.38-1.81] |  |  |
| MFQ-P19_T | . 15 (.23) | $\begin{gathered} .68 \\ (p=.497) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.17 [.73-1.81] |  |  |

Note. MFQ-P19_T = transformed MFQ-P item, $\mathrm{P}=$ parent-report, ${ }^{*} p<.01$.

[^0]d) Rank-ordered item-discrimination indices for the 11 RCADS items plus symptom impact and duration items

| Item name | Item | Item- anxiety diagnosis correlation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Controlled for Gender | Controlled for age |
| Impact-Distress | How much do these difficulties upset or distress your child? | .65* | .63* | .65* |
| Impact-Family | How much of an impact do these difficulties have on you or the family as a whole? | .60* | .58* | .61* |
| Impact-School | How much do these difficulties get in the way of your child's everyday life in these areas? (School) | .59* | .57* | .59* |
| Impact-Outside the school | How much do these difficulties get in the way of your child's everyday life in these areas? (Outside the school) | .58* | .56* | .58* |
| Impact-Home | How much do these difficulties get in the way of your child's everyday life in these areas? (Home) | .54* | .52* | .54* |
| Impact-Friends | How much do these difficulties get in the way of your child's everyday life in these areas? (Friends) | .49* | .46* | .49* |
| Impact-Time | How long has your child had these difficulties for? | .23* | .21* | .24* |

Note. ${ }^{*} p<.01$.
e) ROC curve analyses for different combinations of symptom impact and duration items

|  | Total Boys |  |  | Girls |  | Older adolescents |  |  | Younger adolescents |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AUC } \\ & \text { (total) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cut- } \\ & \text { off } \end{aligned}$ | Sens Spec | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cut- } \\ \text { off } \end{gathered}$ | Sens/ Spec | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cut- } \\ \text { off } \end{gathered}$ | Sens/ Spec | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cut- } \\ & \text { off } \end{aligned}$ | Sens/ Spec | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cut- } \\ \text { off } \end{gathered}$ | Sens/ Spec |
| RCADS 11itemTotal | . 88 | 10.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .80 / \\ & .79 \end{aligned}$ | 7.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .96 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 11.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .78 / \\ & .75 \end{aligned}$ | 9.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .84 / \\ & .77 \end{aligned}$ | 10.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .80 / \\ & .77 \end{aligned}$ |
| RCADS 11itemTotal matched to adolescent-report | . 89 | 14.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .82 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 12.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .86 / \\ & .84 \end{aligned}$ | 14.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .87 / \\ & .74 \end{aligned}$ | 14.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .84 / . \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 14.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .80 / \\ & .79 \end{aligned}$ |
| RCADS 11 itemTotal +6 Impact items | . 90 | 20.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .84 / \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 17.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .82 / \\ & .82 \end{aligned}$ | 22.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .83 / \\ & .78 \end{aligned}$ | 20.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .84 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 20.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .85 / \\ & .79 \end{aligned}$ |
| RCADS 11 itemTotal +5 Impact items | . 90 | 19.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .82 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 15.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .89 / \\ & .84 \end{aligned}$ | 21.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .81 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 18.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .87 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 19.6 | $\begin{aligned} & .81 / \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| RCADS 11 itemTotal +4 Impact items | . 90 | 18.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .81 / \\ & .81 \end{aligned}$ | 14.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .86 / \\ & .84 \end{aligned}$ | 19.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .83 / \\ & .77 \end{aligned}$ | 17.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .87 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 18.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .80 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ |
| RCADS 11 - <br> itemTotal + 3 <br> Impact item | . 90 | 16.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .81 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 13.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .86 / \\ & .84 \end{aligned}$ | 17.5 | $.84 / .$ | 15.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .86 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 16.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .80 / \\ & .79 \end{aligned}$ |
| RCADS 11itemTotal + 2 | . 90 | 14.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .82 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 11.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .92 / \\ & .82 \end{aligned}$ | 15.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .81 / \\ & .76 \end{aligned}$ | 13.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .86 / \\ & .80 \end{aligned}$ | 14.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .82 / \\ & .79 \end{aligned}$ |
| RCADS 11itemTotal + 1 Impact item ${ }^{2}$ | . 89 | 12.5 | $\begin{gathered} .83 / \\ .80 \end{gathered}$ | 10.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .84 / \\ & .84 \end{aligned}$ | 13.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .83 / \\ & .75 \end{aligned}$ | 12.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .84 / \\ & .83 \end{aligned}$ | 12.5 | $\begin{aligned} & .81 / \\ & .79 \end{aligned}$ |

Note. Sens/Spec $=$ Sensitivity/Specificity.

[^1]f) Summary of binary logistic regression for the 11 RCADS items with and without symptom impact items



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The ROC curve analyses confirmed that the optimal parent-report depression scale with MFQ-16 risk item was not significantly different ( $p=.93$ ) from the parent-report depression scale that included the same MFQ-19 risk item as adolescent-report depression scale.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ The ROC curve analyses confirmed that the optimal parent-report total scale with one symptom impact item was not significantly different $(p=.62)$ from the parent-report total scale that included the same symptom impact items as adolescent-report total scale.

