

# **Social Determinants of Health and Suicidal Behaviors among Children: U.S. Longitudinal Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study**

Yunyu Xiao, PhD<sup>1</sup>, J. John Mann, MD<sup>2,3</sup>, Yu Hou, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Julian Chun-Chung Chow, PhD<sup>4</sup>, Timothy T. Brown, PhD<sup>5</sup>, Paul Siu-Fai Yip<sup>6,7</sup>, Alexander C. Tsai<sup>8,9</sup>, Jyotishman Pathak, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Fei Wang, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Chang Su, PhD<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Weill Cornell Medicine | NewYork-Presbyterian, Department of Population Health Sciences, New York, NY

<sup>2</sup> Departments of Psychiatry and Radiology, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, Columbia University, New York, NY

<sup>3</sup> Division of Molecular Imaging and Neuropathology, New York State Psychiatric Institute, New York, NY

<sup>4</sup> School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley, California, CA

<sup>5</sup> School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, California, CA

<sup>6</sup> Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

<sup>7</sup> HKJC Centre for Suicide Research and Prevention, Hong Kong

<sup>8</sup> Center for Global Health and Mongan Institute, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA

<sup>9</sup> Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

<sup>10</sup> Department of Health Service Administration and Policy, College of Public Health, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

**Corresponding Author:**

Chang Su,

1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue Ritter Annex Room 535,

Philadelphia, PA 19122

[suchangsc10@gmail.com](mailto:suchangsc10@gmail.com)

## Key Points

**Question** What are the social determinants of mental health, suicidal ideation, and suicidal behavior among children in the U.S.?

**Findings** In this cohort of 10 504 children, we used machine learning to identify four patterns of social determinants of health (SDoH). At baseline, socioeconomic deprivation was associated with internalizing and externalizing problems. Over follow-up, structural racism and discrimination were associated with suicide attempts.

**Meaning** Multiple dimensions of structural interventions targeting different SDoH are needed to improve child mental health outcomes.

## Abstract

**Importance** Social determinants of health (SDoH) have well-characterized associations with child mental health outcomes. Their complex, multilevel influences on child mental health are less well understood.

**Objective** To identify patterns across multiple domains of SDoH and estimate their associations with child mental health and suicidality outcomes over time.

**Design** Panel study of 11 810 children aged 9 to 10 years who were enrolled in the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study and followed from September 1, 2016, and April 24, 2021.

**Setting** Nationally-representative, population-based study across 21 sites in the U.S.

**Participants** ABCD participants and their participating parents/guardians.

**Exposures** 84 structural SDoH factors at baseline across 9 domains (discrimination, crime and drug use, education, health and environment, family type and disability, housing and transportation, minority status and language, socioeconomic status, and urbanization). We used unsupervised machine learning to identify patterns of clustering underlying the SDoH data.

**Main Outcomes and Measures** Child mental health was measured with the parent-report Child Behavior Checklist. Suicidal ideation and suicide attempts were measured with child- and parent-report computerized versions of the Kiddie Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia.

**Results** Of 10 504 children included at baseline (median [SD] age, 9.9 [0.6] years), 5510 [52.5%] were boys and 4994 [47.5%] were girls; 229 (2.2%) were Asian, 1468 (14.0%) were Black, 2128 (20.3%) were Hispanic, 5565 (53.0%) were White, and 1108

(10.5%) were multiracial. Four SDoH patterns were identified: affluence (SDoH Pattern I); structural racism and discrimination (SDoH Pattern II); socioeconomic deprivation (SDoH Pattern III); and high crime, low education, and populated (SDoH Pattern IV) areas. Children with **High Socioeconomic Deprivation at baseline (SDoH Pattern III)** reported higher rates of externalizing ( $\beta$ , 1.43, 95% CI, 0.83, 2.02), internalizing ( $\beta$ , 0.75, 95% CI, 0.14, 1.37), and total ( $\beta$ , 1.16, 95% CI, 0.50, 1.81) problems, but these trajectories decreased over time. **Children with High Structural Racism and Discrimination at baseline** were the only group showing increasing trajectories of suicide attempts (OR, 1.42, 95% CI, [1.04, 1.93]) and depression ( $\beta$ , 0.19, 95% CI, 0.08, 0.29) over time. In contrast, **living in affluent communities (SDoH Pattern I)** was associated with lower rates of all internalizing and externalizing problems at baseline, but increasing trajectories of depression ( $\beta$ , 0.17, 95% CI, 0.09, 0.25), anxiety ( $\beta$ , 0.10, 95% CI, 0.02, 0.18), and withdrawal ( $\beta$ , 0.09, 95% CI, 0.01, 0.17) over time.

**Conclusions and Relevance** Multiple domains of SDoH are associated with child mental health outcomes in cross section and over time. Targeted structural interventions may improve mental health outcomes and reduce suicide attempts among children.

**Conflict of Interest Disclosures** Dr. Mann received royalties for commercial use of the C-SSRS from the Research Foundation for Mental Hygiene. Dr. Tsai receives a financial honorarium from Elsevier, Inc. for his role as Co-Editor in Chief of the journal *SSM-Mental Health*. All other authors report no conflicts of interest.

**Funding** This research is supported by grant CORONAVIRUSHUB-D-21-00125 from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

**Role of the Funder/Sponsor** The sponsor had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

## Introduction

Social determinants of health (SDoH) have an increasingly recognized influence on the disparities in child mental health and suicidal ideation and suicide attempts (SI/SAs).<sup>1–7</sup> Previous research has shown that county-level socioeconomic characteristics, such as poverty, unemployment, divorce rates, and social isolation, are associated with poorer mental health, greater rates of substance use, and higher suicide rates.<sup>3,4,8–10</sup> In particular, higher county-level poverty was associated with greater suicide rates in children aged 5 to 19 years old, compared with counties with lower poverty rates.<sup>6</sup> Rural areas had more firearm access and fewer mental health facilities and antidepressant medication prescriptions, which may contribute to rural-urban disparities in youth suicide.<sup>5,7</sup> Understanding the associations between socioeconomic and structural factors and child mental health outcomes is critical to improving precision in designing social policies and programs.

SDoH is defined by the World Health Organization as the “conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work, and age”.<sup>11,12</sup> Previous studies have tried to capture multiple SDoH by creating a composite index of contextual factors, including the Area Deprivation Index (ADI)<sup>13</sup> and Social Vulnerability Index (SVI),<sup>14</sup> and correlating these measures with other ecological measures of health (e.g., at the county or state levels).<sup>3,4,8,9</sup> However, these index-based measures fail to capture the multidimensional nature of SDoH. Most indices only contain a limited number of variables (15 variables for ADI, 17 variables for SVI) and derive data from a single source (e.g., American

Community Survey [ACS]). Driven principally by socioeconomic domains, few indices include measures that address structural racism (defined as the totality of ways in which society fosters discrimination through mutually reinforcing inequitable systems),<sup>15</sup> which may be the fundamental cause of mental health disparities.<sup>16–18</sup> In addition, few longitudinal studies existed to quantify the relationships between early childhood SDoH and subsequent trajectories of mental health.<sup>19,20</sup> Such information would be critical to informing early detection efforts to prevent mental and behavioral health problems.

This study aims to identify underlying patterns of SDoH among children using unsupervised machine learning techniques. Specifically, an SDoH pattern can be represented as a subgroup of children who have similar SDoH profiles. The premise of this manuscript is that a data-driven approach can identify meaningful SDoH patterns while addressing the heterogeneity and multicollinearity among multiple domains of SDoH. We further examine the associations between the SDoH patterns with subsequent mental health trajectories.

## Methods

### Study Design, Setting, and Population

Data were drawn from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study<sup>21</sup>. The baseline data are based on a stratified probability sample of schools from 21 metropolitan areas in the United States, from which 11 878 children were recruited in 2016-18. Children and parents completed surveys regarding their mental health, socioeconomic characteristics, and developmental outcomes. The marginal age, sex,



and race/ethnic compositions for children across the data collection sites match closely with those of the U.S., as identified in the ACS from the US Census.<sup>22</sup> More details about ABCD are described elsewhere.<sup>21</sup>

## Measures

### *Social Determinants of Health (SDoH)*

We used ABCD linked external data, which includes geocoded population-level socioeconomic and environmental datasets derived from the primary residential addresses of the participating children. Drawing from multiple conceptual frameworks, previous empirical studies, and systematic reviews,<sup>23–26</sup> we considered 84 contextual-level variables across five major areas defined by Healthy People 2030, including social and community context, economic stability, education access/quality, healthcare access/quality, and the neighborhood and built environment.<sup>11</sup> We also reviewed existing SDoH composite indices (e.g., ADI,<sup>27–29</sup> SVI,<sup>14</sup> the Opportunity Atlas [OA],<sup>30</sup> and the Child Opportunity Index [COI]<sup>31</sup>) and related literature<sup>23–26</sup> to categorize our SDoH variables into nine domains, including bias (e.g., implicit and explicit attitudes towards race, sex, sexual orientation, immigrant status), crime and drugs (county-level counts of arrests and offenses from the Uniform Crime Reporting [UCR] dataset), education (e.g., educational and social resources, early childhood centers, educational level of area residents), health access and environment (e.g., access to healthy food, green space, walkability index as determined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), household composition and disability (e.g., the proportion of persons over 65 years old, persons with disabilities, and other socioeconomically vulnerable groups), minority

status and language (e.g., percentage of residents belonging to minority populations, percentage of residents with limited English proficiency), socioeconomic status (e.g., poverty rate, unemployment rate, percentage of residents without a high-school diploma), and housing type and transportation (e.g., percentage of mobile homes, crowded housing conditions). The categorization of SDoH follows the WHO SDoH framework and measurements of multidimensional structural racism.<sup>11,12,32</sup> Detailed definitions and dimensions of SDoH can be found in **Figure 1** and **eTable 1** in the [Supplemental Online Content](#).

### *Child Mental Health Outcomes*

We used the parent/caregiver-report Child Behavioral Checklist (CBCL),<sup>33</sup> an empirically-validated and widely-used assessment, to measure children's dimensional psychopathology and adaptive functioning. We included 8 individual scales for internalizing problems (e.g., anxious, withdrawn, somatic complaints), externalizing problems (e.g., rule-breaking, aggressive behaviors), and social-behavioral problems (e.g., thoughts, social, attention); 3 summary scores (internalizing, externalizing total problems); and 6 DSM-Oriented symptom subscales (depression, anxiety, attention deficits and hyperactivity, somatic problems, oppositional behavior, and conduct problems). Raw scores on this measure were converted to *t* scores using sex- and age-based norms derived from population-based studies. A high score reflects a more severe mental health problem, with a *T* score greater than 60 representing a clinically significant disorder.<sup>34</sup> The rationale for using a parent/caregiver-report instrument for comprehensive mental health assessment has been discussed previously by the ABCD

investigators.<sup>33,35–37</sup> We used parent- and child-reported current and past suicidal ideation and suicide attempts from the Kiddie Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia-Present and Lifetime Version using the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (Fifth Edition) criteria (K-SADS-PL DSM-5).<sup>38,39</sup> Any endorsement of the 18 suicidality-related items by either parent or child was included. All of the above mental health conditions were assessed at baseline and 1- and 2-year follow-up.

### *Sociodemographic Characteristics*

Socio-demographic information about the participating children was based on parent/caregiver-reported sex, race/ethnicity (Asian, Black, Hispanic, Multi-Racial, white), parental marital status, household income, and family history of suicide and depressive disorders.

More details can be found in **Figure 1** and **eMethod 1** in the **Supplemental Online Content**.

### **Statistical analysis**

Among the 84 candidate SDoH variables, 82 are continuous variables and 2 are categorical variables. We assessed the missingness of all 84 variables and the distributions of the 82 continuous variables (see **eTable 1**). The 2 categorical variables were converted to binary variables (see **eTable 1**). Study participants with any missing values in the 84 variables were dropped from the analysis. The percentage of

missingness ranged from 5-8% for nearly all variables. All continuous variables were scaled based on their z-score.

We assumed that a given pattern of SDoH can be represented by a subgroup of individuals (i.e., children in the ABCD cohort) who have homogenous neighborhood-level profiles of SDoH. To this end, we performed a data-driven cluster analysis to derive patterns of SDoH. After data preparation, hierarchical agglomerative clustering with Euclidean distance calculation and the Ward linkage criterion<sup>40</sup> were applied to the SDoH variables. We used hierarchical agglomerative clustering because it is robust to different types of data distributions and typically produces a dendrogram that visualizes the data structure to help determine the optimal cluster number, and because it has shown promise in identifying underlying patterns from clinical profiles.<sup>41–45</sup> Besides producing the dendrogram, we calculated 14 measures of clustering models provided by ‘NbClust’ software<sup>46</sup> to determine the optimal number of clusters, i.e., patterns of SDoH. More details and rationale for these methods can be found in the **eMethods 2** and **3** in the [Supplemental Online Content](#).

To evaluate the stability and robustness of the identified patterns of SDoH, we conducted several sensitivity analyses. First, we evaluated the extent to which our findings were sensitive to dropping participants due to missing values. This sensitivity analysis included children whose SDoH variables have a missing rate of < 70% to re-identify SDoH patterns. K-nearest neighbors (KNN) imputation<sup>47</sup> was used to address missing values. Second, we evaluated sensitivity to the included data samples.

Specifically, we first split the entire cohort into 5 folds, then each time, we successively dropped 1 fold (20% children) and used the remaining 4 folds (80% children) to construct a subset.<sup>48</sup> We then re-identified SDoH patterns in each subset. In both sensitivity analyses, patterns of SDoH were re-identified using the hierarchical clustering algorithm, following the same criteria as in the primary analysis for determining the optimal number of clusters. Finally, we compared the re-identified patterns of SDoH with those identified in the primary analysis (cluster labels from primary and sensitivity analyses were aligned based on a manual review of SDoH profiles of the clusters). We then assessed the extent to which there was overlap between the patterns of SDoH produced in the primary analysis vs. the patterns produced in the sensitivity analysis.

To interpret our identified patterns of SDoH, we visualized them in two ways: 1) Based on the 84 scaled SDoH variables, we calculated 2D representations for the individuals. We visualized them in 2D space using t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding (t-SNE)<sup>49</sup>. We then visualized the identified SDoH patterns in the 2D t-SNE space (see **eMethod 4** in the [Supplemental Online Content](#)). 2) We used a chord diagram to show the SDoH characteristics of each identified pattern (see **eMethod 5** for details). We also characterized the identified SDoH patterns by evaluating their differences according to children's demographics, family mental health histories, SDoH profiles, and prevalence of mental health conditions at baseline, and 1-year and 2-year follow-up. Data were presented as median (with interquartile range [IQR] for data that are not normally distributed) or mean (with standard deviation [SD] for data that are normally distributed)

for continuous variables and exact patient number (with percentage) for categorical variables. To compare SDoH patterns, we performed analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests for continuous data and  $\chi^2$  tests for categorical data. Two-tailed P-values smaller than 0.05 were considered as the threshold for statistical significance.

We estimated the associations between each of the identified baseline patterns of SDoH and the mental health conditions. For each mental health outcome with continuous values (e.g., the CBCL scales), we fitted a linear mixed effect model for each SDoH pattern, specifying member in the SDoH pattern as the explanatory variable of interest. For each outcome with binary values (i.e., suicide attempts or suicidal ideation), we fit a mixed effect logistic regression model separately for each SDoH pattern. For each of these regression models, study site (n=21) was included as a random effect, and baseline age, sex, and race/ethnicity were included as covariates.

We further evaluated changes in mental health outcomes (trajectories) by patterns of SDoH. For each pattern of SDoH, we fitted a linear mixed effects regression model (for the CBCL scales) or a mixed effects logistic regression model (for suicide attempts and suicidal ideation) to estimate trajectories for each mental health outcome. Age was specified as the explanatory variable of interest, with random effects for individuals and study sites. Sex and race/ethnicity were also included as covariates. Statistical significance was determined by a 2-sided P value <.05.

Data management and preprocessing were conducted in Pandas 1.2.1

(<https://pandas.pydata.org>) and NumPy 1.20.1 (<https://numpy.org>) in Python 3.7.

Hierarchical clustering analysis and t-SNE were performed using SciKit-Learn 0.24

(<https://scikit-learn.org/stable/>) in Python 3.7 and NbClust in R 4.1. Chord diagrams

were created using the R package 'circlize' ([https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/circlize/index.html)

[project.org/web/packages/circlize/index.html](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/circlize/index.html)). Mixed effects regression models were

fitted using the R package 'lme4'. All other statistical analyses were conducted using R

version 4.1.

## Results

### Summary Characteristics of the Child Participants

The characteristics of the analytical sample are reported in Table 1. Of 10 504 children in the baseline sample included in this analysis (median [SD] age, 9.9 [0.6] years), 5510 [52.5%] were boys, 4994 [47.5%] were girls, 229 (2.2%) were Asian, 1468 (14.0%) were Black, 2128 (20.3%) were Hispanic, 5565 (53.0%) were white, and 1108 (10.5%) were multiracial children. Most children lived with married parents (7177, 68.3%). Nearly 26% (n = 2775) lived in families reporting an annual income of less than \$50 000. More than half (52.5%, n = 5515) had a blood relative with a history of depression, and 567 (5.4%) had a parent who attempted or died by suicide.

### Patterns of SDoH

We identified four patterns across the 84 indicators of SDoH (see **eResult 1** and **eFigures 1** and **2** in the **Supplemental Online Content**). To facilitate interpretation,

greater levels of each domain and variables indicate poorer SDoH (visualized patterns in Figure 2 and summary statistics shown in Table 1). SDoH Pattern I (Affluent Communities,  $n = 4078$ , 38.8%) was characterized by higher socioeconomic status across all domains. SDoH Pattern II (High Structural Racism and Discrimination,  $n = 2661$ , 25.3%) was characterized by the highest level of bias and discrimination toward women, sexual minorities, and immigrants while having a larger proportion of mobile homes, group quarters (institutions and other group living arrangements, such as nursing homes and military barracks), and having a higher percentage of renters (rather than homeowners). SDoH Pattern III (High Socioeconomic Deprivation,  $n = 2653$ , 25.3%) was characterized by high rates of poverty, single mothers, people with disabilities, households without a vehicle, and traffic congestions in urban areas while having low access to healthy food and healthcare facilities. SDoH Pattern IV (High Crime, Low Education, Populated,  $n = 1112$ , 10.6%) had the highest rates of crime and drug sales, crowded housing, minority populations, and air pollution, while having low access to educational resources and poor quality education, green space, and homeownership. Results of sensitivity analyses confirmed the 4-cluster structure in the data. The patterns of SDoH that were reidentified in both sensitivity analyses overlapped highly with the patterns identified in the primary analysis. More details can be found **eResults 2**, **eFigures 3** and **4** in the **Supplemental Online Content**.

### **Associations between SDoH Patterns and Baseline Child Mental Health**

Children living in **SDoH Pattern III (High Socioeconomic Deprivation)** reported significantly higher rates of baseline internalizing ( $\beta$ , 0.75, 95% CI, 0.14, 1.37),



externalizing ( $\beta$ , 1.43, 95% CI, 0.83, 2.02) and total problems ( $\beta$ , 1.16, 95% CI, 0.50, 1.81), specifically for withdrawal/depression, somatic complaints, social problems, thought problems, rule-breaking problems, and problems of aggression ( $P < .05$ , Figure 3). They were also more likely to have DSM-5 oriented depression ( $\beta$ , 0.36, 95% CI, 0.03, 0.68), somatic problems ( $\beta$ , 0.49, 95% CI, 0.11, 0.86), oppositional behaviors ( $\beta$ , 0.40, 95% CI, 0.10, 0.71) and conduct problems ( $\beta$ , 0.96, 95% CI, 0.64, 1.27). Children from SDoH Pattern II (High Structural Racism and Discrimination) also reported more somatic complaints ( $\beta$ , 0.41, 95% CI, 0.05, 0.77), thought problems ( $\beta$ , 0.36, 95% CI, 0.02, 0.70) and DSM-5 oriented somatic problems ( $\beta$ , 0.49, 95% CI, 0.11, 0.86), but did not have higher CBCL composite scores. Children who lived in affluent communities (SDoH Pattern I) had lower rates of all internalizing and externalizing problems, except for the anxious/depressed syndrome, and were the only group less likely to report suicide attempts (Odds Ratio [OR], -0.39, 95% CI, -0.76, -0.02).

### **Associations between SDoH Patterns and Child Mental Health Trajectories over Follow-Up**

We found evidence of disparities in child mental health trajectories according to the different patterns of SDoH (Figure 4). Over time, children belonging to the SDoH Pattern II (High Structural Racism and Discrimination) group had increasing trajectories of DSM-5 oriented depression ( $\beta$ , 0.19, 95% CI, 0.08, 0.29) and the highest scores in internalizing problems, total problems, anxiety/depression, withdrawal/depression, somatic complaints, thought problems, attention problems, DSM-5 oriented anxiety disorders, ADHD, somatic problems, and suicidal behaviors. This group was the only

group with an increasing trajectory of suicide attempts over time (OR, 1.42, 95% CI, [1.04, 1.93]).

Despite having lower rates of mental health problems at baseline, children living in **affluent communities (SDoH I)** had increasing trajectories of DSM-5 oriented depression ( $\beta$ , 0.17, 95% CI, 0.09, 0.25), DSM-5 oriented anxiety ( $\beta$ , 0.10, 95% CI, 0.02, 0.18), and withdrawal/depression ( $\beta$ , 0.09, 95% CI, 0.01, 0.17). On the other hand, their trajectories of suicidal ideation were decreasing over time (OR, 0.84, 95% CI, 0.77, 0.92). Children belonging to the **SDoH III (High Socioeconomic Deprivation)** group exhibited a contrasting pattern, with high levels of mental health problems at baseline but decreasing trajectories in all mental health measures, including internalizing problems ( $\beta$ , -0.52, 95% CI, -0.71, -0.34), externalizing problems ( $\beta$ , -0.57, 95% CI, -0.75, -0.40), total problems ( $\beta$ , -0.75, 95% CI, -0.94, -0.57), and their subscales, as well as all DSM-5 oriented scales (e.g., anxiety, ADHD, somatic problems, oppositional behavior, and conduct problems,  $P < .05$ ) except for DSM-5 oriented depression. Children belonging to the **SDoH IV (High Crime, Low Education, Populated)** group had increasing but nonsignificant trajectories of suicidal ideation over time.

## Discussion

Using data from a large, nationally representative panel study of children in the U.S., we used machine learning to derive 4 patterns of SDoH summarizing 84 different population-level socioeconomic and environmental variables. These patterns of SDoH were multidimensional, and differed in their levels of discrimination, crime and drugs,

education, health and environment, family type and disability, housing and transportation, minority status and language, socioeconomic status, and urbanization. The clustering technique we used differs from other groupings methods, which have been restricted by a pre-defined threshold, have typically been restricted to a single domain of SDoH, or have relied on substantive knowledge about multiple domains.<sup>50</sup> Importantly, our analysis revealed heterogeneity in the extent to which children are exposed to SDoH, as well as differential associations with mental health trajectories over follow-up. This information has important implications for screening, identification of child mental health problems, and intervention to prevent child mental health problems earlier in the life course. SDoH can be identified through publicly available datasets linked to the residential histories, and can potentially be useful in guiding early detection and treatment. Targeted social and public policies are needed to buffer children against the adverse effects of these social and structural influences on their mental health and development.<sup>51</sup>

Children living in **SDoH Pattern III (High Socioeconomic Deprivation)** show greater internalizing, externalizing, total problems, and their subscales at baseline. This is consistent with prior cross-sectional studies on the associations between deprivation and worse child mental health outcomes.<sup>52–54</sup> Our findings strengthen existing knowledge by demonstrating the decreasing longitudinal trajectories between child mental health and area-level socioeconomic deprivation. During COVID-19, there were strong associations between area deprivation and greater stress among children.<sup>55</sup> Early and comprehensive poverty alleviation programs can be promising tools to reduce

the disparities in mental illness between children living in deprived areas and their better-off peers.<sup>56</sup> Further investigations are needed to address the causal mechanisms linking socioeconomic deprivation and child mental health. It is important to evaluate the relative contributions of economic deprivations and individual family profiles (e.g., adverse childhood experiences, parental alcohol addictions, single-parent families). Additionally, children in SDoH Pattern III may also build up resilience in the long term, and exploring the protective factors against living in deprived areas is important to inform policy targets.<sup>57</sup>

Children living in **SDoH Pattern II (High Structural Racism and Discrimination)** had a notable risk of increasing suicide attempts trajectories, compared to the other SDoH Pattern. This is consistent with recent studies demonstrating the adverse impact of structural racism and perceived discrimination on child suicidal behaviors.<sup>58,58</sup> **SDoH Pattern II** is also associated with greater trajectories of DSM-5 depression diagnosis. Our results are the first attempts to empirically support Krieger's ecosocial theory of disease distribution in a child cohort, which describes how living in high structural racism and sexism contexts could embody mental illness towards minoritized populations in the life course.<sup>59–61</sup> We found high-structural racism contexts as an important SDoH factor. Mental health providers should be aware of structural discrimination's detrimental effect on childhood mental health.<sup>55,62,62,63</sup> These results shed led to new insights into multi-level policies and clinical interventions to reduce bias, stigma, and racism at the contextual level to improve child mental health.

Nearly 40% of the child samples were in **SDoH Pattern I (Affluent Communities)**.

While they reported lower proportions and risks of most mental illnesses, they were the only group exhibiting increasing trajectories of DSM-5-oriented depression, anxiety, and withdrawn/depression syndrome. The high prevalence of anxiety disorders was similar to previous reports conducted among affluent, urban child samples in Britain<sup>64,65</sup> and Brazil.<sup>66</sup> Our findings addressed special attention to depression and anxiety among children from affluent communities, which may be derived from their academic and interpersonal stressors.<sup>67–69</sup> Importantly, during the COVID-19, the pressures on academic performance and pandemic-related stressors may be special risks for adverse mental illness among children, even if they live in affluent communities.<sup>70</sup>

Universal mental health screening, as recommended by the US Surgeon General,<sup>71</sup> is important for all children to address the current mental health crisis, regardless of their families' socioeconomic status.<sup>72</sup> **SDoH Pattern IV (High Crime, Low Education, Populated)** did not show significant associations with child mental illness at the baseline. However, they reported increasing suicidal ideation trajectories. Recent community-based studies, mostly cross-sectional and among adults, have found emerging associations between area-level violent crime rates and suicide death rates.<sup>73,74</sup> Our study is one of the first to demonstrate the longitudinal associations between high-crime exposure and suicidal ideation among pre-adolescent children.

## **Strengths and Limitations**

The strengths of our study include the use of data-driven techniques to identify underlying patterns of SDoH across wide-ranging, multidimensional indicators in a

large, population-based, longitudinal sample of children. Our measures of child mental health outcomes are comprehensive and consistent with the DSM-5.<sup>33,35</sup> However, interpretation of our findings is also subjective to several limitations. First, all mental health measures were based on self-report. We included parent-report assessments for CBCL, measured annually, to capture the mental health trajectories over time, but potential discrepancies between the reporting of the children and parents remain.<sup>75</sup> Second, the ABCD sample is not nationally representative, although it covers 17 states across 21 study sites. Third, our data on the SDoH were limited by what is available in the ABCD-linked external data. This is not expected to be a significant limitation given that we included 9 different domains following influential theoretical frameworks<sup>12,25,55,76</sup> and our previous empirical results based on the ABCD data.<sup>55</sup> As more SDoH variables become available to investigators, further probing of the reproducibility of our findings is warranted. Fourth, missing data were common for some variables included in the clustering models. We used a complete-case analysis, but sensitivity analyses showed similar results when excluding only variables with a high degree of missingness.

## Conclusion

Our study provides an innovative way to understand the complex linkages between contextual socioeconomic/environmental variables and child mental health. Modeling the underlying patterns of SDoH – rather than using a single composite deprivation index – may better capture the complexity and spatial heterogeneity of SDoH, and also improve our understanding of their unique relationships with child mental health and suicidal ideation and behaviors. The identified SDoH can potentially contribute to

screening efforts to improve the early detection and treatment of mental health problems. The study findings also suggest that policymakers can improve equity in mental health and service utilization through the use of targeted social and economic legislation and other policies,<sup>51</sup> such as those targeting economic development, job security, food security, and education, which can potentially reduce rates of externalizing problems among children living in socioeconomically deprived areas.<sup>77</sup> Yet children in affluent communities with access to economic and healthcare resources also have worsening trajectories of depression and anxiety. Our novel approach using machine learning algorithm to identify patterns of SDoH provides actionable information that key stakeholders can use when designing and targeting interventions.

## Reference

1. Xiao Y, Cerel J, Mann JJ. Temporal Trends in Suicidal Ideation and Attempts Among US Adolescents by Sex and Race/Ethnicity, 1991-2019. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(6):e2113513-e2113513. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.13513
2. Rockett IRH, Jia H, Ali B, et al. Association of State Social and Environmental Factors With Rates of Self-injury Mortality and Suicide in the United States. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(2):e2146591. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.46591
3. Steelesmith DL, Fontanella CA, Campo JV, Bridge JA, Warren KL, Root ED. Contextual factors associated with county-level suicide rates in the United States, 1999 to 2016. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(9):e1910936-e1910936. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.10936
4. Suk R, Hong YR, Wasserman RM, et al. Analysis of Suicide After Cancer Diagnosis by US County-Level Income and Rural vs Urban Designation, 2000-2016. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(10):e2129913. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.29913
5. Graves JM, Abshire DA, Mackelprang JL, Amiri S, Beck A. Association of Rurality With Availability of Youth Mental Health Facilities With Suicide Prevention Services in the US. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(10):e2021471. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.21471



6. Hoffmann JA, Farrell CA, Monuteaux MC, Fleegler EW, Lee LK. Association of Pediatric Suicide With County-Level Poverty in the United States, 2007-2016. *JAMA Pediatr.* 2020;174(3):287-294. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2019.5678
7. Spark TL, Wright-Kelly E, Ma M, James KA, Reid CE, Brooks-Russell A. Assessment of Rural-Urban and Geospatial Differences in Perceived Handgun Access and Reported Suicidality Among Youth in Colorado. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021;4(10):e2127816. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.27816
8. Venkataramani AS, Bair EF, O'Brien RL, Tsai AC. Association between automotive assembly plant closures and opioid overdose mortality in the United States: a difference-in-differences analysis. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2020;180(2):254-262.
9. Duncan SC, Duncan TE, Strycker LA. A multilevel analysis of neighborhood context and youth alcohol and drug problems. *Prev Sci.* 2002;3(2):125-133.
10. Yildiz M, Demirhan E, Gurbuz S. Contextual socioeconomic disadvantage and adolescent suicide attempts: a multilevel investigation. *J Youth Adolesc.* 2019;48(4):802-814.
11. CDC. About Social Determinants of Health (SDOH). Published March 10, 2021. Accessed April 17, 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/about.html>
12. WHO. Social determinants of health. Published 2022. Accessed April 21, 2022. <https://www.who.int/health-topics/social-determinants-of-health>

13. Kind AJH, Buckingham WR. Making Neighborhood-Disadvantage Metrics Accessible — The Neighborhood Atlas. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(26):2456-2458.  
doi:10.1056/NEJMp1802313
  
14. Flanagan BE, Gregory EW, Hallisey EJ, Heitgerd JL, Lewis B. A social vulnerability index for disaster management. *J Homel Secur Emerg Manag*. 2011;8(1).
  
15. Krieger N. Questioning epidemiology: objectivity, advocacy, and socially responsible science. *Am J Public Health*. 1999;89(8):1151-1153.
  
16. Johnson TJ. Intersection of Bias, Structural Racism, and Social Determinants With Health Care Inequities. *Pediatrics*. 2020;146(2). doi:10.1542/peds.2020-003657
  
17. Razai MS, Majeed A, Esmail A. Structural racism is a fundamental cause and driver of ethnic disparities in health. *BMJ*. Published online April 12, 2021:n938.  
doi:10.1136/bmj.n938
  
18. Slopen N, Heard-Garris N. Structural Racism and Pediatric Health—A Call for Research to Confront the Origins of Racial Disparities in Health. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2022;176(1):13. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.3594
  
19. Paradies Y, Ben J, Denson N, et al. Racism as a Determinant of Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Hills RK, ed. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10(9):e0138511. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0138511

20. Ribeiro WS, Bauer A, Andrade MCR, et al. Income inequality and mental illness-related morbidity and resilience: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2017;4(7):554-562. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30159-1
21. ABCD Research Consortium. Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study (ABCD) - Annual Release 4.0 #1299. doi:10.15154/1523041
22. US Census Bureau. American Community Survey (ACS). Census.gov. Published 2022. Accessed April 21, 2022. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs>
23. Solar O, Irwin A. *A Conceptual Framework for Action on the Social Determinants of Health*. WHO Document Production Services; 2010. doi:10.13016/17cr-aqb9
24. Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative. A public health framework for reducing health inequities. BARHII. Published 2015. Accessed April 17, 2022. <https://www.barhii.org/barhii-framework>
25. Hammond G, Joynt Maddox KE. A Theoretical Framework for Clinical Implementation of Social Determinants of Health. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2019;4(12):1189-1190. doi:10.1001/jamacardio.2019.3805
26. Koh HK. A 2020 Vision for Healthy People. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(18):1653-1656. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1001601
27. Singh GK, Siahpush M. Increasing inequalities in all-cause and cardiovascular mortality among US adults aged 25–64 years by area socioeconomic status, 1969–1998. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2002;31(3):600-613. doi:10.1093/ije/31.3.600

28. Singh GK. Area Deprivation and Widening Inequalities in US Mortality, 1969–1998. *Am J Public Health*. 2003;93(7):1137-1143. doi:10.2105/AJPH.93.7.1137
  
29. Singh GK, Azuine RE, Siahpush M, Kogan MD. All-Cause and Cause-Specific Mortality among US Youth: Socioeconomic and Rural–Urban Disparities and International Patterns. *J Urban Health*. 2013;90(3):388-405. doi:10.1007/s11524-012-9744-0
  
30. Chetty R, Friedman JN, Hendren N, Jones MR, Porter SR. *The Opportunity Atlas: Mapping the Childhood Roots of Social Mobility*. National Bureau of Economic Research; 2018. doi:10.3386/w25147
  
31. Acevedo-Garcia D, McArdle N, Hardy EF, et al. The Child Opportunity Index: Improving Collaboration Between Community Development And Public Health. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2014;33(11):1948-1957. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0679
  
32. Adkins-Jackson PB, Chantarat T, Bailey ZD, Ponce NA. Measuring Structural Racism: A Guide for Epidemiologists and Other Health Researchers. *Am J Epidemiol*. Published online September 25, 2021:kwab239. doi:10.1093/aje/kwab239
  
33. Achenbach TM. *The Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA): Development, Findings, Theory, and Applications*. University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families; 2009.

34. Achenbach TM, McConaughy SH, Howell CT. Child/adolescent behavioral and emotional problems: implications of cross-informant correlations for situational specificity. *Psychol Bull.* 1987;101(2):213.
  
35. Barch DM, Albaugh MD, Baskin-Sommers A, et al. Demographic and mental health assessments in the adolescent brain and cognitive development study: Updates and age-related trajectories. *Dev Cogn Neurosci.* 2021;52:101031.  
doi:10.1016/j.dcn.2021.101031
  
36. Barch DM, Albaugh MD, Avenevoli S, et al. Demographic, physical and mental health assessments in the adolescent brain and cognitive development study: Rationale and description. *Dev Cogn Neurosci.* 2018;32:55-66.
  
37. Karcher NR, Barch DM. The ABCD study: understanding the development of risk for mental and physical health outcomes. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2021;46(1):131-142.
  
38. Kaufman J, Birmaher B, Brent D, et al. Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Age Children-Present and Lifetime Version (K-SADS-PL): initial reliability and validity data. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 1997;36(7):980-988. doi:10.1097/00004583-199707000-00021
  
39. Townsend L, Kobak K, Kearney C, et al. Development of Three Web-Based Computerized Versions of the Kiddie Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia Child Psychiatric Diagnostic Interview: Preliminary Validity Data. *J*

*Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2020;59(2):309-325.

doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2019.05.009

40. Murtagh F, Legendre P. Ward's hierarchical agglomerative clustering method: which algorithms implement Ward's criterion? *J Classif.* 2014;31(3):274-295.
41. Su C, Zhang Y, Flory JH, et al. Clinical subphenotypes in COVID-19: derivation, validation, prediction, temporal patterns, and interaction with social determinants of health. *Npj Digit Med.* 2021;4(1):110. doi:10.1038/s41746-021-00481-w
42. Su C, Tong J, Wang F. Mining genetic and transcriptomic data using machine learning approaches in Parkinson's disease. *Npj Park Dis.* 2020;6(1):1-10. doi:10.1038/s41531-020-00127-w
43. Su C, Xu Z, Hoffman K, et al. Identifying organ dysfunction trajectory-based subphenotypes in critically ill patients with COVID-19. *Sci Rep.* 2021;11(1):15872. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-95431-7
44. Xiao Y, Lindsey MA. Racial/ethnic, sex, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic disparities in suicidal trajectories and mental health treatment among adolescents transitioning to young adulthood in the USA: a population-based cohort study. *Adm Policy Ment Health Ment Health Serv Res.* Published online 2021:1-15.
45. Xiao Y, Lindsey MA. Adolescent social networks matter for suicidal trajectories: disparities across race/ethnicity, sex, sexual identity, and socioeconomic status. *Psychol Med.* Published online 2021:1-12.

46. Charrad M, Ghazzali N, Boiteau V, Niknafs A. NbClust: an R package for determining the relevant number of clusters in a data set. *J Stat Softw.* 2014;61:1-36.
47. Troyanskaya O, Cantor M, Sherlock G, et al. Missing value estimation methods for DNA microarrays. *Bioinformatics.* 2001;17(6):520-525.
48. Brendel M, Su C, Hou Y, Henchcliffe C, Wang F. Comprehensive subtyping of Parkinson's disease patients with similarity fusion: a case study with BioFIND data. *Npj Park Dis.* 2021;7(1):1-9. doi:10.1038/s41531-021-00228-0
49. Van der Maaten L, Hinton G. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *J Mach Learn Res.* 2008;9(11).
50. Zhang Y, Khullar D, Wang F, et al. Socioeconomic variation in characteristics, outcomes, and healthcare utilization of COVID-19 patients in New York City. Lazzeri C, ed. *PLOS ONE.* 2021;16(7):e0255171. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0255171
51. Venkataramani AS, O'Brien R, Tsai AC. Declining Life Expectancy in the United States: The Need for Social Policy as Health Policy. *JAMA.* 2021;325(7):621-622. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.26339
52. Deighton J, Lereya ST, Casey P, Patalay P, Humphrey N, Wolpert M. Prevalence of mental health problems in schools: poverty and other risk factors among 28 000 adolescents in England. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2019;215(3):565-567. doi:10.1192/bjp.2019.19

53. Patalay P, Moulton V, Goodman A, Ploubidis GB. Cross-Domain Symptom Development Typologies and Their Antecedents: Results From the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2017;56(9):765-776.e2.  
doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2017.06.009
54. Ziebold C, Evans-Lacko S, Andrade MCR, et al. Childhood poverty and mental health disorders in early adulthood: evidence from a Brazilian cohort study. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. Published online December 2, 2021.  
doi:10.1007/s00787-021-01923-2
55. Xiao Y, Yip PSF, Pathak J, Mann JJ. Association of Social Determinants of Health and Vaccinations With Child Mental Health During the COVID-19 Pandemic in the US. *JAMA Psychiatry*. Published online April 27, 2022.  
doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.0818
56. Zaneva M, Guzman-Holst C, Reeves A, Bowes L. The Impact of Monetary Poverty Alleviation Programs on Children's and Adolescents' Mental Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Across Low-, Middle-, and High-Income Countries. *J Adolesc Health*. Published online April 13, 2022.  
doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2022.02.011
57. Ungar M, Theron L. Resilience and mental health: how multisystemic processes contribute to positive outcomes. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2020;7(5):441-448.  
doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(19)30434-1



58. Nagata JM, Ganson KT, Sajjad OM, Benabou SE, Bibbins-Domingo K. Prevalence of Perceived Racism and Discrimination Among US Children Aged 10 and 11 Years: The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study. *JAMA Pediatr.* 2021;175(8):861-863. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.1022
  
59. Krieger N. *Ecosocial Theory, Embodied Truths, and the People's Health*. Oxford University Press; 2021.
  
60. Krieger N. Measures of Racism, Sexism, Heterosexism, and Gender Binarism for Health Equity Research: From Structural Injustice to Embodied Harm—An Ecosocial Analysis. *Annu Rev Public Health.* 2020;41(1):37-62. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040119-094017
  
61. Krieger N. Methods for the Scientific Study of Discrimination and Health: An Ecosocial Approach. *Am J Public Health.* 2012;102(5):936-944. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300544
  
62. Bailey ZD, Feldman JM, Bassett MT. How Structural Racism Works — Racist Policies as a Root Cause of U.S. Racial Health Inequities. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;384(8):768-773. doi:10.1056/NEJMms2025396
  
63. Bailey ZD, Krieger N, Agénor M, Graves J, Linos N, Bassett MT. Structural racism and health inequities in the USA: evidence and interventions. *The Lancet.* 2017;389(10077):1453-1463.

64. Ford T, Goodman R, Meltzer H. The British Child and Adolescent Mental Health Survey 1999: The Prevalence of DSM-IV Disorders. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2003;42(10):1203-1211. doi:10.1097/00004583-200310000-00011
65. Meltzer H, Gatward R, Goodman R, Ford T. Mental health of children and adolescents in Great Britain. *Int Rev Psychiatry*. 2003;15(1-2):185-187. doi:10.1080/0954026021000046155
66. Fleitlich-Bilyk B, Goodman R. Prevalence of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Disorders in Southeast Brazil. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2004;43(6):727-734. doi:10.1097/01.chi.0000120021.14101.ca
67. Xiao Y, Romanelli M, Lindsey MA. A latent class analysis of health lifestyles and suicidal behaviors among US adolescents. *J Affect Disord*. 2019;255:116-126. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2019.05.031
68. Kim SY, Kim HR, Park B, Choi HG. Comparison of stress and suicide-related behaviors among Korean youths before and during the CoViD-19 pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(12):e2136137-e2136137.
69. Rotenstein LS, Ramos MA, Torre M, et al. Prevalence of Depression, Depressive Symptoms, and Suicidal Ideation Among Medical Students: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JAMA*. 2016;316(21):2214-2236. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.17324
70. Zhang L, Zhang D, Fang J, Wan Y, Tao F, Sun Y. Assessment of mental health of Chinese primary school students before and after school closing and opening

during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(9):e2021482-e2021482.

71. U.S. Surgeon General. *U.S. Surgeon General Issues Advisory on Youth Mental Health Crisis Further Exposed by COVID-19 Pandemic.*; 2021. Accessed December 26, 2021. <https://www.hhs.gov/about/news/2021/12/07/us-surgeon-general-issues-advisory-on-youth-mental-health-crisis-further-exposed-by-covid-19-pandemic.html>
72. Guo S, Jhe GB. Universal Depression Screening in Schools—Promises and Challenges in Addressing Adolescent Mental Health Need. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(11):e2132858-e2132858.
73. Finegan M, Firth N, Delgadillo J. Adverse impact of neighbourhood socioeconomic deprivation on psychological treatment outcomes: the role of area-level income and crime. *Psychother Res*. 2020;30(4):546-554. doi:10.1080/10503307.2019.1649500
74. Weisburd D, Cave B, Nelson M, et al. Mean Streets and Mental Health: Depression and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder at Crime Hot Spots. *Am J Community Psychol*. 2018;61(3-4):285-295. doi:10.1002/ajcp.12232
75. Janiri D, Doucet GE, Pompili M, et al. Risk and protective factors for childhood suicidality: a US population-based study. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2020;7(4):317-326. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30049-3

76. Shim RS, Compton MT. Addressing the Social Determinants of Mental Health: If Not Now, When? If Not Us, Who? *Psychiatr Serv*. 2018;69(8):844-846.  
doi:10.1176/appi.ps.201800060
77. Paquin V, Muckle G, Bolanis D, et al. Longitudinal Trajectories of Food Insecurity in Childhood and Their Associations With Mental Health and Functioning in Adolescence. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(12):e2140085.  
doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.40085

**Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of the Study Cohort and the Four Identified Social Determinants of Health Patterns**

Characteristics	All	SDoH Patterns				P value <sup>c</sup>
		SDoH Pattern I: Affluent Communities	SDoH Pattern II: High Structural Racism and Discrimination	SDoH Pattern III: High Socioeconomic Deprivation	SDoH Pattern IV: High Crime, Low Education, Populated	
	n = 10 504	n = 4078	n = 2661	n = 2653	n = 1112	-
<b>Demographics</b>						
Age, yr, mean (SD)	9.9 (0.6)	9.9 (0.6)	9.9 (0.6)	9.9 (0.6)	9.9 (0.6)	<0.001
Sex female, No. (%)	4994 (47.5)	1907 (46.8)	1250 (47.0)	1288 (48.5)	549 (49.4)	0.29
Parents' education (< Bachelor), No (%)	4176 (39.8)	766 (18.8)	981 (36.9)	1754 (66.1)	675 (60.7)	0.01
Race and ethnicity, No (%)						
Asian	229 (2.2)	141 (3.5)	15 (0.6)	19 (0.7)	54 (4.9)	
Black	1468 (14.0)	178 (4.4)	219 (8.2)	999 (37.7)	72 (6.5)	
Hispanic	2128 (20.3)	449 (11.0)	246 (9.2)	760 (28.6)	673 (60.5)	<0.001
Multi-Racial	1108 (10.5)	416 (10.2)	291 (10.9)	297 (11.2)	104 (9.4)	
White	5565 (53.0)	2890 (70.9)	1889 (71.0)	577 (21.7)	209 (18.8)	
Parents' marital status, No (%)						
Married	7177 (68.3)	3306 (81.1)	2035 (76.5)	1179 (44.4)	657 (59.1)	
Single parent	2651 (25.2)	647 (15.9)	501 (18.8)	1181 (44.5)	322 (29.0)	<0.001
Living with partner	597 (5.7)	119 (2.9)	115 (4.3)	251 (9.5)	112 (10.1)	
Household Income, No (%)						
< \$50 000 per year	2776 (26.4)	382 (9.4)	588 (22.1)	1356 (51.1)	450 (40.5)	
\$50 000 - \$100 000 per year	2775 (26.4)	978 (24.0)	966 (36.3)	606 (22.8)	225 (20.2)	<0.001
>\$100 000 per year	4082 (38.9)	2480 (60.8)	969 (36.4)	351 (13.2)	282 (25.4)	
<b>Family history</b>						
Blood relative has suicide history, No (%)	2005 (19.1)	754 (18.5)	585 (22.0)	502 (18.9)	164 (14.7)	<0.001
Blood relative has depression, No (%)	5515 (52.5)	2242 (55.0)	1589 (59.7)	1261 (47.5)	423 (38.0)	<0.001
Either parent with alcohol problem, No (%)	1519 (14.5)	546 (13.4)	388 (14.6)	429 (16.2)	156 (14.0)	0.012
Either parent with drug use problem, No (%)	3091 (29.4)	1161 (28.5)	890 (33.4)	809 (30.5)	231 (20.8)	<0.001
Either parent with depression problem, No (%)	1119 (10.7)	301 (7.4)	317 (11.9)	391 (14.7)	110 (9.9)	<0.001
"Either parent been to a doctor or counselor due to emotional/mental problem, No (%)	4032 (38.4)	1725 (42.3)	1135 (42.7)	892 (33.6)	280 (25.2)	<0.001
Either parent attempted or committed died by suicide, No (%)	567 (5.4)	166 (4.1)	174 (6.5)	174 (6.6)	53 (4.8)	<0.001
<b>Mental Health Outcomes<sup>a</sup></b>						
CBCL Anxious/Depressed, mean (SD)	53.46 (5.91)	53.29 (5.69)	53.95 (6.56)	53.36 (5.72)	53.13 (5.40)	<0.001
CBCL Withdrawn/Depressed, mean (SD)	53.47 (5.72)	53.06 (5.20)	53.62 (5.93)	54.01 (6.24)	53.30 (5.54)	<0.001
CBCL Somatic Complaints, mean (SD)	54.89 (6.04)	54.42 (5.68)	55.44 (6.37)	55.18 (6.16)	54.61 (6.05)	<0.001
CBCL Social Problems, mean (SD)	52.76 (4.68)	52.26 (4.20)	52.93 (4.91)	53.40 (5.15)	52.58 (4.37)	<0.001
CBCL Thought Problems, mean (SD)	53.77 (5.86)	53.45 (5.48)	54.39 (6.28)	54.08 (6.27)	52.76 (4.86)	<0.001
CBCL Attention Problems, mean (SD)	53.86 (6.11)	53.41 (5.69)	54.21 (6.43)	54.45 (6.56)	53.31 (5.51)	<0.001
CBCL Rule-Breaking Behaviors, mean (SD)	52.74 (4.83)	52.11 (4.13)	52.80 (4.77)	53.79 (5.80)	52.39 (4.38)	<0.001
CBCL Aggressive Behaviors, mean (SD)	52.79 (5.46)	52.34 (4.87)	53.05 (5.70)	53.39 (6.16)	52.39 (4.94)	<0.001

CBCL Externalizing Problems, mean (SD)	48.43 (10.59)	47.78 (10.24)	49.43 (10.78)	48.70 (10.83)	47.74 (10.58)	<0.001
CBCL Internalizing Problems, mean (SD)	45.68 (10.27)	44.52 (9.77)	46.43 (10.21)	47.08 (10.96)	44.80 (9.91)	<0.001
CBCL Total Problems, mean (SD)	45.81 (11.26)	44.67 (10.75)	46.98 (11.10)	46.94 (11.95)	44.52 (11.20)	<0.001
CBCL DSM-5 Depression, mean (SD)	53.58 (5.68)	53.23 (5.28)	53.97 (6.10)	53.85 (5.94)	53.26 (5.34)	<0.001
CBCL DSM-5 Anxiety Disorders, mean (SD)	53.46 (6.06)	53.14 (5.61)	53.96 (6.71)	53.58 (6.18)	53.12 (5.64)	<0.001
CBCL DSM-5 ADHD, mean (SD)	53.20 (5.60)	52.74 (5.27)	53.53 (5.78)	53.78 (6.04)	52.69 (5.04)	<0.001
CBCL DSM-5 Somatic Problems, mean (SD)	55.48 (6.61)	55.01 (6.31)	56.12 (6.93)	55.73 (6.67)	55.08 (6.57)	<0.001
CBCL DSM-5 Opposition Behaviors, mean (SD)	53.45 (5.36)	53.15 (5.08)	53.74 (5.56)	53.77 (5.65)	53.09 (5.11)	<0.001
CBCL DSM-5 Conduct Problems, mean (SD)	52.97 (5.44)	52.30 (4.67)	53.20 (5.60)	54.04 (6.39)	52.36 (4.65)	<0.001
Suicidal Behaviors, No (%) <sup>b</sup>						
Suicide Attempt	161 (1.5)	43 (1.1)	42 (1.6)	57 (2.1)	19 (1.7)	0.004
Suicide Ideation	1308 (12.5)	515 (12.6)	348 (13.1)	318 (12.0)	127 (11.4)	0.45


Abbreviations: ADHD, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder; CBCL, Child Behavior Checklist; DSM-5, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition; SD, standard deviation; SDoH, social determinants of health.

<sup>a</sup> CBCL was used to assess children's internalizing problems (e.g., anxious, withdrawn, somatic complaints), externalizing problems (e.g., rule-breaking, aggressive behaviors), and three social-behavioral problems (e.g., thoughts, social, attention) according to parent or caregiver reports. We also included the CBCL DSM-Oriented symptom subscales for depression, anxiety, ADHD; somatic problems, opposition behaviors, and conduct problems. Raw scores on this measure were converted to t scores, with a t score greater than 60 representing a clinically significant disorder.

<sup>b</sup> Suicidal behaviors (suicide attempts and suicide ideation) were aggregation of parent- and child-reported outcomes.

<sup>c</sup> Comparisons across all 4 SDoH patterns were performed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for continuous variables and  $\chi^2$  test for categorical variables. Two-tailed *P*-values smaller than 0.05 were considered as the threshold for statistical significance.


## Figures



**Figure 1. Study pipeline<sup>a</sup>**

Abbreviations: SDoH, social determinants of health. CBCL, Child Behavior Checklist; DSM-5, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition.

<sup>a</sup>We first collected 84 neighborhood-level SDoH variables from 9 domains for children in the ABCD cohort. After necessary data pre-processing, we performed clustering analysis to identify SDoH patterns. We performed sensitivity analyses to evaluate the reproducibility of the SDoH patterns. Finally, we estimated cross-sectional associations between SDoH patterns and children's mental health at baseline and longitudinal mental health trajectories by SDoH patterns.




**Figure 2. Characteristics of the identified social determinants of health (SDoH) patterns<sup>a</sup>**

<sup>a</sup>**A.** Chord diagrams showing differences in SDoH profiles across the 9 domains of the identified SDoH patterns. The width of a ribbon represents the proportion to the extent of disadvantaged status in a specific SDoH domain of a specific SDoH pattern. In other words, a broader ribbon between a SDoH pattern and a SDoH domain means the SDoH pattern has more disadvantaged status in the SDoH domain, compared to others. **B.** Geographic distributions of the SDoH patterns. Specifically, each pie indicates a specific site in the ABCD study, and the size of pie is proportional to the number of participants recruited from each site.

Abbreviations: FTD, family type and disability; H&E, health and environment; H&T, housing and transportation; M&L, minority and language. SDoH, social determinants of health; SES, socioeconomic status.






**Figure 3. Forest plot showing associations between the identified social determinants of health (SDoH) patterns and mental health outcomes<sup>a</sup>**

Abbreviations: ADHD, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder; CBCL, Child Behavior Checklist; DSM-5, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition.

<sup>a</sup>For outcomes in CBCL symptom scales (continuous),  $\beta$  (95% CI) and  $P$  values are based on linear mixed effect regressions analyses, adjusting for baseline age, sex, and race/ethnicity and including a random-effects term to account for within-site clustering; for suicidal behavior outcomes (binary),  $\beta$  (95% CI) and  $P$  values are based on was estimated based on mixed effect

logistic regressions analyses, adjusting for baseline age, sex, and race/ethnicity and including a random-effects term to account for within-site clustering.



**Figure 4. Estimated mental health trajectories by social determinants of health (SDoH) patterns<sup>a</sup>**

Abbreviations: ADHD, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder; CBCL, Child Behavior Checklist; DSM-5, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition.

<sup>a</sup>For outcomes in CBCL symptom scales (continuous),  $\beta$  (95% CI) and  $P$  values are based on linear mixed effect regressions analyses, adjusting for baseline age, sex, and race/ethnicity and including a random-effects term to account for within-site clustering; for suicidal behavior outcomes (binary),  $\beta$  (95% CI) and  $P$  values are based on was estimated based on mixed effect logistic regressions analyses, adjusting for baseline age, sex, and race/ethnicity and including a random-effects term to account for within-site clustering.