

1 **Depression, Anxiety, Somatic symptom and their determinants**
2 **among High School and Preparatory School Adolescents in Gondar**
3 **Town, Northwest Ethiopia, 2022.****Non-recursive Structural Equation**
4 **Modeling.**

5 Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher^{1*}, Rediet Eristu², Ayenew Molla²

6 ¹ Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Asrat Woldeyes Health
7 Science Campus, Debre Birhan University, Debre Birhan, Ethiopia

8 ² Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Institute of Public Health, College of Medicine
9 and Health Sciences, University of Gondar, Gondar, Ethiopia

10 * Corresponding author

11 Email: zenebeabe7054@gmail.com (ZA)

12 **Abstract**

13 **Introduction:** In Developing Countries including Ethiopia, mental health is not only a public
14 concern; but also a developmental issue. Depression and anxiety are the commonest mental
15 health disorders and often somatic symptoms co-exist with them. Adolescents with common
16 mental health problems are associated with increased risk of suicide, future unemployment, and
17 poor quality of life. Little is known about the mental health of adolescents in the Ethiopia. Thus,
18 this study aimed to assess the magnitude and determinants of depression, anxiety, and somatic
19 symptoms among high school and preparatory school adolescents in Gondar town.

20 **Methods**

21 Institution based cross-sectional study was conducted from June 8 to 24, 2022. Two-stage
22 stratified random sampling was used to select 1407 high school and preparatory school
23 adolescents in Gondar town. Data were collected through structured and standard self-
24 administered questionnaires. STATA version 16 and AMOS version 21 were used for analysis.
25 Non-recursive structural equation modeling was employed to assess the direct, indirect, and total
26 effects of the predictors. Degree of relationship was interpreted based on adjusted regression
27 coefficients with corresponding 95% confidence interval.

28 **Results**

29 Magnitude of anxiety, depression, and somatic symptoms were 25.05% (95%CI: 22.8, 27.5),
30 28.21 (95% CI: 25.8, 31%), and 25.24(95% CI: 23, 27.6%), respectively. High self-rated academic
31 ability ($\beta=-0.03$, 95% CI: -0.065, -0.006) and high perceived social support ($\beta=-0.22$, 95% CI: 0-
32 .304, -0.139) had significant negative effect on anxiety. High levels of depression had a direct
33 positive effect ($\beta= 0.74$, 95% CI: 0.508, 1.010) on anxiety. High level of stress had significant
34 direct ($\beta=0.54$, 95% CI: 0.293, 0.745) and indirect ($\beta=0.57$, 95% CI: 0.379, 0.814) positive effect
35 on anxiety. High level of anxiety was significantly related with high level of depression ($\beta=0.74$,
36 95% CI= 0.483, 1.081). High perceived social support ($\beta= -0.13$, 95% CI: -0.229,-0.029), and
37 having a history of death of beloved one within the past six months ($\beta= 0.03$, 95% CI: 0.014,
38 0.256) had a significant direct positive effect on depression. Having medically confirmed chronic
39 illness ($\beta=0.21$, 95% CI=:0.114, 0.311), being female ($\beta= 0.06$, 95% CI= 0.003, 0.109) and high
40 level of stress ($\beta= -0.06$, 95% CI: -0,454, 0.247) had significant indirect effect on depression.
41 Stress ($\beta= 0.86$, 95% CI: 0.700, 1.025), anxiety ($\beta=0.66$, 95% CI: 0.270, 3.825) and depression
42 ($\beta= 0.96$, 95% CI: 0.167, 3.629) were significant predictors of somatic symptoms.

43 **Conclusions and recommendations**

44 Magnitude of anxiety, depression, and somatic symptoms were moderate. Self-rated academic
45 ability, physical trauma, school type, sex, stress, ever use of alcohol, perceived social support,
46 death of beloved one, and having medically confirmed chronic illness were independent
47 predictors of anxiety, depression and somatic symptoms. The bidirectional relationship between
48 anxiety and depression was significant. Emphasis should be given to the prevention and
49 management of mental health in the adolescent, particularly targeting adolescents with the
50 aforementioned factors.

51 **Keywords:** anxiety, depression, somatic symptoms, adolescents, structural equation modeling,
52 Ethiopia

53 **Introduction**

54 Mental health disorder is defined as “syndrome characterized by clinically significant
55 disturbance in an individual's thought, emotion regulation, or behavior that reflects a dysfunction
56 in the psychological, biological, or development processes underlying mental functioning”[1].

57 Mental health disorder accounts for 16% of global burden of disease and injuries and more than
58 80% of people with mental health disorders live in low and middle income countries, with
59 increase in incidence and mortality [2]. Adolescent are especially vulnerable to developing
60 mental illness[3]. In this population mental health disorders is increased by 32.18% from 1999 to
61 2019 [4]. World health organization(WHO) estimates that 10-20% of adolescents are affected by
62 mental health problem in the world [5]. In low- and middle-income countries, adolescents
63 mental health is not only a major public health challenge, but also a development concern [6].
64 Human suffering and financial costs associated with mental health disorders are substantial and
65 growing globally [7]. Each year more than 12 billion working days are lost due to mental illness.
66 Between 2011-2030 , it is estimated that mental illness will cost the global economy 16 trillion
67 united states dollar in lost economic output more than diabetes, cancer, and respiratory diseases
68 [6]. Depression and anxiety are among the common mental health disorders [8],and often
69 somatic symptom co-exist with them [9, 10].

70 Depression, which is the second common mental health disorder in adolescents is characterized
71 by loss of interest or pleasure, feelings of guilt or low self-worth, feelings of tiredness, disturbed
72 sleep or appetite, and poor concentration and sadness [11]. In combination with anxiety, it
73 contributes for 45% of the overall burden of disease [12]. In 2018, over one million adolescents
74 died from preventable causes, with depression playing a significant role [13]. In Asia, its
75 magnitude ranges from 24.3% to 57.7% [14] and in Sub-Saharan Africa, it ranges from 15.5%
76 [15] to 45.90% [16, 17]. In Ethiopia, 28% [18] of adolescents in Jimma and 36.2% [19] of
77 adolescents in Aksum were depressed.

78 Anxiety is characterized by emotional feelings of excessive fear, nervousness, avoiding treats
79 in the environment perceived by them, and physical symptoms such as fast respiration,
80 increased blood pressure, and tightness of the chest [20, 21]. Globally, 301.39 million peoples
81 are affected by anxiety [22]. It is the leading cause of mental disorder in the world, which
82 accounts for about 28.68 million disability-adjusted life years in the global burden of disease
83 (GBD) [23]. Anxiety is the commonest mental health disorder in adolescents [24], with high
84 magnitude in developed as well as in developing countries[25]. In adolescents, it ranges from
85 42.1% [26] to 80.85% in Asia [27], and in sub-Saharan Africa 29.8% of adolescents had anxiety
86 [3]. A study conducted in Kenya showed that 37.99% of high school adolescents had anxiety
87 [17]. A systematic review conducted among children and youth in Ethiopia revealed that general
88 anxiety disorder ranges from 0.5-23% [28].

89 Somatic symptom is characterized by a comprehensive list of symptoms such as pain,
90 breathlessness, numbness, palpitation, tiredness, headache, dizziness, and gastroenterological
91 problems. Somatic symptom disorder is a disorder in which individuals excessively or
92 disproportionally think or feel about the symptoms, which result in significant disturbance in

93 daily life [29]. Often depression and anxiety co-exists with somatic symptom [30-32], which is
94 one of the remarkably widespread issues in primary health care and subspecialty settings [10].
95 Somatic symptoms results in more than half of the patient visit in primary health care [33]. Its
96 magnitude is estimated to be 5 to 7% [34] in general population and 5 to 30 % [35] [36] in
97 adolescent.

98 Studies showed that age [17], female sex [18, 37-39], being in public school [40], high family
99 academic pressure [41] [42], poor self-rated academic ability [43, 44], alcohol use [45] [46],
100 cigarette smoking [47, 48] ,stress, [49, 50] [51], somatic symptom[18, 37, 38, 49, 52, 53], and
101 anxiety [54, 55] had a positive relation with depression. While other factors like social support
102 [43, 44, 52, 56] and family education had negative association [53].

103 Literatures reported that female sex [27, 57], age [17, 26], smoking [48, 58], alcohol use , self-
104 rated academic ability [26, 59], family academic pressure [41]. Stress [60, 61], somatic symptom
105 disorder [62] and depression [63] had positive relationship with anxiety.

106 Different scholars reported that female sex [64] [65, 66] , being in private school [64], physically
107 activity [67, 68], extra school tutoring [69] , stress [70] [71, 72], anxiety [65, 73, 74] and
108 depression [65, 75, 76] had significant relation with somatic symptom.

109 Common mental health disorders in adolescents are associated with severe mental health
110 problems in the future, suicidal ideation, increased risk of drugs and substance abuse, violent
111 behavior, unprotected sex and acquired sexually transmitted infections, school dropouts, future
112 unemployment, and poor quality of life [77-82]. Since it is commonly associated with heart
113 disease, cancer, and diabetes mellitus, depression increases pre-mature death by 40-60% [83].
114 Somatic symptoms delay the diagnosis of depression and anxiety, because most people seek

115 medical attention for bodily symptoms. Individuals with somatic symptoms experience harm
116 from unnecessary testing and treatment [84].

117 Despite the fact that mental health is a key part of the sustainable development goals (SDG)
118 which affect every other goals [6], the magnitude of mental health disorders is still high [27]. To
119 decrease the burden of mental illness, targeting adolescents is important; since more than half of
120 mental health problems starts at this age [6], and 50% of adolescent mental health problems will
121 proceed to adulthood [85]. Adolescents in low and middle-income countries are
122 disproportionally affected by mental health disorders; however, there are limited data on the
123 prevalence and determinants of mental illness in Sub-Saharan Africa [86] [87].

124 In Ethiopia, though mental health services were included in the national health policy, there is a
125 paucity of evidence on the magnitude and determinants of anxiety, somatic symptoms, and their
126 relation with depression. Even studies conducted outside of Ethiopia had methodological flaws,
127 as they used logistic or linear regression to assess multiple mental health outcomes, which cannot
128 address the bidirectional relationship between outcome variables and the indirect effects of
129 predictors. In such cases, non-recursive structural equation modeling, which is a multivariate
130 statistical framework used to measure the complex relationships between different observed and
131 latent variables simultaneously is preferable.

132 Therefore, this study intended to fill this gap by assessing the magnitude, relationship, and
133 determinants of depression, anxiety, and somatic symptoms among high school and preparatory
134 school adolescents in Gondar town by using non-recursive structural equation modeling. The
135 findings from this study will help the psychologist, psychiatrists, policy makers, students,
136 community and the government to tackle the increasing burden of mental health problems.

137 Moreover, it will be used as an input toward sustainable development and as a baseline data for
138 further research.

139 **Methods and Materials**

140 **Study design, setting, and period**

141 Institution based cross-sectional study was conducted from June 8 -June 24, 2022 in Gondar
142 town, Amhara Region state, northwest, Ethiopia. It is located 728 kilometers from Ethiopia's
143 capital city of Addis Ababa, and 180 kilometers from Bahir Dar, the capital city of the Amhara
144 regional state. There are 395, 000 residents [88], 48 healthcare facilities (one comprehensive
145 specialized hospital, eight health centers, one private general hospital, fifteen specialist clinics,
146 fifteen medium clinics, and eight primary clinics). According to the town administrative
147 educational department report, the town has seventeen high and preparatory schools (twelve
148 public and five private), with a total number of 24,308 students. Among them, 2408 students
149 were from private schools (1457 girls and 951 boys) and 21900 students were from public
150 schools (12052 girls and 9848 boys).

151 **Population**

152 All high and preparatory school adolescents in Gondar town were the source population and all
153 high and preparatory school adolescents in randomly selected schools in Gondar town were the
154 study population.

155 **Eligibility criteria**

156 All high and preparatory school adolescents in Gondar town who were registered for the second
157 semester of 2021-2022 academic years were included in the study. Night preparatory and high

158 school students and students who were transferred in from other areas after January 8, 2022 were
159 excluded.

160 **Sample size determination**

161 Sample size calculation for structural equation modeling depends on the model complexity. The
162 general rule of thumb approach for sample size calculation in structural equation modeling
163 ranges from 5 to 20 times per free parameters[89]. In this study, 5:1 ratios were used to get the
164 minimum adequate sample size. Based on the hypothesized model *Fig 1*, a total of 134 free
165 parameter were available(18 variance for exogenous variables), (40 regression coefficients which
166 are; the coefficients between exogenous observed variables and latent variable, and coefficients
167 between latent variables), (32 loading which is the loading between latent variables and
168 indicators except those path coefficients fixed to one(5 path coefficients fixed to one in this
169 study) , (37 errors variance for indicator' variables), (3 covariance between disturbances), (4
170 disturbance of endogenous latent variables) (*Fig 1*).

171 Considering 134 free parameters, the sample size was

$$172 \quad 134*5=670$$

173 Since the sampling procedure is multistage sampling with 2 stages, a design effect of 2 was
174 considered.

175 Therefore, the sample size becomes $670*2 = 1340$

176 After adjusting 5% for non-response rate, the final sample size became

$$177 \quad 1340+1340*5\%=1407$$

178 *Fig 1: Hypothetical structural equation modeling on the magnitude and determinants of*
179 *Depression, Anxiety and somatic symptoms among high school and preparatory school*
180 *adolescents in Gondar town 2022 (both measurement and structural model)*

181 **Sampling procedure**

182 In this study, two-stage stratified random sampling technique was used to select participants. In
183 Gondar town, there are seventeen high and preparatory schools; of which twelve are public
184 schools (Shinta, Hidar 11, Ayer Tena , Azezo Preparatory, Hidase Teda, Azezo Dimaza, Loza
185 Birhan, Fasiledus Preparatory, Fasiledus General Secondary and Preparatory, Walagi, Anigereb,
186 and Felegi), and five are private schools(Debre selam , Waliya, Kings Acadami, Gondar
187 university community and Abune Samuel). A study conducted in Telangana state, India, showed
188 that adolescents in public schools had a higher proportion of depression than those in private
189 school [40]. As a result, stratification by school type was done and study subjects were
190 proportionally allocated. Then, two schools from private (Walya and Debre selam) and four
191 schools from public (Azezo preparatory school, Fasiledus preparatory school, Shinta, and
192 Anigereb) were selected randomly. After that, heterogeneity by grade level was considered and,
193 again stratification was done by grade level. Students were proportionally allocated in each grade
194 and finally 1407 students were selected randomly by computer generated random sampling (*Fig*
195 *2*).

196 *Fig 2: Diagrammatical representation of the sampling procedure that was used to assess the*
197 *magnitude and determinants of depression, anxiety, and somatic symptoms among high school*
198 *and preparatory school adolescents in Gondar town, 2022. Where N= total number of students*

199 **Variables of the study**

200 **Outcome variables (endogenous constructs):**

201 Depression, anxiety, and somatic symptoms

202 **Independent variables:**

203 **Observed Exogenous Variables:**

204 **Socio-demographic variables:** age, sex, original residence, grade level, school type, father
205 education, and mother education

206 **Behavior related factors:** physical activity, alcohol use

207 **Academic related factors:** extra school tutoring, number of study hours per day, self-rated
208 academic ability, and family academic pressure

209 **Relationships and related factors:** Death of beloved one

210 **Clinical factors:** family history of mental illness, history of physical trauma, medically
211 confirmed chronic illness

212 **Exogenous latent variable:** social support

213 **Endogenous latent variable:** Stress

214 **Operational definition**

215 **Depression:** Students were classified as having depression, if their total score on the Patients
216 Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9A) was 10 or higher.

217 Regarding the severity level of depression, students were categorized as those with mild,
218 moderate, moderately severe and severe depression, if they had a total score of 5-9, 10-14, 15-
219 19, and 20-27 respectively [90].

220 **Anxiety:** Students were classified as anxious if their total score on the general anxiety scale
221 (GAS-7) was 10 or higher [91]. Regarding the severity level of anxiety, they were categorized as
222 having mild 5–9 score, moderate 10–14 scores, and severe anxiety with a score of 15–21 [92].

223 **Somatic symptom:** Participants were classified as having somatic symptoms when they scored
224 ≥ 9 in the somatic symptom Scale (SSS-8), which has an optimum sensitivity of 72% and
225 specificity of 59% [93].

226 Students were classified as having 4 to 7 low, 8 to 11 medium, 12 to 15 high, or 16 to 32 very
227 high somatic symptom severity levels [94].

228 **Perceived Stress:** Students who have a total perceived stress(PSS-10) scores of 0-13, 14-26, and
229 27-40 were categorized as having low, moderate, and high perceived stress level respectively
230 [95].

231 **Perceived social support:** Based on Oslo social support scale(OSS-3), students were
232 categorized as having poor social support 3–8 score, moderate social support 9–11 score, and
233 strong social support with 12–14 score [96].

234 **Physical activity:** a student who answered 2 days and above for the question in the past one
235 week, how many days did you exercise for at least 60 minutes until we felt sweaty or shortness
236 of breath were categorized as physically active; and those who answered one day and no was
237 categorized as physically inactive [97].

238 **Ever use of alcohol:** Students who had a history of alcohol drinks (like beer, Tella, Katikala,
239 Wine) at least once in his/her life time were considered as positive for ever use of alcohol [98].

240 **Current alcohol use:** Individuals who have a history of alcohol drunk in the past 3 months were
241 considered as positive for current alcohol user [98].

242 **Data collection procedures and tools**

243 Primary data were gathered using structured questionnaire through self-administered
244 questionnaire for those who could see and by face-to-face interviews for individuals who could
245 not see. Four trained data collectors who have a first degree in public health officer were
246 assigned for data collection.

247 The tool for this study contains 9 domains which are: socio-demographic characteristics,
248 behavioral factors, academic related factors, and relationship related factors, clinical factors,
249 depression, anxiety, somatic symptom, and stress domains.

250 Depression was assessed using PHQ-9A, it is a depression screening tool with 9-items, each item
251 were measured by Likert scale ranging from 0 “not at all” to 3 “nearly every day” and its total
252 score range from 0 to 27 [99].

253 Anxiety was assessed using GAS-7, which is a brief measure of anxiety that contains seven items
254 which are rated in four point Likert scales that range from 0 “not at all” to 3 nearly every day”.
255 Its summed score ranges from 0- 21 [91].

256 Somatic symptom was assessed using SSS-8, which had comparable reliability and validity with
257 the patient’s health questionnaire (PHQ-15) [100]. Each item was measured by Likert scale
258 ranging from 0 “not at all” to 4”very much’, a total scoring range from minimal 0 to maximum
259 32 [94].

260 Stress was assessed by using Perceived stress scale (PSS-10), it contains 10 items. Each item
261 scored on an ordinal scale of 0–4, where 0 represents “never” and 3 represents “very often”.
262 Individual scores range from 0 to 40 [95].

263 Perceived social support: Oslo Social Support scale (OSSS-3) was to assess the perceived social
264 support of students. It is 3 items with a Likert scale that ranges from 1 to 4 for the first item

265 (number of people you can count if you face a great personal problem) and 1 to 5 ranges for the
266 rest items, its summed score range from 3 to 14 [96] .

267 **Data quality and management**

268 To maintain the quality of the data, one day training was given for data collectors on the
269 objective of the study, the technique of data collection, the content of the questionnaire, and the
270 issue of confidentiality. Before the actual data collection, the questionnaire that developed in
271 English language was translated in to Amharic and re- translated in to English by another person
272 to check consistency. Four public health experts and two psychiatrists checked the face validity
273 of the tool. Construct validity and reliability were checked, since the tool for anxiety, somatic
274 symptoms, and stress was not validated among Ethiopian adolescents, and tools validated in
275 other countries may not be reliable and valid in Ethiopia due to socioeconomic, sociocultural,
276 and linguistic differences.

277 Moreover, a pilot study was also used to check the way that each questionnaire were understood
278 by different participants and modifications were done accordingly based on the feedback. None
279 of the participants answered yes to smoking; as a result, it was excluded from the final study.

280 The data collectors immediately checked the collected data for completeness and consistency,
281 and early correctional measures were taken. Repeated trials were taken into account for
282 responders who were unavailable at the time of data collection. Data were cleaned, coded, and
283 entered in to Epi-data software. During data entry, missing, outliers and entry errors were
284 checked manually by going back to the checklist. After data entry, data recording and missing
285 value management were considered accordingly.

286 **Reliability and validity of the tool**

287 To validate the tool, external participatory pilot study was conducted among 201 students, 177
 288 from Azezo Dimaza General High and Preparatory school (public), and 24 from University of
 289 Gondar Community High school (private).

290 Reliability of the tool was checked by using Cronbach alpha and the tool was reliable, since the
 291 Cronbach alpha values were above 0.7 for both overall and particular factors except for social
 292 support (

293 **Table 1**). For social support, since it had small number items (<5), average inter-item covariance
 294 (AIIC) value was used, thus was 0.4, which in the acceptable range (0.2 to 0.4) [101].

295 The convergent and discriminate validity of the tool was checked. Even if the Average Variance
 296 Extracted (AVE) was below 0.5, the convergent validity was maintained. Since, all standardized
 297 factor loadings were significant (p value <0.05) and composite reliability was above 0.6 [102] (

298 *Table 1*). The discriminate validity of the tool was also evidenced, since all inter-factor
 299 correlations were less than the square root of AVE for each factor (

300 **Table 1**).

301 *Table 1: Average variance extracted, composite reliability, and Spearman rank correlation of*
 302 *tools used to measure anxiety, depression, somatic symptoms ,stress, and social support among*
 303 *high and preparatory school adolescents in Gondar town northwest Ethiopia 2022.*

Factors	AVE	CR	Correlation					
			Anxiety	Depression	Somatic symptom	Stress	Social support	
Anxiety	0.34	0.78	1.000					
Depression	0.4	0.82	0.52	1.00				
Somatic symptom	0.37	0.82	0.33	0.43	1.00			
Stress	0.43	0.86	0.44	0.42	0.29	1.00		
Social support	0.35	0.53	-0.08	0.01	-0.05	0.02	1.00	

304 **Omitted variable bias**

305 Omitted variable bias (OVB) was also checked in the pilot study. It occurs when a statistical
306 model eliminates one or more independent variables that are correlated with one or more of the
307 included independent variables and are determinants of the dependent variable. Ramsey
308 regression equation specification error test (RESET) was used to check OVB. Ramsey (RESET)
309 values above 0.05 indicates the absence of omitted variable bias [103]. In our case, the minimum
310 Ramsey RESET p value was 0.2 (*Table 2*). Hence, there was no significant omitted variable bias.
311 Table 2: Ramsey RESET for anxiety, depression, and somatic symptoms considering all
312 predictors

Dependent variable	Ramsey RESET test P-value
Anxiety	0.83
Depression	0.61
Somatic symptom	0.20

313 **Data processing, model building and analysis**

314 Collected data were coded and entered in to Epi-data software version 4.6, and exported to
315 STATA version 16 and AMOS version 21 for further analysis. Descriptive analyses were done
316 and text, tables, graphs, charts, and figures were used for data summarization. Non-recursive
317 structural equation modeling was employed to assess the complex relationship between different
318 latent and observed variables.

319 Structural equation modeling contains two components which are measurement model and
320 structural model [104]. **Measurement model:** Is a confirmatory factor analysis model for
321 grouping multiple indicators in to some constructs [104]. In this study, the measurement model
322 was used to assess the relationship between anxiety, depression, somatic symptoms, stress, and
323 social support with their indicators. Indicators were reflective. i.e. path is directed from the
324 construct to the indicators.

325 **Structural model:** It was used to assess the interrelationship between latent variables and the
326 relationship between latent variables and observed predictors [104]. In this study, the structural
327 components were the interrelationship between depression, anxiety, and somatic symptoms, and
328 their relation to other latent and observed predictors.

329 **Assumptions in non-recursive structural equation modeling**

330 **Specified model:** Model specification is the first step in structural equation modeling. It is a
331 statement of the theoretical model in terms of equations or a diagram [104]. In this study, we
332 specified the model after extensive literature searching and reading as presented in *Fig 1*.

333 **Identified Model:** There are three levels of identification in the structural equation model:
334 under-identified, just identified, and over-identified. To precede with the given model, the model
335 should be over identified or just identified [104]. For non-recursive models, instrumental
336 variables(IV) are mandatory to estimate the parameters [104]. Instrumental variables are
337 methodological devices used to resolve problems of endogeneity; which occurs when an
338 explanatory variable correlates with the error term of the dependent variable. All non-recursive
339 models suffer from endogeneity problems and need IVs. In an equation system as $IV \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y$, IV
340 is any variable that has a strong and significant direct effect on X, but is not correlated with the
341 disturbance term of Y [104].

342 In this study, that variables affect anxiety directly, but does not affect other latent variables
343 directly are instrumental for anxiety i.e., perceived academic ability and history of physical
344 trauma. For depression, perceived social support and death of beloved one are an instrumental
345 variables and extra school tutoring and average study time per day are an instrumental variables
346 for somatic symptom disorder. In our model (*Fig 1*), there are three reciprocal loops and all
347 disturbances of latent variables involved in the feedback loops are correlated. Therefore, the

348 identification of non-recursive structural equation modeling with complete correlation of error
349 terms was used. There are three ways of identification in non-recursive structural equation
350 modeling; which are: presence of unique instrumental variables, order condition, and rank
351 condition. Among this, only the rank condition is sufficient for identification, and the rest two
352 are necessary, but not sufficient [104].

353 **A unique instrumental variable**

354 In this study, all endogenous variables in the reciprocal loop had unique instrumental variables.

355 **Order condition**

356 It is a necessary but not sufficient condition for model identification. The number of excluded
357 variables for that specific endogenous variable minus the total number of endogenous variables
358 minus one should be greater than or equal to 0 [104]. In our model, to satisfy order condition,
359 each endogenous variable in the recursive loop should have at least $3-1=2$ excluded variables.
360 Where, 3 is the number of endogenous variables in non-recursive loop. In this study, all
361 endogenous variables in the non-recursive have more than two excluded variables. For
362 Depression, anxiety, and somatic symptom disorder, 9, 8, and 11 variables were excluded.
363 Therefore, model can full fill requirement of order condition.

364 **Rank condition**

365 In this particular study, there are 3 endogenous variables in the non-recursive loop and 17
366 exogenous variables and one endogenous variable out of the feedback loop (*Fig 1*). Rank
367 Conditions were done using the system matrix. To formulate the system matrix, a separate
368 equation for each endogenous variable in the feedback loop is mandatory. Therefore, the
369 equations for depression, anxiety, and somatic symptom disorder are presented as follows

370 $Depression(y_1) = x_2 \text{ alcohol use} + x_3 \text{ chronic illness} + x_4 \text{ physical activity} + x_5 \text{ family mental illness} +$
 $x_7 \text{ school ty} + x_{11} \text{ death of beloved one} + x_{12} \text{ social support} + x_{16} \text{ family pressur}$
 $+ x_{18} \text{ stress} + x_{20}(y_2) + x_{21}(y_3) \text{ somaticsymptom}$

371 $Anxiety(y_2) = x_2 \text{ alcohol use} + x_3 \text{ chronic illness} + x_4 \text{ physical activity} + x_5 \text{ family mental illness} + x_7 \text{ school type}$
 $+ x_{13} \text{ physical trauma} + x_{17} \text{ acadamic ability} + x_{18} \text{ stress} + x_{19}(y_1) + x_{21}(y_3)$

372
 373 $Somaticsymptom(y_3) = x_2 \text{ alcohol use} + x_3 \text{ chronic illness} + x_4 \text{ physical activity} + x_5 \text{ family mental illness} + x_7$
 $\text{school type} + x_{14} \text{ study time} + x_{15} \text{ extra school tutoring} + x_{18} \text{ stress} + x_{19}(y_1) + x_{20}(y_2)$

374 Rank conditions in the system matrix below, begins by constructing a system matrix based on the
 375 above equations. Endogenous variables are presented in the row and all variables are presented
 376 in the column. In each row, zero or one appears in the column that corresponds to that row. One
 377 indicates that the variable represented by the column has a direct effect on endogenous variable
 378 in that row or on the endogenous variable itself, 0 indicates the excluded variables for that
 379 specific endogenous variable in that row [104].

380
$$\begin{bmatrix} x & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 15 & 16 & 17 & 18 & y_1 & y_2 & y_3 \\ y_1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ y_2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ y_3 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

381 The following steps were followed for identification of rank condition

- 382 1. Start with the first row of the system matrix. Cross out all entries in that row and cross
 383 out any column in the system matrix with a one in that same row.
- 384 2. Simplify the reduced matrix further by deleting any row with all zeros entries; delete any
 385 row that is an exact duplicate of another or can be reproduced by adding other rows (i.e.,
 386 it is a linear combination of other rows). The number of remaining rows is the rank.

387 If the rank of the reduced matrix is larger than or equal to the sum of the endogenous variables
388 in the recursive loop minus one, then the rank condition is satisfied [104].

389 The rank condition for this particular study became

390 For depression (y1), after you cross the entire first row and the entire column which contains 1 in
391 the row:

392 The reduced matrix becomes:

$$393 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ Rank}=2$$

394 For anxiety (y2), after you cross the entire second row and the entire column which contains 1 in
395 that row:

396 The reduced matrix becomes

$$397 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ Rank}=2$$

398 For Somatic symptom (y3), after we cross the entire third row and the entire column which
399 contains one in that row:

400 Reduced matrix becomes

$$401 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ Rank}=2$$

402 The hypothesized model was identified since all endogenous variables have a rank of two, which
403 is equal to the number of endogenous variables in the feedback loop minus one.

404 **Multivariate normality, outliers, and missing:** Full information maximum likelihood
405 estimation, which assumes multivariate normality for the joint population distribution of the

406 endogenous variables, given the exogenous variables, was used. Multivariate normality was
407 assessed using Mardia's kurtosis and its critical ratio. Absolute values of 7 for Mardia's kurtosis
408 and its critical ratio above 5 were used to declare non-normality [104]. The data were not
409 normally distributed. Although item parceling and outlier deletion were tried to handle it, there
410 was no improvement. As a result, bootstrap maximum likelihood estimation with 3000 samples
411 was used.

412 Mahalanobis distance(MD), which measure the distance relative centroid, was used to check
413 multivariate outliers [104]. MD p values less than 0.001 based on chi-square distribution were
414 used to declare observation as multivariate outlier [105]. There were 62 observations with
415 Mahalanobis distance p-value less than 0.001. The data were examined to see whether they were
416 actually outliers or caused by data entry errors. However, it was not due to data entry error, and
417 as mentioned above, multivariate normality did not improve significantly with their exclusion.
418 So, those outlier observations were kept in order to maintain the study's power.

419 From the total observation, there were six observations with missing values. All missing values
420 were from predictors and had no relationship with the outcome variable; thus, list-wise deletion
421 was performed because they constituted less than 5% of the total sample and were considered
422 missing completely at random [106].

423 **Sample size adequacy and strength of correlation:** The critical ratios for Bartlett's test of
424 sphericity in this study were high and it was significant for all constructs. KMO was above 0.7
425 for the overall, as well as for specific constructs. Hence, the sample is sufficient, the population
426 matrix is not identity, and factor analysis was evidenced[104] (**Table 3**).

427 Table 3: *KMO and Bartlett's test of sphericity to check sampling adequacy and strength of*
428 *correlation for the measurement of anxiety, depression, a somatic symptoms among high and*
429 *preparatory school adolescents in Gondar town, 2022.*

Factors	KMO	Bartlett's tests of sphericity	
		Chi-square	P value
Anxiety	0.88	3100	0.0001
Depression	0.87	2391	0.0001
Somatic	0.85	2155	0.0001
Stress	0.86	3354	0.0001
Overall	0.94	13938	0.0001

430
431 **Independency of observations:** The intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) were used to test
432 the independence of observations. School type and grade level were employed as clustering
433 variables because students are nested in grade level, grade level is nested within schools, and
434 schools are nested in school type. Multilevel SEM was generally taken into consideration at a
435 cut-off value of 0.1 and higher. ICC was less than 0.1 in our study S1 Table1 2, and the usual
436 structural equation model was preferred.

437 **Common Method Bias:** Common method bias (CMB) occurs when the instrument rather than
438 the actual predispositions of the respondents cause variations in responses. Harman's one-factor
439 test was used to check common method bias (CMB). The absence of CMB was determined by
440 the overall variance recovered by one factor being below 50% [107]. There was no CMB in this
441 investigation since the overall variance recovered by one factor was 25.2%, which is below the
442 suggested cutoff.

443 **Strong and valid instrumental variables:** Strength and validity of instrumental variables were
444 checked by using Cragg-Donald Wald F statistic and Sargan Hansen test, respectively. Sargan
445 Hansen test P-value greater than 0.05 was used to ponder valid instruments. F test values above

446 10 were used as a cut of point to declare strong IVs [108]. In the present study, the strength and
447 validity of the instrumental variables between anxiety and somatic symptoms, and between
448 somatic symptoms and depression were invalid and weak. Deleting a non-recursive path is one
449 treatment for a weak and faulty instrument. As a result, the non-recursive paths from somatic
450 symptoms to anxiety and depression were excluded. Finally, identified model with valid and
451 strong instrumental variables in non-recursive loop was preserved S1 Table1 3.

452 **Model fitness evaluation and model comparison**

453 **Chi-square:** Chi-square is the inferential goodness of fit index for structural equation modeling.
454 It test is an accept–support test where the null hypothesis represents the researcher’s belief that
455 the model is correct; thus, a failure to reject the null hypothesis, or the absence of statistical
456 significance ($p \geq .05$) suggests a good fitted model. Chi-square test is sensitive to sample size; in
457 a large samples it may be below 0.05 in good fitted model [104]. In our study, chi-squares
458 adjusted for degrees of freedom (CMIN/DF) were used, CMIN/DF values 1 to 5 were used to
459 declare acceptable fit [109].

460 **Rooted mean square error of approximation:** it is the badness of fit index. Values
461 approximate to zero indicate a small discrepancy between the sample implied and the model
462 implied covariance matrix, as its value increase, the model fit becomes poorer. RMSEA
463 departure from close or approximate fit unlike chi-square, measure departure from the exact fit.
464 In this model, a value of 0.05 and below were used to declare good fitted model [110].

465 **Comparative fit index (CFI):** is one of the relative fit indexes. It was developed as an
466 alternative to the normed fit index (NFI), given that NFI has been shown to be underestimated

467 when small samples are used. $CIF = 1 - \frac{NCP_{model}}{NCP_{null}}$, where NCP is non-central parameter, its value

468 ranges from 0 to 1 with values above 0.9 were considered to indicate acceptable fit [110].

469 **Model comparison:** Model comparison was done using those fit indexes mentioned above and
470 Akaike information criteria (AIC). Finally, a model with minimum information criteria, and
471 RMSEA, and large CFI was selected as a good fitted model

472 **Ethical consideration**

473 Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of University of
474 Gondar Institute of public Health. The ethical approval letter was submitted to Gondar town
475 administrative educational department and to all selected high schools and preparatory schools.
476 Permission was obtained from school directors. Parental informed consent was waived as the
477 research had no/ minimal risk [111]. Following permission from school directors, a detailed
478 participant information sheets were given to each student, and they completed an assent form to
479 indicate a willingness to participate.

480 To ensure privacy and confidentiality, all data was kept in a locked cabinet at the investigator's
481 home. Collected data were used for the study purpose only and any personal identifiers were not
482 mentioned. They were told about the benefits and risk objectives and their right to refuse/
483 discontinue the study at any time without any penalty or loss of benefit.

484 **Results**

485 **Socio-demographic characteristics and clinical factors of** 486 **respondents**

487 Out of 1407 randomly selected individuals, 1379 completed the questionnaire; hence, the
488 response rate was 98 %. The mean age of the respondents was 17.23 years with a standard
489 deviation of ± 1.25 years. Majority, 1238(89.78%) of the respondents were from public schools
490 and regarding residence two-thirds 915(66.35%) of the respondents were from an urban areas.
491 Around half, 654(47.43%) of the respondents reported moderate stress, while 72 (5.22%)
492 reported high perceived stress. Majority, 1237(89.7%) of the respondents had not a history of
493 chronic illness, and less than one-tenth 101(7.32%) of the respondents had a family history of
494 mental illness (*Table 4*).

495 *Table 4: Socio- demographic and clinical characteristics of high and preparatory school*
496 *adolescents in Gondar town, 2022 (n=1379)*

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sex		
Male	536	38.87
Female	843	61.13
School type		
Public	1238	89.78
Private	141	10.22
Grade level		
Grade 9	544	39.45
Grade 10	325	23.57
Grade 11	296	21.46
Grade 12	214	15.52
Residence		
Urban	915	66.35
Rural	464	33.65
Physical trauma		

No	1076	78.03
Yes	303	21.97
Medically confirmed chronic illness		
No	1237	89.7
Yes	142	10.3
Stress		
Low	653	47.35
Moderate	654	47.43
High	72	5.22
Family history of mental illness		
No	1278	92.68
Yes	101	7.32
Continuous variable	Mean	SD
Age in year	17.22	±1.25

497 **Behavioral, academic, and relation related factors**

498 More than one-third, 493(35.75%) of the respondents had a history of alcohol drinking.

499 Regarding physical activity, only 224(16.24%) of the respondents were physically active.

500 Majority, 656(47.57% of the respondents had good self-rated academic ability .When we see

501 perceived social support, two-fifths, 564(40.9%) of the respondents had low perceived social

502 support (*Table 5*).

503 *Table 5: Behavioral, academic, and relation related factors of high preparatory school*

504 *adolescents in Gondar town, 2022 (n=1379).*

Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Physical activity		
Inactive	1155	83.76
Active	224	16.24
Ever use of alcohol		
No	886	64.25
Yes	493	35.75
Extra school tutoring*(n=1378)		
No	1011	73.3
Yes	367	26.7

Self-rated academic ability		
Very poor	39	2.83
Poor	70	5.08
Good	656	47.57
Very good	390	28.28
Excellent	224	16.24
Father education *(n=1377)		
Can't read and write	266	19.29
Grade 1- 8	488	35.43
Grade 9-12	308	22.34
Diploma and above	315	22.84
Mother education* (n=1378)		
Can't read and write	429	31.12
Grade 1- 8	436	31.63
Grade 9-12	277	20.10
Diploma and above	236	1.13
Family academic pressure		
Not at all	524	38
Low	375	27.19
Medium	144	10.44
High	336	24.37
Death of loved one in the past 6 months		
No	1058	76.72
Yes	321	23.28
Social support		
Poor	564	40.9
Medium	559	40.54
Good	256	18.56
Current alcohol use(n=1377)*		
No	368	26.73
Yes	1009	73.27
	Median	IQR
Study time in hour (n=1379)	3	±3
Time spend for extra school tutoring in hour(n=367)	2	IQR=±2

505 Where,* indicated variables with missing observations

506 **Magnitude of depression**

507 In this study, the overall magnitude of self-reported depression was 28.21(95% CI= 25.8, 31%).
508 Regarding the level of severity, 34.8% had mild, 18.5% had moderate, 7.72% had moderately
509 severe and 2.04% of respondents had severe depression.
510 More than one-third (34.8%) of participants had a feeling hurting oneself or better off dead.
511 More than two-thirds of the respondents (68.3%) had little interest or pleasure in doing things
512 and more than half of the participants (55.69%) had a feeling of hopelessness S1 Table1 4.

513 **Magnitude of Anxiety**

514 The overall magnitude of self-reported anxiety in this study was 25.05% (95%CI: 22.8, 27.5%).
515 Regarding the severity level of anxiety, 34.08% of respondents had mild, 16.82% moderate, and
516 8.27 % had severe anxiety.
517 Among the total respondents, 16.61% worried too much about different things; nearly every day
518 and 11.54 %could not able to stop worrying too much nearly every day. More than half (58.38%)
519 of the respondents had a feeling of anxious or nervousness S1 Table1 5.

520 **Magnitude of somatic symptoms**

521 In this study, the overall magnitude of self-reported somatic symptom disorder was 25.24 %
522 (95% CI= 23, 27.6%). Regarding the level of severity among the total respondents, 27.27 % had
523 mild, 15.88% moderate, 8.19% high, and 6.38% very high somatic symptom respectively.
524 When you see the response to specific indicators, around two-thirds (65.42%) of the participants
525 had headache. More than one half (53.68%) of the respondents had dizziness and 35.97% of the
526 respondent had abdominal pain or gastro intestinal problem S1 Table1 6.

527 **Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

528 Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was computed to test the measurement model. The model fit
529 measures (CMIN/DF, CFI, TLI, RMSEA) were used to assess model overall goodness of fit. In
530 the hypothesized measurement model S1 Fig 1, the goodness of fit was below the acceptable
531 level: CMIN/DF=5.10, TLI=, CFI=0.81 and RMSEA=0.05. To improve the fit of the model ,
532 factorial item parceling were done [112] S1 Table1 7. After that, the model fits were improved.
533 In the final measurement model *Fig 1*, all goodness of fit values were in the acceptable level
534 (CMIN/DF=2.60, CFI=1.00, TLI=1.00 and RMSEA=0.00). Construct reliability was assessed by
535 using Cronbach's alpha and it were above the required level except for social support. For social
536 support, since it had low number item (<5), average inter-item covariance (AIIC) values were
537 used, the value in this study was 0.31, which in the acceptable range (0.20 to 0.40) [101]. Thus,
538 the constructs reliability of the tool was kept up (*Table 6*).

539 **Fig 3: Final measurement model for the constructs of anxiety, depression, somatic symptoms,**
540 **stress, and social support.**

541 **Key:** a =anxiety, d= depression, SO=somatic symptoms, st=stress, SS= social support, e =error
542 term, and bidirectional arrow indicates covariance

543 *Table 6: reliability and model fit for the final measurement model for the constructs of anxiety,*
544 *depression, somatic symptoms, stress, and social support.*

Conditions	Cronbach alpha	CMIN/DF	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
Anxiety	0.84	2.6	1.0	1.0	0.0
Depression	0.79				
Somatic symptom	0.77				
Stress	0.80				
Social support	0.46				
Over all	0.90				

545

546 **Model selection for the hypothesized model containing both**
547 **measurement and structural model**

548 For the model containing the structural and measurement parts, model comparisons were done
549 using Akaike information criteria (AIC), CMIN/DF, TLI, CFI, and RMSEA. Model with only
550 significant variables with significant disturbance after parcel; which had small AIC, small
551 CMIN/DF, and RMSEA, and large CFI and TLI was selected as a good fitted model (*Table 7*).

552 *Table 7: Model selection for a model containing both measurement and structural parts for*
553 *anxiety, depression, and somatic symptoms among high and preparatory school adolescents in*
554 *Gondar town, 2022.*

Models	AIC	CMIN/DF	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	Remark
Model with all predictors and covariance after parcel	2468	6.8	0.8	0.7	0.1	
Model with only significant variables with significant disturbance after parcel	951	3.00	0.94	0.92	0.027	selected

555 **Factors related with anxiety, depression and somatic symptom**

556 Self-rated academic ability, perceived social support, physical trauma, death of a loved one, ever
557 use of alcohol, having medically confirmed chronic illness, sex, family pressure, school type, and
558 one endogenous variable stress were all significantly related to anxiety, depression, and somatic
559 symptoms, either directly or indirectly. There was a significant bidirectional relationship
560 between anxiety and depression (*Fig 4, Table 8, Table 9, Table 10*).

561 *Fig 4: Standardized SEM for factors related with anxiety, depression, and somatic symptom*
562 *among high and preparatory school adolescents in Gondar town, Northwest, Ethiopia, 2022.*

563 **Factors related to anxiety among high and preparatory school adolescents**

564 School type, sex, stress, and depression had statistically significant direct and indirect
565 relationships with anxiety. Self-rated academic ability and physical trauma had direct effects,

566 while ever use of alcohol, and having medically confirmed chronic illness had a statistically
 567 insignificant direct, but significant indirect effects on anxiety. Perceived social support,
 568 perceived family academic pressure, and death of beloved one within the past 6 months.

569 Self-rated academic ability had a direct negative effect [adjusted β = -0.03, 95% CI: -0.065, -
 570 0.006] on anxiety. Having a history of physical trauma had positive effect [adjusted β = 0.06,
 571 95% CI: 0.014, 0.125] on anxiety. Being female had a significant direct [adjusted β = 0.08, 95%
 572 CI: 0.019, 0.135] and indirect [adjusted β = 0.04, 95% CI: 0.004, 0.092] positive effect on
 573 anxiety with a total positive effect of 0.12 [adjusted β = 0.12, 95% CI: 0.059, 0.179]. Being in
 574 private school had direct [adjusted β = 0.12, 95% CI: 0.017, 0.226] and indirect [adjusted β =
 575 0.16, 95% CI: 0.056, 0.269] positive effect on anxiety, leading to a total positive effect of 0.28
 576 [adjusted β = 0.28, 95% CI: 0.159, 0.415]. Stress had both direct [adjusted β = 0.54, 95% CI:
 577 0.293, 0.745] and indirect [adjusted β = 0.57, 95% CI: 0.379, 0.814] positive effect on anxiety,
 578 bringing a total positive effect of 1.10[adjusted β = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.955, 1.264]. Perceived social
 579 support had a significant negative indirect effect [adjusted β = -0.22, 95% CI: -0.304, -0.139] on
 580 anxiety, while having a history of death of a loved one in the past 6 months had a significant
 581 positive indirect effect [adjusted β = 0.06, 95% CI: 0.010, 0.122]. Depression had positive direct
 582 effect [adjusted β = 0.74, 95% CI: 0.508, 1.010] on anxiety (*Table 8*).

583 *Table 8: direct, indirect and total effects of socio-demographic, behavioral, relationship related*
 584 *factors, stress and depression on anxiety among adolescents in Gondar town, Northwest*
 585 *Ethiopia, 2022. Unstandardized estimate.*

Variables	Direct effect	Indirect effect	Total effect
DV: Anxiety	Estimate (95% CI)	Estimate (95%CI)	Estimate (95% CI)
Self-rated academic ability	-0.03[-0.065, 0.006] *	----	-0.03[-0.065, 0.006]*

Physical trauma	0.06[0.014, 0.125]*	----	0.06[0.014, 0.125] *
Social support	----	-0.22[-0.304,-0.139] *	-0.22[-0.304,-0.139] *
Death of loved one	----	0.06[0.010, 0.122] *	0.06[0.010, 0.122] *
Ever use of alcohol	-0.03[0.088, 0.035]	0.14[0.071, 0.213] *	0.11[0.041, 0.188] *
History of chronic illness	-0.02[-0.124, 0.078]	0.27[0.165, 0.384] *	0.25[0.132, 0.371] *
Sex	0.08[0.019, 0.135] *	0.04[0.004, 0.092] *	0.12[0.059, 0.179] *
School type	0.12[0.017, 0.226] *	0.16[0.056, 0.269] *	0.28[0.159, 0.415] *
Family academic pressure	----	0.03[0.012, 0.050] *	0.03[0.001, 0.50] *
Stress	0.54[0.293, 0.745] *	0.57[0.379, 0.814] *	1.10[0.955, 1.264] *
Depression	0.74[0.508, 1.010] *	----	0.74[0.508, 1.010] *

586 *Where* *Indicates CI did not include a null value ($\beta=0$), DV= dependent variable, SE= standard

587 error, CI=confidence interval

588 **Factors related to depression among high and preparatory school adolescents in Gondar**

589 **town, 2022.**

590 School type and anxiety were significantly related to depression both directly as well as
591 indirectly. Perceived social support and having a history of death of a loved one within the past
592 six months had significant direct effects on depression. While having medically confirmed
593 chronic illness, having a history of alcohol use, perceived family academic pressure, sex, and
594 stress had an insignificant direct, but significant indirect and total effects on depression. Self-
595 rated academic ability, having history of physical trauma, and depression itself had a statistically
596 significant indirect relationship with depression.

597 Perceived social support had a significant direct negative effect [adjusted $\beta= -0.13$, 95% CI: -
598 0.229,-0.029] on depression. History of experiencing death of beloved one within the past six

599 months had a direct positive effect [adjusted β = 0.03, 95% CI: 0.014, 0.256] on depression.
 600 Learning private school had a significant negative direct [adjusted β = -0.09, 95% CI: -0.194, -
 601 0.004] and positive indirect effect on depression [adjusted β = 0.2, 95% CI: 0.113, 0.320], with a
 602 total positive effect of 0.11 [adjusted β = 0.10, 95% CI: 0.016, 0.207]. Having a medically
 603 confirmed chronic illness had a significant indirect effect on depression [adjusted β = 0.17, 95%
 604 CI: 0.085, 0.265]. Self-rated academic ability had a statistically significant negative indirect
 605 effects [adjusted β =-0.05, 95% CI: -0.083,-0.031] on depression. Having a history of physical
 606 trauma had a statistically significant positive indirect effects [adjusted β = 0.10, 95% CI: 0.037,
 607 0.166] on depression. Anxiety was significantly related to depression [adjusted β = 0.74, 95% CI:
 608 0.483, 1.081] (**Table 9**).

609 *Table 9: direct, indirect and total effects of socio-demographic, behavioral, relationship related*
 610 *factors, stress and anxiety on depression among adolescents in Gondar town, Northwest*
 611 *Ethiopia, 2022. Unstandardized estimate.*

Variables	Direct effect	Indirect effect	Total effect
DV: Depression	Estimate (95%CI)	Estimate(95% CI)	Estimate (95%CI)
Social support	-0.13[-0.229,-0.029]*	----	-0.13[-0.229,-0.029]*
Death of loved one	0.03[0.004, 0.087]*	-----	0.03[0.004, 0.087]*
Self-rated academic ability	----	-0.05[-0.083, -0.031]*	-0.05[-0.083, -0.031]*
Physical trauma	----	0.10[0.037, 0.166]*	0.10[0.037, 0.166]*
Ever use of alcohol	0.06[-0.004, 0.112]	0.08[0.029, 0.139]*	0.14[0.073, 0.201]*
History of chronic illness	0.04[-0.053, 0.124]	0.17[0.085, 0.265]*	0.21[0.114, 0.311]*
Sex	-0.03[-0.099, 0.025]	0.09[0.042,0.162]*	0.06[0.003, 0.109]*
School type	-0.09[-0.194, -0.004]*	0.20[0.113, 0.320] *	0.11[0.016 , 0.207]*

Family pressure	0.02[-0.004, 0.040]	0.02[0.002, 0.043]*	0.04[0.016, 0.060]*
Stress	-0.06[-0.454, 0.247]	0.82[0.530, 1.250]*	0.76[0.642, 0.900]*
Anxiety	0.74[0.483, 1.081*]		0.74[0.483, 1.081*]

612 *Where* *Indicates CI did not include a null value ($\beta=0$), DV= dependent variable, SE= standard
613 error, CI=confidence interval

614 **Factors related to somatic symptoms among high and preparatory school**

615 **adolescents**

616 Having a medically confirmed chronic illness, sex, stress, and depression were all directly and
617 indirectly related to somatic symptoms. Having a history of alcohol drinking, school type and
618 anxiety had insignificant direct, but significant indirect and total effects on somatic symptoms.
619 Self-rated academic ability, perceived social support, physical trauma, and death of a loved one
620 in the past 6 months had a significant indirect effects on somatic symptoms.

621 Having medically confirmed chronic illness had significant positive direct [adjusted $\beta= 0.17$,
622 95% CI= 0.045, 0.290] and indirect [adjusted $\beta= 0.20$, 95% CI: 0.122, 0.289] effect on somatic
623 symptoms, bringing a total positive effects of 0.37 [adjusted $\beta= 0.37$, 95% CI: 0.239, 0.505].
624 Being female had statistically significant direct [adjusted $\beta= 0.10$, 95% CI: 0.050, 0.166] and
625 indirect [adjusted $\beta= 0.03$, 95% CI: 0.002, 0.053] positive effect on somatic symptoms, resulting
626 in a total positive effects of 0.13 [adjusted $\beta= 0.13$, 95% CI: 0.074, 0.198]. Stress had both
627 direct [adjusted $\beta= 0.53$, 95% CI: 0.326, 0.768] and indirect [adjusted $\beta= 0.33$, 95% CI: 0.186,
628 0.472] positive effect on somatic symptoms resulting in a total positive effect of 0.86 [adjusted
629 $\beta= 0.86$, 95% CI: 0.700, 1.025]. Depression had significant direct [adjusted $\beta= 0.38$, 95% CI=
630 0.167, 0.540] and indirect [adjusted $\beta= 0.58$, 95% CI: 0.167, 3.629] positive effect on somatic
631 symptoms resulting in a total positive effect of 0.96 [adjusted $\beta= 0.96$, 95% CI: 0.433, 1.456]. A

632 history of alcohol consumption had a statistically insignificant direct effect on somatic symptoms
 633 [adjusted = 0.03, 95% CI: -0.022, 0.105], but it had a significant positive indirect effect [adjusted
 634 = 0.09, 95% CI: 0.044, 0.144], resulting in a total positive effect of 0.12 [adjusted = 0.12, 95%
 635 CI: 0.062, 0.211]. Anxiety has statistically insignificant direct effect on somatic symptoms
 636 [adjusted β = 0.06, 95% CI: -0.101, 0.212], however, it had statistically significant positive
 637 indirect effect [adjusted β = 0.6, 95% CI: 0.243, 3.825], resulting in a total positive effects of 0.66
 638 [adjusted β =0.66, 95% CI: 0.270, 3.825]. Social support [adjusted = -0.11,% CI: -0.176, -0.067]
 639 and self-rated academic ability [adjusted =-0.02, 95%CI: -0.039, -010] had a significant negative
 640 indirect effect on somatic symptoms, whereas a history of death of a loved one within the
 641 previous six months [adjusted = 0.03% CI: 0.005, 0.067] and having history of physical trauma
 642 [adjusted β = 0.04, 95% CI:0.012, 0.083] had significant positive indirect effect on somatic
 643 symptom (*Table 10*).

644 *Table 10: direct, indirect and total effects of socio-demographic, personal, relationship related*
 645 *factors, stress, anxiety, and depression on somatic symptom disorders among adolescents in*
 646 *Gondar town, Northwest Ethiopia, 2022. Unstandardized estimate.*

Variables	Direct effect	Indirect effect	Total effect
DV: Somatic symptom	Estimate (95%)	Estimate (95%)	Estimate (95%)
Self-rated academic ability	----	-0.02[-0.039, -010]*	-0.02[-0.039, -010]*
Physical trauma	----	0.04[0.012, 0.083]*	0.04[0.012, 0.083]*
Social support	----	-0.11[-0.176, -0.067]*	-0.11[-0.176, -0.067]*
Death of loved one with in the Past 6 months	----	0.03[0.005, 0.067]*	0.03[0.005, 0.067]*
Ever use of alcohol	0.03[-0.022, 0.105]	0.09[0.044, 0.144]*	0.12[0.062, 0.211]*

History of medically confirmed chronic illness	0.17[0.045, 0.290]*	0.20[0.122, 0.289]*	0.37[0.239, 0.505]*
Sex	0.11[0.050, 0.166]*	0.03[0.002, 0.053]*	0.14[0.074, 0.198]*
School type	0.03[-0.074, 0.144]	0.13[0.053, 0.216]*	0.16[0.046, 0.292]*
Stress	0.53[0.326, 0.768]*	0.33[0.186, 0.472]*	0.86[0.700, 1.025]*
Depression	0.38[0.167, 0.540]*	0.58[0.167, 3.629]*	0.96[0.433, 3.774]*
Anxiety	0.06[-0.101, 0.212]	0.60[0.243, 3.825]*	0.66[0.270, 3.825]*

647 Where, *Indicates CI did not include a null value ($\beta=0$), DV= dependent variable, SE= standard
648 error, CI=confidence interval

649 Discussion

650 In this study, the magnitude and determinants of anxiety, depression, and somatic symptoms
651 were examined using non-recursive structural equation modeling. Magnitude of depression,
652 anxiety, and somatic symptom were 28.21 [95% CI: 25.8, 31%], 35.82 [(95% CI: 33.3, 38.4%)
653 and 25.24[95% CI: 23, 27.6%] respectively. Self-rated academic ability, physical trauma, school
654 type, sex, stress, ever use of alcohol, perceived social support, death of a loved one, and having
655 medically confirmed chronic illness were independent predictors of anxiety, depression and
656 somatic symptoms. The bidirectional relationship between anxiety and depression was
657 significant. Depression and anxiety were significant predictors of somatic symptom.

658 Magnitude of depression and its associated factors

659 In the current study, the overall prevalence of self-reported depression was 28.21(95% CI=
660 25.8%, 31%). This is in line with the study conducted in Jimma 28% [18], but it was higher
661 than meta-analysis conducted in china 24.3% [14], and lower than the study conducted in Aksum

662 38.2% [19], Nepal 44.2% [113], Bangladesh 36%[114] , and India 57.7% [115]. The reason for
663 this discrepancy may be due to differences in the screening tools used. Meta-analysis conducted
664 in china included articles with different tools such as Beck Depression Inventory (BDI), Zung
665 self-rating depression scale (SDS), and center of Epidemiology studies depression scale (CES-
666 D). The study Nepal and India (CES-D). This variation could also be justified by the difference
667 in the cutoff points used; the study conducted in Aksum and in Bangladesh used a cutoff above
668 five. Furthermore, this could be explained by socio-cultural differences in different settings.

669 In the final model of our study, perceived social support, having a history of death of a loved
670 one within the past six months, school type, sex ,anxiety, having medically confirmed chronic
671 illness, having a history of alcohol use, perceived family academic pressure, Self-rated academic
672 ability and having a history of physical trauma had a statistically significant relationship with
673 depression.

674 Being female had a statistically significant positive effects [adjusted $\beta= 0.06$, 95% CI:0.003,
675 0.109] on depression; this implies that being females increase the level of level of depression
676 compared to males, controlling other factors constant. This finding is consistent with other
677 studies [18, 37-39]. This could be explained by the fact that men and women have different brain
678 chemistry and hormonal variations. Menstrual fluctuations in progesterone and estrogen may
679 affect neurotransmitters in women, and low neurotransmitters may lead to depression[121].
680 Besides, adolescent girls are more likely to have negative life events in relation to their parents
681 and peers, and females are more emotion focused and have a distracting coping style than males
682 [122] . Furthermore, females are more susceptible to the opinions of others, which may leads to
683 depression [123].

684 Perceived social support had a significant direct negative effect [adjusted $\beta = -0.13$, 95% CI: -
685 0.229,-0.029] on depression. This means that as social support increases, the level of depression
686 decreased or students with low social support had higher levels of depression as compared to
687 those who had high social support. This finding is compatible with different reports [43, 44, 52,
688 56]. The probable reason for this might be low social support which may increase feelings of
689 loneliness, worthlessness, and hopelessness; leading to loss of interest in activities and
690 depression. Moreover, students with low social support are more likely to have low self-esteem
691 and negative cognition than those with higher social support, which may lead to depression.

692 Ever use of alcohol had a positive direct effect [$\beta = 0.14$, 95% CI: 0.073, 0.201] on depression.
693 This implied that an adolescent who had a history of alcohol drinking had a higher level of
694 depression as compared to who did not drink. This finding is congruent with the study conducted
695 in USA [45] and in China [46]. This could be due to the fact that alcohol affects brain chemicals
696 like serotonin and dopamine, which are responsible for happiness, and the decrease in thus
697 chemicals leads to feeling down and depressed [124].

698 Students with lower self-rated academic ability had a higher levels of depression [adjusted $\beta = -$
699 0.05, 95% CI= -0.083,-0.031] as compared with those with high self-rated academic ability. This
700 result is compatible with the study conducted in Iran [125]. The possible explanation for this
701 might be, students with low academic ability are terrified of negative responses from teachers,
702 parents, and friends, which may lead to fear about their future career, they will lose confidence in
703 managing their own problems, which will lead them to become anxious, and anxiety will lead to
704 depression.

705 Stress had significant positive effect [adjusted $\beta = 0.76$, 95% CI: 0.642, 0.900] on depression.
706 This indicates that participants with high-level stress had a higher levels of depression, holding

707 other predictors constant. Our finding is supported with different literatures [49, 50]. The
708 possible justification for this could be owing to the fact that high-level stress impairs the brain
709 function, which may lead to fluctuations in neurotransmitters such as dopamine, which leads to
710 depression. In addition, immune dysregulation during stress-full life events leads to anxiety and
711 anxiety leads to depression.

712 Holding other factors constant, perceived family academic pressure had statistically significant
713 positive effects [adjusted $\beta= 0.04$, 95% CI: 0.016, 0.060] on depression. Implies that participants
714 with higher family academic pressure were related to higher level of depression. This finding is
715 supported by a study conducted in Nepal [41] and in Vietnamese [42]. This could be the higher
716 expectation of parents with higher academic pressure leading the student to stress which in turn
717 leads to anxiety and anxiety leads to depression. Furthermore, students who fail to meet
718 expectations may face harsh criticism, which may lead to self-doubt about their abilities, which
719 may lead to a sense of worthlessness and hopelessness.

720 A history of experiencing death of beloved one within the past six months had a direct positive
721 effect [adjusted $\beta= 0.03$, 95% CI: 0.014, 0.256] effect on depression, keeping other predictors
722 constant. This suggests that students who had a history of death of a loved one in the past 6
723 months had higher levels of depression as compared with their counterparts. Possible
724 justification for this could be individuals who have lost a loved one, may feel worthless without
725 that person, and they may experience feelings of loneliness and poor social interaction, which
726 can lead to depression[126]. Moreover, the emotional reaction following grave may lead to
727 depletion of dopamine, which may lead to depression.

728 Participants with a history of physical trauma had a higher levels of depression [adjusted $\beta=$
729 0.10, 95% CI: 0.037, 0.166] compared to those who had not a history of trauma, holding other

730 predictors constant. The plausible explanation for this could be individuals with physical trauma
731 may have subsequent negatives teaches about the event, they may fear that the events will
732 happen again, which may lead them to anxiety, and anxiety leads to depression.

733 Learning in a private school had statistically significant positive effects [adjusted $\beta= 0.10$, 95%
734 CI: 0.016, 0.207] on depression. It can be inferred that participants in private schools had a
735 higher levels of depression compared to their counter parts. In contrast to our finding, the study
736 conducted in India [40] showed that public school students had a higher level of depression than
737 private school students; this disparity may be explained by differences in sample size and method
738 of analysis; our study had a larger sample size than the India study, and the India study did not
739 address the confounding effect. Higher levels of depression in private schools may be due to
740 parents' expectations of high academic achievement in private schools; which lead students to be
741 stressed when they try to meet their parents' expectations, and stress leads to depression.

742 Holding other predictors constant, medically confirmed chronic illness increased the level of
743 depression [adjusted $\beta= 0.21$, 95% CI: 0.114, 0.311]. This could be justified by the fact that
744 chronic illness decreases the ability to do things, and people with chronic illness may fear the
745 consequences of their illness. Which can lead to anxiety and anxiety can lead to depression.
746 Furthermore, it can be explained by the physical effect of the condition and the treatment effect
747 for those who are on treatment.

748 High level of anxiety was significantly related to higher level of depression [adjusted $\beta= 0.74$,
749 95% CI: 0.483, 1.081]. This finding is compatible with other findings [54, 55]. The possible
750 justification for this may be an individual with anxiety may try to control their worries, but if
751 they are unable to do so, their emotions will be affected and they will become down, hopeless,

752 and depressed. It can also be explained by the sharing of a common set of genes and
753 environmental factors [127].

754 **Magnitude of Anxiety and its associated factors**

755 In this study, the prevalence of anxiety was 25.05% (95%CI: 22.8, 27.5%). It is consistent with
756 the study conducted among children's and youth in Ethiopia 0.5 to 23% [28]. However, this
757 finding is lower than the study conducted in Kenya 37.99% [17], Saudi Arabia 63.5% to 66%
758 [116, 117], in Jordan 42.1% [26] , and in Chandigarh 80.85% [27]. In contrast to this, it was
759 higher than the worldwide estimates of anxiety among children and adolescents (6.5 to 10 %)
760 [118], and among the study conducted in 82 countries, which reported 13-14% in Africa, 9-
761 10% in America, 8-9% in Europe, and 7-8% in Asia [25]. Such variation in the prevalence of
762 anxiety across different continents could originate from variations in the anxiety screening tools
763 used. A study conducted in Saudi Arabia used depression anxiety stress scale (DASS-42, a study
764 conducted in Jordan used symptom checklists anxiety scale, a study conducted in Chandigarh
765 used depression anxiety stress scale-21. Besides, it could also be justified by the different in the
766 cutoff point used: a study conducted in Saudi Arabia used GAS- above five. Thus, variation may
767 also be explained by deference in population characteristics, a study conducted in 82 countries
768 community based study which may decrease the magnitude. Furthermore, cultural differences in
769 different parts of the world may lead to such variations.

770 From the final non-recursive structural equation model our study, we found that self-rated
771 academic ability and perceived social support had a significant negative effects on anxiety,
772 depression, stress, physical trauma, school type, sex, ever use of alcohol, perceived family

773 academic pressure, medically confirmed chronic illness, death of a loved one within the past 6
774 months had significant positive effect on anxiety.

775 As self-rated academic ability of the student increases, the level of anxiety decreases [adjusted
776 $\beta = -0.03$, 95% CI: -0.065, -0.006]. This finding was supported by different studies [26, 59, 128].
777 The plausible reason for this might be students with high self-rated academic ability will be more
778 likely to make decisions, express their feelings without feeling embarrassed, and be more
779 optimistic. Moreover, it could be explained by encouragement and positive response from
780 parents, teachers, and peers.

781 In a study conducted in china [129], alcohol has positive effect on anxiety. Which is supported
782 by our study [adjusted $\beta = 0.11$, 95% CI: 0.041, 0.188]. It can be inferred that adolescents who
783 had a history of alcohol drinking had a higher levels of anxiety than their counterparts, keeping
784 other predictors constant. This could be owing to the fact that ethanol disrupts brain development
785 by killing neurons, resulting in cognitive and affective dysfunction [130]. Which can lead to
786 stress and depression, and stress and depression can lead to anxiety. Furthermore, alcohol
787 drinking may lead to anxiety by decreasing the age-appropriate activities of adolescents such as
788 physical activity and social relationships. Besides, alcohol increases conflict with others [131]
789 and conflict leads to stress that may lead to anxiety.

790 Being female had a statistically significant positive effect [adjusted $\beta = 0.12$, 95% CI: 0.059,
791 0.179] on anxiety. This suggests that controlling other predictors' constant, female students had
792 higher levels of anxiety than male students. This finding is in harmony with the study conducted
793 in different continents [27, 57]. The possible explanation could be that females may be subjected
794 to more life stressors, such as the monthly menstrual cycle and psychological and physical

795 violence [132]. In addition, it can be explained by the higher hormonal fluctuation in women,
796 which exposes them to become anxious [133].

797 In the current study, perceived social support had a significant negative indirect effect [adjusted
798 $\beta=-0.22$, 95% CI: -0.304 , -0.139] on anxiety. This implied that, controlling other determinants
799 constant, as social support increases, the anxiety level will decrease. Direct Comparison is
800 difficult, since none of the other studies assessed the indirect effect of social support on anxiety
801 through depression. This may be explained by the fact that low social support increases the
802 feeling of loneliness and worthless. Which leads to hopelessness, low self-esteem, and negative
803 cognition; that may lead to depression and depression leads to anxiety.

804 Stress had significant positive effects [adjusted $\beta= 1.10$, 95% CI: 0.955 , 1.264] on anxiety. It can
805 be concluded that, as the level of the level of stress increases, the level of anxiety will also
806 increase, keeping other factors constant. Our finding is compatible with different literatures[60,
807 61]. This could be justified by the fact that high levels of stress cause immune dysregulation,
808 which causes an increase in cortisol and corticotrophin hormones, which can impair brain
809 function and eventually lead to anxiety.

810 Perceived family academic pressure had an indirect positive effect [adjusted $\beta= 0.03$, 95% CI:
811 0.001 , 0.50] on anxiety. Means that, as student perceived family academic pressure increases, the
812 level of anxiety will also increase. This finding is supported with the finding in Nepal [41], in
813 south Africa [134], and in Vietnamese [42]. This might be justified by the fact that parents with
814 high academic pressure have higher academic expectations, when students trying to cope with
815 this high expectation may develop stress which in turns leads to anxiety [44].

816 Controlling other factors, constant death of a beloved one within the past 6 months had a
817 significant positive indirect effect [adjusted $\beta= 0.06$, 95% CI: 0.010 , 0.122] on anxiety. Means

818 those participants who had a history of death of the beloved one in the past 6 months had a
819 higher level of anxiety compared to their counterparts. This could be an individual with death of
820 a loved one, may consider themselves as worthless without that person, they may develop a
821 feeling of loneliness, which might lead to depression and depression leads to anxiety.

822 Our findings showed that, holding other predictors constants, having a history of physical trauma
823 had a direct positive effect [adjusted $\beta= 0.06$, 95% CI: 0.014, 0.125] on anxiety. This indicates
824 that students with physical trauma had higher levels of anxiety as compared with those who had
825 not. Our finding was supported by the study conducted in Netherland [135]. This consistency
826 could be justified by the fact that in reaction to trauma, neurotransmitters such as dopamine,
827 serotonin, and gamma amino butyric acid may be impacted by cortisol, and depletion of thus
828 neurotransmitters may lead to anxiety. Besides, individuals with physical trauma may internalize
829 the event and may have subsequent negative thoughts about themselves; which affect their
830 emotional experience, which might leads to anxiety [136].

831 A study conducted in India [137] reported that school type had not a significant relationship
832 with anxiety. Contrarily, in our study school type had a significant relationship with level of
833 anxiety [adjusted $\beta= 0.28$, 95% CI: 0.159, 0.415. It implied that adolescents in private schools
834 experienced higher levels of anxiety than their peers did. It could be due to high control and
835 supervision by parents and teachers in private schools. Furthermore, it might be due to the high
836 academic expectation of students in private schools to satisfy their parents, which may lead to
837 become anxious by fearing future fear of low academic achievement.

838 Having medically confirmed chronic illness had significant positive effects [adjusted $\beta= 0.25$,
839 95% CI: 0.132, 0.371] on anxiety. The plausible explanation for this could be that individuals
840 with chronic illness may have excessive fear about it consequences; they may worry about what

841 peoples say about their illness. This leads to anxiety. Furthermore, it could be justified by the
842 physical effect of the condition, the treatment effect for those who started treatment, which may
843 directly lead to depression, and depression leads to anxiety.

844 Controlling other predictors, constant depression had a direct positive effect on anxiety [adjusted
845 $\beta= 0.74$, 95% CI: 0.508, 1.010]. Our finding is in an agreement with the study conducted in
846 United Kingdom [63]. This could be depressed people spend a lot of time worrying about their
847 symptoms, which causes anxiety. Moreover, it could be due to a shared set of genes [127].

848 **Somatic symptom and its associated factors**

849 In the current analysis, the prevalence of self-reported somatic symptom disorder was 25.24 %
850 (95% CI= 23, 27.6%). This is consistent with the study conducted among children and
851 adolescents in Tarragona which reported 5 to 30 % [35]. The finding in the present study was
852 higher than the magnitude in the general population 5 to 7% [119] and lower than study
853 conducted in Qatar, which reported 47.8% in female and 52.2% in male [120]. The possible
854 explanation for this could be due to variation in the screening tools. The study conducted in
855 Qatar used General Health Questionnaire-12. The study among the general population of
856 children and adolescents used a child somatization inventory. Furthermore, it could also be a
857 variation in population, the study conducted in Qatar was conducted among patients and the
858 study among the general population of children and adolescents including non-school
859 adolescents. Moreover, socio-cultural variation could also be the possible justification.

860 **Factors related with depression, anxiety, and somatic symptoms**

861 In the analysis results of the current study, medically confirmed chronic illness, sex, stress, and
862 depression were significantly related with somatic symptoms both directly and indirectly. Having
863 a history of alcohol drinking, school type, anxiety, self-rated academic ability, perceived social

864 support, physical trauma, and death of the beloved one within the past 6 months had a significant
865 indirect effects on somatic symptoms.

866 Controlling other predictors, constants, medically confirmed chronic illness had a significant
867 positive effect [adjusted $\beta= 0.37$, 95% CI: 0.239, 0.505 on somatic symptoms. This could be
868 individuals with chronic illness may have excessive fear about it consequence which leads to
869 anxiety and anxiety leads to a somatic symptoms. Moreover, it could be by the physical effect of
870 the condition and treatment effect for those who are on treatment, which may directly lead to
871 depression, and depression leads to a somatic symptoms. Direct effect of chronic illness on
872 cognitive function may also be the possible reason.

873 Keeping other factors, constant the history of death of the beloved one in the past 6 months had a
874 significant indirectly effects [adjusted $\beta= 0.03$,% CI: 0.005, 0.067] on somatic symptoms. Direct
875 comparison is not possible, since there is no study conducted with adolescents in Ethiopia or
876 outside. But, it is consistent with the study conducted in Nepal among widows [138]. The
877 possible explanation could be an individual with death of beloved, one may consider themselves
878 as worthless without that person, they could have a feeling of lonesomeness and poor social
879 interaction which leads to depression [126] and depression leads to somatic symptoms.

880 Being female had a statistically significant positive effect [adjusted $\beta=0.13$, 95% CI: 0.074,
881 0.198] on somatic symptoms. This suggests that female students had higher levels of somatic
882 symptoms compared to male students, holding other determinants constant. This finding is
883 supported with other studies [64, 65]. The possible justification for consistency could be
884 psychosocial and biological factors or complex mixture of them [122] that may lead women's at
885 risk of somatic symptoms. Moreover, it could be justified by women's ability to quickly
886 acknowledge psychological distress and seek help for it.

887 As the stress level increase, the level of somatic symptoms will also increase [adjusted $\beta= 0.86$,
888 95% C: 0.700, 1.025]. This means that students with lower levels of stress had a lower levels of
889 somatic symptoms compared to those with lower levels of stress. Our finding is in line with the
890 study conducted in Sweden [70]. The plausible explanation for this might be high cortisol release
891 in response to stress may affect neuro-transmitters; which could lead to impairment in brain
892 function and development of somatic symptom disorders.

893 As the level of depression increase, the level of somatic symptoms will also increase [adjusted
894 $\beta= 0.96$, 95% CI: 0.167, 3.629], which means that students with higher levels of depression had a
895 higher levels of somatic symptoms. This result is supported with other studies [65, 75, 76].
896 Possible explanation for this consistency could be in the depressed individual's neurotransmitters
897 like nor-epinephrine and serotonin are low and the decrement in such neurotransmitters may lead
898 individuals to focus on physical symptoms. Moreover, it could be explained by the co-
899 occurrence of somatic symptoms and depression. Sharing of common sets of genes and
900 environmental factors may also be a possible justification.

901 In our study, having ever use of alcohol had a statistically significant positive effect [adjusted $\beta=$
902 0.12, 95% CI: 0.062, 0.211] on somatic symptoms, keeping other predictors constant; this means
903 that individuals who had a history of alcohol use had a higher levels of somatic symptom
904 compared to their counterparts. Compatible with our finding, a literature review on the
905 relationship between anxiety, depression and substance use [139] showed similar finding. The
906 probable reason could be the direct effect of ethanol on nerve cell [130] which leads to
907 heightened awareness of normal body sensation.

908 Anxiety had significant positive effect [adjusted $\beta=0.66$, 95% CI: 0.270, 3.825] on somatic
909 symptoms. This implies that participants with a higher level of anxiety will have higher level of

910 somatic symptom as compared to those with lower levels of anxiety. The result of the present
911 study is line with other studies [65, 73, 74]. It could be excessive and uncontrolled, worrying in
912 an anxious individual may lead to depression, and depression in turn leads to a somatic
913 symptoms. Besides, a common set of gene components for anxiety and somatic symptoms might
914 also be the possible reason.

915 Social support had a statistically significant indirect negative effect [adjusted $\beta = -0.11$, % CI: -
916 0.176, -0.067] on somatic symptoms; implying that as social support increases the level of
917 somatic symptoms will also increase. In other words, students with low social support had a
918 higher level of somatic symptoms, compared to those with high social support. This finding is
919 congruent with the study conducted in United Kingdom [140]. It could be justified by individuals
920 with low social support may have low self-esteem and negative cognition, which could lead to
921 depression and depression could lead to somatic symptoms.

922 Self-rated academic ability had a significant negative indirect effect [adjusted $\beta = -0.02$, 95%
923 CI: -0.039, -0.010] on somatic symptoms; implying that holding other predictors constant, as
924 student self-rated academic ability increased the level of somatic symptoms will also increase.
925 The present study was supported by the study conducted in Slovakia [138]. The possible
926 explanation for this consistency could be students spending half of their day time in school. For
927 students with lower academic achievement, interaction with teachers and with their peers will be
928 affected; which leads to anxiety and anxiety leads to a somatic symptoms.

929 Having a history of physical trauma had a significant positive indirect effect [adjusted $\beta = 0.04$,
930 95% CI: 0.012, 0.083] on somatic symptoms. It can be interpreted as school adolescents with a
931 history of physical trauma had a higher level of somatic symptoms as compared to their
932 counterparts. This finding is consistent with other study [141]. This may be justified by the fact

933 that trauma could have long-lasting effects on how individuals recognize themselves and their
934 coping abilities, which leads to anxiety and in turn anxiety leads to somatic symptoms.
935 Moreover, new stressful events may intensify the effect of trauma, which will aggravate already
936 present somatic symptoms.

937 Being in a private schools increased the level of somatic symptoms [adjusted $\beta= 0.16$, 95% CI:
938 0.046, 0.292] compared to being in public schools, controlling other factors constant. This
939 finding is consistent with the study conducted in Turkey[64]. Possible justification could be
940 private school students and their parents are optimistic of academic achievement than public
941 school students and parents. Great expectation of high academic achievement leads to the
942 creation of high standards of behavior, which may lead them to become anxious and anxiety
943 leads to a somatic symptoms. Furthermore, this may be due to higher parental and teacher
944 supervision and control in private schools which lead to low psychological autonomy.

945 **Strength and limitations**

946 Bidirectional relationship between anxiety and depression was assessed. Besides, the indirect and
947 direct effects of different independent variables on different dependent variables were assed
948 simultaneously. However, this study is not without limitations, only school adolescents were
949 included in the study, which may affect the generalizability to all adolescents.

950

951 **Conclusion**

952 In this study, a moderate magnitude of anxiety, depression, and somatic symptoms were found.
953 Stress, school type, and sex had significant direct and indirect relationship with anxiety.

954 Depression, self-rated academic ability and physical trauma had a direct effects, while ever use
955 of alcohol, medically confirmed chronic illness, perceived social support, perceived family
956 academic pressure, and death of a loved one within the past 6 months had a significant indirect
957 relationship with anxiety.

958 School type and anxiety were significantly related with depression both directly and indirectly.
959 Perceived social support and having a history of death of a loved one within the past six months
960 had statistically significant direct effect on depression. Whereas, having medically confirmed
961 chronic illness, ever use of alcohol, perceived family academic pressure, sex, stress, self-rated
962 academic ability, and having a history of physical trauma had a significant indirect relationship
963 with depression.

964 Depression, stress, medically confirmed chronic illness, and being female were significantly
965 related with somatic symptoms both directly and indirectly. Simultaneously, alcohol use in the
966 past 6 months, school type, anxiety, self-rated academic ability, perceived social support,
967 physical trauma, and death of a loved one had a significant indirect effect on somatic symptoms.

968 Abbreviations

969 AIC: Akaike information Criteria, OVB: Omitted variable bias, CFI: Comparative Fix index,
970 CMB: Common Method Bias, GBD: Global Burden of Disease, GFI: Goodness of Fit Index,
971 IRB: Institutional Review Board, IV: Instrumental Variable, MD: Mahalanobis distance: OVB:
972 Omitted Variable Bias, PHQ-9A: Patent Health Questionnaire for Adolescent, PSS: Perceived
973 Stress Scale, RMSEA: Rooted Mean Square Error of Approximation, SDG: Sustainable
974 Development Goal, SSS: Somatic Symptom Scale, TLS: Tucker Lewis Index, WHO: World
975 Health Organization

976 **Acknowledgments**

977 First and foremost, we would like to express our gratitude to the Almighty God, who has served
978 as our compass and source of strength throughout the paper. Next, we would like to thank
979 University of Gondar College of Medicine and Health Science, Institute of Public Health for
980 giving us this great opportunity to do this paper and for the internet access. Following that, we
981 would like to thank the Gondar Town Administrative Education Department and the School
982 Directors for their information. Finally, we would like to thank each participant for agreeing to
983 take part and providing the essential data.

984 **Authors' contribution**

985 Conceptualization: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher

986 Data curation: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher. Ayenew Molla, Rediet Eristu

987 Formal analysis: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher

988 Investigation: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher. Ayenew Molla, Rediet Eristu

989 Methodology: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher. Ayenew Molla, Rediet Eristu

990 Project administration: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher. Ayenew Molla, Rediet Eristu

991 Resource: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher. Ayenew Molla, Rediet Eristu

992 Software: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher, Ayenew Molla, Rediet Eristu

993 Supervision: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher, Ayenew Molla, Rediet Eristu

994 Validation: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher, Ayenew Molla, Rediet Eristu

995 Visualization: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher

996 Writing – original draft: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher

997 Writing – review and editing: Zenebe Abebe Gebreegziabher. Ayenew Molla, Rediet Eristu

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011 **References**

- 1012 1. American Psychiatric Association, D. and A.P. Association, *Diagnostic and statistical manual of*
1013 *mental disorders: DSM-5*. Vol. 5. 2013: American psychiatric association Washington, DC.
- 1014 2. World Health Organization, *The global burden of disease: 2004 update*. 2008: World Health
1015 Organization.
- 1016 3. Jörns-Presentati, A., et al., *The prevalence of mental health problems in sub-Saharan*
1017 *adolescents: A systematic review*. Plos one, 2021. **16**(5): p. e0251689.
- 1018 4. Armocida, B., et al., *Burden of non-communicable diseases among adolescents aged 10–24 years*
1019 *in the EU, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis of the Global Burden of Diseases Study 2019*. The
1020 Lancet Child & Adolescent Health, 2022.
- 1021 5. WHO, *Adolescents mental health*. 2019.
- 1022 6. Ryan, G., O. Qureshi, and N. Salaria, *Mental health and the 2030 Sustainable Development*
1023 *Agenda: global inaction on mental health is putting the brakes on development*. London, UK:
1024 London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, 2018.
- 1025 7. Kassebaum, N.J., et al., *Global, regional, and national disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) for*
1026 *315 diseases and injuries and healthy life expectancy (HALE), 1990–2015: a systematic analysis*
1027 *for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015*. The Lancet, 2016. **388**(10053): p. 1603-1658.
- 1028 8. Sayers, J., *The world health report 2001-Mental health: new understanding, new hope*. Bulletin
1029 of the World Health Organization, 2001. **79**: p. 1085-1085.

- 1030 9. Organization, W.H., *Depression and other common mental disorders: global health estimates*.
1031 2017, World Health Organization.
- 1032 10. Perez, D.L., et al., *A neural circuit framework for somatosensory amplification in somatoform*
1033 *disorders*. J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci, 2015. **27**(1): p. e40-50.
- 1034 11. WHO. *depression definition* 2019; Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescent-mental-health)
1035 [sheets/detail/adolescent-mental-health](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescent-mental-health).
- 1036 12. Lancet, T., *Better understanding of youth mental health*. 2017. p. 1670.
- 1037 13. WHO., *Adolescents: health risks and solutions*. Geneva: World Health Organization. 2018.
- 1038 14. Tang, X., et al., *Prevalence of depressive symptoms among adolescents in secondary school in*
1039 *mainland China: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. J Affect Disord, 2019. **245**: p. 498-507.
- 1040 15. El-Missiry, A., et al., *Screening for depression in a sample of Egyptian secondary school female*
1041 *students*. J Affect Disord, 2012. **136**(1-2): p. e61-e68.
- 1042 16. Erskine, H.E., et al., *The global coverage of prevalence data for mental disorders in children and*
1043 *adolescents*. Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci, 2017. **26**(4): p. 395-402.
- 1044 17. Osborn, T.L., et al., *Depression and Anxiety Symptoms, Social Support, and Demographic Factors*
1045 *Among Kenyan High School Students*. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 2020. **29**(5): p. 1432-
1046 1443.
- 1047 18. Girma, S., et al., *Depression and its determinants among adolescents in Jimma town, Southwest*
1048 *Ethiopia*. Plos one, 2021. **16**(5): p. e0250927.
- 1049 19. Tirfeneh, E. and M. Srahbzu, *Depression and its association with parental neglect among*
1050 *adolescents at governmental high schools of Aksum town, Tigray, Ethiopia, 2019: a cross*
1051 *sectional study*. Depression research and treatment, 2020. **2020**.
- 1052 20. Bandelow, B. and S. Michaelis, *Epidemiology of anxiety disorders in the 21st century*. Dialogues
1053 in clinical neuroscience, 2022.
- 1054 21. Beesdo, K., et al., *Incidence and risk patterns of anxiety and depressive disorders and*
1055 *categorization of generalized anxiety disorder*. Archives of general psychiatry, 2010. **67**(1): p. 47-
1056 57.
- 1057 22. Yang, X., et al., *Global, regional and national burden of anxiety disorders from 1990 to 2019:*
1058 *results from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019*. Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences,
1059 2021. **30**: p. e36.
- 1060 23. Vos, T., et al., *Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–*
1061 *2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019*. The Lancet, 2020.
1062 **396**(10258): p. 1204-1222.
- 1063 24. Kessler, R.C., et al., *Twelve-month and lifetime prevalence and lifetime morbid risk of anxiety and*
1064 *mood disorders in the United States*. International journal of methods in psychiatric research,
1065 2012. **21**(3): p. 169-184.
- 1066 25. Biswas, T., et al., *Global variation in the prevalence of suicidal ideation, anxiety and their*
1067 *correlates among adolescents: a population based study of 82 countries*. EClinicalMedicine,
1068 2020. **24**: p. 100395.
- 1069 26. Malak, M.Z. and A.H. Khalifeh, *Anxiety and depression among school students in Jordan:*
1070 *Prevalence, risk factors, and predictors*. Perspectives in psychiatric care, 2018. **54**(2): p. 242-250.
- 1071 27. Sandal, R.K., et al., *Prevalence of Depression, Anxiety and Stress among school going adolescent*
1072 *in Chandigarh*. Journal of family medicine and primary care, 2017. **6**(2): p. 405-410.
- 1073 28. Biftu, B. and Y. Guracho, *A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Anxiety among Children and*
1074 *Youth in Ethiopia*. J Depress Anxiety Disord, 2021. **3**(2): p. 89-100.
- 1075 29. Eriksen, T.E. and M.B. Risør, *What is called symptom?* Med Health Care Philos, 2014. **17**(1): p.
1076 89-102.

- 1077 30. Edgcomb, J.B., C.H. Tseng, and B. Kerner, *Medically unexplained somatic symptoms and bipolar*
1078 *spectrum disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. J Affect Disord, 2016. **204**: p. 205-
1079 13.
- 1080 31. Tomenson, B., et al., *Total somatic symptom score as a predictor of health outcome in somatic*
1081 *symptom disorders*. Br J Psychiatry, 2013. **203**(5): p. 373-80.
- 1082 32. Löwe, B., et al., *Depression, anxiety and somatization in primary care: syndrome overlap and*
1083 *functional impairment*. General hospital psychiatry, 2008. **30**(3): p. 191-199.
- 1084 33. Kroenke, K. and A.D. Mangelsdorff, *Common symptoms in ambulatory care: Incidence,*
1085 *evaluation, therapy, and outcome*. The American Journal of Medicine, 1989. **86**(3): p. 262-266.
- 1086 34. Kurlansik, S.L. and M.S. Maffei, *Somatic symptom disorder*. American family physician, 2016.
1087 **93**(1): p. 49-54.
- 1088 35. Martin, J.C.S., et al., *Somatic complaints and symptoms of anxiety and depression in a school-*
1089 *based sample of preadolescents and early adolescents. Functional impairment and implications*
1090 *for treatment*. Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies, 2011. **11**(2): p. 191-208.
- 1091 36. Carlsson, J., *Prevalence of headache in schoolchildren: relation to family and school factors*. Acta
1092 Paediatr, 1996. **85**(6): p. 692-6.
- 1093 37. Trivedi, D., et al., *Depression among adolescent students in South India: How serious is the issue?*
1094 *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 2016. **58**(3): p. 349-350.
- 1095 38. Raheel, H., *Depression and associated factors among adolescent females in Riyadh, Kingdom of*
1096 *Saudi Arabia, a cross-sectional study*. International journal of preventive medicine, 2015. **6**.
- 1097 39. Rehm, J. and K.D. Shield, *Global burden of disease and the impact of mental and addictive*
1098 *disorders*. Current psychiatry reports, 2019. **21**(2): p. 1-7.
- 1099 40. Kumar, R.K., et al., *The prevalence of depression, anxiety, and stress among high school*
1100 *adolescent's children in public and private schools in Rangareddy district Telangana state: A*
1101 *cross-sectional study*. Journal of Education and Health Promotion, 2022. **11**(1): p. 83.
- 1102 41. BP, C., *Stress, anxiety, and depression among adolescent students of public schools in*
1103 *Kathmandu*. Journal of Institute of Medicine, 2018. **40**(3).
- 1104 42. Nguyen, D.T., et al., *Depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation among Vietnamese secondary*
1105 *school students and proposed solutions: a cross-sectional study*. BMC public health, 2013. **13**(1):
1106 p. 1-10.
- 1107 43. Addy, N.D., et al., *Mental health difficulties, coping mechanisms and support systems among*
1108 *school-going adolescents in Ghana: A mixed-methods study*. PLoS one, 2021. **16**(4): p. e0250424.
- 1109 44. Deb, S., E. Strodl, and H. Sun, *Academic stress, parental pressure, anxiety and mental health*
1110 *among Indian high school students*. International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Science,
1111 2015. **5**(1): p. 26-34.
- 1112 45. Galaif, E.R., et al., *Suicidality, depression, and alcohol use among adolescents: a review of*
1113 *empirical findings*. International journal of adolescent medicine and health, 2007. **19**(1): p. 27-
1114 36.
- 1115 46. Huang, R., et al., *Reported alcohol drinking and mental health problems in Hong Kong Chinese*
1116 *adolescents*. Drug and alcohol dependence, 2016. **164**: p. 47-54.
- 1117 47. Shah, S.M., et al., *Self-esteem and other risk factors for depressive symptoms among adolescents*
1118 *in United Arab Emirates*. PloS one, 2020. **15**(1): p. e0227483.
- 1119 48. Gülsen, A. and B. Uygur, *Psychological Features of Smokers*. Respir Care, 2018. **63**(12): p. 1492-
1120 1497.
- 1121 49. Ibrahim, N., et al., *Prevalence and predictors of depression and suicidal ideation among*
1122 *adolescents attending government secondary schools in Malaysia*. Medical Journal of Malaysia,
1123 2017. **72**(4): p. 221-227.

- 1124 50. Ghobadzadeh, M., et al., *Relationships between adolescent stress, depressive symptoms, and*
1125 *sexual risk behavior in young adulthood: A structural equation modeling analysis.* Journal of
1126 Pediatric Health Care, 2019. **33**(4): p. 394-403.
- 1127 51. Lindholdt, L., et al., *Perceived stress among adolescents as a marker for future mental disorders:*
1128 *A prospective cohort study.* Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 2021: p. 1403494821993719.
- 1129 52. Cao, C., et al., *Anxiety, depression, and PTSD symptoms among high school students in china in*
1130 *response to the COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown.* Journal of Affective Disorders, 2022. **296**: p.
1131 126-129.
- 1132 53. AlAzzam, M., et al., *Predictors of depression and anxiety among senior high school students*
1133 *during COVID-19 pandemic: The context of home quarantine and online education.* The Journal
1134 of School Nursing, 2021. **37**(4): p. 241-248.
- 1135 54. Wittchen, H.-U., C.A. Essau, and J.-C. Krieg, *Anxiety disorders: similarities and differences of*
1136 *comorbidity in treated and untreated groups.* The British Journal of Psychiatry, 1991. **159**(S12):
1137 p. 23-33.
- 1138 55. Essau, C.A., J. Conradt, and F. Petermann, *Frequency, comorbidity, and psychosocial impairment*
1139 *of anxiety disorders in German adolescents.* Journal of anxiety disorders, 2000. **14**(3): p. 263-
1140 279.
- 1141 56. Chang, C.-W., R. Yuan, and J.-K. Chen, *Social support and depression among Chinese adolescents:*
1142 *The mediating roles of self-esteem and self-efficacy.* Children and Youth Services Review, 2018.
1143 **88**: p. 128-134.
- 1144 57. Tramonte, L. and D. Willms, *The prevalence of anxiety among middle and secondary school*
1145 *students in Canada.* Canadian Journal of Public Health/Revue Canadienne de Sante'e Publique,
1146 2010: p. S19-S22.
- 1147 58. Smith, L., et al., *Correlates of symptoms of anxiety and depression and mental wellbeing*
1148 *associated with COVID-19: a cross-sectional study of UK-based respondents.* Psychiatry Res,
1149 2020. **291**: p. 113138.
- 1150 59. Syokwaa, K.A., P.J. Aloka, and S.N.F. Ndunge, *The relationship between anxiety levels and*
1151 *academic achievement among students in selected secondary schools in Lang'ata District, Kenya.*
1152 Journal of Educational and Social Research, 2014. **4**(3): p. 403-403.
- 1153 60. Khanum, F. and S. Razack, *Anxiety-Herbal treatment: A review.* Res Rev Biomed Biotech, 2010.
1154 **1**(2): p. 83-89.
- 1155 61. Kumari, A. and J. Jain, *Examination stress and anxiety: A study of college students.* Global Journal
1156 of Multidisciplinary Studies, 2014. **4**(1): p. 31-40.
- 1157 62. Bekhuis, E., et al., *Differential associations of specific depressive and anxiety disorders with*
1158 *somatic symptoms.* Journal of psychosomatic research, 2015. **78**(2): p. 116-122.
- 1159 63. Rice, F., M.B.M. van den Bree, and A. Thapar, *A population-based study of anxiety as a precursor*
1160 *for depression in childhood and adolescence.* BMC Psychiatry, 2004. **4**(1): p. 43.
- 1161 64. Karaca, S., et al., *Somatic Symptoms in Secondary School Students and Parental Attitudes.*
1162 Journal of Psychiatric Nursing/Psikiyatri Hemsireleri Dernegi, 2015. **6**(3).
- 1163 65. Haraldstad, K. and T.H. Stea, *Associations between pain, self-efficacy, sleep duration, and*
1164 *symptoms of depression in adolescents: a cross-sectional survey.* BMC public health, 2021. **21**(1):
1165 p. 1-7.
- 1166 66. Larsson, B.S., *Somatic complaints and their relationship to depressive symptoms in Swedish*
1167 *adolescents.* Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 1991. **32**(5): p. 821-832.
- 1168 67. Heidari, Z., et al., *Demographic and Life Styles Determinants of Somatic Complaints' Structures: A*
1169 *Cross-sectional Study on a Large Sample of Iranian Adults Using Factor Mixture Model.* Int J Prev
1170 Med, 2017. **8**: p. 8.

- 1171 68. Ruotsalainen, H., et al., *Systematic review of physical activity and exercise interventions on body*
1172 *mass indices, subsequent physical activity and psychological symptoms in overweight and obese*
1173 *adolescents*. Journal of advanced nursing, 2015. **71**(11): p. 2461-2477.
- 1174 69. Noh, J.-W., et al., *Relationships between Extra-School Tutoring Time, Somatic Symptoms, and*
1175 *Sleep Duration of Adolescent Students: A Panel Analysis Using Data from the Korean Children*
1176 *and Youth Panel Survey*. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health,
1177 2020. **17**(21): p. 8037.
- 1178 70. Glise, K., G. Ahlborg, and I.H. Jonsdottir, *Prevalence and course of somatic symptoms in patients*
1179 *with stress-related exhaustion: does sex or age matter*. BMC psychiatry, 2014. **14**(1): p. 1-13.
- 1180 71. Garralda, M.E., *Unexplained physical complaints*. Pediatric Clinics, 2011. **58**(4): p. 803-813.
- 1181 72. Glise, K., G. Ahlborg, Jr., and I.H. Jonsdottir, *Prevalence and course of somatic symptoms in*
1182 *patients with stress-related exhaustion: does sex or age matter*. BMC psychiatry, 2014. **14**: p.
1183 118-118.
- 1184 73. van Boven, K., et al., *Do unexplained symptoms predict anxiety or depression? Ten-year data*
1185 *from a practice-based research network*. British Journal of General Practice, 2011. **61**(587): p.
1186 e316-e325.
- 1187 74. Kingery, J.N., G.S. Ginsburg, and C.A. Alfano, *Somatic symptoms and anxiety among African*
1188 *American adolescents*. Journal of Black Psychology, 2007. **33**(4): p. 363-378.
- 1189 75. Janssens, K.A., et al., *Anxiety and depression are risk factors rather than consequences of*
1190 *functional somatic symptoms in a general population of adolescents: the TRAILS study*. Journal of
1191 Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 2010. **51**(3): p. 304-312.
- 1192 76. Knook, L.M., et al., *Psychiatric disorders in children and adolescents presenting with unexplained*
1193 *chronic pain: what is the prevalence and clinical relevancy?* European child & adolescent
1194 psychiatry, 2011. **20**(1): p. 39-48.
- 1195 77. Rojas, G., et al., *[Association between drug consumption and depression among high school*
1196 *students]*. Rev Med Chil, 2012. **140**(2): p. 184-91.
- 1197 78. Yen, C.F., et al., *Tattooing among high school students in southern Taiwan: the prevalence,*
1198 *correlates and associations with risk-taking behaviors and depression*. Kaohsiung J Med Sci,
1199 2012. **28**(7): p. 383-9.
- 1200 79. Mackenzie, S., et al., *Depression and suicide ideation among students accessing campus health*
1201 *care*. Am J Orthopsychiatry, 2011. **81**(1): p. 101-7.
- 1202 80. Dunlavy, A.C., E.O. Aquah, and M.L. Wilson, *Suicidal ideation among school-attending*
1203 *adolescents in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania*. Tanzania Journal of Health Research, 2015. **17**(1).
- 1204 81. World Health Organization, 2021.
- 1205 82. Clayborne, Z.M., M. Varin, and I. Colman, *Systematic review and meta-analysis: adolescent*
1206 *depression and long-term psychosocial outcomes*. Journal of the American Academy of Child &
1207 Adolescent Psychiatry, 2019. **58**(1): p. 72-79.
- 1208 83. Saxena, S. and Y. Setoya, *World Health Organization's Comprehensive Mental Health Action Plan*
1209 *2013–2020*. 2014.
- 1210 84. Murray, A.M., et al., *Barriers to the diagnosis of somatoform disorders in primary care: protocol*
1211 *for a systematic review of the current status*. Systematic reviews, 2013. **2**(1): p. 1-8.
- 1212 85. Abdulghani, H.M., et al., *Stress and its effects on medical students: a cross-sectional study at a*
1213 *college of medicine in Saudi Arabia*. Journal of health, population, and nutrition, 2011. **29**(5): p.
1214 516.
- 1215 86. Organization, W.H., *World health statistics overview 2019: monitoring health for the SDGs,*
1216 *sustainable development goals*. 2019, World Health Organization.
- 1217 87. Erskine, H., et al., *The global coverage of prevalence data for mental disorders in children and*
1218 *adolescents*. Epidemiology and psychiatric sciences, 2017. **26**(4): p. 395-402.

- 1219 88. report, G.c.a., *total population estimation report*. Gondar city administrative office, 2022.
- 1220 89. Bentler, P.M. and C.-P. Chou, *Practical issues in structural modeling*. Sociological methods &
1221 research, 1987. **16**(1): p. 78-117.
- 1222 90. Kroenke, K., R.L. Spitzer, and J.B. Williams, *The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity*
1223 *measure*. J Gen Intern Med, 2001. **16**(9): p. 606-13.
- 1224 91. Spitzer, R.L., et al., *A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7*.
1225 Archives of internal medicine, 2006. **166**(10): p. 1092-1097.
- 1226 92. Spitzer, R.L., et al., *A Brief Measure for Assessing Generalized Anxiety Disorder: The GAD-7*.
1227 Archives of Internal Medicine, 2006. **166**(10): p. 1092-1097.
- 1228 93. Toussaint, A., et al., *Detecting DSM-5 somatic symptom disorder: criterion validity of the Patient*
1229 *Health Questionnaire-15 (PHQ-15) and the Somatic Symptom Scale-8 (SSS-8) in combination with*
1230 *the Somatic Symptom Disorder – B Criteria Scale (SSD-12)*. Psychological Medicine, 2019. **50**(2):
1231 p. 324-333.
- 1232 94. Gierk, B., et al., *The somatic symptom scale–8 (SSS-8): a brief measure of somatic symptom*
1233 *burden*. JAMA internal medicine, 2014. **174**(3): p. 399-407.
- 1234 95. Cohen, S., T. Kamarck, and R. Mermelstein, *A global measure of perceived stress*. Journal of
1235 health and social behavior, 1983: p. 385-396.
- 1236 96. Bøen, H., O.S. Dalgard, and E. Bjertness, *The importance of social support in the associations*
1237 *between psychological distress and somatic health problems and socio-economic factors among*
1238 *older adults living at home: a cross sectional study*. BMC geriatrics, 2012. **12**(1): p. 1-12.
- 1239 97. Prochaska, J.J., J.F. Sallis, and B. Long, *A physical activity screening measure for use with*
1240 *adolescents in primary care*. Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine, 2001. **155**(5): p. 554-
1241 559.
- 1242 98. Group, W.A.W., *The alcohol, smoking and substance involvement screening test (ASSIST):*
1243 *development, reliability and feasibility*. Addiction, 2002. **97**(9): p. 1183-1194.
- 1244 99. Kroenke, K., R.L. Spitzer, and J.B. Williams, *The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity*
1245 *measure*. Journal of general internal medicine, 2001. **16**(9): p. 606-613.
- 1246 100. Gierk, B., et al., *Assessing somatic symptom burden: A psychometric comparison of the Patient*
1247 *Health Questionnaire—15 (PHQ-15) and the Somatic Symptom Scale—8 (SSS-8)*. Journal of
1248 Psychosomatic Research, 2015. **78**(4): p. 352-355.
- 1249 101. Clark, L.A. and D. Watson, *Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development*.
1250 2016.
- 1251 102. Fornell, C. and D.F. Larcker, *Structural equation models with unobservable variables and*
1252 *measurement error: Algebra and statistics*. 1981, Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
- 1253 103. Shukur, G. and P. Mantalos, *Size and power of the RESET test as applied to systems of equations:*
1254 *a bootstrap approach*. Journal of modern applied statistical methods, 2004. **3**(2): p. 10.
- 1255 104. Kline, R.B., *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. 2015: Guilford publications.
- 1256 105. Kumar, S. and S. Kumar, *Structure equation modeling basic assumptions and concepts: A novices*
1257 *guide*. Asian Journal of Management Sciences, 2015. **3**(07): p. 25-28.
- 1258 106. Roth, P.L. and F.S. Switzer III, *A Monte Carlo analysis of missing data techniques in a HRM*
1259 *setting*. Journal of Management, 1995. **21**(5): p. 1003-1023.
- 1260 107. Aguirre-Urreta, M.I. and J. Hu, *Detecting common method bias: Performance of the Harman's*
1261 *single-factor test*. ACM SIGMIS Database: the DATABASE for Advances in Information Systems,
1262 2019. **50**(2): p. 45-70.
- 1263 108. Paxton, P., et al., *Nonrecursive models: Endogeneity, reciprocal relationships, and feedback*
1264 *loops*. Vol. 168. 2011: Sage Publications.
- 1265 109. Smith, T.D. and B.F. McMillan, *A Primer of Model Fit Indices in Structural Equation Modeling*.
1266 2001.

- 1267 110. Hoyle, R.H., *The structural equation modeling approach: Basic concepts and fundamental issues*.
1268 1995.
- 1269 111. Technology, E.F.M.o.S.a., *national-research-ethics-review-guideline*. 2014.
- 1270 112. Steiger, J.H., *Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach*.
1271 *Multivariate behavioral research*, 1990. **25**(2): p. 173-180.
- 1272 113. Bhattarai, D., N. Shrestha, and S. Paudel, *Prevalence and factors associated with depression*
1273 *among higher secondary school adolescents of Pokhara Metropolitan, Nepal: a cross-sectional*
1274 *study*. *BMJ Open*, 2020. **10**(12): p. e044042.
- 1275 114. Anjum, A., et al., *Investigating the prevalence of and factors associated with depressive*
1276 *symptoms among urban and semi-urban school adolescents in Bangladesh: a pilot study*.
1277 *International health*, 2019.
- 1278 115. Urmila, K., et al., *Prevalence and risk factors associated with depression among higher secondary*
1279 *school students residing in a boarding school of North Kerala, India*. *Int J Contemp Pediatr*, 2017.
1280 **4**(3): p. 735.
- 1281 116. Khalid S, A.G., A.A. Hasan S, and M. Ossama A, *Prevalence of depression, anxiety and stress as*
1282 *measured by the depression, anxiety, and stress scale [DASS-42] among secondary school girls in*
1283 *Abha, Saudi Arabia*. 2009.
- 1284 117. Alharbi, R., et al., *Depression and anxiety among high school student at Qassim Region*. *Journal*
1285 *of family medicine and primary care*, 2019. **8**(2): p. 504.
- 1286 118. Polanczyk, G.V., et al., *Annual research review: A meta-analysis of the worldwide prevalence of*
1287 *mental disorders in children and adolescents*. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry*, 2015.
1288 **56**(3): p. 345-365.
- 1289 119. Widiger, T.A., P.T. Costa, and A.P. Association, *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of*
1290 *personality*. 2013: JSTOR.
- 1291 120. Bener, A., S. Ghuloum, and F.T. Burgut, *Gender differences in prevalence of somatoform*
1292 *disorders in patients visiting primary care centers*. *Journal of primary care & community health*,
1293 2010. **1**(1): p. 37-42.
- 1294 121. Wharton, W., et al., *Neurobiological underpinnings of the estrogen-mood relationship*. *Current*
1295 *psychiatry reviews*, 2012. **8**(3): p. 247-256.
- 1296 122. Johnson, D.P. and M.A. Whisman, *Gender differences in rumination: A meta-analysis*. *Personality*
1297 *and individual differences*, 2013. **55**(4): p. 367-374.
- 1298 123. Altemus, M., N. Sarvaiya, and C.N. Epperson, *Sex differences in anxiety and depression clinical*
1299 *perspectives*. *Frontiers in neuroendocrinology*, 2014. **35**(3): p. 320-330.
- 1300 124. Deykin, E.Y., J.C. Levy, and V. Wells, *Adolescent depression, alcohol and drug abuse*. *American*
1301 *Journal of Public Health*, 1987. **77**(2): p. 178-182.
- 1302 125. Yousefi, F., et al., *The relationship between gender, age, depression and academic achievement*.
1303 2010.
- 1304 126. Care, B., *Children and grief. A reference list compiled by dr. philos. Atle Dyregrov Center for Crisis*
1305 *Psychology, Bergen, Norway*. *School Psychology International*, 1994. **22**: p. 417-433.
- 1306 127. Kendler, K.S., et al., *The structure of genetic and environmental risk factors for common*
1307 *psychiatric and substance use disorders in men and women*. *Archives of general psychiatry*,
1308 2003. **60**(9): p. 929-937.
- 1309 128. El-Anzi, F.O., *Academic achievement and its relationship with anxiety, self-esteem, optimism,*
1310 *and pessimism in Kuwaiti students*. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*,
1311 2005. **33**(1): p. 95-104.
- 1312 129. Huang, R., et al., *Reported alcohol drinking and mental health problems in Hong Kong Chinese*
1313 *adolescents*. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 2016. **164**: p. 47-54.

- 1314 130. Guerri, C. and M. Pascual, *Mechanisms involved in the neurotoxic, cognitive, and*
1315 *neurobehavioral effects of alcohol consumption during adolescence*. Alcohol, 2010. **44**(1): p. 15-
1316 26.
- 1317 131. Miller, J.W., et al., *Binge drinking and associated health risk behaviors among high school*
1318 *students*. Pediatrics, 2007. **119**(1): p. 76-85.
- 1319 132. Moksnes, U.K. and G.A. Espnes, *Self-esteem and emotional health in adolescents—gender and*
1320 *age as potential moderators*. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 2012. **53**(6): p. 483-489.
- 1321 133. Narbone, M., et al., *Hormonal dysregulation and catamenial epilepsy*. Functional Neurology,
1322 1990. **5**(1): p. 49-53.
- 1323 134. Da Costa, L.C. and B. Mash, *A description of the psychosocial factors associated with depression*
1324 *and anxiety in South African adolescents attending urban private practices in Johannesburg*.
1325 South African Family Practice, 2008. **50**(5): p. 51-51.
- 1326 135. Hovens, J.G., et al., *Childhood life events and childhood trauma in adult patients with depressive,*
1327 *anxiety and comorbid disorders vs. controls*. Acta psychiatrica scandinavica, 2010. **122**(1): p. 66-
1328 74.
- 1329 136. Association, A.P., *DSM 5 diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, in *DSM 5*
1330 *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*. 2013. p. 947 p.-947 p.
- 1331 137. Kumar, R.K., et al., *The prevalence of depression, anxiety, and stress among high school*
1332 *adolescent's children in public and private schools in Rangareddy district Telangana state: A*
1333 *cross-sectional study*. Journal of Education and Health Promotion, 2022. **11**.
- 1334 138. Demuthova, S., *The School Environment as a Source of Somatic Problems in Adolescents*. Revista
1335 Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională, 2019. **11**(2): p. 59-71.
- 1336 139. Hassan, I. and R. Ali, *The association between somatic symptoms, anxiety disorders and*
1337 *substance use. A literature review*. Psychiatric quarterly, 2011. **82**(4): p. 315-328.
- 1338 140. Cottrell, D.J., *Fifteen-minute consultation: Medically unexplained symptoms*. Archives of Disease
1339 in Childhood-Education and Practice, 2016. **101**(3): p. 114-118.
- 1340 141. Petkus, A.J., et al., *Trauma history is associated with psychological distress and somatic*
1341 *symptoms in homebound older adults*. The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 2009. **17**(9):
1342 p. 810-818.

1343

1344

1345

1346

1347

1348

1349

1350

1351

1352

1353

1354

1355

1356

1357

1358

1359

1360

1361

1362

1363

1364

1365

1366

1367


1368

1369

1370


1371

- 1372 **Supporting Information's**
- 1373 S1 Table1 1: tools
- 1374 S1 Table1 2: intraclass correlation coefficients
- 1375 S1 Table1 3: Instrumental variable validity and strength
- 1376 S1 Table1 4: depression among adolescents
- 1377 S1 Table1 5: anxiety among adolescents
- 1378 S1 Table1 6: somatic symptom among adolescent
- 1379 S1 Fig 1: hypothetical measurement model
- 1380 S1 Table1 7: Factorial average item parceling
- 1381 S2 1: Data set




Figure


Final Measurement Model



Figure



Figure



Figure