

1 **Advancing Research on Mechanisms of Resilience (ARMOR) Prospective Longitudinal Study of**
2 **Adaptation in Young Military Recruits: Protocol and rationale for methods and measures**

3
4
5
6 Melissa A. Polusny, PhD^{1,2,3}, Craig A. Marquardt, PhD^{1,3}, Shelly Hubbling^{1,3}, Emily Hagel
7 Campbell^{1,2}, Paul A. Arbisi, PhD^{1,3,4}, Nicholas D. Davenport, PhD^{1,3}, Kelvin O. Lim, MD^{1,3}, Shumel
8 Lissek⁴, PhD, Jonathan D. Schaefer, PhD⁵, Scott R. Sponheim, PhD^{1,3,4}, Ann S. Masten, PhD⁵, and
9 Siamak Noorbaloochi, PhD^{1,2,6}

- 10
11 1. Minneapolis VA Health Care System, Minneapolis, MN;
12 2. Center for Care Delivery Outcomes Research, Minneapolis, MN;
13 3. Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of Minnesota Medical
14 School
15 4. Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
16 5. Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
17 6. Department of Medicine, University of Minnesota Medical School
18

19 **Author Note**

20 Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Melissa Polusny, PhD,
21 Minneapolis VA Medical Center, One Veterans Drive (B68-2), Minneapolis, MN 55417. Email:
22 melissa.polusny@va.gov. Office Phone: (612) 467-3965; Cell Phone: (612) 910-7075.
23 Melissa A. Polusny <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4932-305X>

24
25
26 References: 82

27 Tables: 5

28 Figures: 2

29 Appendices: 0

30 Abstract word count: 386 (word limit 450)

31 Article text word count: 6,057

32 Trial registry number: n/a

33 **Funding Source:** National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health of the National
34 Institutes of Health
35

36 **Abstract**

37 **Background:** Military service provides a unique opportunity for studying resilience, a dynamic
38 process of successful adaptation (i.e., doing well in terms of functioning and symptoms) in
39 response to significant adversity. Despite tremendous interest in positive adaptation among
40 military service members, little is known about the processes underlying their resilience.
41 Understanding neurobiological, cognitive, and social mechanisms underlying adaptive
42 functioning following military stressor exposure is essential to enhance the resilience of military
43 service members.

44 **Objectives:** The primary objective of the Advancing Research on Mechanisms of Resilience
45 (ARMOR) longitudinal study is to characterize trajectories of positive adaptation among young
46 military recruits in response to Basic Combat Training (BCT), a well-defined, uniform, 10-week
47 period of intense stress (Aim 1) and identify promotive and protective processes contributing to
48 individual variations in resilience (Aim 2). The secondary objective is to investigate pathways by
49 which neurobehavioral markers of self-regulation assessed by electroencephalography (EEG)
50 and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) contribute to adaptive trajectories (Aim 3).

51 **Methods:** ARMOR is an ongoing, prospective longitudinal cohort study of young military recruits
52 who recently joined the National Guard but have not yet shipped for BCT. Participants (N=1,201)
53 are assessed at five timepoints over the initial 2+ years of military service beginning before BCT
54 (baseline) and followed up at 2 weeks, 6, 12, and 18 months post-BCT. At each time point,
55 participants complete online questionnaires assessing vulnerability and protective factors,
56 mental health and social-emotional functioning, and, at Time 0 only, a battery of neurocognitive
57 tests. A subset of participants also complete structured diagnostic interviews, additional self-

58 report measures, and perform neurobehavioral tasks before and after BCT during EEG sessions,
59 and, at pre-BCT only, during MRI sessions.

60 **Results:** Study enrollment began April 14, 2019 and ended in October 16, 2021. A total of 1,201
61 participants are enrolled in the study (68.9% male; mean age = 18.9, SD = 3.0). Follow-up data-
62 collection is ongoing and projected to continue through March 2024. We will disseminate
63 findings through conferences, webinars, open access publications, and communications with
64 participants and stakeholders.

65 **Conclusions:** Results are expected to elucidate how young military recruits adapt to military
66 stressors during the initial years of military service. Understanding positive adaptation of military
67 recruits in the face of BCT has implications for developing prevention and intervention strategies
68 to enhance resilience of military trainees and potentially other young people facing significant
69 life challenges.

70
71 *Keywords:* study protocol, military personnel, longitudinal studies, resilience, adaptive behavior,
72 stress, adversity, mechanisms, protective factors

73

74

75

76 Introduction

77 Across the military career life cycle, service members are at considerable risk for
78 exposure to stressors that may impact their health, well-being, and performance.¹⁻³ Extensive
79 research has identified factors that contribute to risk for psychopathology (e.g., post-traumatic
80 stress symptoms, depression) following combat exposure and other military-related stressors.
81 However, mounting evidence suggests that the majority of individuals show resilience, adapting
82 successfully to risk and adversity.⁴⁻⁸ Understanding the neurobiological, cognitive, and social
83 mechanisms underlying successful adaptation following military stressor exposure is essential
84 to designing prevention and intervention strategies to enhance resilience for military
85 populations.⁹ However, the mechanisms and processes that facilitate resilience following
86 military stress remain poorly understood.

87 Most studies on resilience within the military context have operationalized resilience as
88 a static, trait-like attribute or have relied on cross-sectional designs.¹⁰ One-time assessments of
89 adaptation, adversity exposure, and resilience, particularly through self-report questionnaires,
90 provide very limited insights into risk and protective processes and their influence on later
91 mental health outcomes. There is now growing consensus that resilience is a multidimensional
92 and dynamic process that unfolds over time in response to a challenge.¹¹⁻¹⁴ We define
93 resilience as the capability of a system to adapt successfully through multiple processes to
94 challenges that threaten system function.¹² Additionally, the resilience of an individual person
95 draws on support from systems beyond the individual, including supportive relationships, such
96 as battle buddies or unit support.^{15,16} Variations in the nature and timing of adversity exposure
97 also influence how individuals adapt, and it is ideal to have assessments of adaptive functioning

98 before, during, and following exposure to well-described uniform stressors. BCT provides a
99 systematic and relatively uniform challenge with known timing, so that assessments of
100 adversity, potential vulnerabilities, and protective influences, as well as adaptive functioning
101 can be obtained before, during, and following a well-described period of challenge. Therefore,
102 our approach to operationalizing resilience calls for a prospective, longitudinal study design
103 that tracks the adaptation of military service members (MSMs) over time with assessments
104 before and following BCT and related, well-defined challenges.

105 A growing body of longitudinal research with military populations has identified distinct
106 latent classes (groupings) of service members demonstrating similar trajectories of adaptation
107 over time.^{5,17,18} This literature suggests there is significant heterogeneity in people's response
108 to comparable stressors. However, these studies have generally examined trajectories following
109 deployment and across the transition from military to civilian life.^{19,20} Little research has
110 focused on young military recruits beginning at the outset of their military careers. During the
111 initial years of military service, recruits are faced with numerous challenges (e.g., moving away
112 from home, separation from family/friends, dramatic changes in living environment, and
113 intense military training) as they are enculturated into military life. Moreover, for most recruits,
114 this transition from civilian to military life occurs within the context of also transitioning from
115 adolescence to emerging adulthood.²¹ Identifying potential contributing factors linked to risk
116 and resilience early in military service may be particularly useful in effectively intervening with
117 service members during this key developmental transition. Longitudinal studies have also
118 examined a limited number of outcomes in isolation (e.g., PTSD, depression, alcohol use). Our
119 conceptualization of resilience as a multidimensional process, in which a person may show

120 successful adaptation within some domains, but not others,²² calls for research that assesses
121 multiple outcome domains (e.g., internalizing symptoms, externalizing problems, social-
122 occupational functioning) over time. Finally, prior research has investigated the role of
123 demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender), psychological factors (e.g., neuroticism, self-
124 efficacy), and environmental factors (e.g., social support, subsequent life stressors) in
125 differentiating individuals who manifest resilience from those who exhibit maladaptive
126 trajectories.^{5,19,20} Few studies have integrated neurobehavioral paradigms into longitudinal
127 cohort studies,^{17,23} so the neurobiological, cognitive, and/or behavioral processes contributing
128 to trajectory membership remains largely unknown.

129 Drawing on the above literature, the ARMOR study was established at the Minneapolis
130 Veterans Affairs Health Care System (MVAHCS) and the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
131 (UMN).²⁴ The overarching goal of this prospective, longitudinal cohort study with an embedded
132 laboratory sub-study is to develop a comprehensive, multilevel model of resilience to guide the
133 development of prevention and intervention strategies for military trainees and potentially
134 other young people facing significant life challenges.

135 **Figure 1** presents the basic conceptual model guiding the study.²⁵ It recognizes that
136 individuals are embedded within a complex system of risk and protective factors that span
137 multiple levels from individual neurobiological and behavioral factors to social and broader
138 environmental factors. This multisystemic perspective acknowledges the dynamic and
139 reciprocal relationships among these influences and their joint impact on resilience.²⁶ The
140 model also emphasizes potential pathways to risk and resilience in the face of adversity (shown
141 as blue and red lines in response to BCT). Challenging life experiences past and present,

142 including childhood adversity or trauma and exposure to military training, can heighten the risk
143 of developing psychopathology. As illustrated by the dotted line in Figure 1, promotive factors,
144 such as cognitive ability and social support, directly contribute to positive adaptation regardless
145 of risk level. The dashed line in Figure 1 illustrates how protective factors can act as buffers
146 against the detrimental effects of adversity. In the ARMOR study, the focus is on investigating
147 self-regulation as a key protective process contributing to resilience.

148 Self-regulation is comprised of three distinct but interrelated neurocognitive processes
149 involving affect, behavior, and cognition, which together can facilitate adaptive responding to
150 adversity.²⁷ Attentional control involves the ability to concentrate and sustain attention despite
151 distractions, inhibitory control refers to the regulation of maladaptive behavior in favor of goal
152 directed actions, and behavioral flexibility enables the adaptation of behavioral strategies to
153 meet environmental demands. Previous studies employing laboratory-based paradigms have
154 identified significant associations between these self-regulatory processes and measures of
155 trait resilience, implying their potential as stress-buffering mechanisms.²⁸ However, few studies
156 have examined neurobiological, cognitive, and/or behavioral processes in relation to resilience
157 trajectory membership.⁴

158 **Study aims**

159 The primary objective of the ARMOR study is to characterize trajectories of adaptation
160 among young military recruits in response to BCT over the first two years of military service
161 (Aim 1) and identify promotive factors and protective processes contributing to individual
162 variations in adaptation (Aim 2). The secondary objective is to investigate whether

163 neurobehavioral markers of self-regulation are predictive of resilient/non-resilient trajectories
164 (Aim 3).

165 **Fig. 1.** Integrated Multilevel Model of Resilience for Military Service Members

166 *Note.* Conceptual model of resilience as a dynamic process in response to the challenges of
167 Basic Combat Training (BCT). Risk and protective factors across multiple levels (individual,
168 social, and environmental) are depicted in the box on the left. Promotive and protective
169 pathways are depicted with dashed and dotted lines, respectively. Positive (blue) and negative
170 (red) responses to the challenges of BCT are shown in the graphs in the box on the right. From
171 “A dynamic, multilevel approach to conceptualising and designing resilience research in the
172 context of military stress,” MA, Polusny and CR, Erbes, 2023, *Stress & Health*, used under
173 Creative Commons CC-BU license.

174 **Methods**

175 **Study design**

176 ARMOR is a prospective, longitudinal cohort study of young military recruits, including
177 those who are age 17 at study entry, that investigates mechanisms contributing to manifested
178 resilience across multiple levels of analysis (neural, cognitive, behavioral, and social). The study
179 includes two components: (a) an online longitudinal survey component, including self-report
180 measures presented via Qualtrics and neurocognitive tests using the Penn Computerized
181 Neurocognitive Battery, and (b) a laboratory sub-study component, consisting of clinical
182 diagnostic interviews, additional self-report questionnaires, and a series of performance-based
183 tasks involving electroencephalography (EEG) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)

184 assessments. We aimed to enroll a cohort of at least 1,200 young military recruits who recently
185 enlisted in the Minnesota Army National Guard (MNARNG). Subject recruitment began on
186 4/14/2019 and ended on 10/16/2021. Data collection is ongoing and is expected to continue
187 into 2024. As shown in **Figure 2**, participants are assessed at baseline (T0) before exposure to a
188 uniform military challenge (BCT) and are currently being followed up at four time points (study
189 is ongoing): two weeks following return from BCT (T1) and at six months (T2), 12 months (T3),
190 and 18 months (T4) post-BCT. A subset of participants from the longitudinal cohort (n = 123)
191 completed the laboratory sub-study procedures prior to shipping to BCT (pre-BCT) and after
192 returning from training (post-BCT).

193 **Ethical considerations**

194 This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Boards of the University of
195 Minnesota (STUDY00004470) and Minneapolis VA Health Care System (VAM-18-
196 00334/1594664). All study procedures were also approved by the relevant military command.

197 All participants provided informed consent. Participants were provided with a letter that
198 explained all procedures, risks, and benefits. This information was verbally presented during
199 briefings, and participants indicated their consent to take part in the survey component by
200 entering a unique study ID number to begin the online survey. A waiver of the requirement to
201 document consent for the survey component of this study was granted. The survey component
202 of this study was also approved to include individuals under 18 years of age under 21 CFR
203 50.51/45 CFR 46.404. For the subset of participants 18 years or older taking part in the
204 laboratory sub-study, written informed consent was obtained prior to participation in any
205 laboratory study procedures.

206 **Context and setting**

207 This study aims to investigate mental health and adaptive functioning among young
208 military recruits before and after BCT, and beyond, offering a unique opportunity to study
209 resilience in response to a well-defined, naturally occurring, uniform military stressor. BCT is a
210 mandatory, intensive, 10-week training course that all military recruits must successfully
211 complete. The training environment is highly structured, characterized by low personal
212 autonomy, with strict discipline enforced by drill instructors.²⁹ One distinctive aspect of BCT is
213 the deliberate introduction of numerous stressors into the training environment, designed to
214 prepare recruits for the challenges they will face in future military life.³⁰ These challenges
215 include prolonged separation/isolation from family/friends, dramatic changes in living
216 environment, extreme physical demands, mental challenges, and simulated combat. This
217 process is believed to foster unit cohesion and cultivate a strong sense of mental and physical
218 toughness known as the “warrior ethos.” Previous research has shown that BCT has positive
219 effects on cognitive performance, mood, and physical fitness,^{31–35} and it is associated with
220 increased unit cohesion over time, which in turn, leads to reduced psychological distress and
221 improvements in tolerating training stressors.³⁶

222 While the majority of military recruits successfully adapt to the challenges of BCT, some
223 individuals experience it as highly stressful and a considerable percentage (approximately 20%)
224 of National Guard recruits fail to complete BCT.³⁷ This suggests that although BCT is a uniform
225 stressor experienced by all recruits, its impact and perceived stressfulness vary among
226 individuals. A study of Swiss Armed Forces recruits participating in a 21-week BCT course found
227 that higher perceived stress at the beginning of training was associated with greater mental

228 distress and poorer military performance at later stages. Previous studies focusing solely on BCT
229 completers have overlooked valuable data from a significant minority of individuals who exhibit
230 reduced resilience.

231 To comprehensively understand how BCT influences adaptive functioning and study
232 resilience processes over time, we employ a prospective, longitudinal research design with data
233 collection before and after the relatively uniform stressor of BCT. This design makes it possible
234 to capture change within subjects over time and allows us to test the temporal ordering of
235 variables. Longitudinal designs permit stronger inferences about causal effects, although not
236 the rigor of a randomized controlled trial. Our design also provides insight into the underlying
237 mechanisms contributing to individual variations in resilience and allows for studying the
238 impact of unforeseen events such as the COVID-19 pandemic and military deployments on
239 resilience trajectories. By evaluating the perceived frequency and intensity of stressor exposure
240 during BCT, we capture the individual experiences of military recruits. Furthermore, our focus
241 on young, healthy participants at the beginning of their military careers, before significant
242 exposure to military stressors, enables us to take a developmental approach to studying
243 resilience within a military context. Finally, the integration of a laboratory sub-study within our
244 research design provides an opportunity to conduct in-depth, multilevel assessments of a
245 subset of the cohort. This laboratory sub-study allows us to investigate neurobehavioral
246 markers of self-regulation that may predict resilience trajectories, enhancing our understanding
247 of the underlying mechanisms associated with resilience in the context of military training.

248 **Participants and recruitment**

249 Enrollment of participants for this study was based on specific inclusion criteria.
250 Individuals aged 17 years or older, who were newly enlisted members of the National Guard
251 and had been assigned a ship date to complete BCT during the study period, were eligible for
252 participation. Exclusion criteria included a history of prior military service or any previous
253 experience with BCT.

254 To recruit participants, a consecutive approach was employed within designated National
255 Guard Recruitment Sustainment Program (RSP) units across the state until the target sample
256 was reached. The research team conducted participant recruitment between April 14, 2019 and
257 October 16, 2021, utilizing briefing presentations held during drill events at military posts. The
258 relevant Army National Guard command provided the research team with a list of all potentially
259 eligible MSMs. During briefings, interested individuals were provided with a study packet,
260 which included a consent/assent letter, “Help Us Keep in Touch” locator form, “What to Expect
261 Next” card illustrating the study design in layman’s terms, and a randomly generated unique
262 study identification (ID) number. Throughout the recruitment process, detailed documentation
263 was maintained. This included recording the total number of eligible MSMs approached, as well
264 as the number of participants enrolled, those who refused to participate, and those found to be
265 ineligible based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

266 **Survey data collection procedures**

267 For the online survey component conducted at baseline (Time 0), participants were
268 asked to complete a battery of self-report questionnaires on Qualtrics as well as select tests

269 from the Penn Computerized Neurocognitive Battery (PCNB). Time 0 data was collected using
270 study Chromebooks in classrooms at local armories. Participants were instructed to log into a
271 secure online Qualtrics platform using their unique study ID for authentication. On average, the
272 baseline data collection process took approximately 135 minutes ($SD = 41$).

273 Since exposure to BCT is required for continued follow-up, participants are monitored
274 over the course of the study and retrospectively excluded if discharged prior to exposure to
275 BCT. Participants' exposure to BCT is verified prior to the initial follow-up wave (T1), and those
276 eligible to continue study participation are invited to complete the battery of self-report
277 questionnaires at each follow-up time point (see **Table 1**). All follow-up assessments are
278 completed outside of drill training. Participants either complete a battery of computerized self-
279 administered questionnaires using a confidential online survey which is linked to the
280 participants' study ID or via a paper-and-pencil version of questionnaires marked with study ID.

281 To ensure continuity of follow-up assessments, we adapted a longitudinal retention
282 model developed by Scott and colleagues³⁸ to engage and maintain contact with participants
283 from enrollment through the final follow-up time point. During enrollment, participants were
284 asked to provide detailed contact information, BCT ship and return dates, as well as full contact
285 information for three alternate contacts who can help the study team locate the participant if
286 needed. Study engagement will be maintained between follow-up waves through periodic
287 communication (i.e., newsletters, greeting cards), and survey non-respondents will be
288 contacted to encourage survey completion. Due to military regulations, participants did not
289 receive financial compensation at baseline. However, potential participants were informed they
290 would receive up to \$150 for completing follow-up surveys.

Table 1. Self-report measures administered over time in the ARMOR longitudinal study

Outcome/Domain	Measure	k	T0	T1	T2	T3	T4
Internalizing symptoms	PROMIS-Depression 4 ³⁹	4	X	X	X	X	X
	PROMIS-Anxiety 4 ³⁹	4	X	X	X	X	X
	PROMIS-Anger 5 ³⁹	5	X	X	X	X	X
	Primary Care PTSD Screen DSM-5 ⁴⁰	6	X	X	X	X	X
Externalizing problems	Behavioral Report on Rule-Breaking ⁴¹	18	X	X	X	X	X
	Alcohol Use Disorders Test ⁴²	10	X	X	X	X	X
	Drug Abuse Screening Test ⁴³	10	X	X	X	X	X
Social-occupational functioning	PROMIS - Role Satisfaction ⁴⁴	4	X	X	X	X	X
	PROMIS - Social Participation ⁴⁴	4	X	X	X	X	X
	Couple Satisfaction Inventory ⁴⁵	4	X	X	X	X	X
	Revised Conflict Tactic Scales Items ⁴⁶	2	X	X	X	X	X
	Endicott Work Productivity Scale ⁴⁷	12	X	X	X	X	X
	Utrecht Work Engagement Scale ⁴⁸	9	X	X	X	X	X
Health	Patient Health Questionnaire-15 ⁴⁹	15	X	X	X	X	X
	Graded Chronic Pain Scale-Revised ⁵⁰	6		X	X	X	X
Self-regulatory processes	Difficulties in Emotional Regulation Scale-16 ⁵¹	16	X	X	X	X	X
	Multidimensional Experiential Avoidance Questionnaire-30 ⁵²	30	X	X	X	X	X
	Attention Control Scale ⁵³	20	X	X	X	X	X
	Flexible Regulatory Emotional Expression ⁵⁴	16	X	X	X	X	X
	Identity Coherence Scale ⁵⁵	12	X	X	X	X	X
	Response to Stressful Experiences Scale ⁵⁶	22	X	X	X	X	X
Supportive relationships	PROMIS-Emotional Support 4 ^{57,58}	4	X	X	X	X	X
	PROMIS-Informational Support 4	4	X	X	X	X	X
	PROMIS-Instrumental Support 4	4	X	X	X	X	X
	Deployment Risk and Resilience Inventory-2 Unit Support ⁵⁹	12	X	X	X	X	X
Personality	Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire-Brief Form ⁶⁰	155	X				
	Triarchic Psychopathy Measure ⁶¹	58	X				
Vulnerability/risk factors	Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaire ^{62†}	17	X			X	
	DRRI-2 Prior Stressors ⁶⁶	18	X				
	DRRI-2 Adapted Post-deployment Life Stressor ⁵⁹			X	X	X	X
	Past suicide behaviors ⁶³	6	X				
	Basic Training Stressors Scale ²⁴	14		X			

291 Note: k = number of items, T0 = Baseline/Time 0 collected before Basic Combat Training (BCT); T1 = Time 1
 292 collected 2 weeks following BCT; T2 = Time 2 collected 6 months post-BCT; T3 = Time 3 collected 12 months post-
 293 BCT; T4 = Time 4 collected 18 months post-BCT; DRRI-2 = Deployment Risk and Resilience Inventory-2 †Adverse
 294 Childhood Experiences Questionnaire adapted for youth at T0.

295 **Measures**

296 **Table 1** lists the battery of self-report questionnaires administered online via Qualtrics
297 at baseline and at each follow-up. This battery of measures assesses eight domains
298 (internalizing symptoms, externalizing problems, social-occupational functioning, health, self-
299 regulation processes, supportive relationships, personality, and vulnerability/risk factors). While
300 most questionnaires are repeated across all timepoints (T0-T4) as they are critical for tracking
301 outcome trajectories and resilience processes, some are assessed only at T0 (i.e., personality)
302 or T1 (i.e., BCT stressor exposure) as they do not require repeated assessment. **Table 2** provides
303 a complete description of neurocognitive tests administered at baseline from the PCNB, which
304 measures performance accuracy (e.g., proportion of correct responses) and speed (e.g., median
305 correct response time) in major cognitive domains.⁶⁴ All participants enrolled in the longitudinal
306 study were also asked for a DNA saliva sample at baseline that is stored for future analysis.

307 **Outcomes**

308 Primary outcomes include trajectories of internalizing symptoms, externalizing problems,
309 social-occupational functioning, and global adaptive functioning. Secondary outcomes are self-
310 reported self-regulatory processes, neurobehavioral markers of self-regulation, and ecologically
311 valid markers of functioning extracted from administrative military records.

312 **Administrative data**

313 The study team will work with the local National Guard to extract administrative data
314 capturing sociodemographic and service-related variables (i.e., Armed Forces Qualification Test
315 score, training dates, and military discharge). Administrative data from military records will be

Table 2. Tests from the Penn Computerized Neurocognitive Battery included in the ARMOR longitudinal study (Time 0 only)

Neurobehavioral Function	Domain	Test
Executive control	Attention	Penn Continuous Performance Test
Complex cognition	Language reasoning	Penn Verbal Reasoning Test
Episodic memory	Face memory	Penn Facial Memory Test
Social cognition	Emotion differentiation	Penn Emotion Differentiation Test

316 de-identified and matched by participant ID.

317 **Laboratory sub-study data collection procedures**

318 A subsample of the longitudinal cohort (n=123) was identified to participate in a
319 laboratory visit both pre and post-BCT. Laboratory participants are selected based on their
320 responses to baseline self-report measures and a predictive algorithm developed in the pilot
321 UG3 phase of this project (details reported elsewhere).⁶⁵ This strategy is intended to provide a
322 subsample enriched with subjects at relatively high-risk of maladaptive functioning (n~72)
323 compared to a low-risk group (n~48). Participants are briefly screened by phone, and those
324 reporting contraindications to MRI due to the potential presence of metal in the body (e.g.,
325 employed as a metal worker, implanted medical devices) or due to problems with being in
326 enclosed places are excluded.

327 Data for the laboratory sub-study is collected during an 8-9 hour combined total visit to
328 the MVHCS and UMN Center for Magnetic Resonance Research (CMRR). First, participants
329 undergo a structured clinical interview (1-2 hours) with a trained master's level assessor under
330 the supervision of a licensed clinical psychologist (CRE or PAA). The Structured Clinical Interview
331 for DSM-5 is used to diagnose lifetime and current mental disorders.⁶⁶ The Clinician
332 Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5 is used to diagnose PTSD.⁶⁷ Next, while undergoing
333 preparation for the EEG session, participants are asked to complete a battery of paper-and-

334 pencil questionnaires specifically targeting constructs related to self-regulation (see **Table 3**).

335 **Electroencephalography (EEG)**

336 Participants will complete an EEG session to measure resting state neural function as
337 well as brain responses during cognitive tasks. We will use electrodes embedded in an elastic
338 cap to record from 128 scalp sites. The precise physical location of electrodes will be recorded
339 in three-dimensional space with respect to auricular and nasion landmarks so EEG recordings
340 can be integrated with the corresponding structural MRI data. To measure eye movements for
341 the detection of bioelectrical artifacts vertical electro-oculograms (VEOG) will be recorded from
342 above and below the right eye and horizontal electro-oculograms (HEOG) will be recorded from
343 outer ocular canthi. Left and right forearm electromyographs (EMGs), and electrocardiograms
344 (EKG) will be recorded to identify and reduce artifact and quantify aspects of muscle
345 contraction associated with button presses. EEG signals will be digitized at a rate of 512 Hz with
346 0.5 Hz low frequency cut-off and 200 Hz high frequency cut-off filters. Each participant will
347 complete assessments of visual acuity and handedness as well as information about
348 medications, alcohol, caffeine, and sleep in the last 24 hours. Self-report ratings of emotional
349 state will be assessed before and after EEG recording sessions using the Positive Affect Negative
350 Affect Scale (PANAS).⁶⁸

351 During EEG collection at the pre and post-BCT visits, participants perform a series of
352 neurobehavioral tasks assessing attentional control (dot probe paradigm),^{75,76} emotional
353 inhibitory control (go/no-go paradigm),^{77,78} and feedback processing (gambling decision
354 paradigm).⁷⁹ **Table 4** provides a description of neurobehavioral tasks administered and domains
355 assessed.

Measure	<i>k</i>	Pre--BCT Lab	Post-BCT Lab
Patient Health Questionnaire-9 ⁷³	9	X	X
Beck Depression Inventory-II ⁷⁰	21	X	X
Depressive Symptom Index — Suicidality Subscale ⁷¹	4	X	X
State Trait Anxiety Inventory ⁷²	40	X	X
Positive and Negative Affect Schedule ⁶⁸	20		
Anxiety Sensitivity Index ⁷³	16	X	X
Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale-Short Form ⁷⁴	12	X	X

Note. *k* = Number of items comprising measure, BCT = Basic Combat Training

356 **Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)**

357 At the pre-BCT laboratory visit only, MRI data are collected at the University of
358 Minnesota’s Center for Magnetic Resonance Research (CMRR) on a 3T Siemens Prisma scanner,
359 using a 32-channel birdcage head coil with foam pads to minimize head movements. Sequences
360 included T1-weighted MP-RAGE, T2-weighted SPACE, diffusion-weighted, resting state
361 functional, and task-based functional MRI. While in the MRI environment, participants
362 complete the Farmer task (see **Table 4**), a gamified task designed to assess adaptive versus
363 maladaptive, avoidance responding in the face of physical threat. The task measures fear
364 reactivity and behavioral avoidance to safe cues that resemble cues of imminent electric
365 shocks.⁸⁰ Decisions to ‘unnecessarily’ avoid during safe cues is considered *maladaptive* because
366 danger (threat of shock) is not a realistic possibility, and avoiding unnecessarily compromises
367 performance on the task. Adaptive responding is operationalized by higher rates of decisions to
368 push through (i.e., low levels of avoidance) when encountering safe, yet danger-resembling,
369 cues.

370 Finally, participants are asked to provide a blood sample to be stored for future research
371 (30 min). Participants were compensated up to \$400 for completion of both the pre-BCT and
372 post-BCT visits.

Neurobehavioral task	Task description	Domain assessed	Pre-BCT	Post-BCT
Dot Probe Task ⁷⁵	Participants passively inspect rapidly presented face pairs with neutral, happy, or angry/threatening expressions. Faces are replaced with either a blank space or an asterisk (target probe) placed in the same position as one of the two faces. Participants are instructed to respond as quickly as possible to indicate on which side the target probe appeared.	Attentional bias	X	X
Emotional Go/No-Go Task ⁷⁷	Participants view a series of rapidly presented visual targets and nontargets. Participants are instructed to press a response button for each target presented ("Go trials") and to avoid pressing the button for each nontarget ("NoGo trials"). Errors (response to NoGo trials or failure to respond to Go trials) are accompanied by visual (red bar in center of screen) and auditory (unpleasant buzzer sound) feedback. The task is completed in three blocks with adaptive response timing windows to increase task difficulty based on performance. Participants are also instructed they can win a monetary reward based on the number of points earned, which is displayed on screen every 20 trials. During the second block, time windows are shortened to increase the task's difficulty beyond what is feasible for participants. Points awarded during the second block for correct responses are also significantly reduced.	Inhibitory control	X	X
Gambling task ⁷⁹	For each trial, participants are presented with two adjacent squares each enclosing a number (5 or 25). Participants are instructed to choose between the two squares and then receive feedback (the chosen box turns red or green to signify either a win or a loss with red or green as the winning color counterbalanced across participants).	Error/performance monitoring, risk-taking	X	X

Farmer task ⁸⁰	The participant is a farmer whose task it is to travel between a shed and garden to harvest crops. Two different roads connect a shed to a garden: 1) a short road, and 2) a long road. Traveling the short road is perilous (contingently associated with electric shock [3-5mA, 100ms]) but allows the farmer quick travel from shed to garden and assures a successful harvest. Conversely, traveling the long road is always safe but often prevents the farmer from arriving at the garden before “wild birds” eat the crop. Through fear-conditioning, participants learn shock is predicted by a symbol, a ring of extreme size (CS+) but not the other size rings (conditioned safety-cue: CS-) displayed on the screen. The task measures fear generalization by assessing avoidance behavior in response to generalization stimuli similar but not identical to the CS+.	Maladaptive behavioral avoidance	X	
---------------------------	--	----------------------------------	---	--

373 **Data management**

374 Data collected via the online survey platform (Qualtrics) administered at the UMN and
 375 will be downloaded securely into the study databases stored on a shared server at the MVAHCS
 376 with access limited to authorized study personnel. Qualtrics includes a complete suite of
 377 features to support HIPAA compliance, including a full audit trail, user-based privileges, and
 378 integration with the institutional LDAP server. Hard copy surveys will be double entered and
 379 checked for consistency. Laboratory sub-study data (i.e., neuroimaging and EEG data) will be
 380 stored in secure databases held on servers at UMN and are only available to lead investigators
 381 of each sub-study component. Administrative data will be transferred directly from MNARNG to
 382 a secure server at MVAHCS via secure data transfer. At MVAHCS, the data will be accessible by
 383 a named CCDOR Data/Statistics Team member. This individual will de-identify the personal
 384 information, match records with study ID number, and transfer it to shared server for the study.

385 Study ID numbers will be used for data transfer, communication, and analysis purposes to
386 protect confidentiality. Participant contact information linked with study ID number will be
387 stored on a SQL server database will be created on internal VA web servers. Only individuals
388 with a need to access the data, as vetted by the principal investigator are granted access.
389 Access to contact information is obtained through Windows authentication (i.e., PIV card and
390 password to the network).

391 **Sample size and power analysis**

392 Sample size calculations were based on the primary objective of the study (Aims 1-2)
393 using structural equation models of various hypothesized structures (nested and longitudinal).
394 This demand resulted in a sample size that could provide enough power to test such
395 hypotheses across varying degrees of freedom. Control of Root Mean Square Error of
396 Approximation (RMSEA) was the criteria used for our sample size and power calculations.
397 According to MacCallum and colleagues,⁸¹ RMSEA= 0.01, 0.05, and 0.08 indicate excellent,
398 good, and mediocre fit. **Table 5** gives the needed sample sizes and the corresponding powers
399 for various degrees of freedom, assuming a null RMSEA of 0.05 and an alpha=0.05. Assuming a
400 retention rate of 65% to reach an effective sample size of 780, we needed to recruit 1200
401 participants. Note that for n=780, models with df=5 and greater, would have an expected
402 power of at least 0.909.

403 **Statistical analyses planned**

404 Aim 1 will characterize adaptation among young military recruits over the first two years
405 of service. Consistent with a hierarchical concept of the structure of resilience, we will use
406 latent growth mixture modeling (LGMM) to identify the latent trajectories of adaptation and its

Table 5. Sample size and power calculations

Sample size	df=2	df=5
700	0.567	0.878
800	0.619	0.916
1000	0.707	0.961
1200	0.776	0.982

407 indicators. We will apply LGMM at the level of internalizing symptoms, externalizing problems,
408 and social-occupational functioning, as well as an overall model that simultaneously embeds all
409 three domains into a model of adaptive functioning. We have hypothesized that at least three
410 trajectories (one showing resilient adaptive functioning or low pathology, and others showing
411 new onset and chronic distress) will emerge for each domain assessed (internalizing symptoms,
412 externalizing problems, social-occupational functioning, and global adaptive functioning).

413 Note: All remaining analyses for Aims 2 and 3 will be conducted on the trajectory class
414 membership data for each of these four domain outcomes to test for specificity of resilience
415 mechanisms.

416 Aim 2 will identify promotive factors and protective processes contributing to individual
417 variations in adaptation. We will apply structural equation modeling and Bayesian Network
418 Analysis to detect and identify the latent constructs and the dependency structure between
419 different domains. We will also examine the effect of protective and vulnerability factors on
420 membership in different trajectory classes. We propose to investigate this in two
421 complementary ways. First, in our SEM modeling we will augment the measurement submodels
422 of the most parsimonious latent growth structural mixture models accepted in Aim 1 with the
423 indicators of protective/vulnerability measurements (**Tables 1 and 2**) and evaluate the change
424 in the relationships (coefficients) indicators have with the latent trajectories. We will treat
425 potential predictors as moderators or mediators, depending on the hypothesized role in the

426 model, and we will test their contribution to the model by change in model fit indices (AIC, BIC,
427 RMSE, G^2). In our second approach, trajectory class membership assignment in Aim 1 will be
428 used as dependent variables (resilience vs non-resilient/distressed trajectories) and
429 protective/vulnerability factors as predictors in random intercept multinomial logistic mixed
430 models that will provide a quantitative picture of the unique contribution of these measures.
431 We hypothesize risk factors listed in **Tables 1 and 2** will predict membership in non-
432 resilient/distressed trajectory classes, while protective/promotive factors will predict
433 membership in the resilient/non-distressed trajectory class. All analyses will be estimated
434 within the propensity classes that adjust for any possible lack of imbalance and will be
435 performed both on the complete cases and five imputed data sets.

436 Aim 3 investigates whether neurobehavioral markers of self-regulation assessed using a
437 series of performance-based tasks involving EEG and fMRI assessments are predictive of
438 resilient/non-resilient trajectories. EEG recordings will undergo an independent component
439 analysis-based processing pipeline to isolate and remove noisy time segments, signal artifacts
440 (e.g., eye movements), and bad electrodes. Recording epochs centered around the onset of
441 task stimuli will be extracted for the analysis of event-related potentials (ERPs) and time-
442 frequency energy. Given the study focus on conflict monitoring and bottom-up covert
443 attention, we plan to examine brain responses at midline frontal (e.g., FCz) and lateralized
444 posterior electrodes (e.g., PO7, PO8), respectively. We will quantify brain response metrics such
445 as feedback-related negativity and theta-band oscillations, which we predict will be associated
446 with trajectory class membership. fMRI during the Farmer Task will be analyzed using an event-
447 related design to model BOLD fluctuations to stimuli onsets using Analysis of Functional Neural

448 Images (AFNI) software.⁸² Functional activation maps will be computed by regressing each
449 voxel's fMRI response time-course onto an ideal response function for 5 stimulus types: the
450 danger cue, three classes of safety cues with parametrically varying levels of perceptual
451 similarity to the danger cue, and a control condition including a safety cue with no similarity to
452 the danger cue.⁸³ We will focus particularly on fMRI responses to these stimuli in brain areas
453 associated with fear reactivity (anterior insula, dorsomedial prefrontal cortex) and fear
454 inhibition (ventromedial prefrontal cortex, anterior hippocampus). Fear-related brain
455 activations to safe cues resembling danger cues (relative to safe cues without danger-cue
456 resemblance) will be used as predictors of maladaptive avoidance (costly/unnecessary
457 avoidance to safe cues resembling danger cues). Finally, these brain and behavioral responses,
458 as well as their moderation by protective (e.g., social support, military cohesion, self-regulation)
459 and vulnerability factors (e.g., BCT stressors, anxiety traits) will be used as predictors of
460 trajectory class membership.

461 **Missing data**

462 Every effort will be made to maximize complete data and responding across waves in
463 the longitudinal survey (Aims 1 and 2). However, the collected data at each wave will be subject
464 to various random missingness. At the end of each wave, the mechanism of missingness for
465 each measured variable will be assessed and an imputation model proper to that variable
466 (predictor/response/ adjustor covariate) will be identified. Appropriate imputation methods
467 based on variable characteristics (e.g., regression for continuous variables, propensity or
468 discrimination models or categorical models) will be used. After selecting a relevant model, and
469 more importantly, deciding on the predictors of missingness, five imputed data sets will be

470 constructed for each wave. The relevant analyses will then be based on the combined
471 inferences derived from these five imputed data sets.

472 **Results**

473 Study enrollment began April 14, 2019 and ended in October 16, 2021. A total of 1,201
474 participants are enrolled in the study (68.9% male; mean age = 18.9, SD = 3.0). Follow-up data-
475 collection is ongoing and is projected to continue through March 2024.

476 **Discussion**

477 To our knowledge, ARMOR is the first study to characterize trajectories of adjustment
478 (i.e., resilient versus non-resilient) among US Army National Guard recruits using
479 multidimensional assessments undertaken beginning at career onset and spanning two
480 subsequent years. By assessing recruits before BCT and following up across 4 timepoints, the
481 design provides an opportunity to map individual trajectories in response to exposure to a
482 naturally occurring, uniform military challenge. The study aims to characterize adaptation
483 among young military recruits over the first two years of service and identify processes
484 contributing to individual variations in adaptation. While studies have identified numerous
485 resilience factors, this study takes a longitudinal, multi-level approach to examine mechanisms
486 underlying individual variations in resilience trajectories. In addition, this study utilizes an
487 embedded laboratory sub-study design that integrates novel laboratory-based experimental
488 paradigms for assessing dynamic self-regulatory processes into a large, prospective,
489 longitudinal study. This approach will enable us to explore whether neurobehavioral markers of
490 self-regulation assessed using a series of performance-based tasks involving EEG and fMRI

491 assessments are predictive of resilient/non-resilient trajectories. By understanding the
492 mechanisms underlying self-regulatory processes implicated in resilience, findings from our
493 study will provide a foundation for the development of prevention and intervention strategies
494 which may help to promote positive adaptation and resilience among young military recruits.
495 Specifically, findings of this study may support the optimization of mindfulness-based
496 interventions, which focus on increasing awareness of one's thoughts, emotions, and actions to
497 improve specific aspects of executive functioning including attention, cognitive control, and
498 emotion regulation.

499 **Patient and public involvement**

500 Military stakeholders from the local National Guard command were involved in the
501 research process beginning at the early planning stage by identifying relevant research
502 questions and providing consultation on feasibility of study methods. Outcome measures were
503 informed by their priorities and military experience. Local National Guard command also
504 facilitated the study team's access to military personnel and allocated training time for the
505 investigators to present information about the study to potential participants and collect
506 baseline data.

507 Findings of the study will be shared with stakeholders through regular briefings to
508 military command. Findings will be communicated to the public through various types of media,
509 including print (e.g., newsletters, white papers) and broadcast channels (e.g., television and
510 radio). Findings will be disseminated to the scientific community through peer reviewed
511 publications and presentations.

512 **Acknowledgements**

513 The authors wish to acknowledge Dr. Christopher Erbes, who passed away on May 30,
514 2021. Dr. Erbes served as Multiple PI on this project and contributed to the overall design and
515 conceptualization of the study.

516 The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent
517 the official views of the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Army, or Defense or the National
518 Institutes of Health (NIH).

519 We received funding from UH3AT009651 from the National Center for Complementary
520 and Integrative Health (NCCIH) of the NIH. This work also was supported by resources and the
521 use of facilities at the Minneapolis VA Health Care System, Minneapolis, MN. We would like to
522 express our gratitude to the National Guard service members volunteering to participate in the
523 study.

525 **References**

- 526 1. Smith BN, Vaughn RA, Vogt D, King DW, King LA, Shipherd JC. Main and interactive effects
527 of social support in predicting mental health symptoms in men and women following
528 military stressor exposure. *Anxiety Stress Coping*. 2011;(1477-2205 (Electronic)).
- 529 2. Campbell DJ, Nobel OBY. Occupational stressors in military service: A review and
530 framework. *Mil Psychol*. 2009;21(sup2):S47-S67.
- 531 3. Adler AB, Castro CA. An occupational mental health model for the military. *Mil Behav*
532 *Health*. 2013;1(1):41-45.
- 533 4. Galatzer-Levy IR, Huang SH, Bonanno GA. Trajectories of resilience and dysfunction
534 following potential trauma: A review and statistical evaluation. *Clin Psychol Rev*.
535 2018;63:41-55.
- 536 5. Polusny MA, Erbes CR, Kramer MD, et al. Resilience and posttraumatic stress disorder
537 symptoms in National Guard Soldiers deployed to Iraq: A prospective study of latent class
538 trajectories and their predictors. *J Trauma Stress*. 2017;30(4):351-361.
- 539 6. Xue C, Ge Y, Tang B, et al. A meta-analysis of risk factors for combat-related PTSD among
540 military personnel and veterans. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(1932-6203 (Electronic)):e0120270.
541 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120270
- 542 7. Ramchand R, Rudavsky R, Grant S, Tanielian T, Jaycox L. Prevalence of, risk factors for, and
543 consequences of posttraumatic stress disorder and other mental health problems in
544 military populations deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan. *Curr Psychiatry Rep*. 2015;17(1535-
545 1645 (Electronic)):37. doi:10.1007/s11920-015-0575-z
- 546 8. Stander VA, Thomsen CJ, Highfill-McRoy RM. Etiology of depression comorbidity in combat-
547 related PTSD: a review of the literature. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2014;34(2):87-98.
- 548 9. Lin T, Vaisvaser S, Fruchter E, et al. A neurobehavioral account for individual differences in
549 resilience to chronic military stress. *Psychol Med*. 2015;45(1469-8978 (Electronic)):1011-
550 1023.
- 551 10. van der Meulen E, van der Velden PG, van Aert RC, van Veldhoven MJ. Longitudinal
552 associations of psychological resilience with mental health and functioning among military
553 personnel: A meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Soc Sci Med*. 2020;255:112814.
- 554 11. Choi KW, Stein MB, Dunn EC, Koenen KC, Smoller JW. Genomics and psychological
555 resilience: a research agenda. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2019;24(12):1770-1778. doi:10.1038/s41380-
556 019-0457-6

- 557 12. Masten AS, Lucke CM, Nelson KM, Stallworthy IC. Resilience in Development and
558 Psychopathology: Multisystem Perspectives. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol.* 2021;17(1):521-549.
559 doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-081219-120307
- 560 13. Brown L, Cohen B, Costello R, Brazhnik O, Galis Z. Conceptualizing a resilience research
561 framework at The National Institutes of Health. *Stress Health.* Published online 2023.
- 562 14. Ungar M. *Multisystemic Resilience: Adaptation and Transformation in Contexts of Change.*
563 Oxford University Press; 2021.
- 564 15. Han SC, Castro F, Lee LO, et al. Military unit support, postdeployment social support, and
565 PTSD symptoms among active duty and National Guard soldiers deployed to Iraq. *J Anxiety*
566 *Disord.* 2014;28(1873-7897 (Electronic)):446-453. doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2014.04.004
- 567 16. Pietrzak RH, Johnson DC, Goldstein MB, et al. Psychosocial buffers of traumatic stress,
568 depressive symptoms, and psychosocial difficulties in veterans of Operations Enduring
569 Freedom and Iraqi Freedom: The role of resilience, unit support, and postdeployment social
570 support. *J Affect Disord.* Published online 2009.
- 571 17. Galatzer-Levy IR, Huang SH, Bonanno GA. Trajectories of resilience and dysfunction
572 following potential trauma: A review and statistical evaluation. *Clin Psychol Rev.*
573 2018;63:41-55. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2018.05.008
- 574 18. Bonanno GA, Mancini AD, Horton JL, et al. Trajectories of trauma symptoms and resilience
575 in deployed US military service members: Prospective cohort study. *Br J Psychiatry.*
576 2012;200(4):317-323. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.111.096552
- 577 19. Pavlacic JM, Buchanan EM, McCaslin SE, Schulenberg SE, Young JN. A systematic review of
578 posttraumatic stress and resilience trajectories: Identifying predictors for future treatment
579 of veterans and service members. *Prof Psychol Res Pract.* 2022;53(3):266.
- 580 20. Erbes CR, Arbisi PA, Kramer MD, DeGarmo D, Polusny MA. Characterizing spouse/partner
581 depression and alcohol problems over the course of military deployment. *J Consult Clin*
582 *Psychol.* 2017;85(4):297-308.
- 583 21. Luecken L, Gress-Smith JL. Early adversity and resilience in emerging adulthood. In: Zautra
584 A, Reich JW, Hall JS, eds. *Handbook of Adult Resilience.* Guilford Publications; 2010:238-257.
- 585 22. Infurna FJ, Luthar SS. Parents' adjustment following the death of their child: Resilience is
586 multidimensional and differs across outcomes examined. *J Res Personal.* 2017;68:38-53.
- 587 23. McGlinchey RE, Milberg WP, Fonda JR, Fortier CB. A methodology for assessing deployment
588 trauma and its consequences in OEF/OIF/OND veterans: The TRACTS longitudinal
589 prospective cohort study. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res.* 2017;26(3):e1556.

- 590 24. Polusny MA, Marquardt CA, Hagel-Campbell E, et al. ADVANCING RESEARCH ON
591 MECHANISMS OF RESILIENCE (ARMOR) LONGITUDINAL COHORT STUDY OF NEW MILITARY
592 RECRUITS: RESULTS FROM A FEASIBILITY PILOT STUDY. *Res Hum Dev.* 2021;18(3):212-229.
593 doi:10.1080/15427609.2021.1964898
- 594 25. Polusny MA, Erbes CR. A dynamic, multilevel approach to conceptualising and designing
595 resilience research in the context of military stress. *Stress Health.* Published online 2023.
- 596 26. Feder A, Fred-Torres S, Southwick SM, Charney DS. The biology of human resilience:
597 opportunities for enhancing resilience across the life span. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2019;86(6):443-
598 453.
- 599 27. Vink M, Gladwin TE, Geeraerts S, et al. Towards an integrated account of the development
600 of self-regulation from a neurocognitive perspective: A framework for current and future
601 longitudinal multi-modal investigations. *Dev Cogn Neurosci.* 2020;45:100829.
- 602 28. Torrence RD, Troup LJ. Event-related potentials of attentional bias toward faces in the
603 dot-probe task: A systematic review. *Psychophysiology.* 2018;55(6):e13051.
- 604 29. Adler AB, Williams J, McGurk D, Moss A, Bliese PD. Resilience training with soldiers during
605 basic combat training: randomisation by platoon. *Appl Psychol Health Well Being.*
606 2015;7(1758-0854 (Electronic)):85-107.
- 607 30. Bulmer S, Drain JR, Tait JL, et al. Quantification of Recruit Training Demands and Subjective
608 Wellbeing during Basic Military Training. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2022;19(12):7360.
609 doi:10.3390/ijerph19127360
- 610 31. Lieberman HR, Karl JP, Niro PJ, et al. Positive Effects of Basic Training on Cognitive
611 Performance and Mood of Adult Females. *Hum Factors J Hum Factors Ergon Soc.*
612 2014;56(6):1113-1123. doi:10.1177/0018720813519472
- 613 32. Lieberman HR, Karl JP, McClung JP, Williams KW, Cable S. Improved Mood State and
614 Absence of Sex Differences in Response to the Stress of Army Basic Combat Training. *Appl*
615 *Psychol Health Well Being.* 2016;8(1758-0854 (Electronic)):351-363.
616 doi:10.1111/aphw.12075
- 617 33. Crowley SK, Wilkinson LL, Wigfall LT, et al. Physical fitness and depressive symptoms during
618 army basic combat training. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2015;47(1):151.
- 619 34. Friedland N, Keinan G. Training effective performance in stressful situations: Three
620 approaches and implications for combat training. *Mil Psychol.* 1992;4(3):157-174.
- 621 35. Redmond SA, Wilcox SL, Campbell S, et al. A brief introduction to the military workplace
622 culture. *Work.* 2015;50(1):9-20. doi:10.3233/WOR-141987

- 623 36. Williams J, Brown JB, Bray RM, Anderson G, Olmsted KR, Adler AB. Unit cohesion, resilience,
624 and mental health of soldiers in basic combat training. *Mil Psychol*. 2016;28(4):241-250.
625 <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/mil/28/4/241>
- 626 37. United States Government Accountability Office. *Military Recruiting: Army National Guard*
627 *Needs to Continue Monitoring, Collect Better Data, and Assess Incentives Programs*. Vol
628 GAO-16-36.; 2015. <http://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673689.pdf>
- 629 38. Scott CK, Sonis J, Creamer M, Dennis ML. Maximizing follow-up in longitudinal studies of
630 traumatized populations. *J Trauma Stress*. 2006;19(0894-9867 (Print)):757-769.
- 631 39. Cella D, Choi SW, Condon DM, et al. PROMIS® adult health profiles: efficient short-form
632 measures of seven health domains. *Value Health*. 2019;22(5):537-544.
- 633 40. Prins A, Bovin MJ, Smolenski DJ, et al. The primary care PTSD screen for DSM-5 (PC-PTSD-5):
634 development and evaluation within a veteran primary care sample. *J Gen Intern Med*.
635 2016;31(10):1206-1211.
- 636 41. Nelson LD, Patrick CJ, Bernat EM. Operationalizing proneness to externalizing
637 psychopathology as a multivariate psychophysiological phenotype. *Psychophysiology*.
638 2011;48(1):64-72.
- 639 42. Saunders JB, Aasland OG, Babor TF, de la Fuente JR, Grant M. Development of the Alcohol
640 Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative Project on Early Detection of
641 Persons with Harmful Alcohol Consumption--II. *Addiction*. 1993;88(6):791-804.
- 642 43. Skinner HA. The drug abuse screening test. *Addict Behav*. 1982;7(4):363-371.
- 643 44. Hahn EA, Beaumont JL, Pilkonis PA, et al. The PROMIS satisfaction with social participation
644 measures demonstrated responsiveness in diverse clinical populations. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
645 2016;73:135-141. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.08.034
- 646 45. Funk JL, Rogge RD. Testing the ruler with item response theory: Increasing precision of
647 measurement for relationship satisfaction with the Couples Satisfaction Index. *J Fam*
648 *Psychol*. 2007;21(4):572-583. jfunk@psych.rochester.edu
- 649 46. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, Sugarman DB. The revised Conflict Tactics Scales
650 (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *J Fam Issues*. 1996;17(3):283-316.
- 651 47. Endicott J, Nee J. Endicott Work Productivity Scale (EWPS): a new measure to assess
652 treatment effects. *Psychopharmacol Bull*. 1997;33(0048-5764 (Print)):13-16.
- 653 48. Schaufeli WB, Bakker AB, Salanova M. Utrecht work engagement scale-9. *Educ Psychol*
654 *Meas*. Published online 2003.

- 655 49. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-15: Validity of a new measure for evaluating
656 the severity of somatic symptoms. *Psychosom Med*. 2002;64(0033-3174 (Print)):258-266.
- 657 50. Von Korff M, DeBar LL, Krebs EE, Kerns RD, Deyo RA, Keefe FJ. Graded chronic pain scale
658 revised: mild, bothersome, and high impact chronic pain. *Pain*. 2020;161(3):651.
- 659 51. Bjureberg J, Ljótsson B, Tull MT, et al. Development and Validation of a Brief Version of the
660 Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale: The DERS-16. *J Psychopathol Behav Assess*.
661 2016;38(2):284-296. doi:10.1007/s10862-015-9514-x
- 662 52. Sahdra BK, Ciarrochi J, Parker P, Scrucca L. Using Genetic Algorithms in a Large Nationally
663 Representative American Sample to Abbreviate the Multidimensional Experiential
664 Avoidance Questionnaire. *Front Psychol*. 2016;7:189. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00189
- 665 53. Derryberry D, Reed MA. Anxiety-related attentional biases and their regulation by
666 attentional control. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 2002;111(2):225-236.
- 667 54. Burton CL, Bonanno GA. Measuring ability to enhance and suppress emotional expression:
668 The Flexible Regulation of Emotional Expression (FREE) Scale. *Psychol Assess*.
669 2016;28(8):929-941.
- 670 55. Rosenthal DA, Gurney RM, Moore SM. From trust on intimacy: A new inventory for
671 examining erikson's stages of psychosocial development. *J Youth Adolesc*. 1981;10(6):525-
672 537. doi:10.1007/BF02087944
- 673 56. Johnson DC, Polusny MA, Erbes CR, et al. Development and initial validation of the
674 Response to Stressful Experiences Scale. *Mil Med*. 2011;176(0026-4075 (Print)):161-169.
- 675 57. Hahn EA, DeVellis RF, Bode RK, et al. Measuring social health in the patient-reported
676 outcomes measurement information system (PROMIS): item bank development and
677 testing. *Qual Life Res*. 2010;19(7):1035-1044.
- 678 58. Hahn EA, DeWalt DA, Bode RK, et al. New English and Spanish social health measures will
679 facilitate evaluating health determinants. *Health Psychol*. 2014;33(1930-7810
680 (Electronic)):490-499. doi:10.1037/hea0000055
- 681 59. Vogt D, Smith BN, King L, King D, Knight J, Vasterling J. Deployment Risk and REsilience
682 Inventory-2 (DRRI-2): An updated tool for assessing psychosocial risk and resilience factors
683 among service members and veterans. *J Trauma Stress*. 2013;26:710-717.
- 684 60. Patrick CJ, Curtin JJ, Tellegen A. Development and validation of a brief form of the
685 Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire. *Psychol Assess*. 2002;14(2):150-163.
- 686 61. Blagov PS, Patrick CJ, Oost KM, Goodman JA, Pugh AT. Triarchic psychopathy measure:
687 Validity in relation to normal-range traits, personality pathology, and psychological
688 adjustment. *J Personal Disord*. 2016;30(1):71-81.

- 689 62. Felitti VJ, Anda RF, Nordenberg D, et al. Relationship of childhood abuse and household
690 dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The adverse childhood
691 experiences (ACE) study. *Am J Prev Med.* 1998;14(4):245-258.
- 692 63. Ramsay R, Bagley C. The Prevalence of Suicidal Behaviors, Attitudes and Associated Social
693 Experiences in an Urban Population. *Suicide Life Threat Behav.* 1985;15(3):151-167.
694 doi:10.1111/j.1943-278X.1985.tb00941.x
- 695 64. Moore TM, Reise SP, Gur RE, Hakonarson H, Gur RC. Psychometric properties of the Penn
696 Computerized Neurocognitive Battery. *Neuropsychology.* 2015;29(1931-1559
697 (Electronic)):235-246.
- 698 65. Noorbaloochi S, Hagel-Campbell E, Polusny MA. A Model Enterprise : A super-learner
699 algorithm for combining alternative supervised and unsupervised classification methods.
700 *Manuscr Prep.* Published online 2023.
- 701 66. First MB, Williams JBW, Karg RS, Spitzer RL. Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5-Reseach
702 Version (SCID-5 for DSM-5, Research Version; SCID-5-RV). Published online 2015.
- 703 67. Weathers FW, Bovin MJ, Lee DJ, et al. The Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5
704 (CAPS-5): Development and initial psychometric evaluation in military veterans. *Psychol*
705 *Assess.* 2018;30(3):383.
- 706 68. Watson D, Clark LA. The PANAS-X: Manual for the positive and negative affect schedule-
707 expanded form. Published online 1994.
- 708 69. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity
709 measure. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2001;16(9):606-613.
- 710 70. Beck AT, Steer RAB GK. *Manual for the Beck Depression Inventory.* Vol 2nd. The
711 Psychological Corporation; 1996.
- 712 71. Stanley IH, Hom MA, Christensen K, Keane TM, Marx BP, Björngvinsson T. Psychometric
713 properties of the Depressive Symptom Index-Suicidality Subscale (DSI-SS) in an adult
714 psychiatric sample. *Psychol Assess.* 2021;33(10):987.
- 715 72. Spielberger CD. State-trait anxiety inventory for adults. Published online 1983.
- 716 73. Reiss S, Peterson RA, Gursky DM, McNally RJ. Anxiety sensitivity, anxiety frequency and the
717 prediction of fearfulness. *Behav Res Ther.* 1986;24(0005-7967 (Print)):1-8.
- 718 74. Carleton RN, Duranceau S, Shulman EP, Zerff M, Gonzales J, Mishra S. Self-reported
719 intolerance of uncertainty and behavioural decisions. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry.*
720 2016;51:58-65.

- 721 75. Mogg K, Garner M, Bradley BP. Anxiety and orienting of gaze to angry and fearful faces. *Biol*
722 *Psychiatry*. 2007;76(0301-0511 (Print)):163-169.
- 723 76. Frewen PA, Dozois DJ, Joanisse MF, Neufeld RW. Selective attention to threat versus
724 reward: Meta-analysis and neural-network modeling of the dot-probe task. *Clin Psychol*
725 *Rev*. 2008;28(2):307-337.
- 726 77. Lewis MD, Lamm C, Segalowitz SJ, Stieben J, Zelazo PD. Neurophysiological correlates of
727 emotion regulation in children and adolescents. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2006;18(3):430-443.
- 728 78. Gillespie SM, Lee J, Williams R, Jones A. Psychopathy and response inhibition: A meta-
729 analysis of go/no-go and stop signal task performance. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. Published
730 online 2022:104868.
- 731 79. Gehring WJ, Willoughby AR. The medial frontal cortex and the rapid processing of monetary
732 gains and losses. *Science*. 2002;295(5563):2279-2282.
- 733 80. van MB, Wiggert N, Wicker I, Lissek S. Maladaptive behavioral consequences of conditioned
734 fear-generalization: a pronounced, yet sparsely studied, feature of anxiety pathology. *Behav*
735 *Res Ther*. 2014;57(1873-622X (Electronic)):29-37. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2014.03.009
- 736 81. MacCallum RC, Browne MW, Sugawara HM. Power analysis and determination of sample
737 size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychol Methods*. 1996;1(2):130.
- 738 82. Cox RW. AFNI: software for analysis and visualization of functional magnetic resonance
739 neuroimages. *Comput Biomed Res*. 1996;29(3):162-173.
- 740 83. Kaczurkin AN, Burton PC, Chazin SM, et al. Neural Substrates of Overgeneralized
741 Conditioned Fear in PTSD. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2016;(1535-7228
742 (Electronic)):appiajp201615121549.

744 **Authors' Contributions**

745 Melissa Polusny was responsible for the overall conception and design of the study and
746 led manuscript writing.

747 Craig Marquardt made substantial contributions to the acquisition of data and revising
748 the manuscript critically.

749 Shelly Hubbling made substantial contributions to the acquisition of data for the study,
750 reviewing the manuscript.

751 Emily Hagel Campbell made substantial contributions to analysis and interpretation of
752 data, reviewing the manuscript.

753 Paul Arbisi made substantial contributions to the acquisition of data and revising the
754 manuscript critically.

755 Nicholas Davenport made substantial contributions to the acquisition of data and
756 revising the manuscript critically.

757 Kelvin Lim made substantial contributions to the acquisition of data and revising the
758 manuscript critically.

759 Shumel Lissek made substantial contributions to the acquisition of data and revising the
760 manuscript critically.

761 Jonathan Schaefer contributed substantially revising the manuscript critically.

762 Scott Sponheim made substantial contributions to the acquisition of data and revising
763 the manuscript critically.

764 Ann Masten contributed to the conception and design of the study, revising the
765 manuscript critically.

766 Siamak Noorbaloochi contributed to the conception and design of the study, analysis
767 and interpretation of data, and revising the manuscript critically.

768 All authors have provided final approval of the manuscript for submission.

769 **Funding Statement**

770 This work was supported by the National Center for Complementary and Integrative
771 Health of the National Institutes of Health grant number UH3AT009651.

772 **Competing Interests Statement**

773 The authors have no conflicts of interest.




Figure 1




Figure 2