

Supplemental Online Content

Specific diagnostic criteria identify those at high risk for progression from ‘preaddiction’ to severe alcohol use disorder

Alex P. Miller^{1*}, Sally I-Chun Kuo², Emma C. Johnson¹, Rebecca Tillman¹, Sarah J. Brislin², Danielle M. Dick², Chella Kamarajan³, Sivan Kinreich³, John Kramer⁴, Vivia V. McCutcheon¹, Martin H. Plawecki⁵, Bernice Porjesz³, Marc A. Schuckit⁶, Jessica E. Salvatore², Howard J. Edenberg⁷, Kathleen K. Bucholz¹, Jaquelyn L. Meyers³, & Arpana Agrawal¹

¹Department of Psychiatry, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO, USA, ²Department of Psychiatry, Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Piscataway, NJ, USA, ³Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, State University of New York Health Sciences University, Brooklyn, NY, USA, ⁴Department of Psychiatry, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, USA, ⁵Department of Psychiatry, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN, USA, ⁶Department of Psychiatry, University of California San Diego Medical School, San Diego, CA, USA, ⁷Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN, USA

eMethods. Supplemental methods

eTable 1. Cross-sectional COGA cohort ($N = 13,110$) item response theory severity parameters and endorsement rates for DSM-5 AUD criteria organized by diagnostic groups

eTable 2. All correlate sample sizes for COGA cross-sectional cohort organized by diagnostic groups

eTable 3. Results from mixed effect logistic AUD PGS regression models in COGA cross-sectional sample

eTable 4. Alcohol-related, psychiatric comorbidity, electroencephalography, and AUD polygenic score correlate sample sizes for COGA cross-sectional cohort organized by low- and high-risk mild-to-moderate and severe AUD

eTable 5. Results from mixed linear and logistic regression models comparing alcohol-related, psychiatric, electroencephalography, and polygenic score correlates across low-risk mild-to-moderate, high-risk mild-to-moderate, and severe AUD in COGA cross-sectional cohort

eResults. Supplemental survival analysis results

eReferences

This supplementary material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

eMethods. Supplemental methods

Assessment

Diagnostic assessment of an array of lifetime alcohol use disorder (AUD) symptoms in COGA, which can be mapped onto a variety of diagnostic classification systems, including both DSM-IV¹ and DSM-5², was conducted using the Semi-Structured Interview for the Genetics of Alcoholism (SSAGA), which also includes criterion-level and diagnostic assessments of other psychiatric and substance use disorders (SUDs) as well as other non-diagnostic aspects of alcohol use.^{3,4} Individuals below age 18 at time of assessment were administered an adolescent SSAGA (c-SSAGA)^{4,5} in both cross-sectional and longitudinal cohorts.

Alcohol Use Disorder Polygenic Scores

AUD polygenic scores (PGS) were calculated for genotyped individuals of European (EA; $n=5,396$) and African (AA; $n=1,774$) ancestry. Ancestral background was defined using both principal components analysis of array data and self-declared non-Hispanic white (EA) and non-Hispanic Black (AA) ethnicity/race. Additional details regarding genotyping, imputation, and quality control are available in a related publication.⁶ Summary statistics from a genome-wide association study (GWAS) meta-analysis of data from the Million Veterans Program (MVP; $n_{\text{case}}=45,995$, $n_{\text{control}}=221,396$),⁷ a “leave-one-out” GWAS of alcohol dependence from the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium (PGC) analysis that excluded the COGA sample ($n_{\text{case}}=10,381$, $n_{\text{control}}=31,801$),⁸ and FinnGen Research Project Release 8 ($n_{\text{case}}=14,307$, $n_{\text{control}}=328,192$)⁹ were used to code PGS using PRS-CS-auto¹⁰ in EA individuals. PRS-CSx,¹¹ was used with GWAS summary statistics from both the EA analyses as well as a GWAS meta-analysis of AUD in AA individuals from PGC, not including COGA ($n_{\text{case}}=3,335$, $n_{\text{control}}=2,945$)⁸ and MVP ($n_{\text{case}}=17,267$, $n_{\text{control}}=39,381$)¹² to create meta-analyzed combined weights. Individual PGSs were then calculated in PLINK 1.9¹³ using PRS-CS- and PRS-CSx-derived weights. PGS were scaled to $M=0$, $SD=1$ using the *scale* function in R.

Diagnostic group (i.e., low-risk mild-to-moderate, high-risk mild-to-moderate, and severe AUD) associations with AUD PGS were examined separately for each ancestral group using mixed effect linear regression models fitted using the *lme4* package (v1.1-30)¹⁴ controlling for age, age², sex, 10 genetic ancestry principal components, birth cohort (dummy variables representing birth years prior to 1930, 1930 to 1949, 1950 to 1969, and 1970 and after), and genotyping array type (for European subsample) as fixed effects, and for family ID as a random intercept. Mixed models were specified comparing (1) low-risk and high-risk mild-to-moderate AUD to severe AUD (reference group) and (2) low-risk mild-to-moderate and severe AUD to high-risk mild-to-moderate AUD (reference group). Additional mixed effect linear regression models with these covariates were used to examine associations between AUD PGSs and AUD criterion counts. Follow-up pairwise comparisons (e.g., high-risk vs. low-risk mild-to-moderate AUD, moderate vs. mild AUD, AUD vs. no AUD, etc.) were also conducted using mixed effect logistic regression models with these same covariates (**eTable 3**).

Item Response Theory Analysis

To test the assumptions of local independence and unidimensionality of one-parameter logistic item response theory (IRT) models,¹⁵ a criteria-based confirmatory factor analysis was conducted for the full sample specifying a single AUD factor using weighted least square mean and variance adjusted estimation in the *lavaan* package (v0.6-12)¹⁶ in R.¹⁷ This single-factor model provided excellent fit to data (RMSEA, 0.035; 90% CI, 0.033-0.037; CFI, 0.998; TLI, 0.998; SRMR, 0.020). While two-parameter IRT models also provide information regarding the relative discrimination ability of each criteria/item, as has been suggested previously,^{18,19} these models significantly complicate the goal of selecting criteria based on severity as they introduce further complexity given the additional information regarding discrimination. Thus, for the current approach, the one-parameter logistic model is preferred as it provides a more parsimonious description of the data, provides adequate fit, and is more consistent with current AUD diagnostic schemes in clinical practice (i.e., presence vs. absence).

Survival Analyses

The longitudinal cohort was restricted to alcohol-exposed individuals having data for at least baseline and one follow-up interview. The small number ($n=71$) of individuals who had met criteria for severe AUD at baseline were

also excluded. As with the cross-sectional sample, sex, self-reported race/ethnicity, and AUD diagnostic information were measured using SSAGA/c-SSAGA interviews at each available timepoint for each individual in the longitudinal cohort ($N=2,818$). Waves of data were restructured to reflect age at each assessment (range=13-36 years). Age at onset of severe AUD was coded as the earliest assessment age at which an individual endorsed 6+ AUD criteria, while age at final assessment was used for those who did not meet severe AUD criteria during the study period (i.e., right-censored).

eTable 1. Cross-sectional COGA cohort ($N = 13,110$) item response theory severity parameters and endorsement rates for DSM-5 AUD criteria organized by diagnostic groups

	Severity Parameter b (SE)	Average Symptom Count M (SD)	Criteria Endorsement by Diagnostic Group (%; 95% CI)				
			Mild-to-Moderate AUD (“Preaddiction”)				
			Single Criterion $n = 1,649$	Mild AUD (2-3 criteria) $n = 2,184$	Moderate AUD (4-5 criteria) $n = 1,295$	Mild-to-Moderate AUD (2-5 criteria) $n = 3,479$	Severe AUD (≥ 6 criteria) $n = 3,298$
Hazardous Use	0.07 (0.03)	5.8 (3.3)	37.2 [34.9, 39.6]	64.5 [62.4, 66.5]	80.5 [78.2, 82.5]	70.4 [68.9, 71.9]	93.5 [92.6, 94.3]
Larger/Longer	0.14 (0.03)	6.0 (3.2)	23.9 [21.9, 26.0]	63.0 [61.0, 65.1]	85.5 [83.5, 87.4]	71.4 [69.9, 72.9]	96.0 [95.3, 96.6]
Tolerance	0.82 (0.04)	6.5 (3.2)	15.8 [14.1, 17.6]	43.9 [41.8, 46.0]	68.5 [65.9, 71.0]	53.1 [51.4, 54.7]	89.7 [88.6, 90.7]
Cut Down	0.91 (0.04)	6.7 (3.1)	15.6 [14.0, 17.5]	34.2 [32.2, 36.2]	70.3 [67.8, 72.8]	47.6 [46.0, 49.3]	91.7 [90.7, 92.6]
Social Interpersonal	1.14 (0.04)	7.2 (2.8)	5.0 [4.1, 6.2]	22.2 [20.5, 24.0]	68.2 [65.6, 70.7]	39.3 [37.7, 41.0]	96.6 [95.9, 97.2]
Failure to Fulfill	2.31 (0.04)	8.4 (2.2)	0.6 [0.3, 1.1]	4.2 [3.4, 5.1]	22.3 [20.1, 24.7]	11.0 [10.0, 12.0]	85.4 [84.1, 86.6]
Physical/Psychological	2.56 (0.04)	8.5 (2.3)	0.9 [0.5, 1.5]	4.7 [3.9, 5.7]	19.0 [17.0, 21.2]	10.0 [9.1, 11.1]	77.9 [76.5, 79.3]
Give Up	3.04 (0.04)	9.0 (1.9)	0.2 [0.1, 0.6]	1.6 [1.1, 2.2]	9.0 [7.5, 10.6]	4.3 [3.7, 5.0]	69.5 [67.9, 71.0]
Withdrawal	3.09 (0.04)	9.0 (1.9)	–	1.3 [0.9, 1.9]	9.0 [7.5, 10.6]	4.2 [3.6, 4.9]	68.3 [66.7, 69.9]
Craving	3.46 (0.04)	9.1 (2.0)	0.8 [0.5, 1.4]	1.4 [1.0, 2.0]	7.7 [6.4, 9.3]	3.8 [3.2, 4.5]	57.9 [56.2, 59.6]
Time Spent	4.21 (0.04)	9.4 (2.0)	0.1 [0.0, 0.4]	1.0 [0.7, 1.5]	5.6 [4.5, 7.0]	2.7 [2.2, 3.3]	41.0 [39.4, 42.7]

Note: AUD = alcohol use disorder; **Bold** text denotes criteria designated as high-risk based on IRT results with severity parameter values >2 (i.e., 50% endorsement probability by individuals $2+ SD$ above mean AUD latent severity). Hazardous Use = Recurrent alcohol use (3+ times) in situations in which it is physically hazardous; Larger/longer = Drinking in larger amounts or over longer periods than intended; Tolerance = Need for markedly increased amounts of alcohol to achieve intoxication or desired effect or a markedly diminished effect with continued use of the same amount of alcohol; Cut Down = Persistent desire or three or more unsuccessful efforts to stop, cut down, or control drinking; Social Interpersonal = Continued alcohol use despite having persistent or recurrent (3+ times) social or interpersonal problems caused or exacerbated by the effects of alcohol; Failure to Fulfill = Recurrent use of alcohol resulting in a failure to fulfill major role obligations at work, school, or home; Physical/Psychological = Continued drinking despite knowledge of having a persistent or recurrent physical or psychological problem that is likely to be caused or exacerbated by drinking; Give Up = Important social, occupational, or recreational activities given up or reduced because of drinking; Withdrawal = The characteristic withdrawal syndrome for alcohol; or drinking (or using a closely related substance) to relieve or avoid withdrawal symptoms; Craving = Craving, or a strong desire or urge to use alcohol; Time Spent = A great deal of time spent in activities necessary to obtain, to use, or to recover from the effects of drinking

eTable 2. All correlate sample sizes for COGA cross-sectional cohort organized by diagnostic groups

Variables	No Symptoms <i>n</i> = 4,684	Single Criterion <i>n</i> = 1,649	Mild AUD (2-3 criteria) <i>n</i> = 2,184	Moderate AUD (4-5 criteria) <i>n</i> = 1,295	Mild-to- Moderate AUD <i>n</i> = 3,479	Severe AUD (≥6 criteria) <i>n</i> = 3,298
Sociodemographic						
Sex	4,684	1,649	2,184	1,295	3,479	3,298
Race/Ethnicity	4,684	1,649	2,184	1,295	3,479	3,298
Income	4,506	1,598	2,131	1,267	3,398	3,236
Education in Years	4,680	1,649	2,184	1,294	3,478	3,297
Relationship	4,649	1,637	2,169	1,291	3,460	3,298
Alcohol-Related						
Drinking Every Day Week+	2,745	1,649	2,184	1,295	3,479	3,297
No. Drinks Every Day Week ¹	460	532	1,157	958	2,115	3,085
Blackouts	2,687	1,649	2,184	1,295	3,479	3,297
Age First Intoxication	3,436	1,609	2,169	1,293	3,462	3,289
Age Regular Drinking	2,956	1,578	2,150	1,288	3,438	3,297
Max Drinks ²	4,680	1,646	2,184	1,295	3,479	3,293
Sought Help/Treatment	2,957	1,647	2,184	1,295	3,479	3,298
Psychiatric Comorbidity						
MDD	3,015	1,073	1,437	801	2,238	1,757
ASPD	4,621	1,614	2,132	1,237	3,369	3,017
SUD	4,684	1,649	2,184	1,295	3,479	3,298
Theta ERO	1,885	682	953	578	1,531	1,320
Delta ERO	1,885	682	953	578	1,531	1,320
P300 Amplitude	1,696	607	829	521	1,350	1,097
AUD PGS						
AA Subsample	694	175	214	175	389	516
EA Subsample	1,671	688	1,007	582	1,589	1,448

Note: AUD = alcohol use disorder; MDD = major depressive disorder; ASPD = antisocial personality disorder; SUD = comorbid substance use disorder; ERO = event related oscillations; PGS = polygenic score; AA = African ancestry; EA = European ancestry
Comparison sample sizes varied across correlates according to patterns of missing data.

¹ Sample sizes for maximum number of drinks consumed every day during period of drinking every day for a week or more are restricted based on endorsement of ever drinking every day for a week or more

² Maximized over available interviews

eTable 3. Results from mixed effect logistic AUD PGS regression models in COGA cross-sectional sample

European ancestry subsample (n = 5,396)	OR	95% CI	P
Criterion severity			
High-Risk Mild-to-Moderate AUD vs. Low-Risk Mild-to-Moderate AUD	1.10	[0.98, 1.24]	1.11×10^{-1}
Severe AUD vs. Low-Risk Mild-to-Moderate AUD	1.08	[0.98, 1.19]	1.27×10^{-1}
Severe AUD vs. High-Risk Mild-to-Moderate AUD	0.94	[0.84, 1.07]	3.50×10^{-1}
DSM-5 categories			
Moderate AUD vs. Mild AUD	1.07	[0.96, 1.19]	2.04×10^{-1}
Severe AUD vs. Mild AUD	1.07	[0.97, 1.19]	1.76×10^{-1}
Severe AUD vs. Moderate AUD	0.98	[0.88, 1.09]	7.26×10^{-1}
AUD vs. No AUD	1.16	[1.09, 1.24]	8.69×10^{-6}
Mild-to-moderate vs. No AUD	1.13	[1.04, 1.21]	1.97×10^{-3}
Severe AUD vs. No AUD	1.23	[1.12, 1.35]	1.57×10^{-5}
African ancestry subsample (n = 1,774)			
Criterion severity			
High-Risk Mild-to-Moderate AUD vs. Low-Risk Mild-to-Moderate AUD	1.11	[0.91, 1.35]	3.25×10^{-1}
Severe AUD vs. Low-Risk Mild-to-Moderate AUD	1.30	[1.09, 1.56]	4.33×10^{-3}
Severe AUD vs. High-Risk Mild-to-Moderate AUD	1.08	[0.90, 1.29]	4.13×10^{-1}
DSM-5 categories			
Moderate AUD vs. Mild AUD	1.11	[0.91, 1.36]	2.99×10^{-1}
Severe AUD vs. Mild AUD	1.27	[1.07, 1.51]	7.02×10^{-3}
Severe AUD vs. Moderate AUD	1.10	[0.92, 1.32]	2.84×10^{-1}
AUD vs. No AUD	1.13	[1.01, 1.26]	3.67×10^{-2}
Mild-to-moderate vs. No AUD	1.02	[0.89, 1.17]	7.24×10^{-1}
Severe AUD vs. No AUD	1.27	[1.10, 1.47]	1.47×10^{-3}

Note: AUD = alcohol use disorder; PGS = polygenic score; OR = odds ratio

Fixed covariates: age, age², sex, 10 PCs, genotyping array (for European subsample), cohort

Random covariates: family ID

Ancestry grouping based on PC and reported race/ethnicity (Black non-Hispanic, white non-Hispanic)

*African ancestry sample AUD PGS on AUD symptom count: $\beta = 0.26$, SE = 0.08, $P = 1.04 \times 10^{-3}$

*European ancestry sample AUD PGS on AUD symptom count: $\beta = 0.20$, SE = 0.05, $P = 9.36 \times 10^{-6}$

eTable 4. Alcohol-related, psychiatric comorbidity, electroencephalography, and AUD polygenic score correlate sample sizes for COGA cross-sectional cohort organized by low- and high-risk mild-to-moderate and severe AUD

Variables	Mild-to-Moderate AUD (“Preaddiction”)		Severe AUD <i>n</i> = 3,298
	Endorsed Low-Risk Criteria <i>n</i> = 2,486	Endorsed High-Risk Criteria <i>n</i> = 993	
Alcohol-Related			
Drinking Every Day Week+	2,486	993	3,297
No. Drinks Every Day Week ¹	1,422	693	3,085
Blackouts	2,486	993	3,297
Age First Intoxication	2,474	988	3,289
Age Regular Drinking	2,459	979	3,297
Max Drinks ²	2,486	993	3,293
Sought Help/Treatment	2,486	993	3,298
Psychiatric Comorbidity			
MDD	1,627	611	1,757
ASPD	2,437	932	3,017
SUD	2,486	993	3,298
Theta ERO	1,094	437	1,320
Delta ERO	1,094	437	1,320
P300 Amplitude	966	384	1,097
AUD PGS			
AA Subsample	204	185	516
EA Subsample	1,204	385	1,448

Note: AUD = alcohol use disorder; MDD = major depressive disorder; ASPD = antisocial personality disorder; SUD = comorbid substance use disorder; ERO = event related oscillations; PGS = polygenic score; AA = African ancestry; EA = European Ancestry. Comparison sample sizes varied across correlates according to patterns of missing data.

¹ Sample sizes for maximum number of drinks consumed every day during period of drinking every day for a week or more are restricted based on endorsement of ever drinking every day for a week or more

² Maximized over available interviews

eTable 5. Results from mixed linear and logistic regression models comparing alcohol-related, psychiatric, electroencephalography, and polygenic score correlates across low-risk mild-to-moderate, high-risk mild-to-moderate, and severe AUD in COGA cross-sectional cohort

Variables	High-risk mild-to-moderate AUD vs. low-risk mild-to-moderate AUD		Severe AUD vs. high-risk mild-to-moderate AUD		Severe AUD vs. low-risk mild-to-moderate AUD	
	OR/ β	95% CI	OR/ β	95% CI	OR/ β	95% CI
Alcohol-Related						
Drinking Every Day Week+	1.14	[0.93, 1.39]	4.04	[3.12, 5.23]	4.61	[3.45, 6.15]
No. Drinks Every Day Week+	0.15	[0.05, 0.25]	0.52	[0.42, 0.61]	0.67	[0.55, 0.78]
Blackouts	0.96	[0.79, 1.15]	2.55	[2.06, 3.15]	2.44	[1.91, 3.11]
Age First Intoxication	0.08	[0.00, 0.15]	-0.29	[-0.37, -0.21]	-0.21	[-0.31, -0.11]
Age Regular Drinking	0.06	[-0.02, 0.13]	-0.26	[-0.34, -0.18]	-0.20	[-0.30, -0.11]
Max Drinks	0.08	[0.01, 0.15]	0.58	[0.50, 0.66]	0.66	[0.57, 0.75]
Sought Help/Treatment	1.48	[1.19, 1.85]	7.18	[5.86, 8.81]	10.63	[8.24, 13.72]
Psychiatric Comorbidity						
MDD	1.53	[1.12, 2.10]	2.07	[1.45, 2.94]	3.17	[2.07, 4.83]
ASPD	1.56	[1.17, 2.08]	1.84	[1.40, 2.42]	2.87	[2.04, 4.04]
SUD	1.34	[1.09, 1.63]	2.61	[2.08, 3.28]	3.49	[2.70, 4.52]
Theta ERO	-0.12	[-0.24, 0.00]	-0.09	[-0.22, 0.04]	-0.21	[-0.36, -0.06]
Delta ERO	0.00	[-0.12, 0.12]	-0.05	[-0.18, 0.08]	-0.05	[-0.20, 0.10]
P300 Amplitude	-0.08	[-0.20, 0.03]	-0.10	[-0.22, 0.03]	-0.18	[-0.32, -0.04]
AUD PGS						
EA Subsample	0.09	[-0.01, 0.20]	0.02	[-0.09, 0.13]	0.07	[-0.01, 0.16]
AA Subsample	0.12	[-0.28, 0.05]	0.12	[-0.05, 0.28]	0.22	[0.06, 0.38]

Note: AUD = alcohol use disorder; MDD = major depressive disorder; ASPD = antisocial personality disorder; SUD = comorbid substance use disorder; ERO = event related oscillations; PGS = polygenic score; AA = African ancestry; EA = European ancestry; OR = odds ratio; β = standardized regression coefficient

eResults. Supplemental results from survival analyses

In the longitudinal sample ($N=2,818$), a total of 252 individuals eventually met criteria for severe AUD (i.e., 8.9% of total sample; median onset age of 24 years). Cox proportional hazards regression models demonstrated increasing hazards as a function of prior criterion count-based severity: single ($n=566$) vs. no criteria ($n=1,236$; adjusted hazard ratio [aH], 1.13; 95% CI, 0.66-1.93); mild AUD ($n=833$; aHR, 3.48; 95% CI, 2.37-5.11; 14.7% transition); and moderate AUD ($n=183$; aHR, 11.30; 95% CI, 7.33-17.43; 40.4% transition; between mild and moderate AUD aHR, 3.25; 95% CI, 2.10-5.03). In total, 1,016 individuals in the sample (36.1%) met criteria for mild-to-moderate AUD prior their final assessment, and 196 of these individuals (19.3%) went on to develop severe AUD at a subsequent timepoint. Cox proportion hazards analyses similarly found that a prior mild-to-moderate AUD diagnosis was associated with a significantly elevated hazards of severe AUD after adjusting for covariates (aHR, 11.30; 95% CI, 7.33-17.43; Figure 2), though this result was primarily driven by those endorsing high-risk criteria (see main text).

Other youth characteristics that have been previously linked to progression to severe AUD were also significantly associated with progression to severe AUD; however, adjusted hazards for these characteristics ranged from aHR, 0.75-0.79 for age at onset variables (i.e., first drink, regular drinking, and first intoxication; inverse aHR, 1.27-1.33) to aHR=7.88 for other SUDs, suggesting in general that these indices are not as predictive of transitioning to severe AUD as either a prior moderate AUD diagnosis or a high-risk mild-to-moderate AUD diagnosis. In multivariate models including all risk factor variables in addition to covariates mentioned above (i.e., accounting for shared variance among these feature), high-risk mild-to-moderate was the strongest predictor (aHR, 4.25; 95% CI, 2.57-7.04) followed by other SUDs (aHR, 3.65; 95% CI, 2.42-5.52). Similar models for prior mild vs. moderate AUD also demonstrated an association between a prior diagnosis of moderate AUD and progression to severe AUD (aHR, 4.46; 95% CI, 2.70-7.35) that was larger in magnitude than other youth characteristics (other SUDs aHR, 3.76; 95% CI, 2.49-5.68).

References

1. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 4th ed. American Psychiatric Association; 1994.
2. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 5th ed. American Psychiatric Association; 2013.
3. Hesselbrock M, Easton C, Bucholz KK, Schuckit M, Hesselbrock V. A validity study of the SSAGA: A comparison with the SCAN. *Addict Abingdon Engl*. 1999;94(9):1361-1370. doi:10.1046/j.1360-0443.1999.94913618.x
4. Bucholz KK, Cadoret R, Cloninger CR, et al. A new, semi-structured psychiatric interview for use in genetic linkage studies: A report on the reliability of the SSAGA. *J Stud Alcohol*. 1994;55(2):149-158.
5. Bucholz KK, McCutcheon VV, Agrawal A, et al. Comparison of parent, peer, psychiatric, and cannabis use influences across stages of offspring alcohol involvement: Evidence from the COGA prospective study. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2017;41(2):359-368. doi:10.1111/acer.13293
6. Johnson EC, Salvatore JE, Lai D, et al. The Collaborative Study on the Genetics of Alcoholism: Genetics. *Genes Brain Behav*. Published online 2023.
7. Zhou H, Sealock JM, Sanchez-Roige S, et al. Genome-wide meta-analysis of problematic alcohol use in 435,563 individuals yields insights into biology and relationships with other traits. *Nat Neurosci*. 2020;23(7):809-818. doi:10.1038/s41593-020-0643-5
8. Walters RK, Polimanti R, Johnson EC, et al. Transancestral GWAS of alcohol dependence reveals common genetic underpinnings with psychiatric disorders. *Nat Neurosci*. 2018;21(12):1656-1669. doi:10.1038/s41593-018-0275-1
9. Kurki MI, Karjalainen J, Palta P, et al. FinnGen provides genetic insights from a well-phenotyped isolated population. *Nature*. 2023;613(7944):508-518. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-05473-8
10. Ge T, Chen CY, Ni Y, Feng YCA, Smoller JW. Polygenic prediction via Bayesian regression and continuous shrinkage priors. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10(1):1776. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-09718-5
11. Ruan Y, Lin YF, Feng YCA, et al. Improving polygenic prediction in ancestrally diverse populations. *Nat Genet*. 2022;54(5):573-580. doi:10.1038/s41588-022-01054-7
12. Kranzler HR, Zhou H, Kember RL, et al. Genome-wide association study of alcohol consumption and use disorder in 274,424 individuals from multiple populations. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10(1):1-11. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-09480-8
13. Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LCAM, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ. Second-generation PLINK: Rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *GigaScience*. 2015;4(1):1-16. doi:10.1186/s13742-015-0047-8
14. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J Stat Softw*. 2015;67(1). doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01
15. Embretson SE, Reise SP. *Item Response Theory for Psychologists*. Psychology Press; 2000.
16. Rosseel Y. lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *J Stat Softw*. 2012;48:1-36. doi:10.18637/jss.v048.i02
17. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2023. <https://www.r-project.org/>
18. Kahler CW, Strong DR. A Rasch model analysis of DSM-IV alcohol abuse and dependence items in the National Epidemiological Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2006;30(7):1165-1175. doi:10.1111/j.1530-0277.2006.00140.x
19. Boness CL, Lane SP, Sher KJ. Not all alcohol use disorder criteria are equally severe: towards severity grading of individual criteria in college drinkers. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2019;33(1):35-49. doi:10.1037/adb0000443