

Concept Paper Form

Provisional Paper Title: The p factor: An empirical evaluation of methods and concepts
Proposing Author: Avshalom Caspi, Ph.D.,
Author's Email: ac115@duke.edu
P.I. Sponsor: Click or tap here to enter text. (if the proposing author is a student or colleague of an original PI)
Today's Date: 10/5/2020

Please describe your proposal in 2-3 pages with sufficient detail for helpful review.

Objective of the study:

The first part of this article outlines the history behind the idea of a general factor of psychopathology, the 'p' factor. This historical treatment is informative because it explains how the idea originated in order to account for emerging discoveries in developmental and psychiatric epidemiology (e.g., about comorbidity; about ubiquitous risk factors shared between disorders vs. scarce risk factors that are disorder-specific; about shifting disorders; about the perils of statistical controls for comorbidity). The historical treatment also reveals how small, almost incidental decisions can generate unnecessary debate (e.g., about the use of the bifactor model).

The second part of this article addresses the debate about how to derive a general factor of psychopathology. Here we will compare a 1-factor model, a correlated-factor model, a higher-order model, a bi-factor model, and variations on the bifactor model (called S-1 models). We will evaluate and compare model-fit statistics and factor loadings, and correlations between the different factors. Our question is: Does it matter how the general factor is derived?

The third part of the article tests the correlates of the general factor of psychopathology. Here we tackle a fundamental confusion about 'p' factor's raison d'être. Some researchers argue that a risky test of the validity of the 'p' factor is that "including a general factor should improve the correlated factor model's external validity." Other researchers claim that the p factor can recapitulate much of the same information that can be gleaned from multivariable representations of the structure of psychopathology. In this section, we will evaluate well-established correlates of psychopathology, including: family history of disorder, exposure to adversity and victimization, emotional and behavioral dysregulation, low IQ, and inflammation.

The final part of the article articulates future directions and testable hypotheses. We will discuss the following items.

The value of standard reporting strategies.

On the ‘dangers’ of statistically controlling comorbidity.

What is the meaning of the general factor?

Data analysis methods:

We will use data from the E-Risk study. We will use the same mental health data that we have used in previous research:

Statistical analysis:

We will compare/contrast various methods of parsing the structure of psychopathology using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) models:

- One-factor model
- Correlated-factors model
- Higher-order factor model
- 2 Bifactor models (w/ and w/o correlated specific factors)
- 3 Bifactor S-1 models (i.e., bifactor model omitting EXT, INT, THD specific factors one at a time)

NOTE: The models reported here will differ somewhat from those reported in Schaefer, et al. (2017). In order to fit the wide array of models, we will need to treat the indicators of psychopathology as skewed continuous variables rather than as ordinal variables as was done in Schaefer, et al (2017). To account for the skewed nature of the symptom criteria scales, we will use the MLR (robust maximum likelihood) estimator, which “introduces data-based corrections to the test statistic and standard errors to offset the bias introduced by the non-normal distribution.” (<https://curranbauer.org/can-i-estimate-an-sem-if-the-sample-data-are-not-normally-distributed/>). This change will also allow us to report traditional SEM model fit indices that were unavailable in the ordinal specification.

The models will be assessed using the following criteria:

- Traditional SEM model fit indices (e.g., chi-square, RMSEA, CFI/TLI, SRMR, AIC, BIC, Sample-size adjusted BIC)
- It is becoming well-known that traditional model fit indices tend to favor the bifactor model even when it is not the ‘true’ underlying model; given this, we will also examine various ancillary model fit indices [e.g., omega H, omega S, H, explained common variance, item explained common variance, relative parameter bias, tau equivalence (relative strength of loadings on the general vs specific factors)]
- Examine correlations between extracted factor scores across the models (including measures of factor determinacy)

- Examine similarities/differences in heritability of the extracted factors
- Compare the magnitude of correlations of the various factor scores with external correlates (e.g., family history of mental health problems, IQ, ACEs, poly-victimization, low self-control, suPAR)
 - We will attempt to run these within the SEM framework (given the complexity of the models, this may or may not work)
 - We will examine sex adjusted partial correlations between the extracted factors scores and the external correlates
- Do measures of p predict external correlates above and beyond measures of externalizing, internalizing, and thought disorder factors obtained from the correlated-factors model? (i.e., is there added value to estimating p?)
 - We will examine partial correlations between the extracted factor scores and the external correlates; variables partialled will include sex, externalizing, internalizing and thought disorder factors from the correlated factor model
- What do the specific factors in the bifactor model represent? Do correlations between the specific factors from the bifactor model and external correlates “match” partialled correlations from the correlated factors model (e.g., effect of INT after partialling EXT & THD correlated factors)?
- All statistical models will account for the nesting of twins within families.

Variables needed at which ages:

See attached table

Significance of the Study (for theory, research methods or clinical practice):

The purpose of this article is to shed light on the history of research about the ‘p’ factor, clarify ideas, end unproductive debates, generate testable hypotheses, and present guiding ideas for future research.

References cited:

|

Data Security Agreement

Provisional Paper Title: The p factor: An empirical evaluation of methods and concepts
Proposing Author: Avshalom Caspi, Ph.D.,
Today's Date: 10/5/2020

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I am current on Human Subjects Training (CITI (www.citiprogram.org) or equivalent)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	My project is covered by the Duke ethics committee OR I have /will obtain ethical approval from my home institution.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I will treat all data as "restricted" and store in a secure fashion. My computer or laptop is: a) encrypted (recommended programs are FileVault2 for Macs, and Bitlocker for Windows machines) b) password-protected c) configured to lock-out after 15 minutes of inactivity AND d) has an antivirus client installed as well as being patched regularly.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I will not "sync" the data to a mobile device.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In the event that my laptop with data on it is lost, stolen or hacked, I will immediately contact Moffitt or Caspi.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I will not share the data with anyone, including my students or other collaborators not specifically listed on this concept paper.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I will not post data online or submit the data file to a journal for them to post. <i>Some journals are now requesting the data file as part of the manuscript submission process. Study participants have not given informed consent for unrestricted open access, so we have a managed-access process. Speak to Temi or Avshalom for strategies for achieving compliance with data-sharing policies of journals.</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I will delete all data files from my computer after the project is complete. Collaborators and trainees may not take a data file away from the office. This data remains the property of the Study and cannot be used for further analyses without an approved concept paper for new analyses.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I have read the Data Use Guidelines and agree to follow the instructions.

Signature: avshalom caspi

Variables needed:

	SR_hysum18E	Iq5e
	SR_hysum18Y	Iq5y
familyid	SR_symtot18e	Fsiq5e
atwinid	SR_symtot18y	Fsiq5y
btwinid		
rorderp5	Gadsxe18	fhanypm12
torder	Gadsxy18	
risks	gadCritScE18	harme512
cohort	gadCritScY18	harmy512
sampsex		
zygosity_2018	mdesxe18	Lowsc510E
seswq35	mdesxy18	Lowsc510Y
	mdeCritScE18	
	mdeCritScY18	polyve512c
alcsxe18		polyvy512c
alcsxy18		
alccritscE18	eatcritscE18	polyvctze18
alccritscY18	eatCritScY18	polyvctzy18
		polyvctzce18
		polyvctzcy18
marjsxe18	PTSDscale_e18	
marjsxy18	PTSDscale_y18	
marjcritscE18	PTSDcritsc_E18	
marjcritscY18	PTSDcritsc_Y18	CRPmgLE18
		CRPmgLY18
drugsxe18	psysympel18	
drugsxy18	psysympy18	IL6pgmLE18
drugcritscE18		IL6pgmLY18
drugcritscY18		
	ff15e18	suPARngml_E
	ff16e18	suPARngml_Y
CigsDayE18	ff17e18	
CigsDayY18	ff18e18	
	ff19e18	iq18e
smkftndE18	ff20e18	iq18y
smkftndY18	ff15y18	fsiq18e
	ff16y18	fsiq18y
cdsxe18	ff17y18	
cdsxy18	ff18y18	ACES_totalE18
	ff19y18	ACES_totalY18
	ff20y18	
SR_insum18E		
SR_insum18Y		