|  |
| --- |
| Supplementary table 5. Association between peer victimization and PEs according to children versus parents endorsement of trauma exposure |
|  | **Exposure to peer victimization** |  |
|  | **Not exposed** | **Parents report, only** | **Children report, only** | **Parents and children report** |  |
|  | **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(3)** |  |
| N= 2,075 |  1,426 (69%) | 343 (17%) | 190 (9%) | 116 (6%) |  |
|  | Regression coefficients | Differences between coefficients† |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Youth self-report of PE**CAPE total scores (0-80) | B(0)=0, reference category | B(1)= 0.46 (–0.28-1.2), p=0.22 | B(2)=2.73 (1.79-3.67), p<0.001\*\*\* | B(3)=3.72 (2.55-4.9), p=<0.001\*\*\* | B(1)≠B(2) chi2=16.07, p<0.001\*\*\*B(1)≠B(3) chi2=24.51, p<0.001\*\*\*B(2)≠B(3) chi2=1.91, p=0.17 |
| **Parents report of youth PE**CBCL hallucinations (0-6) | B(0)=0, reference category | B(1)= 0.04 (–0.04-0.11), p=0.32 | B(2)=0.06 (–0.04-0.15), p=0.24 | B(3)= 0.08 (–0.04-0.2), p=0.18 |  B(1)≠B(2)chi2=0.1, p=0.75B(1)≠B(3) chi2=0.42, p=0.52B(2)≠B(3) chi2=0.12, p=0.73 |
| **Clinician evaluation of youth PE**CAPE total scores rated by clinicians (0-80) | B(0)=0, reference category | B(1)=0.26 (–0.35-0.87), p=0.4 | B(2)=2.31 (1.54-3.08), p<0.001\*\*\* | B(3)=2.75 (1.79-3.71), p<0.001\*\*\* | B(1)≠B(2) chi2=19.4, p<0.001\*\*\*B(1)≠B(3) chi2=21.13, p≤0.001\*\*\*B(2)≠B(3) chi2=0.56, p=0.46 |
| Modelled according to sample structure: multilevel logistic regression models, cross-level structure with schools and clinicians as levels and city as an independent variable, adjusted for possible confounders: age, gender, IQ, SES, caregiver report of psychotic experiences, overall psychopathology (SDQ)Significance of difference between crude beta coefficients was obtained from post estimation Wald tests of linear hypotheses. \* p value ≤ 0.05; \*\* p value ≤ 0.01; \*\*\* p value ≤ 0.001  |