**Supplemental Materials**

**Resting state fMRI processing**

**Preprocessing.** The data were preprocessed using a combination of toolboxes (AFNI, <http://afni.nimh.nih.gov>, FSL, http://fsl.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl/fslwiki/, SPM, http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm, GIFT, http://mialab.mrn.org/software/gift), and custom scripts written in MATLAB. The preprocessing included image distortion correction using FSL’s topup function and realignment to the single-band reference (SBref) image using AFNI’s align\_epi\_anat.py function. Motion parameters were estimated relative to the SBref images and data was registered to the MNI template using AFNI’s 3dNwarpApply as estimated using AFNI’s auto\_warp.py. The first four volumes of each session were discarded to account for the T1 equilibrium effect. Because participants consisted of children and adolescents, we rewarped the data to a study specific template computed as the average of the first time point from each scan using SPM. Next, we smoothed the data to 6 mm full width at half maximum (FWHM).

**Group independent component analysis.** A subset of the preprocessed functional data including single timepoint was analyzed with gICA implemented in the GIFT software (Calhoun et al., 2001; Calhoun & Adali, 2012) and decomposed into 150 spatially independent components identified in previous studies (Agcaoglu et al., 2019, 2020). Prior to gICA, a scan specific principal component analysis (PCA) was applied to reduce the dimensionality across the 646 time points to 200 maximally variable directions. The reduced data were concatenated across time and a group PCA was applied to further reduce the dimensionality to 150 (Erhardt et al., 2011). One hundred and fifty independent components were estimated from the group PCA reduced matrix using the infomax algorithm (Bell & Sejnowski, 1995). We repeated the ICA algorithm 20 times in ICASSO (see 6; http://www.cis.hut.fi/projects/ica/icasso) to ensure stability of the estimation, and the most central run was selected from the resulting 20 runs (Ma et al., 2011). In the longitudinal analysis, we used the seed components as references and utilized a spatially constrained ICA algorithm (Du et al., 2016; Du & Fan, 2013) to estimate subject specific spatial maps (SMs) and time courses (TCs) from the group maps, called group information guided ICA (GIG‐ICA) as implemented in the GIFT software.

**Post-gICA processing.** Subject specific SMs and TCs were post-processed with methods similar to that described in a previous study (Allen et al., 2011). We calculated one sample t-test maps for each SM across all participants and then thresholded these maps to obtain regions of peak connectivity for the corresponding component. We also computed mean power spectra of the corresponding TCs. Later, these components were analyzed based on criteria such as peak activated voxel location in gray matter, showing less overlap with known vascular, susceptibility, ventricular and edge regions corresponding to head motion by visually and using AFNI whereami function; and 51 components out of 150 were identified as the resting state networks (RSNs). These 51 RSNs were also grouped based on their anatomical and functional properties by visual observation and using AFNI whereami function; including 4 subcortical networks (SC), 3 auditory networks (AUD), 8 sensorimotor networks (SM), 18 visual networks (VIS), 4 default-mode networks (DMN), 12 cognitive control networks (CC), and 2 cerebellar networks (not evaluated here). A list of specific RSNs comprising each network is available in a previous publication (Agcaoglu et al., 2019), and is summarized in Supplemental Table S1. The subject specific TCs were detrended, motion parameters were regressed and then despiked, which involved detecting spikes as determined by AFNI's 3dDespike algorithm and replacing spikes by values obtained from third order spline fit to neighboring clean portions of the data.

**Functional network connectivity (FNC).** FNC is a measure that shows the average FC among different RSNs during scanning, calculated as the pairwise correlation between RSN time courses. TCs were filtered using a fifth-order Butterworth low-pass filter with a high frequency cutoff of 0.15 Hz since correlation among brain networks is primarily driven by the low frequency fluctuations in BOLD fMRI data (Cordes et al., 2001). We estimated the FNC matrix for each subject separately via Pearson correlations using all 646 time courses. Resultant correlations were later z-transformed. FNC matrix was initially organized similar to Allen et al. (Allen et al., 2014) as the main modules of subcortical, auditory, sensorimotor, visual, default-mode, cognitive control, and cerebellar. Then, we applied the Louvain algorithm from the brain connectivity toolbox https://sites.google.com/site/bctnet) to arrange the RSN ordering within these main modules.

Table S1. *Anatomical regions identified in each resting state network and component*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Network** | **IC** | **Resting State Network** | **Coordinates**  **(x, y, z)** |
| ***Cognitive Control*** | | | |
|  | ***83*** | left middle temporal gyrus | -46, 6, -30 |
| right medial temporal pole | 48, 10, -26 |
| ***114*** | left superior medial frontal gyrus | 0, 60, 22 |
| left temporal pole | -36, 22, -20 |
| ***63*** | right middle frontal gyrus | 32, 58, 4 |
| right inferior parietal lobule | 50, -50, 48 |
| ***48*** | left superior medial frontal gyrus | 0, 66, 18 |
| right cerebellum | 48, -72, -38 |
| ***120*** | left inferior frontal gyrus | -48, 30, 18 |
| right inferior frontal gyrus | 50, 22, 28 |
| ***146*** | left inferior frontal gyrus | 50, 18, 6 |
| left insula | -34, 24, -2 |
| ***119*** | left insula | -40, 18, -6 |
| right insula | 44, 16, -2 |
| ***96*** | left inferior parietal lobule | -24, -72, 46 |
| left precentral gyrus | -52, 10, 34 |
| ***102*** | right rolandic operculum | 54, 4, 4 |
| left rolandic operculum | -54, 0, 4 |
| ***55*** | right superior parietal lobule | 18, -54, 66 |
| right cerebellum | 26, -44, -48 |
| ***136*** | left angular gyrus | -52, -78, 28 |
| right middle occipital gyrus | 44, -78, 34 |
|  |  |  |  |
| ***Auditory*** | | | |
|  | ***62*** | left superior temporal gyrus | -52, -18, 6 |
| right superior temporal gyrus | 60, -12, 0 |
| ***145*** | right superior temporal gyrus | 56, -44, 18 |
| left superior temporal gyrus | -58, -54, 12 |
| ***125*** | right insula | 42, -18, 12 |
| left superior temporal gyrus | -46, -24, 12 |
|  |  |  |  |
| ***Sensorimotor*** | | | |
|  | ***9*** | left paracentral lobule | 0, -24, 72 |
| ***8*** | left postcentral gyrus | -46, -30, 54 |
| right postcentral gyrus | 54, -20, 48 |
| ***98*** | left inferior parietal lobule | -54, -30, 45 |
| right supramarginal gyrus | 60, -20, 40 |
| ***26*** | right postcentral gyrus | 44, -30, 58 |
| left postcentral gyrus | -42, -38, 60 |
| ***2*** | left postcentral gyrus | -54, -8, 34 |
| right postcentral gyrus | 60, -6, 30 |
| ***73*** | left paracentral lobule | 0, -24, 54 |
| left rolandic operculum | -40, -26, 18 |
| ***124*** | left inferior parietal lobule | -57, -42, 42 |
| right supramarginal gyrus | 60, -38, 40 |
| ***77*** | left supplementary motor area | 0, 6, 52 |
| right insula | 48, 10, -2 |
|  |  |  |  |
| ***Visual*** | | | |
|  | ***131*** | left inferior temporal gyrus | -52, -50, -12 |
| right fusiform gyrus | 44, -30, -18 |
| ***76*** | right calcarine gyrus | 18, -102, -2 |
| ***34*** | left cuneus | 2, -80, 24 |
| ***42*** | right fusiform gyrus | 32, -78, -14 |
| left cerebellum | -40, -68, -20 |
| ***71*** | left fusiform gyrus | 32, -78, -14 |
| right fusiform gyrus | -40, -68, -20 |
| ***91*** | right lingual gyrus | 24, -72, -12 |
| ***111*** | left lingual gyrus | 0, -78, 4 |
| ***69*** | left cerebellum | -6, -50, -2 |
| ***82*** | right cerebellum | 8, -50, -2 |
| ***70*** | left lingual gyrus | -18, -86, -18 |
| ***33*** | right calcarine gyrus | 8, -68, 10 |
| ***59*** | right lingual gyrus | 12, -56, 10 |
| left middle occipital gyrus | -42, -80, 30 |
| ***130*** | right middle occipital gyrus | 38, -84, 6 |
| left middle occipital gyrus | -36, -86, 6 |
| ***100*** | cerebellar vermis | 2, -42, 4 |
| ***129*** | cerebellar vermis | 6, -56, 0 |
| ***38*** | left precuneus | 0, -66, 58 |
| right superior frontal gyrus | 30, 4, 60 |
| ***37*** | left posterior cingulate gyrus | 0, -54, 30 |
| left angular gyrus | -52, -68, 28 |
| ***27*** | right middle cingulate gyrus | -4, -24, 28 |
| left inferior parietal lobule | -36, -62, 48 |
|  |  |  |  |
| ***Default Mode*** | | | |
|  | ***123*** | right middle cingulate cortex | 2, 42, 10 |
| right insula | 36, 18, -12 |
| ***49*** | left middle orbital gyrus | 0, 48, -6 |
| left middle temporal gyrus | -58, -14, -18 |
| ***90*** | left angular gyrus | -52, -62, 30 |
| left middle frontal gyrus | -42, 18, 46 |
| ***101*** | right middle frontal gyrus | 30, 18, 54 |
| right inferior parietal lobule | 54, -56, 40 |

Note. “IC” = independent component; this value indicates the number of the component identified during resting-state network processing. Note that some ICs contain two anatomical regions, whereas others are comprised of only one region. Coordinates for the peak of activity in the identified IC are noted in the right-most column. Functional network connectivity (FNC) within each of the targeted overarching networks (e.g., Cognitive Control) was computed as the averaged connectivity across all resting state networks subsumed under the network. Analyses to identify the resultant networks detailed above were previously published (Agcaoglu et al., 2019; Taylor et al., 2022).

Table S2. *Correlation matrix of study variables included in final models*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1.** | **2.** | **3.** | **4.** | **5.** | **6.** | **7.** | **8.** | **9.** | **10.** | **11.** | **12.** | **13.** | **14.** | **15.** | **16.** | **17.** | **18.** | **19.** | **20.** | **21.** |
| 1. **Age (T1)** | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Sex** | .01 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Race** | .01 | .11 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Ethnicity** | -.07 | .02 | -.11 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Dysregulation (T1)** | -.08 | -.02 | .01 | .05 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Trauma (T1)** | -.07 | .003 | -.05 | .07 | **.15\*** | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – CCN (T1)** | -.14 | **.15\*** | .02 | -.04 | **.30\*\*** | .02 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – CCN (T2)** | .14 | .11 | -.11 | -.09 | .02 | -.06 | **.44\*\*** | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – CCN (T3)** | -.05 | -.003 | -.14 | -.09 | .01 | .18 | .10 | .28 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – DMN (T1)** | -.05 | .12 | .07 | -.02 | **.21\*\*** | -.01 | **.74\*\*** | **.31\*\*** | -.17 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – DMN (T2)** | .06 | -.01 | -.04 | -.02 | .06 | -.03 | **.28\*\*** | **.72\*\*** | .15 | **.27\*\*** | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – DMN (T3)** | -.15 | -.05 | -.16 | -.06 | -.08 | **.36\*** | .05 | .20 | **.56\*\*** | .03 | **.41\*\*** | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – AUD (T1)** | -.10 | .09 | -.02 | -.03 | **.31\*\*** | .04 | **.80\*\*** | **.45\*\*** | .21 | **.63\*\*** | **.30\*\*** | .05 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – AUD (T2)** | **.21\*** | .01 | -.14 | -.15 | -.03 | .003 | **.30\*\*** | **.83\*\*** | **.37\*\*** | **.19\*** | **.58\*\*** | .17 | **.42\*\*** | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – AUD (T3)** | -.01 | -.07 | -.18 | -.06 | .05 | .16 | .05 | **.31\*** | **.83\*\*** | -.16 | .13 | **.42\*\*** | .25 | **.53\*\*** | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – SM (T1)** | **-.14\*** | .11 | -.02 | -.03 | **.28\*\*** | .01 | **.87\*\*** | **.44\*\*** | .07 | **.62\*\*** | **.28\*\*** | -.09 | **.88\*\*** | **.37\*\*** | .08 | — |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – SM (T2)** | **.21\*** | .02 | -.15 | **-.20\*** | -.02 | -.05 | **.36\*\*** | **.87\*\*** | .27 | **.27\*\*** | **.54\*\*** | .10 | **.42\*\*** | **.86\*\*** | **.40\*\*** | **.40\*\*** | — |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – SM (T3)** | -.14 | -.05 | -.26 | -.14 | .08 | .20 | .11 | **.38\*\*** | **.86\*\*** | -.17 | .24 | **-.44\*\*** | **.33\*** | **.51\*\*** | **.85\*\*** | .21 | **.50\*\*** | — |  |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – VIS (T1)** | **-.22\*\*** | .16\* | -.09 | -.05 | **.21\*\*** | .03 | **.77\*\*** | **.42\*\*** | .12 | **.49\*\*** | **.31\*\*** | .05 | **.66\*\*** | **.25\*\*** | .04 | **.70\*\*** | **.32\*\*** | .17 | — |  |  |
| 1. **CCN – VIS (T2)** | .05 | .07 | -.11 | -.04 | .02 | -.10 | **.39\*\*** | **.81\*\*** | .24 | **.25\*\*** | **.60\*\*** | .03 | **.34\*\*** | **.69\*\*** | **.33\*** | **.40\*\*** | **.70\*\*** | **.44\*\*** | **.47\*\*** | — |  |
| 1. **CCN – VIS (T3)** | -.14 | -.25 | -.17 | -.04 | -.06 | .10 | .10 | .19 | **.73\*\*** | -.06 | .10 | **.38\*\*** | .12 | .13 | **.66\*\*** | .06 | .16 | **.68\*\*** | .20 | .27 | — |

Note. T1 = Time 1, T2 = Time 2, T3= Time 3. CCN = cognitive control; DMN = default mode network; AUD = auditory/temporal; SM = sensorimotor; VIS = visual. Significant correlations are bolded; \*\**p* < .01, \**p* < .05.

Table S3. *Model fit indices for each model tested organized by functional network*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **χ2** | **df** | ***p*** | **χ2diff** | ***p*** | **RMSEA** | **90% CI** | **CFI** |
| CCN – CCN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model 1 | 1.38 | 1 | .24 |  |  | .05 | .00, .21 | .99 |
| Model 2 | 7.48 | 4 | .11 | 6.10 | .11 | .07 | .00, .14 | .90 |
| Model 3 | 10.77 | 6 | .10 | 3.29 | .77 | .06 | .00, .13 | .90 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CCN – DMN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model 1 | 0.10 | 1 | .75 | - | - | .00 | .00, .13 | 1.00 |
| Model 2 | 3.45 | 4 | .49 | 3.35 | .34 | .00 | .00, .10 | 1.00 |
| Model 3 | 7.92 | 6 | .24 | 4.47 | .61 | .04 | .00, .11 | .93 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CCN – AUD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model 1 | 2.73 | 1 | .10 | - | - | .10 | .00, .24 | .95 |
| Model 2 | 14.29 | 4 | .01 | 11.56 | .01 | .12 | .06, .19 | .80 |
| Model 3 | 18.07 | 6 | .01 | 3.78 | .71 | .05 | .05, .16 | .81 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CCN – SM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model 1 | 0.92 | 1 | .34 | - | - | .00 | .00, .19 | 1.00 |
| Model 2 | 19.85 | 4 | .001 | 18.93 | <.001 | .15 | .09, .21 | .72 |
| Model 3 | 26.17 | 6 | .0002 | 6.32 | .39 | .13 | .08, .19 | .71 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CCN – VIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model 1 | 0.84 | 1 | .36 | - | - | .00 | .00, .19 | 1.00 |
| Model 2 | 7.66 | 4 | .10 | 6.82 | .08 | .07 | .00, .15 | .92 |
| Model 3 | 9.82 | 6 | .13 | 2.16 | .90 | .06 | .00, .12 | .93 |

Note. “Model 1” = the baseline latent growth curve model; “Model 2” = the latent growth curve model including age, sex, and site as control variables on the latent intercept and slope; “Model 3” = the final model including dysregulation and trauma exposure; “χ2” = chi-square test of model fit; “df” = degrees of freedom; “χ2diff” = chi-square difference test; “RMSEA” = root mean square error of approximation; “90% CI” = 90% confidence interval around the RMSEA; “CFI” = comparative fit index.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effects of Interest** | | | | |
| **Predictor** | **Outcome** | **b** | **SE** | ***p*** |
| Dysregulation | **I** | **0.004** | **0.001** | **<.001** |
|  | **S** | **-0.002** | **0.001** | **.03** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Trauma Exposure | I | -0.002 | 0.003 | .57 |
|  | S | 0.003 | 0.003 | .40 |
| **Covariates** | | | | |
| **Predictor** | **Outcome** | **b** | **SE** | ***p*** |
| Age | I | -0.005 | 0.003 | .11 |
|  | S | 0.006 | 0.003 | .07 |
|  | Dysregulation | -0.298 | 0.269 | .27 |
|  | Trauma Exposure | -0.075 | 0.08 | .35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Sex | **I** | **0.024** | **0.01** | **.03** |
|  | S | -0.011 | 0.011 | .32 |
|  | Dysregulation | -0.345 | 0.94 | .71 |
|  | Trauma Exposure | 0.014 | 0.28 | .96 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Site | I | -0.013 | 0.01 | .22 |
|  | S | 0.002 | 0.01 | .87 |
|  | Dysregulation | -0.209 | 0.93 | .82 |
|  | Trauma Exposure | -0.098 | 0.28 | .72 |

Table S4. *Latent growth curve model results for baseline levels and changes in cognitive control network connectivity related to dysregulation symptoms and trauma exposure*

Note. I = intercept, S = slope. Significant results *p*<.05 are bolded. Sex was coded as 0 = male, 1 = female. Site was coded as 0 = UNMC, 1 = MRN.

Table S5. *Latent growth curve model results for baseline levels and changes in cognitive control – default mode network connectivity related to dysregulation symptoms and trauma exposure*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effects of Interest** | | | | |
| **Predictor** | **Outcome** | **b** | **SE** | ***p*** |
| Dysregulation | **I** | **0.003** | **0.01** | **<.01** |
|  | S | -0.002 | 0.001 | .06 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Trauma Exposure | I | -0.003 | 0.003 | .27 |
|  | **S** | **0.007** | **0.003** | **.036** |
| **Covariates** | | | | |
| **Predictor** | **Outcome** | **b** | **SE** | ***p*** |
| Age | I | -0.001 | 0.003 | .81 |
|  | S | 0.000 | 0.003 | .95 |
|  | Dysregulation | -0.292 | 0.27 | .28 |
|  | Trauma Exposure | -0.077 | 0.08 | .34 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Sex | I | 0.017 | 0.01 | .12 |
|  | S | -0.010 | 0.01 | .38 |
|  | Dysregulation | -0.342 | 0.94 | .72 |
|  | Trauma Exposure | 0.019 | 0.28 | .94 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Site | **I** | **-0.021** | **0.01** | **.05** |
|  | S | 0.014 | 0.01 | .21 |
|  | Dysregulation | -0.342 | 0.94 | .72 |
|  | Trauma Exposure | -0.100 | 0.28 | .72 |

Note. I = intercept, S = slope. Significant results *p*<.05 are bolded. Sex was coded as 0 = male, 1 = female. Site was coded as 0 = UNMC, 1 = MRN.

Table S6. *Latent growth curve model results for baseline levels and changes in cognitive control – visual network connectivity related to dysregulation symptoms and trauma exposure*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effects of Interest** | | | | |
| **Predictor** | **Outcome** | **b** | **SE** | ***p*** |
| Dysregulation | **I** | **0.003** | **0.001** | **<.01** |
|  | S | -0.001 | 0.001 | .08 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Trauma Exposure | I | -0.001 | 0.003 | .78 |
|  | S | -0.001 | 0.003 | .75 |
| **Covariates** | | | | |
| **Predictor** | **Outcome** | **b** | **SE** | ***p*** |
| Age | **I** | **-0.010** | **0.004** | **<.01** |
|  | S | 0.006 | 0.003 | .09 |
|  | Dysregulation | -0.292 | 0.269 | .28 |
|  | Trauma Exposure | -0.075 | 0.08 | .35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Sex | **I** | **0.027** | **0.01** | **.03** |
|  | **S** | **-0.030** | **0.01** | **<.01** |
|  | Dysregulation | -0.295 | 0.94 | .75 |
|  | Trauma Exposure | 0.013 | 0.28 | .96 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Site | I | -0.012 | 0.01 | .31 |
|  | S | -0.003 | 0.01 | .80 |
|  | Dysregulation | -0.194 | 0.94 | .84 |
|  | Trauma Exposure | -0.098 | 0.28 | .72 |

Note. I = intercept, S = slope. Significant results *p*<.05 are bolded. Sex was coded as 0 = male, 1 = female. Site was coded as 0 = UNMC, 1 = MRN.



**Figure S1. Distribution of trauma history profile.** Violin plot of trauma history profile variable. Participants’ self-reported number of traumatic experiences are displayed with median and quartiles represented by a black bold line and dotted lines, respectively.



**Figure S2. Item level subtypes from the trauma history profile.** The percentage of participants who endorsed each item in the trauma history profile. The number of participants who endorsed the item is also shown above each respective item. D.V. = domestic violence.
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