**Supplementary Table 1**

***Model Comparison Wald Test Statistics***

|  |
| --- |
| **Linear vs. Quadratic** |
|  | χ2 | df | probability |
| Model 1: Childhood Adversity, DD outcomes | 24.03 | 1 | 0.00 |
|  | Est. | SD | 95% CI |
|  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |
|  Quadratic Effect | -.63 | .25 | -1.13 | -.15 |
|  | χ2 | df | probability |
| Model 2: Adolescent Adversity, DD outcomes | 23.83 | 1 | 0.00 |
|  | Est. | SD | 95% CI |
|  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |
|  Quadratic Effect | -.62 | .25 | -1.14 | -.15 |
|  | χ2 | df | probability |
| Model 3: Childhood Adversity, AD outcomes | 21.63 | 1 | 0.00 |
|  | Est. | SD | 95% CI |
|  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |
|  Quadratic Effect | -.83 | .30 | -1.46 | -.26 |
|  | **χ2** | **df** | **probability** |
| Model 4: Adolescent Adversity, AD outcomes | 21.48 | 1 | 0.00 |
|  | Est. | SD | 95% CI |
|  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |
|  Quadratic Effect | -.82 | .30 | -1.45 | -.26 |
| **Time Specific Effects of Interpersonal Support** |
|  | χ2 | df | probability |
| Model 1: Childhood Adversity, DD outcomes | 32.218 | 5 | 0.00 |
|  | Est. | *SD* | 95% CI |
|  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |
|  Time 1 Interaction | .76 | .58 | -.35 | 1.96 |
|  Time 2 Interaction | .78 | .58 | -.32 | 1.97 |
|  Time 3 Interaction | .72 | .53 | -.29 | 1.82 |
|  Time 4 Interaction | .09 | .49 | -.86 | 1.07 |
|  Time 5 Interaction | 1.20 | .59 | .10 | 2.42 |
|  | χ2 | df | probability |
| Model 2: Adolescent Adversity, DD outcomes | 32.750 | 5 | 0.00 |
|  | Est. | *SD* | 95% CI |
|  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |
| Time 1 Interaction | .74 | .61 | -.44 | 1.96 |
| Time 2 Interaction | .80 | .58 | -.29 | 1.99 |
| Time 3 Interaction | .74 | .51 | -.23 | 1.79 |
| Time 4 Interaction | .09 | .50 | -.88 | 1.11 |
| Time 5 Interaction | 1.24 | .59 | .15 | 2.49 |
|  | χ2 | df | probability |
| Model 3: Childhood Adversity, AD outcomes | 26.724 | 5 | 0.00 |
|  | Est. | *SD* | 95% CI |
|  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |
| Time 1 Interaction | -.495 | .675 | -1.740 | .887 |
| Time 2 Interaction | .63 | .59 | -.45 | 1.84 |
| Time 3 Interaction | .28 | .54 | -.75 | 1.37 |
| Time 4 Interaction | .63 | .64 | -.55 | 1.98 |
| Time 5 Interaction | .22 | .52 | -.76 | 1.28 |
|  | χ2 | df | probability |
| Model 4: Adolescent Adversity, AD outcomes | 25.840 | 5 | 0.000 |
|  | Est. | *SD* | 95% CI |
|  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |
| Time 1 Interaction | -.55 | .68 | -1.85 | .81 |
| Time 2 Interaction | .65 | .59 | -.45 | 1.85 |
| Time 3 Interaction | .29 | .55 | -.74 | 1.40 |
| Time 4 Interaction | .66 | .63 | -.47 | 1.99 |
| Time 5 Interaction | .26 | .54 | -.76 | 1.34 |

*Note.* The Bayesian Wald tests (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2021) in the table below involve constraining parameters in the unrestricted model to their hypothesized values under the null hypothesis. For the Wald test of linear versus quadratic effects, the quadratic effect of interpersonal support was constrained to 0. For the Wald test of time-specific effects, the interaction between time and interpersonal support was constrained to 0. A significant test statistic indicates that model fit worsens when a parameter or set of parameters (e.g., quadratic effect) is removed from the model. In the test of time-specific effects of interpersonal support, the interaction terms collectively produced a significant chi-square. However, all 95% credible intervals for the individual time x interpersonal support interaction terms contained 0 (with the exception of one interaction in both DD models). As a result, we deemed the estimated interaction coefficients as noisy and largely indistinguishable from one another. Therefore, interactive paths were omitted from the models. The test of linear versus linear and quadratic compared freely estimated models containing only linear and linear and quadratic paths of the LSI variable (i.e., no interactions). The removal of the quadratic effect produced a significant chi-square. The 95% credible intervals of the quadratic effects further supported this conclusion because they did not include 0. Therefore, quadratic effects were included in our models. LL = lower limit. UL = upper limit.