|  |
| --- |
| **Table S1. World Mental Health Surveys sample characteristics by World Bank Income categoriesa.** |
| **Country** | **Survey** | **Sample characteristics** | **Field dates** | **Age rangeb** | **Sample Size**  | **Response rate (%)** |
| **Part 1 sample** | **Part 2 sub-sample** |
| **Low - lower middle income countries** |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Colombia | NSMH | All urban areas of the country (approximately 73% of the total national population) | 2003 | 18-65 | 4426 | 2381 | 87.7 |
| Iraq | IMHS | Nationally representative. | 2006-7 | 18+ | 4332 | 4332 | 95.2 |
| Nigeria | NSMHW | 21 of the 36 states in the country, representing 57% of the national population. The surveys were conducted in Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa and Efik languages.  | 2002-3 | 18+ | 6752 | 2143 | 79.3 |
| Peru | EMSMP | Nationally representative. | 2004-5 | 18-65 | 3930 | 1801 | 90.2 |
| PRC Shen Zhen | Shenzhen | Shenzhen metropolitan area. Included temporary residents as well as household residents. | 2006-7 | 18+ | 7132 | 2475 | 80.0 |
| Ukraine | CMDPSD | Nationally representative. | 2002 | 18+ | 4725 | 1719 | 78.3 |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Upper-middle income countries** |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Brazil | São Paulo Megacity | São Paulo metropolitan area. | 2005-7 | 18+ | 5037 | 2942 | 81.3 |
| Bulgaria | NSHS | Nationally representative. | 2003-7 | 18+ | 5318 | 2233 | 72.0 |
| Lebanon | LEBANON | Nationally representative. | 2002-3 | 18+ | 2857 | 1031 | 70.0 |
| Romania | RMHS | Nationally representative. | 2005-6 | 18+ | 2357 | 2357 | 70.9 |
| South Africa | SASH | Nationally representative. | 2003-4 | 18+ | 4315 | 4315 | 87.1 |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **High-income countries** |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina | AMHES | Eight largest urban areas of the country (approximately 50% of the total national population) | 2015 | 18-98 | 3927 | 2116 | 77.3 |
| Japan | WMHJ  | Eleven metropolitan areas.  | 2002-6 | 20+ | 4129 | 1682 | 55.1 |
| Northern Ireland | NISHS | Nationally representative. | 2004-7 | 18+ | 4340 | 1986 | 68.4 |
| Poland | EZOP | Nationally representative. | 2010-11 | 18-64 | 10081 | 4000 | 50.4 |
| Portugal | NMHS | Nationally representative. | 2008-9 | 18+ | 3849 | 2060 | 57.3 |
| The United States | NCS-R | Nationally representative. | 2001-3 | 18+ | 9282 | 5692 | 70.9 |
| **Total**  |  |  |  |  | **86789** | **45266** |  |
| **Weighted average response rate (%)** |  |   |  |   |   | **71.1** |
| a The World Bank. (2008). Data and Statistics. Accessed May 12, 2009 at: http://go.worldbank.org/D7SN0B8YU0 |
| bFor the purposes of cross-national comparisons we limit the sample to those 18+. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table S2 Temporal ordering of comorbid disorders and IED.** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | **Comorbid disorder class** |
|  | **Internalizingonly** | **Externalizing only** | **Internalizing andexternalizing** |
| **Temporal ordering** | **n1a** | **n2b** | **%c** | **SE** | **n1a** | **n2b** | **%c** | **SE** | **n1a** | **n2b** | **%c** | **SE** |
| IED before all comorbid disorders | 129 | 435 | 30.6 | 2.9 | 140 | 301 | 49.3 | 3.6 | 134 | 504 | 29.2 | 2.5 |
| IED concurrent with at least one comorbid disorder | 46 | 435 | 9.9 | 1.7 | 22 | 301 | 6.6 | 1.4 | 54 | 504 | 9.9 | 1.6 |
| IED after at least one comorbid disorder | 260 | 435 | 59.5 | 2.9 | 139 | 301 | 44.2 | 3.6 | 316 | 504 | 60.9 | 2.7 |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ***Internalizing disorders include GAD, agoraphobia, panic disorder, PTSD, separation anxiety, social phobia, major depression/dysthymia, bipolar disorder, bulimia nervosa, and binge eating disorder.*** |
| ***Externalizing disorders include ADHD, oppositional defiant disorder, conduct disorder, and alcohol and drug abuse and dependence.*** |
| ***aNominator N (number of participants reporting the outcome)*** |
| ***bDenominator N (number of participants asked the question)*** |
| ***cPercentages are based on weighted data*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table S3a. Lifetime prevalence of suicidality in respondents with or without IED.** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | **No IED** | **IED** |
|  | **Percentages** | **Percentages** | **Parameter estimates** |
| **Suicidality variable** | **n1a** | **n2b** | **%c** | **SE** | **n1a** | **n2b** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** | **Wald X2** | **P-value** | **DF** |
| Ideation | 6492 | 86138 | 7.3 | 0.1 | 263 | 651 | 38.1 | 2.0 | 5.4\* | (4.5-6.5) | 312.7 | <0.001 | 1 |
| Plan | 2068 | 86138 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 127 | 651 | 17.6 | 1.6 | 5.9\* | (4.6-7.4) | 220.7 | <0.001 | 1 |
| Attempt/gesture | 1935 | 86138 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 124 | 651 | 17.4 | 1.4 | 6.3\* | (5.0-7.8) | 264.5 | <0.001 | 1 |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ***Logistic regression was used to compare the prevalence of the suicidality variables. All analyses control for participants' age, sex, education (in country-specific quartiles), and country of origin.*** |
| ***aNominator N (number of participants reporting the outcome)*** |
| ***bDenominator N (number of participants asked the question)*** |
| ***cPercentages are based on weighted data*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table S3b. Lifetime prevalence of suicidality in respondents with IED with or without any lifetime comorbidity.** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | **Respondents without any lifetimecomorbidity** | **Respondents with any lifetime comorbidity** |
|  | **Percentages** | **Percentages** | **Parameter estimates** |
| **Suicidality variable** | **n1a** | **n2b** | **%c** | **SE** | **n1a** | **n2b** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** | **Wald X2** | **P-value** | **DF** |
| Ideation | 23 | 111 | 26.1 | 6.3 | 228 | 504 | 40.9 | 2.5 | 1.4 | (0.7-3.1) | 0.9 | 0.340 | 1 |
| Plan | 5 | 111 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 118 | 504 | 20.5 | 1.9 | 5.4\* | (1.9-15.4) | 10.1 | 0.001 | 1 |
| Attempt/gesture | 10 | 111 | 6.6 | 2.4 | 106 | 504 | 19.4 | 1.8 | 2.4\* | (1.1-5.6) | 4.5 | 0.033 | 1 |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ***Logistic regression was used to compare the prevalence of the suicidality variables. All analyses control for participants' age, sex, education (in country-specific quartiles), and country of origin.*** |
| ***aNominator N (number of participants reporting the outcome)*** |
| ***bDenominator N (number of participants asked the question)*** |
| ***cPercentages are based on weighted data*** |
| Table S4. **Lifetime prevalence of suicidality in respondents without IED or with specific IED subtypes, with respondents without IED as the reference category.** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  |  |  | **IED subtypes** |
|  | **No IED** | **Destroy and hurt** | **Destroy and threaten** | **Destroy things** | **Hurt people** | **Threaten people** |
| **Suicidality**  | **%c** | **SE** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** |
| Ideation | 7.3 | 0.1 | 43.2 | 2.8 | 6.3\* | (4.9-8.1) | 44.6 | 8.0 | 7.2\* | (3.3-16.0) | 31.8 | 6.7 | 4.4\* | (2.2-8.7) | 28.7 | 4.7 | 4.0\* | (2.6-6.4) | 27.9 | 6.4 | 3.6\* | (1.8-7.3) |
| Plan | 2.3 | 0.1 | 20.4 | 2.1 | 6.6\* | (5.0-8.8) | 21.3 | 6.1 | 7.5\* | (3.5-16.1) | 8.4 | 3.2 | 2.7\* | (1.1-6.2) | 15.2 | 3.3 | 5.7\* | (3.5-9.5) | 12.5 | 4.7 | 4.2\* | (1.7-10.4) |
| Attempt/gesture | 2.1 | 0.1 | 22.1 | 2.0 | 7.7\* | (6.0-10.0) | 12.2 | 4.8 | 4.1\* | (1.5-10.8) | 10.1 | 3.8 | 3.7\* | (1.5-8.8) | 13.0 | 3.1 | 5.5\* | (3.2-9.4) | 12.5 | 4.7 | 4.4\* | (1.7-11.4) |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ***IED subtypes were defined based on behavior during anger attacks (lifetime).*** |
| ***Logistic regression was used to compare the prevalence of the suicidality variables. All analyses control for participants' age, sex, education (in country-specific quartiles), and country of origin.***  |
| ***cPercentages are based on weighted data*** |

|  |
| --- |
| Table S5: **Severe 12-month disability in particular domains or in any domain in respondents with specific IED subtypes, with participants who hurt people and destroy things during anger attacks as the reference category.** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  | **IED subtypes** |  |  |  |
|  | **Destroy andhurt** | **Destroy and threaten** | **Destroy things** | **Hurt people** | **Threaten people** | **Overall test** |
| **Disability domain** | **%c** | **SE** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** | **%c** | **SE** | **OR** | **(95% CI)** | **Wald X2** | **P-value** | **DF** |
| Home management | 20.2 | 3.2 | 13.3 | 6.7 | 0.7 | (0.2-2.3) | 9.2 | 4.4 | 0.4 | (0.1-1.2) | 16.6 | 5.5 | 0.6 | (0.2-1.8) | 27.8 | 11.3 | 1.1 | (0.3-4.0) | 3.7 | 0.45 | 4 |
| Ability to work | 16.1 | 2.9 | 11.2 | 6.1 | 0.7 | (0.2-3.0) | 23.5 | 9.7 | 1.5 | (0.5-4.4) | 13.3 | 4.9 | 0.4 | (0.1-1.4) | 12.0 | 6.2 | 0.4 | (0.1-1.6) | 4.0 | 0.40 | 4 |
| Ability to form and maintain close relationships | 31.5 | 4.1 | 19.1 | 7.9 | 0.6 | (0.2-1.7) | 11.8 | 5.1 | 0.3\* | (0.1-0.8) | 22.7 | 6.1 | 0.5 | (0.2-1.2) | 23.9 | 8.5 | 0.7 | (0.2-2.3) | 7.1 | 0.13 | 4 |
| Social life | 29.7 | 3.6 | 17.2 | 9.3 | 0.5 | (0.1-1.9) | 14.8 | 6.4 | 0.4 | (0.1-1.3) | 22.1 | 6.5 | 0.6 | (0.2-1.4) | 30.6 | 9.2 | 1.3 | (0.4-4.0) | 5.1 | 0.27 | 4 |
| **Any domain** | **43.1** | **4.0** | **34.0** | **10.5** | **0.8** | **(0.3-2.1)** | **30.9** | **10.1** | **0.6** | **(0.2-1.5)** | **35.1** | **7.4** | **0.7** | **(0.3-1.5)** | **44.5** | **10.7** | **1.5** | **(0.5-4.3)** | **3.7** | **0.44** | **4** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ***IED subtypes were defined based on behavior during anger attacks (lifetime). Severe disability in a particular domain is defined as a score of >6 on the Sheehan Disability Scale for that domain.*** |
| ***Logistic regression was used to compare the prevalence of severe disability. All analyses control for participants' age, sex, education (in country-specific quartiles), and country of origin.*** |
| ***cPercentages are based on weighted data*** |