Supplementary Online Content

Deneault AA, Plamondon A, Neville RD, et al. Perceived parental technoference and mental health among emerging adolescents. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2024;7(8):e2428261. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.28261

eTable 1. Model Fit and χ^2 Difference Tests
eTable 2. Unstandardized Parameters for the RI-CLPM Anxiety Model With Subgroup Analysis by Gender
eTable 3. Unstandardized Parameters for the RI-CLPM Depression Model With Subgroup Analysis by Gender
eTable 4. Unstandardized Parameters for the RI-CLPM Attention Difficulties Model With Subgroup Analysis by Gender
eTable 5. Unstandardized Parameters for the RI-CLPM Hyperactivity Model With Subgroup Analysis by Gender

This supplementary material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

eTable 1. Model Fit and χ2 Difference Tests

	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI	χ^2	*df*	*p*	$\Delta\chi^2$	*df*	*p*
Parental technoference ←→ Anxiety										
RI-CLPM (*final fitted model*)	.03	.01	.999	.991	2.15	1	.142	–	–	–
RI-CLPM (*constrained*)	.02	.02	.998	.995	7.84	5	.166	5.68	4	.224
CLPM (*traditional*)	.09	.03	.977	.913	46.35	4	< .001	44.20	3	< .001
Parental technoference ←→ Depression										
RI-CLPM (*final fitted model*)[a]	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
RI-CLPM (*constrained*)	.07	.05	.975	.947	45.89	7	< .001	–	–	–
CLPM (*traditional*)	.08	.04	.966	.914	60.35	6	< .001	–	–	–
Parental technoference ←→ Attention difficulties										
RI-CLPM (*final fitted model*)	.01	.01	1.00	.998	1.19	1	.275	–	–	–
RI-CLPM (*constrained*)	.03	.02	.997	.992	9.60	5	.088	8.41	4	.078
CLPM (*traditional*)	.12	.04	.958	.843	77.49	4	< .001	76.30	3	< .001
Parental technoference ←→ Hyperactivity										
RI-CLPM (*final fitted model*)	.03	.01	.999	.991	2.08	1	.149	–	–	–
RI-CLPM (*constrained*)	.02	.02	.999	.997	6.84	5	.233	4.75	4	.314
CLPM (*traditional*)	.12	.04	.957	.840	78.71	4	< .001	76.63	3	< .001

Note. [a] This model could not be estimated due to negative variances.

eTable 2. Unstandardized Parameters for the RI-CLPM Anxiety Model With Subgroup Analysis by Gender

Associations	Girls		Boys	
	ES	**95% CI**	**ES**	**95% CI**
Unstandardized random intercept variance				
Tech	0.71	[0.27, 1.15]	0.83	[0.55, 1.22]
MH	65.62	[26.74, 104.51]	60.93	[41.99, 79.87]
Within-person autoregressive paths[a]				
$Tech_{T1} \rightarrow Tech_{T2}$	0.24	[0.01, 0.48]	0.22	[0.03, 0.41]
$Tech_{T2} \rightarrow Tech_{T3}$	0.35	[0.17, 0.54]	0.30	[0.12, 0.50]
$MH_{T1} \rightarrow MH_{T2}$	0.49	[0.05, 0.93]	0.26	[0.03, 0.50]
$MH_{T2} \rightarrow MH_{T3}$	0.61	[0.42, 0.80]	0.32	[0.09, 0.56]
Between-person association[a]				
Tech ↔ MH	0.25	[-0.12, 0.63]	0.30	[0.08, 0.52]
Within-person cross-sectional associations[a]				
$Tech_{T1} \leftrightarrow MH_{T1}$	0.34	[0.06, 0.62]	0.13	[-0.06, 0.33]
$Tech_{T2} \leftrightarrow MH_{T2}$	0.26	[0.11, 0.40]	0.29	[0.13, 0.46]
$Tech_{T3} \leftrightarrow MH_{T3}$	0.35	[0.24, 0.46]	0.21	[0.08, 0.34]
Within-person cross-lagged effects[a]				
Tech driven effects				
$Tech_{T1} \rightarrow MH_{T2}$	-0.03	[-0.22, 0.16]	0.06	[-0.12, 0.24]
$Tech_{T2} \rightarrow MH_{T3}$	-0.01	[-0.13, 0.12]	0.08	[-0.09, 0.25]
MH driven effects				
$MH_{T1} \rightarrow tech_{T2}$	0.38	[-0.00, 0.76]	0.27	[0.04, 0.50]
$MH_{T2} \rightarrow tech_{T3}$	0.50	[0.32, 0.68]	0.31	[0.08, 0.54]

Note. CI = confidence interval; ES = Effect sizes; MH = mental health; Tech = technoference. [a] Standardized values.

eTable 3. Unstandardized Parameters for the RI-CLPM Depression Model With Subgroup Analysis by Gender

Associations	Girls		Boys	
	ES	**95% CI**	**ES**	**95% CI**
Unstandardized random intercept variance				
Tech	0.59	[0.19, 0.99]	0.92	[0.63, 1.21]
MH	54.81	[37.44, 72.17]	49.28	[16.65, 81.91]
Within-person autoregressive paths[a]				
$Tech_{T1} \rightarrow Tech_{T2}$	0.33	[0.10, 0.57]	0.20	[0.03, 0.37]
$Tech_{T2} \rightarrow Tech_{T3}$	0.41	[0.25, 0.56]	0.25	[0.07, 0.42]
$MH_{T1} \rightarrow MH_{T2}$	-0.22	[-0.68, 0.23]	0.24	[-0.16, 0.64]
$MH_{T2} \rightarrow MH_{T3}$	0.38	[0.26, 0.51]	0.45	[0.24, 0.67]
Between-person association[b]				
Tech ↔ MH	0.32	[0.01, 0.62]	0.27	[0.00, 0.53]
Within-person cross-sectional associations[b]				
$Tech_{T1} \leftrightarrow MH_{T1}$	0.53	[0.30, 0.76]	0.28	[0.07, 0.48]
$Tech_{T2} \leftrightarrow MH_{T2}$	0.29	[0.09, 0.50]	0.40	[0.24, 0.56]
$Tech_{T3} \leftrightarrow MH_{T3}$	0.30	[0.21, 0.39]	0.21	[0.09, 0.33]
Within-person cross-lagged effects[a]				
Tech driven effects				
$Tech_{T1} \rightarrow MH_{T2}$	0.37	[-0.01, 0.74]	0.10	[-0.09, 0.30]
$Tech_{T2} \rightarrow MH_{T3}$	-0.05	[-0.18, 0.09]	-0.05	[-0.17, 0.08]
MH driven effects				
$MH_{T1} \rightarrow tech_{T2}$	0.02	[-0.25, 0.29]	0.07	[-0.14, 0.28]
$MH_{T2} \rightarrow tech_{T3}$	0.14	[0.01, 0.27]	0.12	[-0.08, 0.31]

Note. CI = confidence interval; ES = Effect sizes; MH = mental health; Tech = technoference. [a] Standardized values.

eTable 4. Unstandardized Parameters for the RI-CLPM Attention Difficulties Model With Subgroup Analysis by Gender

Associations	Girls		Boys	
	ES	**95% CI**	**ES**	**95% CI**
Unstandardized random intercept variance				
Tech	0.67	[0.26, 1.09]	0.92	[0.58, 1.25]
MH	67.59	[51.71, 83.47]	84.17	[68.03, 100.30]
Within-person autoregressive paths[a]				
$Tech_{T1} \rightarrow Tech_{T2}$	0.31	[0.08, 0.53]	0.21	[0.02, 0.40]
$Tech_{T2} \rightarrow Tech_{T3}$	0.42	[0.24, 0.60]	0.28	[0.10, 0.47]
$MH_{T1} \rightarrow MH_{T2}$	-0.12	[-0.62, 0.37]	0.08	[-0.22, 0.38]
$MH_{T2} \rightarrow MH_{T3}$	0.24	[0.06, 0.43]	0.06	[-0.19, 0.32]
Between-person association[b]				
Tech ↔ MH	0.39	[0.14, 0.63]	0.14	[-0.05, 0.32]
Within-person cross-sectional associations[b]				
$Tech_{T1} \leftrightarrow MH_{T1}$	0.10	[-0.19, 0.39]	0.06	[-0.14, 0.27]
$Tech_{T2} \leftrightarrow MH_{T2}$	0.09	[-0.18, 0.35]	0.25	[0.03, 0.48]
$Tech_{T3} \leftrightarrow MH_{T3}$	0.26	[0.15, 0.38]	0.14	[-0.01, 0.28]
Within-person cross-lagged effects[a]				
Tech driven effects				
$Tech_{T1} \rightarrow MH_{T2}$	-0.03	[-0.32, 0.26]	0.09	[-0.12, 0.30]
$Tech_{T2} \rightarrow MH_{T3}$	0.00	[-0.16, 0.16]	0.25	[0.04, 0.46]
MH driven effects				
$MH_{T1} \rightarrow tech_{T2}$	-0.06	[-0.34, 0.21]	0.06	[-0.16, 0.29]
$MH_{T2} \rightarrow tech_{T3}$	0.03	[-0.11, 0.17]	0.06	[-0.11, 0.24]

Note. CI = confidence interval; ES = Effect sizes; MH = mental health; Tech = technoference. [a] Standardized values.

eTable 5. Unstandardized Parameters for the RI-CLPM Hyperactivity Model With Subgroup Analysis by Gender

Associations	Girls		Boys	
	ES	**95% CI**	**ES**	**95% CI**
Unstandardized random intercept variance				
Tech	0.67	[0.26, 1.08]	0.88	[0.54, 1.22]
MH	57.96	[45.94, 69.98]	58.13	[43.55, 72.70]
Within-person autoregressive paths[a]				
$Tech_{T1} \rightarrow Tech_{T2}$	0.32	[0.10, 0.54]	0.22	[0.04, 0.41]
$Tech_{T2} \rightarrow Tech_{T3}$	0.42	[0.23, 0.60]	0.25	[0.05, 0.44]
$MH_{T1} \rightarrow MH_{T2}$	0.03	[-0.29, 0.36]	0.17	[-0.08, 0.42]
$MH_{T2} \rightarrow MH_{T3}$	0.14	[-0.09, 0.38]	0.13	[-0.11, 0.38]
Between-person association[b]				
Tech ↔ MH	0.50	[0.24, 0.75]	0.08	[-0.15, 0.30]
Within-person cross-sectional associations[b]				
$Tech_{T1} \leftrightarrow MH_{T1}$	0.09	[-0.14, 0.32]	0.13	[-0.07, 0.33]
$Tech_{T2} \leftrightarrow MH_{T2}$	-0.02	[-0.28, 0.24]	0.39	[0.21, 0.57]
$Tech_{T3} \leftrightarrow MH_{T3}$	0.25	[0.12, 0.37]	0.24	[0.10, 0.39]
Within-person cross-lagged effects[a]				
Tech driven effects				
$Tech_{T1} \rightarrow MH_{T2}$	-0.11	[-0.35, 0.13]	0.16	[-0.03, 0.34]
$Tech_{T2} \rightarrow MH_{T3}$	-0.07	[-0.27, 0.13]	0.20	[-0.01, 0.40]
MH driven effects				
$MH_{T1} \rightarrow tech_{T2}$	-0.17	[-0.40, 0.06]	0.10	[-0.10, 0.30]
$MH_{T2} \rightarrow tech_{T3}$	-0.03	[-0.19, 0.12]	0.17	[-0.02, 0.36]

Note. CI = confidence interval; ES = Effect sizes; MH = mental health; Tech = technoference. [a] Standardized values.