Table S1. Subthreshold Symptoms of Psychosis in Children Aged 8 - 10 Years Old With Chromosome 22q11.2 Deletion Syndrome (22q11DS), n=38

Variable	Description	Mean	Median	Range	Subthreshold/ Psychotic (%)
P1	Unusual Thought Content/ Delusional Ideas	1.0	0	0 - 5	18
P2	Suspiciousness/ Persecutory Ideas	1.0	0	0 - 5	18
P3	Grandiosity	0.3	0	0 - 5	3
P4	Perceptual Abnormalities/ Hallucinations	0.9	0	0 - 5	18
P5	Disorganized Communication	1.2	1	0 - 4	18
N1	Social Anhedonia	1.2	1	0 - 4	16
N2	Avolition	1.9	2	0 - 5	39
N3	Expression of Emotions	0.3	0	0 - 4	3
N4	Experience of Emotions and Self	0.1	0	0 - 2	0
N5	Ideational Richness	1.7	1	0 - 5	39
N6	Occupational Functioning	1.3	1	0 - 4	24
D1	Odd Behavior or Appearance	0.8	0	0 - 5	11
D2	Bizarre Thinking	0.4	0	0 - 3	3
D3	Trouble with Focus and Attention	2.6	3	0 - 5	58
D4	Personal Hygiene	0.8	0	0 - 4	11
G1	Sleep Disturbances	1.0	0	0 - 5	16
G2	Dysphoric Mood	1.1	0	0 - 4	18
G3	Motor Disturbances	0.4	0	0 - 3	3
G4	Impaired Tolerance to Normal Stress	1.5	1.5	0 - 5	29
Factor 1	Positive	0.6	0.2	0 - 3.3	29
Factor 2	Negative	1.3	1.2	0 - 3.7	74
Factor 3	Disorganized	1.0	0.8	0 - 3.3	42

Note: Descriptive statistics for consensus Scale of Prodromal Symptoms (SOPS) subscales scores for the subgroup of participants aged 8 – 10 years old are shown with percentage of participants who scored in the subthreshold or psychotic range (rating ≥3). Composite factor scores are also described with percentages representing proportion of participants reaching a subthreshold level in any subscale of which the factor is comprised.

Table S2. Unidimensional, 2-, 3-, and 4-Factor Exploratory Solutions of the Scale of Prodromal Symptoms (SOPS) (With Oblimin Rotation)

		2-Factor		3-Factor			4-Factor			
Scale	Uni	F1	F2	F1	F2	F3	F1	F2	F3	F4
P1	**0.74**	**0.88**		**0.83**			**0.90**			
P2	**0.76**	**0.59**	*0.25*	**0.55**	*0.29*		**0.57**	*0.26*		
P3	**0.60**	**0.64**		**0.43**		*0.33*	**0.54**			
P4	**0.64**	**0.71**		**0.81**			**0.72**			
P5	**0.58**	**0.43**				**0.47**			**0.43**	
N1	**0.60**		**0.62**		**0.62**			**0.53**		
N2	**0.70**		**0.82**		**0.81**			**0.78**		
N3	**0.63**	*0.31*	**0.37**	*0.30*	**0.39**					**0.85**
N4	**0.38**	**0.38**		**0.39**			*0.28*			**0.28**
N5	**0.49**	**0.38**				**0.34**			**0.36**	
N6	**0.71**		**0.78**		**0.78**			**0.68**		
D1	**0.67**	**0.57**		*0.28*		**0.51**	*0.28*		**0.47**	
D2	**0.73**	**0.88**		**0.66**		*0.31*	**0.64**		*0.26*	
D3	**0.45**		**0.52**		**0.49**			**0.57**		
D4	**0.61**		**0.63**		**0.62**			**0.59**		
G1	**0.54**		**0.54**		**0.56**			**0.52**		
G2	**0.59**		**0.62**		**0.62**			**0.54**		
G3	**0.38**		**0.26**			**0.33**			**0.32**	
G4	**0.62**		**0.76**		**0.74**			**0.73**		

Factor Correlations (φ Matrices)

		F1	F2	F1	F2	F3	F1	F2	F3	F4
	F1	1.00		1.00			1.00			
	F2	0.64	1.00	0.58	1.00		0.50	1.00		
	F3			0.44	0.40	1.00	0.37	0.32	1.00	
	F4						0.43	0.40	0.16	1.00

Note: Loadings < 0.25 removed; dominant loadings bolded; due to Heywood case, the 4-factor solution had to be estimated using Bayesian Markov Chain Monte Carlo; all other models estimated using robust maximum likelihood (MLR in Mplus v7.1). D1 = odd behavior or appearance; D2 = bizarre thinking; D3 = trouble with focus and attention; D4 = personal hygiene; F = factor; G1 = sleep disturbances, G2 = dysphoric mood; G3 = motor disturbances; G4 = impaired tolerance to normal stress; N1 = social anhedonia; N2 = avolition; N3 = expression of emotion; N4 = experience of emotion and self; N5 = ideational richness; N6 = occupational functioning; P1 = unusual thought content/delusional ideas; P2 = suspiciousness/persecutory thinking; P3 = grandiosity; P4 = perceptual abnormalities/hallucinations; P5 = disorganized communication; rotation = oblimin; Uni = unidimensional.

Unidimensional Model: The fit of the unidimensional model is poor: the comparative fit index (CFI) is 0.76, the standardized root mean residual (SRMR) is 0.081, and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) is 0.104 (±0.013) – none of these indices meet convention cutoffs for fit, and a multi-factorial solution is therefore suggested. Nonetheless, the large loadings in the unidimensional model do indicate a strong underlying dimension influencing all factors described below.

Two-Factor Model: The two-factor solution is relatively "clean," with only two cross-loadings. The fit falls just short of acceptable (CFI = 0.89; SRMR = 0.054; RMSEA = 0.076 ± 0.016). A strong inter-factor correlation (0.61) provides further evidence of a strong underlying dimension.

Three-Factor Model: The fit of this model is acceptable (CFI = 0.90; SRMR = 0.044; RMSEA = 0.078 ± 0.017).

Four-Factor Model: Conventional estimation methods (maximum likelihood [ML] and unweighted least squares) failed due to a Heywood case (a communality greater than 1.0). However, the

Bayesian Markov Chain did converge, so this model is probably interpretable. Unfortunately, well-established fit indices like the ones reported above are not available when Bayesian estimation is used.