Supplementary Materials for:

Identifying and Understanding Communities Using Twitter to Connect About Depression: Cross-Sectional Study

Amber D. DeJohn, Emily E. Schulz, Amber L. Pearson, E. Megan Lachmar, Andrea K. Wittenborn

This file contains additional tables used for sensitivity analysis, which excluded Washington, D.C.

Table S1. Sensitivity analysis - regression results excluding Washington, D.C.

Dependent variable: Tweet count			
Independent variables:	IRR	*p* value	95% C.I.
% aged 15-44	1.11	.02	1.02, 1.21
% female	1.70	<.001	1.25, 2.31
% white population	0.99	.34	0.96, 1.02
% single-person household	0.90	.03	0.82, 0.99
% below poverty level	1.05	.30	0.95, 1.16

Table S2. Sensitivity Analysis - Community characteristics by TIVs excluding Washington, D.C.

Community Characteristics	Under-tweeting		Over-tweeting	T3:T1	*r*	*P* value
	TIV1	TIV2	TIV3			
K12 schools per 100,000 children, mean	200	290	212	1.06	0.19	.003
Museums rate, mean[a]	17	33	20	1.18	0.20	.002
% Area occupied by park, mean	8	9	10	1.25	0.05	.46
Places of worship, mean[a]	105	177	93	0.89	0.15	.017
Vacant housing rate, mean[a,b]	6	17	8	1.33	0.16	.01
Owner-occupied housing rate, mean[a,b]	26	29	25	0.96	0.08	.20
% active voter, mean	76	72	74	0.97	-0.14	.027
Mental health care providers rate, mean[a]	209	157	293	1.40	0.09	.17
Non-Profits (all) rate, mean[a]	412	528	579	1.41	0.23	<.001
Non-Profits (health) rate, mean[a]	70	91	84	1.20	0.15	.016
Non-Profits (human services) rate, mean[a]	147	184	195	1.33	0.23	<.001
Non-Profits (public/societal benefit) rate, mean[a]	41	50	80	1.95	0.24	<.001
Non-Profits (religious) rate, mean[a]	12	14	17	1.42	0.12	.057
Non-Profits (education) rate, mean[a]	76	85	97	1.28	0.13	.039

[a]Rate per 100,000 people

[b]Values in thousands