Supplementary Online Content

Zuromski KL, Bernecker SL, Gutierrez PM, et al. Assessment of a risk index for suicide attempts among US Army soldiers with suicide ideation: analysis of data from the Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers (Army STARRS). *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(3):e190766. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.0766

eTable 1. Self-Reported Risk Factors for Subsequent Administratively Recorded Suicide Attempts Involving History of Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviors Among Regular Army Soldiers Who Reported Lifetime Suicide Ideation in the STARRS Consolidated All Army Survey (n = 3,649)

eTable 2. Self-Reported Risk Factors of Subsequent Administratively Recorded Suicide Attempts Involving Severity of Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviors Among Regular Army Soldiers Who Reported Lifetime Suicide Ideation in the STARRS Consolidated All Army Survey (n = 3,649)

eTable 3. Self-Reported Risk Factors of Subsequent Administratively Recorded Suicide Attempts Involving History of Mental Disorders Among Regular Army Soldiers Who Reported Lifetime Suicide Ideation in the STARRS Consolidated All Army Survey (n = 3,649)

eTable 4. Self-Reported Risk Factors of Subsequent Administratively Recorded Suicide Attempts Involving Socio-Demographics and Army Career Characteristics Among Regular Army Soldiers Who Reported Lifetime Suicide Ideation in the STARRS Consolidated All Army Survey (n = 3,649)

eTable 5. Hyperparameter Settings for Super Learner Ensemble

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

eTable 1. Self-reported risk factors for subsequent administratively recorded suicide attempts involving history of self-injurious thoughts and behaviors among Regular Army soldiers who reported lifetime suicide ideation in the STARRS Consolidated All Army Survey (n = 3,649)^a

	Distri	ibution	Uni	variate 1 ^b	Univ	variate 2	Univariate 3		Multi	variate 1 ^c	Multivariate 2 ^d	
	%	(SE)	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)
Ideation onset: ages 15-17 (vs. ≤14)	17.0	(1.6)	1.2	(0.4-3.6)					1.3	(0.4-4.3)	1.2	(0.4-3.7)
Ideation onset: ages 18+ (vs. ≤14)	43.8	(3.4)	1.0	(0.3-3.1)					0.7	(0.2-2.7)	0.7	(0.2-2.7)
F ₂				0.1					0.4		0.2	
Years since onset of ideation (values=1-11+)	8.4	(0.2)	0.9	(0.8-1.1)					0.9	(0.8-1.1)	0.9	(0.8-1.1)
Active ideation (vs. passive)	77.1	(2.3)	2.1	(0.5-9.1)					0.9	(0.2-4.8)	1.5	(0.3-7.5)
Lifetime plan	39.4	(2.9)	3.4*	(1.5-7.9)					2.0	(0.8-4.9)		
Ideation recency: 30-day	11.8	(2.1)	8.5*	(3.3-22.0)					6.6*	(2.3-19.2)	8.5*	(3.3-22.0)
Lifetime attempt	19.7	(2.5)	4.0*	(1.7-9.3)	0.8	(0.1-6.8)						
Number of attempts (values=0-2+, mean)	0.3	(0.0)	2.6*	(1.5-4.4)	3.0	(0.8-11.5)	2.3	(0.8-6.7)	1.7	(0.9-3.2)		
Count of attempts: Exactly 1 (vs. 0)	12.7	(2.2)	2.3	(0.8-6.7)								
Count of attempts: 2+ (vs. 0)	7.0	(1.4)	6.8*	(2.1-22.3)								
F ₂				5.0*								
Count of attempts: 2+ (vs. 0 or 1)	7.0	(1.4)					1.3	(0.2-11.7)				
		•			•				•	· •	•	•

*Significant at the .05 level, two-sided MI-adjusted test

^aResults reflect weighted and multiply imputed (MI) data.

^bThe first univariate model included 2 predictors for ideation age-of-onset, 1 for years since ideation age-of-onset, and 1 for active (vs. passive) ideation. Each univariate OR presented thereafter controlled for these 4 predictors .

^cMultivariate model 1 carried forward the 4 controls and significant predictors from the univariate analysis.

^dMultivariate model 2 dropped the non-significant predictors from multivariate model 1.

eTable 2. Self-reported risk factors of subsequent administratively recorded suicide attempts involving severity of self-injurious thoughts and behaviors among Regular Army soldiers who reported lifetime suicide ideation in the STARRS Consolidated All Army Survey (n = 3,649)^a

	Distribution		U	Univariate			tivariate 1 ^b	Mult	ivariate 2 ^c
	%	(SE)	0	R	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)
Severity of suicidal ideation during worst week									
Days per week (vs. 1)									
2	13.8	(1.7)	1.	3	(0.2-8.9)				
3	14.7	(1.7)	2.	2	(0.2-15.1)				
4	9.9	(1.6)	1.	5	(0.2-10.2)				
5	7.9	(0.9)	1.	5	(0.2-10.2)				
6	5.5	(0.9)	0.	4	(0.0-4.8)				
7	23.3	(2.6)	4.	1	(1.0-17.9)				
F ₆				1	.5				
7 (vs. 6 or less)	23.3	(2.6)	3.	0*	(1.2-7.7)	2.1	(0.7-6.1)		
Time per day (vs. just a few moments)									
Less than 1 hour	26.6	(2.2)	1.	7	(0.3-9.3)				
1 to 4 hours	28.9	(1.9)	1.	8	(0.3-10.7)				
5 to 8 hours	11.0	(1.7)	2.	8	(0.6-13.1)				
9+ hours	11.2	(2.0)	6.	4*	(1.5-27.3)				
F ₆				2	2				
9+ hours (vs. ≤8 hours)	11.2	(2.0)	3.	6*	(1.4-9.1)	2.2	(0.8-6.5)		
Worst week severity (vs. neither)									
7 days per week OR 9+ hours per day	17.7	(1.7)	2.	0	(0.7-6.1)			1.7	(0.5-5.4)
7 days per week AND 9+ hours per day	8.4	(1.9)	4.	8*	(1.7-13.7)			3.8*	(1.1-12.5)
F ₂				4	.0*			2.3	
7 days per week AND/OR 9+ hours per day (vs. neither)	26.1	(1.8)	3.	0*	(1.2-7.7)				
Controllability of thoughts (vs. easy)									
A little difficult	32.1	(2.2)	1.	6	(0.3-8.3)				
Somewhat difficult	19.1	(2.5)	2.	6	(0.6-11.7)				
Very difficult	16.8	(1.9)	3.	9	(0.8-19.9)				
Impossible	5.2	(1.1)	5.	6	(1.0-31.4)				
F ₄				1	.1				

Very difficult to impossible (vs. somewhat difficult or less)	22.0	(1.3)	1.5	(0.5-4.5)		
Any difficulty (vs. easy/no difficulty)	73.2	(1.1)	1.8	(0.4-7.6)		
Frequency of tempting fate (reference: never)						
Rarely	28.4	(3.0)	2.2	(0.6-7.8)		
Sometimes	14.2	(1.5)	2.5	(0.7-9.3)		
Often	10.0	(1.3)	2.9	(0.9-9.6)		
F ₃				1.3		
Sometimes/often (vs. rarely/never)	24.2	(1.4)	1.8	(0.6-5.4)		
Ever (vs. never)	52.6	(1.6)	2.5	(0.9-6.6)		
Lifetime presence of non-suicidal self-injury	25.9	(2.7)	1.6	(0.7-3.8)		

*Significant at the .05 level, two-sided MI-adjusted test
^aResults reflect weighted and multiply imputed (MI) data. All models controlled for ideation age-of-onset, years since ideation age-of-onset, active (vs. passive) ideation, and 30-day ideation recency (as defined in eTable 1) and time-varying rank (as defined in eTable 4).
^bMultivariate model 1 included significant predictors from univariate models.
^cMultivariate model 2 dropped the non-significant predictors from multivariate model 1.

eTable 3. Self-reported risk factors of subsequent administratively recorded suicide attempts involving history of mental disorders among Regular Army soldiers who reported lifetime suicide ideation in the STARRS Consolidated All Army Survey (n = 3,649)^a

	Distri	bution	Univa	riate 1	Multivariate 1 ^b		
	%	(SE)	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)	
Mental disorders							
Internalizing							
Major depressive episode	72.2	(2.0)	4.5	(0.3-39.8)	2.3	(0.2-24.6)	
Generalized anxiety disorder	59.7	(2.5)	2.2	(0.8-5.9)	0.9	(0.3-2.7)	
Post-traumatic stress disorder	65.5	(2.3)	6.8*	(1.1-40.1)	4.6	(0.6-32.6)	
Bipolar disorder	8.7	(1.2)	2.4	(0.8-7.2)	1.9	(0.6-6.2)	
Panic disorder	11.1	(1.6)	0.8	(0.3-1.8)	0.5	(0.2-1.2)	
Any	88.8	(1.6)	34.1*	(8.5-137.3)			
F _{5/4}					1.6		
Externalizing							
Intermittent explosive disorder	42.7	(2.0)	1.1	(0.5-2.8)	0.8	(0.3-1.9)	
Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder	15.6	(2.4)	2.9*	(1.2-6.9)	2.5	(1.0-6.6)	
Substance use disorder	27.9	(2.0)	2.0	(0.7-5.4)	1.5	(0.5-4.5)	
Any	53.3	(1.9)	5.3*	(1.3-21.4)			
F ₃					1.4		
F ₈					1.4		
Total							
Any mental disorder	92.3	(1.1)	51.6*	(6.2-427.1)			
Summary measure 1							
Count of mental disorders: Exactly 1 or 2 (vs. 0)	29.5	(1.4)	24.0*	(1.6-351.1)			
Count of mental disorders: 3+ (vs. 0)	62.8	(1.2)	62.9*	(7.8-506.5)			
F ₂			8	3.1*			
Summary measure 2							
Count of mental disorders: 2+ (vs. 0 or 1)	79.6	(1.5)	32.5*	(7.9-134.3)			
Summary measure 3							
Count of mental disorders: Exactly 1 (vs. 0)	12.8	(1.5)	2.4	(0.2-33.0)			
Count of mental disorders: Exactly 2 (vs. 0)	16.8	(1.6)	39.9*	(2.6-621.9)			

Count of mental disorders: Exactly 3 (vs. 0)	24.7	(2.5)	33.7*	(3.5-328.1)		
Count of mental disorders: Exactly 4 (vs. 0)	19.2	(2.1)	61.8*	(6.9-556.0)		
Count of mental disorders: 5+ (vs. 0)	18.9	(1.8)	99.2*	(11.7-843.3)		
F _(3,172)			6	S.0*		

*Significant at the .05 level, two-sided MI-adjusted test ^aResults reflect weighted and multiply imputed (MI) data. All models controlled for ideation age-of-onset, years since ideation age-of-onset, active (vs. passive) ideation, and 30-day ideation recency (as defined in eTable 1) and time-varying rank (as defined in eTable 2). ^bMultivariate model 1 entered all 8 mental disorders as predictors in the model.

eTable 4. Self-reported risk factors of subsequent administratively recorded suicide attempts involving socio-demographics and Army career characteristics among Regular Army soldiers who reported lifetime suicide ideation in the STARRS Consolidated All Army Survey (n = 3,649)^a

	Dictri	hution	Unive	riato	Multivariato 1			
	Distri	bution	Univa		Multiv			
	%	(SE)	OR	(95% CI)	OR	(95% CI)		
Socio-demographics								
Age (mean, in decades)	3.1	(0.0)	0.5*	(0.3-1.0)	1.3	(0.4-4.5)		
Sex: female (vs. male)	19.5	(1.7)	0.9	(0.3-2.6)				
Race (vs. Non-Hispanic white)								
Non-Hispanic black	14.6	(1.7)	2.5	(0.8-7.8)				
Hispanic	9.0	(1.1)	0.3	(0.1-1.5)				
Other	7.0	(1.2)	0.4	(0.0-3.9)				
F ₃			2.3					
Marital history (vs. currently)								
Previously	9.2	(1.6)	0.7	(0.2-2.7)				
Never	25.1	(2.6)	0.9	(0.3-2.6)				
F ₂			0.2					
Army career characteristics								
Current years of service (means, in decades)	0.9	(0.0)	0.4*	(0.2-0.9)	1.0	(0.2-4.0)		
MOS (vs. combat service support)								
Combat arms	34.5	(2.2)	0.7	(0.3-1.5)				
Combat support	22.5	(2.1)	0.5	(0.1-2.1)				
F ₂			0.7					
Rank (vs. officer)								
Junior	32.9	(2.8)	33.7*	(3.4-285.6)	42.6*	(2.8-649.7)		
Senior	45.4	(2.9)	8.3*	(1.0-68.5)	9.4	(0.9-94.4)		
F ₂			7.6*		4.3*	•		
Deployment (vs. never)								
Currently	9.6	(1.6)	0.5	(0.1-3.1)				
Previously	69.8	(2.8)	1.0	(0.4-2.7)				
F ₂			0.4					
		•						

*Significant at the .05 level, two-sided MI-adjusted test

^aResults reflect weighted and multiply imputed (MI) data. All models controlled for ideation age-of-onset, years since ideation age-of-onset, active (vs. passive) ideation, and 30-day ideation recency (as defined in eTable 1) and time-varying rank (as defined in eTable 2)

	External fold weights											
	1	2	3	4	5							
Generalized linear models ^b												
Screener = p<.1	0.03056	0.02668	0.02473	0.02272	0.01664							
Screener = LASSO, Minimum 5	0.03056	0.02474	0.02473	0.02389	0.01664							
Screener = All	0.02993	0.02839	0.02552	0.02274	0.01664							
Elastic net penalized regression ^c												
Alpha = 0	0.02993	0.02839	0.02549	0.02387	0.01731							
Alpha = 0.1	0.03076	0.02839	0.02549	0.02271	0.01731							
Alpha = 0.2	0.03090	0.02839	0.02549	0.02387	0.01731							
Alpha = 0.3	0.03090	0.02839	0.02549	0.02269	0.01731							
Alpha = 0.4	0.03076	0.02839	0.02579	0.02269	0.01731							
Alpha = 0.5	0.03076	0.02839	0.02549	0.02271	0.01731							
Alpha = 0.6	0.03076	0.02839	0.02549	0.02389	0.01731							
Alpha = 0.7	0.03076	0.02839	0.02549	0.02271	0.01731							
Alpha = 0.8	0.03076	0.02839	0.02549	0.02269	0.01731							
Alpha = 0.9	0.03076	0.02839	0.02473	0.02269	0.01731							
Generalized Additive Models ^d												
Target degrees of freedom = 3	0.02836	0.02839	0.02530	0.02710	0.01741							
Target degrees of freedom = 4	0.02836	0.03010	0.02515	0.02822	0.01741							
Target degrees of freedom = 5	0.02836	0.03010	0.02515	0.02813	0.01741							
Target degrees of freedom = 6	0.02836	0.02795	0.02500	0.03001	0.01741							
Linear multivariate adaptive regression splines ^e												
Screener p<.1	0.05596	0.09909	0.01135	0.07711	0.12819							
Screener LASSO, minimum 5	0.00000	0.08240	0.06152	0.01091	0.01315							
Random Forests [†]												
ntree = 8000	0.03883	0.05118	0.02608	0.11847	0.11051							
ntree = 10000	0.04602	0.04216	0.04328	0.11542	0.11256							
Support Vector Machines ⁹												
Radial kernel, Cost = 1,000	0.01982	0.00000	0.04910	0.00017	0.00000							
Radial kernel, Cost = 1,500	0.02735	0.00000	0.01004	0.00022	0.00814							
Polynomial kernel, Cost = 1,000, Coef() = 2	0.07483	0.04146	0.05961	0.02964	0.00874							
Polynomial kernel, Cost = 1,000, Coef() = 4	0.03521	0.05341	0.05045	0.08302	0.07118							
Polynomial kernel, Cost = 10,000, Coef() = 2	0.06961	0.00024	0.04763	0.06303	0.03083							
Polynomial kernel, Cost = 10,000, Coef() = 4	0.01430	0.06869	0.05434	0.05545	0.04805							
Bayesian Additive Regression Trees ^h												
Number of trees = 25	0.02074	0.00000	0.01310	0.02291	0.00888							
Number of trees = 50	0.02635	0.00000	0.00000	0.00088	0.01825							
Number of trees = 75	0.00000	0.02709	0.05672	0.00044	0.08347							
Regularized gradient boosting												
Number of trees = 30,000	0.02978	0.02143	0.03800	0.00237	0.03268							
Number of trees = 40,000	0.02986	0.03258	0.04850	0.00664	0.03268							

1

eTable 5. Hyperparameter settings for Super Learner ensemble^a

L ^aThe Super Learner optimization method used 1 - cvAUC as the loss function to be optimized. This method returns low non-zero weights rather than zero weights for poor-performing classifiers. As a result, Super Learner usually performs better when poor-performing classifiers are not included in the library. Based on this fact, we excluded the following classifiers because of preliminary evidence of poor performance in a larger original library: polynomial multivariate adaptive regression splines, neural networks, and support vector machines with a linear kernel.

- ^bMcCullagh P, Nelder JA. *Generalized Linear Models*. 2nd ed. Champan & Hall/CRC Monographs on Statistics & Applied Probability Series, #37. Taylor & Francis; 1989.
- ^cZou H, Hastie T. Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol.* 2005;67(2):301-320. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9868.2005.00503.x
- ^dHastie TJ, Tibshirani RJ. *Generalized Additive Models*. 1st ed. Chapman & Hall/CRC Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability, #43; 1990.

^eFriedman JH. Multivariate adaptive regression splines. *The Annals of Statistics*. 1991;19(1):1-67. doi:10.1214/aos/1176347963

^fBreiman L. Random forests. *Machine Learning*. 2001;45(1):5-32. doi:10.1023/a:1010933404324 ^gSteinwart I, Christmann A. *Support Vector Machines*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag New York; 2008.

^hChipman H, George EI, McCulloch R. BART: Bayesian additive regression trees. Ann Appl Stat. 2010;4(1):266-298. doi:10.1214/09aoas285