An examination of idiographic networks of posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms

Jonathan W. Reeves and Aaron J. Fisher

Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to

Jonathan W. Reeves

University of California, Berkeley, Department of Psychology

2121 Berkeley Way, Berkeley, CA 94720

Email: jon.reeves@berkeley.edu

Abstract

Although applying network theory to posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) has yielded promising insights, the lack of equivalence between inter- and intraindividual variation limits the generalizability of these findings to any one individual with PTSD. Better understanding how PTSD symptoms occur and vary over time within an individual instead requires exploring the idiographic network structure of PTSD. To do so, the present study used an intensive repeated measures design to estimate intraindividual networks of PTSD symptoms on a person-by-person basis. Twenty individuals ($N = 20$) who met criteria for PTSD completed daily surveys assessing PTSD symptoms four times per day for approximately 30 days. Employing a recently validated method provided by Fisher, Reeves, Lawyer, Medaglia, and Rubel (2017), we then used these data to estimate a contemporaneous and temporal network of PTSD symptoms for each individual on a person-by-person basis. We then calculated centrality metrics to determine the relative importance of each symptom in each idiographic network. Across all contemporaneous networks, negative trauma-related cognitions and emotions tended to most commonly be the most central symptoms. Further, across all temporal networks, (a) negative trauma-related emotions were the most common driver of variation in other symptoms over time and (b) distressing trauma-related dreams and sleep disturbance were the most common downstream consequences of variation in other PTSD symptoms over time. Finally, we also review data from two randomly selected participants to illustrate how this approach could be used to identify maintenance factors of PTSD for each individual and guide individual treatment planning.

Keywords: posttraumatic stress disorder, network analysis, idiographic research, centrality measures

Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is a common and highly disabling consequence of trauma exposure that confers substantial individual and societal cost worldwide (Kessler, 2000; Lowe, Blachman-Forshay, & Koenen, 2015). Despite its prevalence and associated burden, disagreements regarding the nature and scope of the PTSD diagnosis have existed since its initial inclusion in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III)*; American Psychiatric Association, 1980; Friedman, Resick, & Keane, 2007). Among these controversies, experts have long disputed whether the diagnosis more appropriately represents a distinct categorical entity or the extreme end of a dimension of stress responsiveness. Nevertheless, despite key differences between categorical and dimensional accounts of PTSD, each conceptualizes PTSD within the latent disease model. That is, each presumes that PTSD is an unobserved construct that serves as the common cause of its associated symptoms and their covariance (Schmittmann et al., 2013). Historically, the latent disease model has been the predominant framework for conceptualizing and operationalizing psychological disorders (Borsboom, 2008).

However, researchers have recently provided theoretical and empirical evidence that the latent disease model may be poorly-fit to psychological disorders (Borsboom, 2008, 2017; Schmittmann et al., 2013). Instead, Borsboom and Cramer (2013) have proposed the network theory of psychological disorders, arguing that these phenomena are better understood as distributed networks of mutually interacting, reciprocally reinforcing cognitions, emotions, and behaviors. These reciprocal interactions are reflected in the covariance between symptoms and the visualization of these associations via a network model provides a visual display of the degree to which any two symptoms are concurrently (or temporally) related. Despite the recency of its introduction, the network approach has generated considerable enthusiasm and has been

used to study a variety of psychological disorders (Borsboom, 2017; Fried & Cramer, 2017). For PTSD specifically, several recent studies have used this approach to estimate networks of PTSD symptoms in a diverse set of clinical and non-clinical samples (Afzali, Sunderland, Batterham, et al., 2017; Afzali, Sunderland, Teesson, et al., 2017; Armour, Fried, Deserno, Tsai, & Pietrzak, 2017; Birkeland & Heir, 2017; Bryant et al., 2017; Frewen, Schmittmann, Bringmann, & Borsboom, 2013; Fried et al., 2018; Greene, Gelkopf, Epskamp, & Fried, 2018; Hoffart, Langkaas, Oktedalen, & Johnson, 2019; Knefel, Tran, & Lueger-Schuster, 2016; Mitchell et al., 2017; Spiller et al., 2017; Sullivan, Smith, Lewis, & Jones, 2016). Within these networks, each PTSD symptom is represented as a node and relationships between symptoms are represented as edges – lines between nodes that reflect the strength and direction of the bivariate correlation. By estimating the network structure of PTSD, these studies aim to take a bottom-up, data-driven approach to identifying the symptom dynamics that hold mechanistic importance for PTSD. Experts hope that these insights might provide actionable information about the factors that determine the onset and maintenance of PTSD, with the latter serving as potential candidate targets for intervention and treatment optimization (Fried et al., 2018).

Although this nascent field is promising, the PTSD network structures that populate the existing literature have largely been estimated from cross-sectional data aggregated across individuals. While these networks describe the average association between symptoms and the relative importance of each symptom within each group, they fall short of describing how psychopathology may be organized within any one individual. This is because interindividual variability is not statistically equivalent to intraindividual variability (Hamaker, Dolan, & Molenaar, 2005; Molenaar, 2004). That is, the variance and covariance of PTSD symptoms in cross-sectional group data are not equivalent to the variance and covariance of these same

symptoms for a single individual over time. Further, while some past research has estimated multilevel networks from longitudinal data to address the limitations of cross-sectional PTSD networks (Greene et al., 2018; Hoffart et al., 2019), these still fall short of describing the person-specific nature of these intraindividual processes due to violations of the underlying homogeneity assumptions of these models (Fisher, Medaglia, & Jeronimus, 2018; Molenaar, 2005; Piccirillo & Rodebaugh, 2019). Thus, it follows that insights about the nature of PTSD gleaned from nomothetic networks are unlikely to adequately inform us about processes occurring at the individual-level. Better understanding these nuanced individual-level processes instead requires directly exploring the idiographic network structure of PTSD.

On a related note, a fundamental goal of the network approach is to improve the classification and treatment of psychological disorders (Borsboom, 2017; Hofmann, Curtiss, & McNally, 2016). As noted above, a commonly proposed method for achieving the latter is to directly target highly central symptoms of PTSD revealed in nomothetic network studies through intervention. However, as the lack of statistical equivalence between inter- and intraindividual variability limits the validity of group-to-individual inferences, current insights from cross-sectional networks are likely to translate poorly to clinical decision making – which relates to one person at a time – and may even mislead. For example, in a recent multisite, cross-cultural network study, Fried et al. (2018) demonstrated that the symptom of loss of interest in usual activities was a highly central symptom across cross-sectional networks estimated from four separate PTSD samples. Given that this symptom is rarely the explicit focus of evidence-based treatments for PTSD, the authors suggest that future studies should examine whether targeting this symptom could improve the effectiveness of PTSD treatment. However, due to the lack of equivalence between inter- and intraindividual variability, the assumption that this symptom

would similarly be the most central to the network of each individual in the sample is unlikely to hold. Instead, this symptom could easily be among the *least* central for a given individual, which would make it unlikely to improve the effectiveness of PTSD treatment for that individual through direct intervention. This lack of equivalence is further compounded when considering the relationship this symptom may have with other symptoms over time at the individual-level, which is likely to similarly vary on a person-by-person basis. Such heterogeneity in symptom structure ultimately undermines the goals of the network literature while also further underscoring the need to explore idiographic network models.

Over the past decade, researchers have increasingly pushed for a renewed emphasis on idiographic methods as these might be useful for tailoring psychological interventions to the experiences of individual patients (Fisher, 2015; Fisher & Boswell, 2016; Piccirillo & Rodebaugh, 2019). These authors argue that idiographic methods will be critical to the creation of precision mental health systems and the personalization of assessment and intervention (Fisher et al., 2019; National Institutes of Health, 2017). Fisher et al. (2017) further argue that, through leveraging the rich individual-level information these methods provide, idiographic methods can also be used to meaningfully transform our approach to the classification of psychopathology. Idiographic networks models are especially well-suited for these tasks. This is because these methods can highlight symptom dynamics idiosyncratic to each individual while also, when averaging across separately estimated idiographic models, reveal common processes occurring across individuals. Further, the advent of smartphone-facilitated ecological moment assessment (EMA) designs facilitates the collection of the intensive longitudinal data necessary for idiographic analyses. Thus, these data can now be collected from individuals with relative ease and used to estimate idiographic symptom networks. To date, there have been three studies that

have leveraged EMA paradigms to estimate within-person symptom networks (Bak, Drukker, Hasmi, & van Os, 2016; Epskamp et al., 2018; Fisher et al., 2017). Both Fisher et al. (2017) and Epskamp et al. (2018) used networks to examine symptom relationships contemporaneously (concurrent relationships within a given window of time) and temporally (lagged relationships across sequential measurement windows). To date, however, idiographic symptom networks of PTSD have not yet been estimated.

The aim of the present paper was to examine the potential consistency of network structures among individuals with PTSD. Consistent with other recent idiographic network research (Fisher, Reeves, Lawyer, Medaglia, & Rubel, 2017; Rubel, Fisher, Husen, & Lutz, 2018), we hypothesized that the relationships among symptoms would vary in number and degree from person to person. We recruited participants that met *DSM-5* criteria for current PTSD. Each participant then rated the degree to which they experienced each PTSD symptom four times per day for a minimum of 30 days. The multivariate time series for each individual was used to estimate separate contemporaneous and temporal networks of PTSD symptoms—representations of correlational relationships concurrent in time and across successive moments, respectively. Finally, we calculated centrality metrics to determine the relative importance of each symptom in each idiographic network. We demonstrate how these steps provide rich individual-level data and discuss how network-based insights may be utilized to highlight possible maintaining factors and points for clinical intervention.

Method

Participants

Twenty ($N = 20$) participants with current PTSD were included in the present study. Participants were largely White ($n = 9$; 45%) and male ($n = 12$; 60%) with a mean age of 38.35 ($SD = 12.51$). Of the non-White participants, two (10%) identified as Black, two (10%) as

Hispanic/Latinx, and seven (35%) as multiracial/other. The modal annual household income and highest level of education attained for the present sample was less than \$10,000 per year and a four-year Bachelor's-level degree, respectively. Moreover, 13 (65%) participants met criteria for at least one comorbid diagnosis: social anxiety disorder, $n = 4$; illness anxiety disorder, $n = 1$; agoraphobia, $n = 3$; generalized anxiety disorder, $n = 6$; persistent depressive disorder, $n = 5$; specific phobia, $n = 3$; substance use disorder, $n = 2$; obsessive-compulsive disorder, $n = 1$; panic disorder, $n = 1$.

Procedure

All study procedures were approved by the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of California, Berkeley (Protocol # 2015-01-7093). The study included three phases: (a) recruitment and screening, (b) baseline assessment, and (c) a 30-day ecological momentary assessment (EMA) sampling period. Participants were compensated \$50 for completion of all study procedures. Participants were not offered treatment at any point during the study as compensation for participation.

Recruitment and Screening. Inclusion criteria were a primary diagnosis of PTSD, being between the ages of 18-65, the absence of current mania/psychosis, and having daily access to a web-enabled mobile phone that could receive text messages. Potential participants were recruited from the surrounding community via online advertisements and posted flyers inquiring about PTSD symptoms. Interested individuals were instructed to contact the study laboratory by phone and complete a brief telephone screen. Those that passed the phone screen were then invited to the study laboratory for a structured clinical interview. The Life Events Checklist for DSM-5 (Weathers et al., 2013) and the PTSD Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5; Blevins, Weathers, Davis, Witte, & Domino, 2015) were used to screen for index traumas and PTSD, respectively.

Screened participants with PCL-5 total scores ≥ 38 were deemed to have probable PTSD and were invited for an in-person structured clinical interview.

Of the 294 individuals screened, 100 passed the screening procedure and were invited for an in-person structured clinical interview. Nine (9%) of these eligible participants were excluded after failing to respond to study personnel to schedule the in-person structured clinical interview. Of the 194 participants that did not pass, 43 (22%) were excluded for having PCL-5 total scores below 38, 27 (14%) for reporting no index trauma, 36 (20%) for lacking daily access to a web-enabled smartphone, 2 (1%) for not being between the ages of 18-65, 44 (23%) for personal conflicts that interfered with study participation, 24 (12%) for expressing they were no longer interested in the study, and 20 (10%) for failing to follow up with study personnel to complete the study screener after an initial contact.

Baseline Assessment. After presenting to the study laboratory and providing written informed consent, the Clinician Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5 (CAPS-5; Blake et al., 2000) and the Anxiety and Related Disorders Interview for DSM-5 (Brown & Barlow, 2014) were administered to confirm the presence of PTSD and any comorbid diagnoses, respectively. These structured interviews were administered by trained research assistants under the supervision of an advanced doctoral student in clinical psychology and a PhD-level clinical psychologist. Participants that met inclusion criteria following the structured clinical interview were deemed eligible and invited to participate in the EMA portion of the study.

30-Day EMA Sampling Period. To enroll, each participant provided their personal mobile device number to be entered into a secure web-based survey system. This system sent text messages to each participant's phone four times per day for a minimum of 30 days containing a hyperlink to a web-based survey. Each message populated the back-end of the

system with a time stamp, whether the participant completed the survey or not. For each survey, participants rated the degree to which they experienced a given item over the preceding hours on a 0 (*not at all*) to 100 (*as much as possible*) scale using a visual analog slider. Participants were required to complete at least 80% of the daily surveys to receive the \$50 compensation for study participation and for inclusion in the present analyses. Of 37 eligible participants, six (16%) were excluded for failing to complete the minimum number of phone survey assessments for the present analyses, five (13%) discontinued participation during the phone survey assessment period, four (11%) failed to respond to follow-up with study personnel to complete study enrollment procedures, and two (5%) could not participate due to technical issues. An independent samples *t*-test revealed that there was no difference in PTSD symptom severity (indexed by CAPS-5 total symptom severity scores) between participants that completed the 30-day EMA sampling period and those that did not ($t = .89$, $df = 34$, $p = .38$). The average number of observations across the 20 included participants was 126.15 ($SD = 12.75$), with a minimum of 110 and a maximum of 168.

Measures

Anxiety and Related Disorders Interview Schedule for DSM-5 (ADIS-5; Brown & Barlow, 2014). The ADIS-5 is a semi-structured clinical interview that is designed to diagnose current anxiety, mood, and related disorders according to the new DSM-5 criteria. This updated version of the ADIS-5 builds upon previous versions (the ADIS, AIDS-R, and ADIS-IV for DSM-III, DSM-III-R, and DSM-IV, respectively), which had well-established reliability. The ADIS-IV demonstrates good-to-excellent interrater reliability for DSM-IV disorders (κ ranging from .67 – .86, with the exception of dysthymia, $\kappa = .31$).

Clinician Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5 (CAPS-5; Blake et al., 2000). The CAPS-5 is a 30-item structured clinical interview designed to diagnose lifetime, past-week, and current PTSD and determine PTSD symptom severity based on the new DSM-5 criteria. The CAPS-5 diagnosis has previously demonstrated strong interrater reliability (κ ranging from .78 to 1.00), test-retest reliability ($\kappa = .93$), and correspondence with a diagnosis based on the CAPS for DSM-IV (CAPS-IV; Weathers et al., 2018).

EMA Survey Items. Following study enrollment, each participant was asked to complete surveys assessing current PTSD symptoms four times per day for a minimum of 30 days. Each survey contained 37 items, including 28 items assessing PTSD symptoms outlined in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013)*. The additional nine items included five assessing positive emotional experiences (*enthusiastic, positive, happy, content, and calm*), two assessing physical symptoms (*fatigue and muscle tension*), and two assessing sleep experiences not captured by PTSD symptoms (*total sleep time from the previous night and sleepiness*). The present analyses focus exclusively on the 28 PTSD items. These items were adapted from the PCL-5 (Blevins et al., 2015).

It is important to note that PTSD symptoms of (1) persistent and exaggerated beliefs or expectations about oneself, others, or the world, (2) persistent, distorted cognitions about the cause or consequences of a traumatic event that lead to blame of oneself or others, (3) persistent negative emotional state, and (4) sleep disturbance were each assessed by more than one survey item (with three, two, five, and two survey items, respectively). This approach was taken to capture fluctuations related to each distinct component of these symptoms while completing the daily surveys. Further, to adequately capture intradaily fluctuations in PTSD symptoms

conceptualized as persistent – namely, (a) persistent exaggerated beliefs and expectations of oneself, others, or the world, (b) persistent distorted blame of oneself or others for the event or its consequences, and (c) persistent negative emotional state – items assessing these experiences gauged the degree to which participants experienced thoughts or emotions reflective of these persistent beliefs/states at each survey. Finally, sleep-related PTSD symptoms – that is, (a) traumatic nightmares, (b) difficulty falling or staying asleep, and (c) experiencing unsatisfying sleep – were each assessed only once per day in the initial morning survey. Supplementary materials S1 provides a complete list of the survey items used to assess DSM-5 PTSD symptoms.

Data Analysis

There were four data preparation steps taken prior to estimating each participant's network. First, composite variables were calculated for the symptoms of (1) persistent and exaggerated beliefs or expectations about oneself, others, or the world, (2) persistent, distorted cognitions about the cause or consequences of a traumatic event that lead to blame of oneself or others, (3) persistent negative emotional state, and (4) sleep disturbance by averaging the ratings of the respective items for each symptom. Second, as sleep-related PTSD symptoms were only assessed once per day, the initial observation for each day was duplicated across the successive observations for each respective day, resulting in univariate time series of equal length to the other variables assessed four times per day. Third, for each individual, ratings for each symptom were standardized by subtracting the mean rating for that variable from each rating and dividing by its standard deviation, resulting a matrix of standardized ratings of PTSD symptoms over the 30-day EMA sampling period for each individual. Fourth, for each individual, time stamps accompanying each set of ratings were used to calculate the cumulative time elapsed over the 30-day EMA sampling period. Cumulative time was specifically calculated as the sum of successive

differences between time stamps (placed in chronological order) across the survey sampling period for each individual. This cumulative time variable was then used to apply linear detrending to each variable. The residuals of these models were then retained as the detrended standardized time series of each variable. Cubic spline interpolation was then applied to each detrended time series to resample the unevenly sampled data (sampling intervals of 4, 4, 4, and 12 hours) to an even six-hour sampling interval.

Consistent with a recent approach for estimating the contemporaneous and lagged relationships in idiographic time series networks (Fisher et al., 2017), single-indicator dynamic factor models were constructed for each individual on a person-by-person basis. Path models were estimated with a zero matrix for the observed errors, an identity matrix (diagonal matrix of 1's) for the factor loadings, and the variance of each variable expressed in the latent disturbances. We employed an automated search procedure, using the Lagrange multiplier test, to determine the lagged regression structure for each individual. Each individual model began by estimating all autoregressive paths and correlations between variables at time t and time $t + 1$. Starting with the regression path from time t to time $t + 1$ with the largest associated chi-square change, these paths were iteratively added to the initial model until no remaining paths associated with a chi-square change of at least 5.00 remained. Lagged regression paths backwards in time (from $t + 1$ to t) were suppressed during this procedure. The fit of each individual model was evaluated using cutoffs for the Brown's chi-square goodness-of-fit test, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the confirmatory fit index (CFI). Non-significant chi-square, RMSEA values less than .060, and CFI values greater than or equal to .95 are indicative of excellent fit (see, Hu & Bentler, 1999). Standardized coefficients reflecting (1)

correlations at time t and (2) lagged regression paths between t and $t + 1$ were then extracted to estimate idiographic contemporaneous and temporal networks, respectively.

Network Estimation. For each individual, we then estimated two idiographic networks. First, we used the standardized correlation coefficients at time t to estimate a contemporaneous network model. Specifically, a sparse partial correlation network model was generated for each participant using the least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) regularization method implemented in *R* (R Core Team, 2018) with the package *qgraph* (Epskamp, Cramer, Waldorp, Schmittmann, & Borsboom, 2012). As noted above, contemporaneous networks reflect symptom associations concurrent in time. Next, we used the standardized lagged regression coefficients from time t to time $t + 1$ to estimate a temporal network for each individual. These temporal networks represent the average degree to which variation in one node at time t predicts variation in itself or in another node at time $t + 1$. No regularization was applied to these relationships, with *qgraph* employed as a visualization tool.

Centrality. Following network estimation, we calculated the strength centrality for each node in the contemporaneous networks and both the instrength and outstrength for the temporal networks. Strength is defined as the sum of the absolute magnitude of all edges of a given node to all other connected nodes. Based on the directional relationships in the temporal networks, instrength is defined as the sum of the absolute magnitude of all incoming paths for a given node, while outstrength is defined as the sum of the absolute magnitude of all outgoing paths from a given node.

Results

Model fit

For each individual, the fit of each idiographic dynamic factor model was evaluated using Brown's chi-square goodness-of-fit test, the RMSEA, and CFI (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Table 1 provides fit statistics, degrees of freedom, and number of observations for each individual's model. All models exhibited excellent fit, however it should be acknowledged that this is somewhat tautological, given that fit criteria (i.e. chi-square change) were employed as stoppage rules for model estimation.

Idiographic networks

Idiographic contemporaneous and temporal network visualizations for each individual are available on the Open Science Framework at <https://osf.io/6vxhf/>. The following section summarizes the average centrality for both contemporaneous and temporal networks across all participants. Values for strength, instrength, and outstrength were normalized within each participant (centrality for each symptom divided by the maximum centrality value) to allow for comparison across individuals. Table 2 displays the normalized values for strength, instrength, and outstrength across the sample.

Contemporaneous networks. Across individuals, *negative thoughts about oneself, others, or the world* exhibited the greatest strength, followed closely by *negative trauma-related emotions*. Conversely, *distressing trauma-related dreams* and *sleep disturbance* exhibited the least strength. Thus, negative trauma-related cognitions and emotions were the most densely-connected PTSD symptoms across individuals, indicating that these tended to be the most commonly co-occurring symptoms at any given moment. Conversely, sleep-related PTSD symptoms were the least connected, indicating that these rarely co-occurred with other symptoms. However, given the method used for estimating sleep effects, this may be due to limited variability in the sleep-related items.

Temporal networks. *Distressing trauma-related dreams* and *sleep disturbance* exhibited the greatest instrength across individuals, indicating that these experiences were the most commonly and strongly predicted by other PTSD symptoms over time. *Recurrent, intrusive thoughts or memories of the trauma* instead exhibited the lowest instrength, indicating that these experiences were the least commonly predicted by other symptoms over time across individuals. Thus, to the degree that the temporal spacing in the current study maps onto the timing of intrusive thoughts and memories, these results indicate that recurrent trauma-related intrusions are generated by processes outside of other PTSD symptoms.

Negative trauma-related emotions exhibited the greatest outstrength across individuals, followed closely by *difficulty concentrating*, *feelings of reliving trauma*, *distressing trauma-related dreams*, and *strong negative thoughts about oneself, others, or the world*. Such a diverse list of predictors may reflect the limits of aggregation for understanding idiographic models. That is, because different nodes were the most densely connected and predictive of other nodes, no single node stood out as a driver of symptom variation from observation to observation. However, it is possible that the diversity of ‘top’ predictors in the current study is spurious and driven by the relatively small between-subject sample size. It is plausible that, with larger sample sizes, a more consistent picture may emerge, with fewer principal drivers of variability.

Two Individual Case Examples

The following section includes a detailed description of the results from two randomly selected participants. This step was taken to highlight the rich individual-level data provided by idiographic symptom networks and the potential these networks may hold for guiding individual treatment planning. The two individuals selected include Participant 013 and Participant 039,

whom we will refer to as “Bob” and “Sara”. Table 3 displays the normalized values of strength, instrength, and outstrength for each participant.

Example 1, Bob. Bob was a 36-year-old White man with a primary diagnosis of PTSD and no comorbid diagnoses who reported physical assault as his index trauma. Figure 1 presents Bob’s contemporaneous and temporal networks. Positive relationships between symptoms are depicted in green, whereas negative relationships are depicted in red. *Avoidance of trauma-related people, places, or situations* exhibited the greatest strength, most strongly co-occurring with *being watchful or on guard*, *loss of interest or pleasure in usual activities*, and *negative thoughts about oneself, others, or the world*. Thus, it appears that Bob’s behavioral avoidance of reminders of his trauma were often tied with an enhanced sensitivity to possible threats, an inability to experience pleasure, and negative thoughts about himself, others, or the world.

Physical reactions to trauma reminders exhibited the greatest instrength, being most strongly predicted by preceding *avoidance of trauma-related people, places or situations*, *feelings of reliving the trauma*, and *avoidance of trauma-related thoughts and emotions*. The lattermost symptom also exhibited the greatest outstrength, most strongly preceding *physical reactions to trauma reminders*, *difficulty concentrating*, *exaggerated startle*, and *sleep disturbance*. Although Bob’s cognitive avoidance of trauma reminders led to reductions in other PTSD symptoms, his behavioral avoidance led to heightened physiologic reactivity. Thus, while Bob’s behavioral avoidance amplified physiological symptoms, his cognitive avoidance was likely negatively-reinforcing due to the resultant distress reduction.

Example 2, Sara. Sara was an 18-year-old Hispanic/Latina woman with a primary diagnosis of PTSD and comorbid major depressive disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, and panic disorder. She reported sexual assault as her index trauma. Figure 2 presents Sara’s

contemporaneous and temporal networks. Positive relationships between symptoms are depicted in green, whereas negative relationships are depicted in red. *Negative thoughts about oneself, others, or the world* exhibited the greatest strength, most strongly co-occurring with *distorted trauma-related blame of oneself or other, feeling distant or cut off from others, difficulty feeling positive, and feeling irritable or acting aggressively*. However, this symptom had instrength and outstrength values of zero, reflecting these negative cognitions neither strongly predicted nor were strongly predicted by other symptoms over time. Thus, it appears that Sara's negative trauma-related thoughts about herself, others, or the world often occurred in conjunction with negative emotional states and feelings that may promote isolation from others.

Distressing trauma-related dreams exhibited the greatest instrength, being most strongly predicted by *negative trauma-related emotions*. Conversely, *avoidance of trauma-related people, places, or situations* exhibited the greatest outstrength, most strongly predicting *feeling watchful or on guard* and *loss of interest or pleasure in usual activities*. Thus, Sara's behavioral avoidance of trauma reminders led to enhanced sensitivity to threat and anhedonia. Additionally, her negative trauma-related emotions led to a reduction in the likelihood of having traumatic nightmares.

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to explore the idiographic network structure of PTSD symptoms in order to examine the consistency in network structure among individuals with PTSD. To date, PTSD symptom networks that populate the existing literature have largely been estimated from cross-sectional data aggregated across individuals (Afzali, Sunderland, Batterham, et al., 2017; Afzali, Sunderland, Teesson, et al., 2017; Armour et al., 2017; Birkeland & Heir, 2017; Bryant et al., 2017; Frewen et al., 2013; Fried et al., 2018; Knefel et al., 2016;

Mitchell et al., 2017; Spiller et al., 2017). Additionally, multilevel analyses have estimated networks from longitudinal—but nevertheless, aggregated—data (Greene et al., 2018; Hoffart et al., 2019). Such aggregations assume a degree of homogeneity in network structure that is likely untenable (Fisher, Medaglia, & Jeronimus, 2018), given the lack of statistical equivalence between inter- and intraindividual variability (Hamaker et al., 2005; Molenaar, 2004). Thus, insights from nomothetic networks are unlikely to adequately reflect processes occurring at the individual-level. Instead, describing these individual-level processes requires estimating idiographic symptom networks. We believe that this distinction is critical as our field moves toward adopting a more personalized model of psychological dysfunction and empirically-supported care (Fisher, 2015; Fisher & Boswell, 2016; Piccirillo & Rodebaugh, 2019). The present study estimated contemporaneous and temporal networks for twenty participants with current PTSD. These models reflected the respective concurrent and time-lagged covariance between PTSD symptoms. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to estimate idiographic symptom networks of PTSD.

Results from the present study reinforce theoretical and empirical arguments for the importance of negative trauma-related cognition as a prominent maintaining factor of PTSD (Ehlers & Clark, 2000; Zalta & Foa, 2012). The cognitive model of PTSD argues that these cognitions promote the misperception of ongoing threat and impede the processing of disconfirming information. This leads to reinforcement of the initial misappraisals, promoting chronicity rather than a reduction in distress over time. Consistent with this, *negative thoughts about oneself, others, or the world* was most commonly the most central PTSD symptom across the contemporaneous networks in the present study. This interpretation is further bolstered by results related to *negative trauma-related emotions*. This symptom closely followed *negative*

thoughts about oneself, others, or the world as a highly central symptom across the idiographic contemporaneous networks. Furthermore, *negative trauma-related emotions* most commonly exhibited the greatest influence on other PTSD symptoms over time across the idiographic temporal networks. This is in line with the argument that trauma-related emotions linked to the overestimation of threat further exacerbate PTSD symptoms over time (Ehlers & Clark, 2000). Given this consistency, we conjecture that, despite the small between-subject sample size, the symptoms and experiences of the individuals in the present study may be representative to others with PTSD.

Further, these results also reinforce the literature on the interplay between PTSD symptoms and sleep disturbance (Germain, 2013). In the present study, *distressing trauma-related dreams* and *sleep disturbance* were most commonly the symptoms most strongly influenced by preceding fluctuations in other PTSD symptoms across temporal networks. While not exclusive to PTSD, this highlights a pathway by which symptom-related distress may disturb sleep and ultimately promote maintenance of the disorder rather than recovery. However, this result should be interpreted with caution. As noted above, both *distressing trauma-related dreams* and *sleep disturbance* were each assessed only once per day. Given that ratings of these symptoms were duplicated across a given day to yield series of equal length to other symptoms, it may be that the autoregressions of these symptoms have been artificially inflated, which could produce a larger instrength value. Future studies should endeavor to replicate these results and employ novel paradigms that provide intradaily measurements of sleep disturbance.

Finally, these results also highlight the importance and utility of estimating idiographic symptom networks. As noted above, while cross-sectional nomothetic networks provide robust descriptions of symptom importance and symptom relationships occurring at the group-level,

these fall short of describing the organization or presentation of symptoms within a single individual as they occur over time (Fisher et al., 2018; Fisher et al., 2017; Piccirillo & Rodebaugh, 2019). For example, although *negative trauma-related emotions* has exhibited high centrality in cross-sectional networks in the literature (Armour et al., 2017; Mitchell et al., 2017), the symptom was among the least central symptoms in *Bob's* contemporaneous network. Further, while this symptom was relatively central to Sara's contemporaneous network, it was neither among the most influential nor the most strongly influenced symptom temporally for Sara. Moreover, although Greene et al. (2018) found that *exaggerated startle response* exhibited the most influence over time in a nomothetic temporal network, this symptom showed relatively weak temporal influence for both Sara and Bob. Taken together, these discrepancies suggest that there may be a high degree of nuanced detail in individual-level processes that is overlooked or obscured in nomothetic networks. Given evidence for the substantial heterogeneity present in the diagnosis (Galatzer-Levy & Bryant, 2013), this may be especially pressing in PTSD. However, this heterogeneity may be lessened when using the PTSD criteria outlined in the International Classification of Diseases (World Health Organization, 2018) rather than those in the *DSM* (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Nevertheless, future studies should endeavor to further explore the idiographic network structure of PTSD. A greater volume of work in this area would not only provide an opportunity to better understand nuances in individual-level processes, large sample sizes—or samples across multiple studies—could begin to delineate typologies of network dynamics and PTSD subpopulations defined by dynamic, mechanistic processes.

The past decade has seen several efforts to tailor psychological interventions to the needs and characteristics of each individual patient (Fisher & Boswell, 2016; Piccirillo & Rodebaugh,

2019). These results show the potential utility of combining idiographic approaches and network theory to move us closer to this goal. One possibility is to combine idiographic network data with data-driven algorithms to select specific interventions best-fit to an individual from larger ensembles of empirically-supported techniques. Fisher et al. (2019) provided an example of this approach in a recent open trial of personalized modular therapy for mood and anxiety disorders. These authors used idiographic pre-therapy symptom data with a treatment selection algorithm to match individuals to personalized modular treatments on a person-by-person basis. For PTSD, a similar approach could be used to select a specific evidence-based treatment of PTSD best-fit to each individual's experience (Rubel et al., 2018). For instance, features of Bob's idiographic network reveal that his cognitive avoidance exhibited stronger temporal influence over other symptoms than his behavioral avoidance. Given that both cognitive processing (CPT) and prolonged exposure (PE) therapy are highly efficacious evidence-based treatments for PTSD (Foa, Keane, Friedman, & Cohen, 2008), a digitized system could leverage this person-specific information about Bob to preferentially select CPT over PE as a first-line treatment for Bob based on his individual experience.

Additionally, another possible application involves using idiographic models to enhance the effectiveness of exposure therapy. This could function similarly to functional analytic techniques implemented in cognitive-behavioral interventions (Fisher, 2015), whereby antecedents and consequences of a presenting problem are identified and targeted to facilitate behavior change. Similar to above, features of idiographic network models could be leveraged to augment exposure by identifying symptoms most strongly associated with avoidance for a given individual and targeted with additional empirically-supported techniques. This would provide the patient with alternative strategies to avoidance, each tailored to their individual experience.

Future studies should endeavor to evaluate novel methods for leveraging information drawn from idiographic methods to understand psychopathology processes occurring within each individual and optimize treatment response on a person-by-person basis

Finally, despite its strengths, there are several limitations of the present study that are important to discuss. First, although this study represents the first to estimate idiographic symptom networks of PTSD, the four-times-per-day sampling protocol may arguably provide a relatively coarse temporal resolution of these symptoms. Whereas the present study was able to estimate effects occurring over a four-hour window or more, it may not adequately capture effects occurring more rapidly. Second, on a related note, the dynamic factor models estimated in this study used on a single time-lag. This overlooks effects unfolding over time at additional time-lags, which may be important for precisely detecting feedback loops unfolding over larger windows of time. Third, to address concerns over replicability and guard against over-interpretation, several researchers have pushed for the routine testing of the stability of statistical parameters derived from network models (Epskamp & Fried, 2016; Fried & Cramer, 2017; Fried et al., 2018). However, given that these methods rely on bootstrapping routines that have not been optimized for networks estimated from time series data, this step was not taken in the present study. To address these concerns, future studies should endeavor to increase the frequency and number of observations collected from each individual to examine effects at varying time scales. Further, these studies should also endeavor to evaluate methods to examine the stability of networks derived from time series data, which must necessarily maintain the dependence structure of the original data to ensure valid inference. Despite these limitations, the present study represents an important exploration and extension of past research on PTSD symptom networks that examined the idiographic network structure of PTSD.

References

Afzali, M. H., Sunderland, M., Batterham, P. J., Carragher, N., Caelear, A., & Slade, T. (2017).

Network approach to the symptom-level association between alcohol use disorder and posttraumatic stress disorder. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*, 52(3), 329-339.

doi:10.1007/s00127-016-1331-3

Afzali, M. H., Sunderland, M., Teesson, M., Carragher, N., Mills, K., & Slade, T. (2017). A

network approach to the comorbidity between posttraumatic stress disorder and major depressive disorder: The role of overlapping symptoms. *J Affect Disord*, 208, 490-496.

doi:10.1016/j.jad.2016.10.037

American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Armour, C., Fried, E. I., Deserno, M. K., Tsai, J., & Pietrzak, R. H. (2017). A network analysis of DSM-5 posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms and correlates in U.S. military veterans. *J Anxiety Disord*, 45, 49-59. doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2016.11.008

Bak, M., Drukker, M., Hasmi, L., & van Os, J. (2016). An n=1 Clinical Network Analysis of Symptoms and Treatment in Psychosis. *PLoS ONE*, 11(9), e0162811.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0162811

Birkeland, M. S., & Heir, T. (2017). Making connections: Exploring the centrality of

posttraumatic stress symptoms and covariates after a terrorist attack. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 8(sup 3), 1-25. doi:10.1080/20008198.2017.1333387

Blake, D. D., Weathers, F. W., Nagy, L. M., Kaloupek, D., Klauminzer, G., Charney, D. S., . . .

Buckley, T. C. (2000). *Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale (CAPS): Instruction Manual*.

Boston, MA: National Center for PTSD.

Blevins, C. A., Weathers, F. W., Davis, M. T., Witte, T. K., & Domino, J. L. (2015). The Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5): Development and initial psychometric evaluation. *J Trauma Stress*, 28, 489-498. doi:10.1002/jts.22059

Borsboom, D. (2008). Psychometric perspectives on diagnostic systems. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 64(9), 1089-1108. doi:10.1002/jclp.20503

Borsboom, D. (2017). A network theory of mental disorders. *World Psychiatry*, 16, 5-13.

Borsboom, D., & Cramer, A. O. (2013). Network analysis: an integrative approach to the structure of psychopathology. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol*, 9, 91-121. doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185608

Brown, T. A., & Barlow, D. H. (2014). *Anxiety and Related Disorders Interview Schedule for DSM-5*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bryant, R. A., Creamer, M., O'Donnell, M., Forbes, D., McFarlane, A. C., Silove, D., & Hadzi-Pavlovic, D. (2017). Acute and Chronic Posttraumatic Stress Symptoms in the Emergence of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: A Network Analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 74(2), 135-142. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2016.3470

Ehlers, A., & Clark, D. M. (2000). A cognitive model of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Behav Res Ther*, 38, 319-345.

Epskamp, S., Cramer, A. O. J., Waldorp, L. J., Schmittmann, V. D., & Borsboom, D. (2012). qgraph: Network Visualizations of Relationships in Psychometric Data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(4). doi:10.18637/jss.v048.i04

- Epskamp, S., & Fried, E. I. (2016). A tutorial on regularized partial correlation networks.
- Epskamp, S., van Borkulo, C. D., van der Veen, D. C., Servaas, M. N., Isvoranu, A. M., Riese, H., & Cramer, A. O. J. (2018). Personalized Network Modeling in Psychopathology: The Importance of Contemporaneous and Temporal Connections. *Clin Psychol Sci*, 6(3), 416-427. doi:10.1177/2167702617744325
- Fisher, A. J. (2015). Toward a dynamic model of psychological assessment: Implications for personalized care. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1-11.
- Fisher, A. J., Bosley, H. G., Fernandez, K. C., Reeves, J. W., Soyster, P. D., Diamond, A. E., & Barkin, J. (2019). Open trial of a personalized modular treatment for mood and anxiety. *Behav Res Ther*, 116, 69-79. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2019.01.010
- Fisher, A. J., & Boswell, J. F. (2016). Enhancing the Personalization of Psychotherapy With Dynamic Assessment and Modeling. *Assessment*, 23(4), 496-506. doi:10.1177/1073191116638735
- Fisher, A. J., Medaglia, J. D., & Jeronimus, B. F. (2018). A lack of group-to-individual generalizability is a threat to human subjects research. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. doi:10.1073/pnas.1711978115
- Fisher, A. J., Medaglia, J. D., & Jeronimus, B. F. (2018). Lack of group-to-individual generalizability is a threat to human subjects research. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
- Fisher, A. J., Reeves, J. W., Lawyer, G., Medaglia, J. D., & Rubel, J. A. (2017). Exploring the idiographic dynamics of mood and anxiety via network analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 126(8), 1044-1056. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/abn0000311

- Fisher, A. J., Reeves, J. W., Lawyer, G., Medaglia, J. D., & Rubel, J. A. (2017). Exploring the idiographic dynamics of mood and anxiety via network analysis. *J Abnorm Psychol*, 126(8), 1044-1056. doi:10.1037/abn0000311
- Foa, E. B., Keane, T. M., Friedman, M. J., & Cohen, A. J. (2008). *Effective Treatments for PTSD: Practice Guidelines from the International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies* (2 ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Frewen, P. A., Schmittmann, V. D., Bringmann, L. F., & Borsboom, D. (2013). Perceived causal relations between anxiety, posttraumatic stress and depression: extension to moderation, mediation, and network analysis. *Eur J Psychotraumatol*, 4. doi:10.3402/ejpt.v4i0.20656
- Fried, E. I., & Cramer, A. O. J. (2017). Moving Forward: Challenges and Directions for Psychopathological Network Theory and Methodology. *Perspect Psychol Sci*, 1745691617705892. doi:10.1177/1745691617705892
- Fried, E. I., Eidhof, M. B., Palic, S., Costantini, G., Huisman-van Dijk, H. M., Bockting, C. L. H., . . . Karstoft, K. I. (2018). Replicability and Generalizability of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) Networks: A Cross-Cultural Multisite Study of PTSD Symptoms in Four Trauma Patient Samples. *Clin Psychol Sci*, 6(3), 335-351. doi:10.1177/2167702617745092
- Friedman, M. J., Resick, P. A., & Keane, T. M. (2007). PTSD: Twenty-five years of progress and challenges. In M. J. Friedman, T. M. Keane, & P. A. Resick (Eds.), *Handbook of PTSD: Science and practice* (pp. 3-18). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Galatzer-Levy, I. R., & Bryant, R. A. (2013). 636,120 Ways to Have Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *Perspect Psychol Sci*, 8(6), 651-662. doi:10.1177/1745691613504115

- Germain, A. (2013). Sleep disturbances as the hallmark of PTSD: where are we now? *Am J Psychiatry*, 170(4), 372-382. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2012.12040432
- Greene, T., Gelkopf, M., Epskamp, S., & Fried, E. (2018). Dynamic networks of PTSD symptoms during conflict. *Psychol Med*, 48(14), 2409-2417. doi:10.1017/S0033291718000351
- Hamaker, E. L., Dolan, C. V., & Molenaar, P. C. M. (2005). Statistical Modeling of the Individual: Rationale and Application of Multivariate Stationary Time Series Analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 40(2), 207-233.
- Hoffart, A., Langkaas, T. F., Oktedalen, T., & Johnson, S. U. (2019). The temporal dynamics of symptoms during exposure therapies of PTSD: a network approach. *Eur J Psychotraumatol*, 10(1), 1618134. doi:10.1080/20008198.2019.1618134
- Hofmann, S. G., Curtiss, J., & McNally, R. J. (2016). A Complex Network Perspective on Clinical Science. *Perspect Psychol Sci*, 11(5), 597-605. doi:10.1177/1745691616639283
- Hu, L.-t., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1-55.
- Kessler, R. C. (2000). Posttraumatic stress disorder: The burden to the individual and to society. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 61(Suppl 5), 4-12.
- Knefel, M., Tran, U. S., & Lueger-Schuster, B. (2016). The association of posttraumatic stress disorder, complex posttraumatic stress disorder, and borderline personality disorder from a network analytical perspective. *J Anxiety Disord*, 43, 70-78. doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2016.09.002

- Lowe, R. S., Blachman-Forshay, J., & Koenen, K. C. (2015). Trauma as a public health issue: Epidemiology of trauma and trauma-related disorders. In U. Schyder & M. Cloitre (Eds.), *Evidence based treatments for trauma-related psychological disorders* (pp. 11-40). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Mitchell, K. S., Wolf, E. J., Bovin, M. J., Lee, L. O., Green, J. D., Rosen, R. C., . . . Marx, B. P. (2017). Network models of DSM-5 posttraumatic stress disorder: Implications for ICD-11. *J Abnorm Psychol*, 126(3), 355-366. doi:10.1037/abn0000252
- Molenaar, P. C. M. (2004). A Manifesto on Psychology as Idiographic Science: Bringing the Person Back Into Scientific Psychology, This Time Forever. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, 2(4), 201-218.
- Molenaar, P. C. M. (2005). Rejoinder to Rogosa's Commentary on "A Manifesto on Psychology as Idiographic Science". *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, 3(2), 116-119.
- National Institutes of Health. (2017). Intensive longitudinal analysis of health behaviors: Leveraging new technologies to understand health behaviors (U01). Retrieved from <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/rfa-files/rfa-od-17-004.html>
- Piccirillo, M. L., & Rodebaugh, T. L. (2019). Foundations of idiographic methods in psychology and applications for psychotherapy. *Clin Psychol Rev*. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2019.01.002
- R Core Team. (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Rubel, J. A., Fisher, A. J., Husen, K., & Lutz, W. (2018). Translating Person-Specific Network Models into Personalized Treatments: Development and Demonstration of the Dynamic

- Assessment Treatment Algorithm for Individual Networks (DATA-IN). *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*. doi:10.1159/000487769
- Schmittmann, V. D., Cramer, A., Waldorp, L. J., Epskamp, S., Kievit, R. A., & Borsboom, D. (2013). Deconstructing the construct: A network perspective on psychological phenomena. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 31, 43-53.
- Spiller, T. R., Schick, M., Schnyder, U., Bryant, R. A., Nickerson, A., & Morina, N. (2017). Symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder in a clinical sample of refugees: a network analysis. *Eur J Psychotraumatol*, 8(sup3), 1318032. doi:10.1080/20008198.2017.1318032
- Sullivan, C. P., Smith, A. J., Lewis, M., & Jones, R. T. (2016). Network analysis of ptsd symptoms following mass violence. *Psychol Trauma*. doi:10.1037/tra0000237
- Weathers, F. W., Bovin, M. J., Lee, D. J., Sloan, D. M., Schnurr, P. P., Kaloupek, D. G., . . . Marx, B. P. (2018). The Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5 (CAPS-5): Development and initial psychometric evaluation in military veterans. *Psychol Assess*, 30(3), 383-395. doi:10.1037/pas0000486
- World Health Organization. (2018). *International classification of diseases for mortality and morbidity statistics* (11th Revision ed.).
- Zalta, A. K., & Foa, E. B. (2012). Exposure therapy: Promoting emotional processing of pathological anxiety. In W. O'Donohue & J. E. Fisher (Eds.), *Cognitive Behavior Therapy: Core Principles of Practice* (pp. 75-104). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Table 1*Fit statistics for vector-autoregressive structural equation models.*

ID	χ^2	<i>p</i>	df	RMSEA	CFI	Obs.
002	357.28	.41	352	.04	0.97	123
005	314.26	.79	335	.03	0.99	122
011	382.56	.11	350	.04	0.98	167
013	422.39	.01	360	.06	0.97	123
014	380.14	.26	363	.05	0.97	125
021	313.69	.90	347	.02	1.00	142
031	294.72	.99	352	.00	1.00	117
032	347.27	.66	359	.04	0.98	110
033	392.20	.11	359	.06	0.93	119
036	300.81	.98	351	.01	1.00	117
039	315.44	.90	349	.03	0.99	116
043	313.30	.89	345	.02	0.98	121
046	360.42	.53	363	.04	0.97	115
051	397.67	.04	349	.06	0.96	126
054	342.67	.64	353	.03	0.98	140
061	326.89	.79	348	.03	0.98	121
067	312.24	.87	341	.02	1.00	139
068	366.58	.35	357	.04	0.98	128
069	347.60	.16	322	.05	0.99	124
072	326.59	.78	347	.03	0.99	128

Note. ID = Participant identification number; χ^2 = Brown's χ^2 ; df = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; Obs. = number of observations for a given model.

Table 2*Average normalized values of strength, instrength, and outstrength values across participants*

Item	Strength	Instrength	Outstrength
Recurrent, intrusive memories or thoughts	0.67	0.18	0.22
Distressing dreams about the trauma	0.41	0.48	0.36
Reliving the trauma	0.57	0.39	0.36
Upset when reminded of the trauma	0.67	0.34	0.30
Physical reactions to trauma-reminders	0.65	0.33	0.24
Avoidance of thoughts or feelings	0.52	0.23	0.30
Avoidance of people, places, or situations	0.58	0.32	0.32
Difficulty remembering the trauma	0.53	0.33	0.31
Strong negative expectations or beliefs	0.83	0.26	0.36
Distorted trauma-related blame	0.59	0.28	0.31
Negative trauma-related emotions	0.75	0.29	0.40
Loss of interest or pleasure in usual activities	0.60	0.36	0.29
Feeling distant or cut off	0.60	0.22	0.32
Difficulty feeling positive	0.54	0.26	0.29
Feeling irritable or acting aggressively	0.57	0.20	0.23
Risky or self-destructive behavior	0.48	0.28	0.28
Feeling watchful or on guard	0.63	0.30	0.27
Exaggerated startle	0.58	0.39	0.33
Difficulty concentrating	0.59	0.31	0.38
Sleep disturbance	0.43	0.44	0.34
Descriptive Statistics			
Minimum	0.41	0.18	0.22
Maximum	0.83	0.48	0.40
SD	0.10	0.08	0.05

Note. *SD* = standard deviation.

Table 3*Normalized values of strength, instrength, and outstrength for Participants 013 and 039*

	Strength		Instrength		Outstrength	
	P013	P039	P013	P039	P013	P039
Recurrent, intrusive memories or thoughts	0.69	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Distressing dreams about the trauma	0.86	0.29	0.10	1.00	0.54	0.53
Reliving the trauma	0.70	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.65
Upset when reminded of the trauma	0.88	0.66	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.26
Physical reactions to trauma-reminders	0.83	0.42	1.00	0.20	0.00	0.29
Avoidance of thoughts or feelings	0.59	0.19	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Avoidance of people, places, or situations	1.00	0.79	0.56	0.17	0.36	1.00
Difficulty remembering the trauma	0.67	0.45	0.00	0.56	0.50	0.00
Strong negative expectations or beliefs	0.78	1.00	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.00
Distorted trauma-related blame	0.72	0.54	0.15	0.14	0.96	0.52
Negative trauma-related emotions	0.62	0.60	0.00	0.26	0.12	0.32
Loss of interest or pleasure in usual activities	0.71	0.59	0.70	0.38	0.00	0.40
Feeling distant or cut off	0.70	0.54	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.57
Difficulty feeling positive	0.79	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.13
Feeling irritable or acting aggressively	0.81	0.43	0.00	0.19	0.59	0.70
Risky or self-destructive behavior	0.64	0.44	0.41	0.35	0.00	0.45
Feeling watchful or on guard	0.89	0.47	0.14	0.76	0.00	0.00
Exaggerated startle	0.83	0.31	0.20	0.18	0.19	0.42
Difficulty concentrating	0.76	0.32	0.50	0.18	0.15	0.74
Sleep disturbance	0.43	0.35	0.34	0.42	0.00	0.76

Figure 1
Contemporaneous network at time t (left) and temporal network of lagged relationships between time t and $t + 1$ (right) for Bob

Figure 2

Contemporaneous network at time t (left) and temporal network of lagged relationships between time t and $t + 1$ (right) for Sara