

## **Estimating psychopathological networks: be careful what you wish for**

Authors: Sacha Epskamp, Joost Kruis & Maarten Marsman

Affiliation: Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam,  
The Netherlands.

### **Abstract**

Network models, in which psychopathological disorders are conceptualized as a complex interplay of psychological and biological components, have been gaining substantial ground and popularity in recent psychopathological literature (Borsboom, Cramer, Schmittmann, Epskamp, & Waldorp, 2011). Regularly, network models contain a large number of unknown parameters, yet the sample sizes psychological research has to offer are limited. As such, general assumptions about the true network are introduced to reduce the number of free parameters. As these assumptions are incorporated in the estimation method, the resulting network will always be of the particular structure as assumed by the estimation method; a crucial, yet often ignored, aspect of psychopathological networks. For example, observing a sparse structure when we assume a sparse structure, does not imply that the true model is, in fact, sparse. To illustrate, we discuss a recently published paper that reveals a high-dimensional network of psychopathological symptoms (Boschloo et al., 2015) and furthermore show the effect of the assumption of sparsity in three simulation studies.

### **Estimating psychopathological networks: be careful what you wish for**

Recent psychological literature has focused on a network approach to model many different psychological phenomena (Schmittmann et al., 2013). Such networks can be high-dimensional structures, i.e. the number of unknown parameters is much larger than the available data, which are hard to estimate without making general assumptions on the underlying true model structure. If the true model is assumed to be a sparse, thus containing a small number of connections relative to the number of nodes, a methodology can be applied that will return such a sparse network structure. That is, assuming a sparse network structure will lead to estimating a sparse network structure, which means that certain conclusions cannot be drawn from observing a sparse network structure. In this paper, we therefore argue that care should be taken in interpreting the obtained network structure, as the estimation procedure might pollute the results. We will illustrate this by showing examples of networks obtained when sparse networks are estimated even though the true network structure is dense.

#### Network Psychometrics

The network approach has been particularly promising in the field of psychopathology. Within this framework, symptoms (e.g., insomnia, fatigue and concentration problems) are no longer treated as interchangeable indicators of some latent mental disorder (e.g., depression) but rather play an active, causal role on each other (e.g., insomnia leads to fatigue, fatigue leads to concentration problems, etcetera; Borsboom & Cramer, 2013). Psychopathological disorders, then, are not interpreted as the common cause of observed symptoms, but rather as emergent behavior due to a complex interplay of psychological and biological components. To grasp such a complex structure, a network model can be used in which variables such as symptoms or moods are represented by *nodes*, which are connected with *edges* indicating associations between nodes. This line of research has led to intuitive new insights about various psychopathological concepts such as comorbidity (Borsboom et al., 2011; Cramer, Waldorp, van der Maas, & Borsboom, 2010), the impact of life events (Cramer, Borsboom, Aggen, & Kendler, 2012; Fried et al., 2015), and sudden phase transitions (van de Leemput et al., 2014; Wichers et al., 2016).

The growing popularity of the network perspective on psychological phenomena has culminated in the emergence of a new branch of psychology, dedicated to the estimation of network structures on psychological data, i.e. *network*

*psychometrics* (Epskamp, Maris, Waldorp, & Borsboom, in press). This field has focused on tackling the problem of estimating network structures involving large numbers of parameters in high-dimensional models. When cross-sectional data are analyzed, the most popular models that are used are the Gaussian Graphical Model (GGM; Lauritzen, 1996) for continuous data, and the Ising Model (Ising, 1925) for binary data. In both models, a weights matrix encoding the network structure needs to be estimated, containing  $P(P-1)/2$  number of parameters, where  $P$  is the number of nodes. These parameters encode the conditional relationship between two nodes after conditioning on all other nodes in the network, and can be shown to be quite instable with relatively low sample sizes (Epskamp, Borsboom & Fried, in preparation). *Relative low sample sizes*, here, is a loose term that has not yet been well defined. A general rule of thumb would be to have at least as many observations than the number of parameters. But, as will be shown later, this rule of thumb still results in unstable estimates.

The general solution to overcome the problem of estimating many parameters is to reduce this number by using some form of regularization or penalization. A particular promising technique is to apply the least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO; Tibshirani, 1996) to the edge strengths of the network. The LASSO penalizes the sum of absolute parameter values, such that the estimated values *shrink* to zero. That is, the absolute parameter estimates will be small and often equal exactly zero. The resulting model is therefore almost always *sparse*; only a relative few number of parameters will be estimated to be nonzero. The use of LASSO typically leads to better performance in cross-validations (overfitting is prevented) and results in more easily interpretable models. Most important is that *if the true network structure is sparse*, the LASSO performs well in estimating this network structure and, particularly, estimating few edges to be nonzero that are zero in the true network (i.e., few false positives).

The LASSO uses a tuning parameter that controls the sparsity, which can be chosen to minimize some criterion such as the Extended Bayesian Information Criterion (EBIC; Chen & Chen, 2008). This methodology has been shown to work well for both the GGM (Foygel & Drton, 2010) and the Ising model (Foygel Barber & Drton, 2015; van Borkulo et al., 2014), and has been implemented in easy to use software (e.g., Epskamp, Cramer, Waldorp, Schmittmann, & Borsboom, 2012; van Borkulo et al., 2014) utilized in an increasing number of publications (e.g., Dalege et

al., 2016; Isvoranu et al., in press; Kossakowski et al., 2015; Langley, Wijn, Epskamp, & Van Bork, 2015; Rhemtulla et al., 2016; Van Borkulo et al., 2015). The largest application to date of a psychological network estimated using the LASSO is the work of Boschloo and colleagues (2015), in which 120 psychiatric symptoms were measured in 34,653 subjects and modeled with an Ising Model. We use their work in this paper to illustrate our concerns regarding the interpretation of network structures that are the result of applying a network methodology to data.

### A sparse network model of psychopathology

The network of Boschloo and colleagues (2015) shows a network structure in which symptoms representative of a disorder cluster strongly together. While they agree that the found network structure closely represents the structure that is imposed by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM; American Psychiatric Association, 2013), they conclude that the found structure indicates that symptoms are not interchangeable, as is presumed to be the case in the DSM. Commonly, a DSM diagnosis requires one to have X out of Y symptoms, regardless of which specific symptoms. This means that two persons with very different symptoms can be assigned the same diagnosis. This interchangeability results from an underlying causal notion of unobserved diseases causing symptoms rather than symptoms having an active causal role on each other; a notion more formally known as the common cause model (Schmittmann et al., 2013). Boschloo and colleagues conclude that the network structure shows that symptoms are *not* interchangeable, mainly due to found differences in number of connections and strength of connections between symptoms, a relative small number of pathways between disorders and the presence of some negative connections.

While we do not necessarily disagree with the notion that symptoms play an active, causal role in psychopathology, we wish to point out that the conclusion that symptoms are not interchangeable, is difficult to ascertain from a sparse approximated network structure alone. This is because the LASSO relies on the assumption that the true network structure is *sparse*; the LASSO will always search for a model in which relatively few edges and paths explain the co-occurrence of all nodes. As a result, the LASSO can have a low sensitivity (not all true edges are detected) but always has a high specificity (not many false positives; van Borkulo et al., 2014). It is this reason why network analysts prefer to use the LASSO; the edges that are estimated by the

LASSO can be interpreted to be meaningful, and the LASSO returns a possible explanation of the data using only few connections that can be interpreted as causal pathways (Lauritzen, 1996; Pearl, 2000). The LASSO giving a possible explanation, however, does not mean the LASSO gives the only explanation, nor does it indicate other explanations are false. In the case of Boschloo and colleagues the LASSO giving a sparse explanation can give great insight in a possible way in which psychopathological symptoms interact with each other, but merely finding a sparse structure does not mean that other explanations, e.g., a latent variable model with interchangeable symptoms, are disproved. Using the LASSO would always return a sparse structure, that is what the LASSO does.

### The bet on sparsity

The LASSO is capable of retrieving the true underlying structure, but only if that true structure is sparse. Any regularization method makes the assumption that the true structure can be simplified in some way (e.g., is sparse), as otherwise too many observations are needed to estimate the network structure. This principle has been termed as the ‘bet on sparsity’ (Hastie, Tibshirani, & Friedman, 2001). But what if the truth is not sparse, but dense?

Such a case would precisely arise if the true model were a latent common cause model in which one or several latent variables cause scores on possibly completely interchangeable indicators. This is a feasible alternative as the Ising Model can be shown to be mathematically equivalent to a certain type of latent variable model; the multidimensional item response model (MIRT; Reckase, 2009) with posterior normal distributions on the latent traits (Epskamp et al., in press; Marsman, Maris, Bechger, & Glas, 2015). The corresponding Ising Model is a low-rank network that will often be *dense* (all possible edges are present). Intuitively, this makes sense, as the Ising Model parameterizes conditional dependencies between items after conditioning on all other items, and no two items can be made conditionally independent if the common cause model is true. A low-rank weighted network will show indicators of a latent variable as clusters of nodes that are all connected strongly with each other. Therefore, if a common cause model is the true origin of the co-occurrences in the dataset, the corresponding Ising Model should show the indicators to cluster together, much like the results shown by Boschloo and colleagues.

It is this relationship between the Ising Model and MIRT that has lead to estimating the Ising Model using a different form of regularization; by estimating a low-rank approximation of the network structure (Marsman et al., 2015). Such a structure is strikingly different than the sparse structure returned by LASSO estimation. Where the LASSO will always return many edge parameters to be exactly zero, a low-rank approximation generally estimates no edge to be exactly zero, and hence will typically return a dense network. On the other hand, this dense network is highly constrained by the eigenvector structure, leading to many edge parameters to be roughly equivalent to each other compared to the strongly varying edge parameters LASSO estimation allows. For example, the data can always be recoded such that a rank-1 approximation only has positive connections. These are key points that cannot be ignored when estimating a network structure: regardless of the true network structure that underlies the data, the LASSO will always return a sparse network structure. Similarly, a low-rank approximation will always return a dense low-rank network structure. Both methods take on the bet on sparsity in their own way, sparsity in the number of non-zero parameters, or sparsity in the number of non-zero eigenvalues; both can lose the bet.




Figure 1: True network structures used in simulation study. The first network is a curie-weiss network: a fully connected network in which all edges have the same strength. The second network is a random sparse network. All edge weights are 0.25.

### Estimating an Ising model when the truth is dense

Here we illustrate the effect that the estimation procedure has on the resulting Ising model in two examples. First, we simulated 1,000 observations from the true models shown in Figure 1. The first model is called a *Curie-Weiss model* (Kac, 1968), which is fully connected and in which all edges have the same strength (here set to 0.25). This network is a true rank-1 network, which has been shown to be equivalent to an unidimensional Rasch model (Marsman et al., 2015), in which all indicators are interchangeable. Figure 2 shows the results using three different estimation methods—sequential univariate logistic regressions for unregularized estimation (Epskamp et al., in press), the IsingFit R package (van Borkulo & Epskamp, 2014) for LASSO estimation and a rank-1 approximation (Marsman et al., 2015)—on the first  $n$  number of rows in the simulated dataset. It can be seen that the unregularized estimation shows many spurious differences in edge strength including even many negative edges. LASSO performs better, but estimates a sparse model in which edge weights vary and many edges are estimated to be exactly zero. The Rank-1 approximation works best in capturing the model, which is not surprising since the true model is a rank-1 network.




Figure 2: Examples of estimated network structures when the true network is a Curie-Weiss network, using different sample sizes and estimation methods. Graphs were drawn using the qgraph package (Sacha Epskamp et al., 2012) without setting a maximum value (the strongest edge in each network has full saturation and width).




Figure 3: Examples of estimated network structures when the true network is sparse, using different sample sizes and estimation methods. Graphs were drawn using the qgraph package (Sacha Epskamp et al., 2012) without setting a maximum value (the strongest edge in each network has full saturation and width).

The second model in Figure 1 corresponds to a sparse network in which 20% randomly chosen edge strengths are set to 0.25 and the remaining edge strengths are set to 0 (indicating no edge). As Figure 3 shows, LASSO now performs very well in capturing the true underlying structure. Since both the unregularized estimation and the rank-1 approximation estimate a dense network they have a very poor specificity (many false positive edges). In addition, the rank-1 approximation performs very poor in capturing the underlying true model structure. Thus, this example serves to show that LASSO and low-rank approximations only work well when the assumptions on the true underlying model are met. In particular, using a low-rank approximation when the truth is sparse will result in many false positives, whereas using a LASSO when the truth is dense will result in many false negatives. In addition, even when the true model is a model in which every node is interchangeable, the LASSO would still return a model in which nodes could be interpreted to not be interchangeable.

For the second example, we simulated data under the latent variable model as shown in Figure 4, using an MIRT model (Reckase, 2009). In this model, the symptoms for Dysthymia and Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD) were taken from the supplementary materials of Boschloo and colleagues (2015), with the exception of the GAD symptom “sleep disturbance”, which we split in two: insomnia and hypersomnia. The item discriminations of each symptom were set to 1 to indicate






Figure 4: Multi-dimensional IRT model (MIRT) used in simulating data. All latent variables were normally distributed with standard deviation of 1 and all symptoms were binary. The edges in this model correspond to item discrimination parameters.

symptoms are interchangeable and item difficulties were set to 0. All latent variables were simulated to be normally distributed with a standard deviation of 1, and the correlation between dysthymia and GAD was set to 0.55, in line with the empirically estimated comorbidity (Kessler, Chiu, Demler, & Walters, 2005). Nodes 2 and 3 in dysthymia and nodes 6 and 7 in GAD are mutually exclusive, which we modeled by adding orthogonal factors with slightly higher item discriminations of 1.1 and -1.1. Furthermore, nodes 7, 8, 9 and 10 of dysthymia are identical to nodes 6, 7, 8 and 9 of GAD respectively, which we modeled by adding orthogonal factors with item discriminations of 0.75. While these nodes appear the same, they do not correlate 1 typically because a skip structure is imposed in datasets such as the one analyzed by Boschloo and colleagues. We did not impose a skip structure to keep the simulation study simple. Such shared symptoms are termed *bridge symptoms* in network analysis, as they are assumed to connect the clusters of disorders and explain comorbidity (Borsboom et al., 2011; Cramer et al., 2010). In sum, the model shown in Figure 1 generates data that is plausible given the latent disease conceptualization of psychopathology.

Figure 5 shows the simulated and recovered network structures. First we simulated 10,000,000 observations from this model, and estimated the corresponding Ising model using non-regularized estimation by framing the Ising Model as a log-linear model (Agresti, 1990; Epskamp et al., in press; estimation done using the IsingSampler package, Epskamp, 2014). Panel (a) shows the results, which give a




Figure 5: Estimated network structures based on data generated by the MIRT model in Figure 4.

good proxy of the true corresponding Ising structure. It can be seen that the true model is dense, indicators of the disorders cluster together, two negative connections are formed between the mutually exclusive indicators and bridging connections are formed between the shared indicators. Next, we simulated 1,000 observations from the model in Figure 1 and estimated the Ising Model in various ways. Panel (b) shows unregularized estimation via a log-linear model, and shows many spurious strong connections, including much more negative connections than present in the true model. As such, panel (b) highlights our need to regularize, even in a sizable dataset of 1,000 observations for a 19-node network. The simulated data has 22.2 observations for every parameter, much more than the 4.9 observations per parameter in the work of Boschloo and colleagues. As such, panel (a) shows that even in the high sample size of 34,653 subjects and when more subjects are measured than parameters are present in the model, it can still be advisable to use some form of regularization, as is done by Boschloo and colleagues in using the LASSO. Panel (c)

shows the result from using LASSO (using the IsingFit package; van Borkulo et al., 2014). In this model, the clustering is generally retrieved, two of the bridging connections are retrieved and one negative connection is retrieved. However, the resulting structure is much more sparse than the true model, and interpreting this structure could lead to the same conclusions as made by Boschloo and colleagues (2015): the number of connections differ across symptoms, connections strengths varied considerably across symptoms and relatively few connections connect the two disorders. Finally, panel (d) shows the result of a rank-2 approximation, which is equivalent to a two-factor model. Here, it can be seen that while a dense structure is retrieved that shows the correct clustering, violations of the clustering—the negative and bridging edges—are not retrieved.

### Conclusion

Network estimation has grown increasingly popular in psychopathological research. The estimation of network structures, such as the Ising model, is a complicated problem due to the fast growing number of parameters to be estimated. Figures 2, 3 and 5 show that estimating an Ising model even with a relatively large sample size results in poor estimates without the use of some form of constraint on the parameter space. Two such constraints are to limit the size and number of non-zero parameters (LASSO) or to reduce the rank of a network (low-rank approximation). It is important to realize that using such an estimation method makes an assumption on the underlying true model structure: the LASSO assumes a sparse structure whereas low-rank approximation assumes a dense but low rank structure. These assumptions cannot be validated by investigating the results of the estimation methods; the LASSO always gives a sparse structure, which does not mean that the true underlying structure could not have been dense. On the other hand, low-rank approximations rarely produce sparse structures, but that does not mean that the true underlying structure could not have been sparse.

Figure 2 illustrated this point by showing that LASSO estimation when the true network structure is a Curie-Weiss model still results in a sparse structure. This means that observing any of the sparse structures shown in Figure 2 does not mean that the nodes in the network could not represent interchangeable indicators of a single latent trait. Figure 5 illustrates this point again in a plausible scenario in psychopathology, and furthermore shows that when the true network structure is complicated and neither sparse nor low-rank, as is the case here, all regularization

methods fail partly even when using a relatively high sample size. As such, interpreting the sparsity of such a structure is meaningless; the LASSO resulting in a sparse model gives as little evidence for the true model being sparse, as a low-rank approximation returning a dense model gives evidence for the true model being dense. Those characteristics from the networks we obtain are a consequence of the method used for estimating a network structure, specifically the assumptions made by the used method about the data generating network structure, pollute the resulting estimated model (Kruis & Maris, 2015).

Recently it has been demonstrated that equivalent mathematical representations exist for statistical models that assume either a common cause (latent variable) or reciprocal affect (network) relation, between an unobservable psychological phenomenon of interest and the process by which data is generated on the measures of its indicators (Epskamp et al., in press; Marsman et al., 2015; Kruis & Maris, in preparation). Consequently, when a model from one of these frameworks can sufficiently describe the associative structure of the measured variables, there exists an alternative representation from the other framework that can equally well describe the structure of the data. With respect to Boschloo and colleagues, for example, their sparse network structure resulting from the application of the LASSO to the data, can likely also be described by a multidimensional latent variable model, with a single latent variable for each clique in the network, and residual correlations. The realization that the network structure we obtain from our data is both dependent upon the procedure that we use to estimate this structure, and can subsequently even be interpreted in theoretically very distinct ways, has an important implication. Namely, it shows that the application of a model to data is in itself meaningless, without the attachment of some fundamental theory about the psychological phenomena we are trying to measure (Kruis & Maris, in preparation).

Our aim here is therefore not to say that one method of estimating network structures should be preferred over another, or that estimating network structures is wrong. On the contrary, network models show great promise in mapping out and visualizing relationships present in the data and are a powerful tool in grasping high dimensional multivariate relationships. In addition, network models can be powerful tools to estimate the backbones of potential causal relationships, if those relationships are assumed to exist. Using the LASSO to estimate such network structures is a powerful tool in performing fast high-dimensional model selection that results in very

little false positives, and interpreting network structures obtained from the LASSO can give great insight in strong relationships present in the dataset. Our aim is to make clear that the choice of estimation method is not a trivial thing, and can greatly impact both the estimated structure as well as any conclusion drawn from that structure. In the particular cases described here, using LASSO estimation will result in a sparse structure, and using a low-rank approximation will result in a dense low-rank result. That is what these methods do, so be careful what you wish for

### References

- Agresti, A. (1990). *Categorical data analysis*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association.
- Borsboom, D., & Cramer, A. O. J. (2013). Network Analysis: An Integrative Approach to the Structure of Psychopathology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 9, 91–121.
- Borsboom, D., Cramer, A. O. J., Schmittmann, V. D., Epskamp, S., & Waldorp, L. J. (2011). The Small World of Psychopathology. *PLoS ONE*, 11, e27407.
- Boschloo, L., Van Borkulo, C. D., Rhemtulla, M., Keyes, K. M., Borsboom, D., & Schoevers, R. A. (2015). The network structure of symptoms of the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. *PLoS ONE*, 10, e0137621.
- Chen, J., & Chen, Z. (2008). Extended Bayesian information criteria for model selection with large model spaces. *Biometrika*, 95, 759–771.
- Cramer, A. O. J., Borsboom, D., Aggen, S. H., & Kendler, K. S. (2012). The pathoplasticity of dysphoric episodes: differential impact of stressful life events on the pattern of depressive symptom inter-correlations. *Psychological Medicine*, 42, 957–965.
- Cramer, A. O. J., Waldorp, L. J., van der Maas, H. L. J., & Borsboom, D. (2010). Comorbidity: a network perspective. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 137–150.
- Dalege, J., Borsboom, D., van Harreveld, F., van den Berg, H., Conner, M., & van der Maas, H. L. J. (2016). Toward a formalized account of attitudes: The Causal Attitude Network (CAN) model. *Psychological Review*, 123, 2.
- Epskamp, S. (2014). IsingSampler: Sampling methods and distribution functions for

- the Ising model. Retrieved from [github.com/SachaEpskamp/IsingSampler](https://github.com/SachaEpskamp/IsingSampler).
- Epskamp, S., Borsboom, D., & Fried, E. I. (in preparation). Estimating psychological networks and their stability: a tutorial paper.
- 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), 1–18.
- Epskamp, S., Maris, G., Waldorp, L. J., & Borsboom, D. (in press). Network Psychometrics. In P. Irwing, D. Hughes, & T. Booth (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychometrics*. New York, NY, USA: Wiley.
- Foygel Barber, R., & Drton, M. (2015). High-dimensional Ising model selection with Bayesian information criteria. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9, 567–607.
- Foygel, R., & Drton, M. (2010). Extended Bayesian information criteria for Gaussian graphical models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 23, 604–612.
- Fried, E. I., Bockting, C., Arjadi, R., Borsboom, D., Amshoff, M., Cramer, O. J., ... Stroebe, M. (2015). From loss to loneliness: The relationship between bereavement and depressive symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 124, 256–265.
- Friedman, J. H., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models via Coordinate Descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 33, 1–22.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (2014). glasso: Graphical lasso- estimation of Gaussian graphical models. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/package=glasso>
- Ising, E. (1925). Beitrag zur theorie des ferromagnetismus. *Zeitschrift Für Physik A Hadrons and Nuclei*, 31, 253–258.
- Isvoranu, A., van Borkulo, C. D., Boyette, L., Wigman, J. T. W., Vinkers, C. H., Borsboom, D., & GROUP Investigators. (in press). A Network Approach to Psychosis: Pathways between Childhood Trauma and Psychotic Symptoms. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*.
- Kac, M. (1968). *Mathematical mechanism of phase transition*. New York, NY: Gordon & Breach.
- Kessler, R. C., Chiu, W. T., Demler, O., & Walters, E. E. (2005). Prevalence, severity, and comorbidity of 12-month DSM-IV disorders in the National

- Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 62, 617–627.
- Kossakowski, J. J., Epskamp, S., Kieffer, J. M., van Borkulo, C. D., Rhemtulla, M., & Borsboom, D. (2015). The application of a network approach to Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQoL): introducing a new method for assessing HRQoL in healthy adults and cancer patients. *Quality of Life Research*, 1–12.
- Kruis, J., & Maris, G. (2015). *The alternative bet on sparsity*. In Kruis, J., *On the Mathematical Equivalence, Biological Plausibility, & Sparsity Assumptions of Network Models* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Kruis, J., & Maris, G. (2016). *Three representations of the Ising model*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Langley, D. J., Wijn, R., Epskamp, S., & Van Bork, R. (2015). Should I Get That Job? Exploring Influence to Encourage Vaccination via Online Social Media. *ECIS 2015 Research-in-Progress Papers*. Paper 64.
- Lauritzen, S. L. (1996). *Graphical models*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Marsman, M., Maris, G., Bechger, T., & Glas, C. (2015). Bayesian inference for low-rank Ising networks. *Scientific Reports*, 5 (9050), 1–7.
- Pearl, J. (2000). *Causality: models, reasoning and inference* (Vol. 29). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ Press.
- Reckase, M. D. (2009). *Multidimensional item response theory*. New York, NY, USA: Springer.
- Rhemtulla, M., Fried, E. I., Aggen, S. H., Tuerlinckx, F., Kendler, K. S., & Borsboom, D. (2016). Network analysis of substance abuse and dependence symptoms. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 161, 230–237.
- Schmittmann, V. D., Cramer, A. O. J., 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.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 267–288.
- Van Borkulo, C., Boschloo, L., Borsboom, D., Penninx, B. W. J. H., Waldorp, L. J., & Schoevers, R. A. (2015). Association of Symptom Network Structure With the Course of Longitudinal Depression. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 72 (12), 1157–1264.
- van Borkulo, C. D., Borsboom, D., Epskamp, S., Blanken, T. F., Boschloo, L., Schoevers, R. A., & Waldorp, L. J. (2014b). A new method for constructing

- networks from binary data. *Nature: Scientific Reports*, 4 (5918).
- van Borkulo, C. D., & Epskamp, S. (2014). IsingFit: Fitting Ising models using the eLasso method. Retrieved from <http://cran.r-project.org/package=IsingFit>
- van de Leemput, I. a, Wickers, M., Cramer, A. O. J., Borsboom, D., Tuerlinckx, F., Kuppens, P., ... Scheffer, M. (2014). Critical slowing down as early warning for the onset and termination of depression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111, 87–92.
- Wichers M., Groot P.C., Psychosystems, ESM Group, EWS Group (2016). Critical Slowing Down as a Personalized Early Warning Signal for Depression. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 85, 114–116.