**Supplemental Methods**

**Measures**

**Daily domains of PD.** Four factor-analytically derived domains of daily personality pathology were created from 16 daily diary items that were designed to capture day-to-day expressions of PDs (Wright et al., 2015). When participants were missing a data point, typically the score was imputed by averaging the scores from the previous and following two days. Of all of the data points across participants, less than 7% were imputed. Across the sample, the percentage of missing data points ranged from 0 to 19.4% (*M* = 6.52%; *SD* = 5.26%), and 23 participants had over 10% missing. Only four participants had two or more adjacent data points missing; three of them had one instance of two adjacent missing data points, one of them had one instance of two adjacent missing data points and one instance of three adjacent missing data points. When one of the two prior data points was an imputed value, we took an average of the two prior data points and the two latter data points. When one of the two data points after were missing, we took an average of the two prior data points and one data point after (the value that was not missing). For data points that were followed by two missing data points, we imputed the value by taking an average of the two previous data points only.

**Data Analysis**

**GIMME model selection.** Since GIMME model fitting is data-driven, multiple solutions can occur when two connections (e.g., usually contemporaneous connections from A to B or B to A) could equally improve model fit at a given iteration. To address this, each solution path (i.e., A to B and B to A) is followed (until it fits the data well), and then solutions are compared (Beltz and Molenaar, 2016).Out of the 91 time series (91 participants) submitted to GIMME analyses that were included in the final sample, 77 time series resulted in multiple solutions. In each case, each model structure that was produced was reviewed to determine whether two of four alternative indices met criteria that indicate excellent fit (Brown, 2014): root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) < .05, standardize root mean residual (SRMR) < .05, comparative fit index (CFI) > .95, and non-normed fit index (NNFI) > .95. All solutions must also be identified. Following recommended procedures (Beltz and Molenaar, 2016), model structures that did not meet these requirements were discarded. The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC; Akaike, 1974) was used to compare the remaining solutions, which has been validated in previous simulation studies (Beltz and Molenaar, 2016). The model solution with the lowest AIC was selected as the final model solution for that participant. In rare cases (*n*=5), model solutions demonstrated equivalent AICs, but included different significant connections. In these instances, we examined the standard errors and chose the model solution with the lowest values or that would have presumably been selected by the original GIMME program (that does not generate multiple solutions).

***a posteriori* model validation.** GIMME produces models with contemporaneous and first order lagged connections, meaning that the lagged connections represent estimates at one time point prior (i.e., 1 day before), with the assumption that the model residuals are white noise (i.e., all temporal information is captured by the modeled connections). The individual-level models must be submitted to *a posteriori* validation to verify this assumption (as described in Beltz and Molenaar, 2015). If the validation process indicates that the first order connections did not sufficiently capture all sequential dependencies in each participant’s data (according to white noise tests), then higher order lagged connections (i.e., estimates at two or three days prior) are added to the model. White noise tests were carried out in LISREL (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1992). The tests were evaluated with the same alternative fit indices and criteria as the final models. When residuals were not white noise, Lagrange Multiplier equivalents (modification indices; Sörbom, 1989) were used to add second order connections to individual-level maps, then white noise tests were repeated. If residuals were still not white noise, modification indices were used to add third order connections to individual-level maps. If the third order connections did not significantly improve model fit, then we used the second order model that met standards of acceptable fit (i.e., one, but not two, of the four alternative fit indices met the criteria for excellent fit). The first order connections were sufficient for 78 participants (85.7% of sample). A minority of participants required lag 2 connections (12.1%) or lag 3 connections (2.20%). When estimating higher order models, we similarly generated multiple model solutions and chose the model solution that met the criteria for alternative fit indices and had the lowest AIC for each individual. Although higher-order lagged connections were included within individual maps to accurately represent network connectivity, network features were calculated only using first-order connections, as these parameters were present across all participants. Participants with first order models did not statistically differ in gender, age, daily levels of domains, or any PD symptom count, from participants with second or third order models (all *p*s> .05). To determine whether associations were driven by participants with higher-order models, all analyses were also repeated excluding the few individuals who had lags of 2 or 3 in their models. In the smaller sample (*n*=78), the pattern of results was the same in terms of the effect sizes of associations; see Supplemental Table 2.

**Supplemental Discussion**

**Future Applications: Applying GIMME to Narcissistic Personality Disorder**

GIMME-MS is particularly well-suited to explicitly test hypotheses within recent models on the interpersonal dynamics of PDs (Hopwood, 2018). Interpersonal models of PD emphasize the relevance of social situations that occur frequently within an individual’s day-to-day life, which are influenced by and trigger specific expressions of pathology. For instance, clinical reports of narcissistic personality disorder describe distinct states of both grandiosity and vulnerability (Wright and Edershile, 2018, Hopwood, 2018). In the interpersonal model of PD, narcissistic personality disorder is thought to be characterized by perceptions of threat to one’s feelings of superiority, resulting in feelings of anxiety and envy and a desire to assert one’s self, which leads to displays of grandiosity (Hopwood, 2018). The other person would likely respond negatively to such displays, and perhaps become competitive, reinforcing this sequence (i.e., individual with narcissistic personality disorder perceives a status threat) (Wright et al., 2017). Thus, GIMME-MS could be used to study the extent to which an individual fluctuates between grandiosity and vulnerability, and factors that impact this fluctuation.


To implement this in a study, individuals would receive several specific queries throughout the day (i.e., morning, afternoon, and evening) about any interpersonal situations that they encountered. For each encounter, participants would respond to probes regarding their interaction, emotional state, goals during the interaction, and resulting behavior; they would also be asked about the response of the other individual (informed by the elements of the interpersonal sequence described by Hopwood, 2018). In line with previous applications of GIMME, 100 completed encounter surveys, would be collected (see Beltz and Gates, 2017 for a GIMME tutorial). Responses would be coded and used in a GIMME network that included nodes for the extent to which different types of perceptions (e.g., status threat, abandonment), affect (e.g., anxiety, anger), motives (e.g., agency, communion), and behaviors (e.g., grandiosity, vulnerability) were present in the situation, and results would demonstrate whether the proposed connections (‘edges’) were both present and in the expected direction and temporal order.

In the proposed interpersonal model, for individuals with narcissistic symptoms, we hypothesize the detection of a group-level contemporaneous connection (reflecting homogeneity) for the perception of status threat predicting anxiety affect, and a contemporaneous connection of anxious affect predicting agency motives. Individual-level connections would reveal the extent to which interpersonal sequences predict either expressions of grandiosity (i.e., contemporaneous connection from agency motive to grandiose) or vulnerability (i.e., contemporaneous connection from agency motive to vulnerable), and the interplay between these behaviors (i.e., contemporaneous or lagged connections between grandiosity and vulnerability). Moreover, the presence of lagged connections of behaviors predicting perceptions (i.e., grandiose behavior from a previous interpersonal encounter predicts current perception of status threat) would indicate that interpersonal sequences were reinforcing for a given individual.


Further, beyond providing more insight into the underlying dynamic processes and heterogeneity of clinical expression, GIMME networks could be reviewed to identify potential targets of treatment and to develop more effective strategies tailored to an individual’s unique network of pathology. For example, based on the interpersonal sequences within GIMME networks, clinicians may focus on evaluating specific automatic thoughts reflecting the perceptions that precipitate interpersonal sequences (e.g., “He thinks he’s better than me. I’ll show him.”) or may introduce specific emotion regulation strategies depending on the type of affect that is predictive of harmful behaviors (e.g., emotion regulation for anger versus sadness).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplemental Table 1. Regression Analyses between Network Features and Baseline Personality Disorder Symptom Counts, Controlling for Average Ratings of Daily Domains of Personality Pathology and Age in the Entire Sample (N = 91) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Borderline | | | Narcissistic | | | Avoidant | | | Obsessive-compulsive | | | Paranoid | | | Schizotypal | | |
|  | B | SE | β | B | SE | β | B | SE | β | B | SE | β | B | SE | β | B | SE | β |
| Model: Auto-regressive NA | -1.39 | .79 | -.18+ | -.34 | .68 | -.05 | -.07 | .41 | -.02 | .65 | .41 | .17 | -.84 | .45 | -.17+ | -.89 | .65 | -.15 |
| Daily average NA | .47 | .44 | .19 | -.05 | .38 | -.02 | .58 | .23 | .43\* | -.07 | .23 | -.05 | .02 | .25 | .01 | .56 | .36 | .28 |
| Daily average DET | .35 | .39 | .14 | .16 | .34 | .07 | .11 | .20 | .08 | -.01 | .21 | -.01 | .50 | .23 | .31\* | -.22 | .32 | -.11 |
| Daily average DIS | -.54 | .96 | -.10 | .21 | .82 | .05 | -.55 | .49 | -.20 | .78 | .50 | .30 | -.22 | .55 | -.07 | -.22 | .79 | -.05 |
| Daily average HOS | .79 | .89 | .15 | 1.08 | .76 | .25 | -.24 | .46 | -.09 | -.23 | .46 | -.09 | 1.06 | .51 | .33\* | .97 | .73 | .24 |
| Age | -.07 | .03 | -.24\* | -.03 | .02 | -.14 | -.05 | .01 | -.31\*\* | .01 | .02 | .10 | -.04 | .02 | -.24\* | -.02 | .02 | -.09 |
| *R2*, *F* | .18, 3.04\* | | | .12, 1.91+ | | | .24, 4.47\*\* | | | .08, 1.15 | | | .32, 6.53\*\*\* | | | .13, 2.08+ | | |
| Model: Auto-regressive DET | 1.23 | .74 | .17 | .87 | .63 | .14 | -.20 | .38 | -.05 | .53 | .39 | .15 | .13 | .43 | .03 | .77 | .61 | .13 |
| Daily average NA | .49 | .44 | .19 | -.02 | .38 | -.01 | .57 | .23 | .42\* | -.03 | .23 | -.03 | .01 | .26 | .00 | .56 | .36 | .28 |
| Daily average DET | .30 | .39 | .12 | .12 | .34 | .06 | .12 | .20 | .09 | -.03 | .21 | -.02 | .49 | .23 | .31\* | -.25 | .32 | -.12 |
| Daily average DIS | -.37 | .95 | -.07 | .26 | .81 | .06 | -.55 | .49 | -.19 | .71 | .50 | .27 | -.13 | .56 | -.04 | -.11 | .78 | -.03 |
| Daily average HOS | .63 | .88 | .12 | 1.09 | .75 | .25 | -.27 | .45 | -.10 | -.08 | .46 | -.03 | .92 | .51 | .28+ | .86 | .72 | .21 |
| Age | -.06 | .03 | -.20\* | -.03 | .02 | -.12 | -.05 | .01 | -.31\*\* | .01 | .01 | .09 | -.04 | .02 | -.22\* | -.02 | .02 | -.07 |
| *R2*, *F* | .18, 2.97\* | | | .14, 2.23\* | | | .24, 4.52\*\* | | | .07, 1.03 | | | .29, 5.74\*\*\* | | | .13, 2.03+ | | |
| Model: Auto-regressive DIS | -2.40 | .86 | -.31\*\* | -.18 | .76 | -.03 | .18 | .45 | .04 | 1.11 | .45 | .29\* | -.28 | .51 | -.06 | -.32 | .73 | -.05 |
| Daily average NA | .73 | .44 | .29 | -.03 | .39 | -.02 | .55 | .23 | .41\* | -.19 | .23 | -.15 | .04 | .27 | .02 | .57 | .38 | .29 |
| Daily average DET | .30 | .38 | .12 | .15 | .34 | .07 | .12 | .20 | .08 | .01 | .20 | .01 | .50 | .23 | .31\* | -.22 | .33 | -.11 |
| Daily average DIS | -.05 | .94 | -.01 | .28 | .83 | .06 | -.57 | .49 | -.20 | .55 | .49 | .21 | -.09 | .56 | -.03 | -.07 | .80 | -.02 |
| Daily average HOS | .40 | .85 | .08 | 1.01 | .76 | .24 | -.24 | .45 | -.09 | -.05 | .45 | -.02 | .89 | .51 | .28+ | .78 | .73 | .19 |
| Age | -.07 | .03 | -.26\* | -.03 | .02 | -.14 | -.04 | .01 | -.20\*\* | .02 | .01 | .13 | -.04 | .02 | -.23\* | -.02 | .02 | -.08 |
| *R2*, *F* | .22, 3.95\*\* | | | .12, 1.88+ | | | .24, 4.49\*\* | | | .11, 1.76 | | | .29, 5.79\*\*\* | | | .11, 1.76 | | |
| Model: Auto-regressive HOS | .33 | .91 | .04 | .64 | .77 | .10 | .25 | .46 | .06 | 1.16 | .46 | .30\* | -.44 | .52 | -.09 | -1.01 | .74 | -.16 |
| Daily average NA | .43 | .45 | .17 | -.08 | .38 | -.04 | .57 | .23 | .42\* | -.09 | .23 | -.08 | .02 | .26 | .01 | .57 | .36 | .28 |
| Daily average DET | .34 | .40 | .13 | .15 | .34 | .07 | .11 | .20 | .08 | -.02 | .20 | -.02 | .51 | .23 | .31\* | -.21 | .32 | -.10 |
| Daily average DIS | -.30 | 1.00 | -.06 | .44 | .85 | .10 | -.47 | .51 | -.17 | 1.04 | .50 | .40\* | -.26 | .57 | -.08 | -.41 | .81 | -.10 |
| Daily average HOS | .39 | .98 | .08 | .73 | .83 | .17 | -.37 | .50 | -.13 | -.64 | .49 | -.25 | 1.11 | .56 | .34+ | 1.26 | .79 | .31 |
| Age | -.06 | .03 | -.21\* | -.03 | .02 | -.12 | -.05 | .01 | -.30\*\* | .01 | .01 | .10 | -.04 | .02 | -.22\* | -02 | .02 | -.09 |
| *R2*, *F* | .14, 2.46\* | | | .13, 2.00+ | | | .24, 4.53\*\* | | | .12, 1.84 | | | .30, 5.89\*\*\* | | | .13, 2.08+ | | |
| Model: Within-Degree Int | -.31 | .38 | -.08 | -.27 | .33 | -.09 | -.01 | .20 | -.00 | .35 | .20 | .19+ | -.43 | .22 | -.18\* | -.10 | .32 | -.03 |
| Daily average NA | .39 | .45 | .15 | -.10 | .38 | -.05 | .57 | .23 | .42\* | .01 | .23 | .01 | -.07 | .25 | -.05 | .52 | .37 | .26 |
| Daily average DET | .40 | .40 | .16 | .20 | .34 | .09 | .11 | .20 | .08 | -.07 | .21 | -.05 | .57 | .23 | .36\* | -.20 | .33 | -.10 |
| Daily average DIS | -.37 | .97 | -.07 | .27 | .82 | .06 | -.55 | .49 | -.19 | .68 | .50 | .26 | -.10 | .54 | -.03 | -.11 | .79 | -.03 |
| Daily average HOS | .51 | .89 | .10 | 1.00 | .75 | .23 | -.26 | .45 | -.09 | -.09 | .46 | -.03 | .87 | .50 | .27+ | .79 | .73 | .19 |
| Age | -.06 | .03 | -.22\* | -.03 | .02 | -.14 | -.05 | .01 | -.31\*\* | .01 | .01 | .10 | -.04 | .02 | -.23\* | -.02 | .02 | -.08 |
| *R2* , *F* | .15, 2.55\* | | | .13, 1.99+ | | | .24, 4.46\*\* | | | .08, 1.24 | | | .32, 6.67\*\*\* | | | .11, 1.75 | | |
| Model: Within-Degree Ext | .00 | .41 | .00 | .43 | .34 | .15 | -.02 | .21 | -.01 | .61 | .20 | .36\*\* | -.11 | .23 | -.05 | .04 | .33 | .02 |
| Daily average NA | .44 | .45 | .17 | -.11 | .38 | -.05 | .58 | .23 | .43\* | -.13 | .22 | -.10 | .02 | .26 | .01 | .53 | .37 | .26 |
| Daily average DET | .35 | .40 | .14 | .14 | .34 | .07 | .11 | .20 | .08 | -.03 | .20 | -.03 | .50 | .23 | .31\* | -.22 | .33 | -.11 |
| Daily average DIS | -.39 | .98 | -.07 | .42 | .82 | .10 | -.56 | .50 | -.20 | .95 | .49 | .36+ | -.17 | .56 | -.05 | -.10 | .80 | -.02 |
| Daily average HOS | .54 | .95 | .11 | .66 | .80 | .16 | -.24 | .48 | -.09 | -.62 | .47 | -.25 | 1.00 | .55 | .31+ | .77 | .78 | .19 |
| Age | -.06 | .03 | -.21\* | -.02 | .02 | -.10 | -.05 | .01 | -.31\*\* | .02 | .01 | .15 | -.04 | .02 | -.23\* | -.02 | .02 | -.07 |
| *R2*, *F* | .15, 2.43\* | | | .13, 2.16+ | | | .24, 4.46\*\* | | | .14, 2.31\* | | | .29, 5.77\*\*\* | | | .11, 1.73 | | |
| Model: Between-Degree Ext & Int | .75 | .32 | .24\* | .57 | .27 | .22\* | .00 | .17 | .00 | -.15 | .17 | -.10 | .18 | .19 | .09 | .45 | .27 | .18+ |
| Daily average NA | .63 | .44 | .16 | .09 | .38 | .04 | .57 | .23 | .43\* | -.09 | .24 | -.07 | .05 | .26 | .03 | .65 | .37 | .32+ |
| Daily average DET | .33 | .39 | .13 | .14 | .33 | .07 | .11 | .20 | .08 | -.00 | .21 | -.00 | .50 | .23 | .31\* | -.23 | .32 | -.11 |
| Daily average DIS | -1.01 | .98 | -.19 | -.23 | .83 | -.05 | -.55 | .51 | -.19 | .83 | .52 | .32 | -.28 | .58 | -.08 | -.49 | .81 | -.12 |
| Daily average HOS | .81 | .87 | .16 | 1.23 | .74 | .29 | -.25 | .45 | -.09 | -.17 | .47 | -.07 | .98 | .51 | .30+ | .96 | .72 | .24 |
| Age | -.06 | .03 | -.23\* | -.03 | .02 | -.15 | -.05 | .01 | -.31\*\* | .01 | .02 | .09 | -.04 | .02 | -.22\* | -.02 | .02 | -.09 |
| *R2*, *F* | .20,3.48\*\* | | | .16, 2.68\* | | | .24, 4.46\*\* | | | .06, .85 | | | .30, 5.93\*\*\* | | | .14, 2.25\* | | |
| Note. + *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001. NA = negative affect. DET= detachment. DIS= disinhibition. HOS= hostility. Int= internalizing. Ext= externalizing. 11 models were run separately with a given personality disorder as the outcome (i.e., 11 models, one per network feature, with borderline symptom count as the outcome). In each model, one network feature served as the predictor, and there were five covariates including each of the daily levels of the four personality domains (i.e., negative affect, detachment, disinhibition, and hostility) and age. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplemental Table 2. Regression Analyses between Network Features and Baseline Personality Disorder Symptom Counts, Controlling for Average Ratings of Daily Domains of Personality Pathology and Age Only in Participants with First Order Models (N = 78) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Borderline | | | Narcissistic | | | Avoidant | | | Obsessive-compulsive | | | Paranoid | | | Schizotypal | | |
|  | B | SE | β | B | SE | β | B | SE | β | B | SE | β | B | SE | β | B | SE | β |
| Model: Auto-regressive NA | -1.62 | .86 | -.21+ | -.08 | .79 | -.01 | -.30 | .45 | -.07 | .48 | .46 | .12 | -.78 | .48 | -.16 | -.1.18 | .75 | -.19 |
| Daily average NA | .57 | .48 | .21 | -.07 | .44 | -.03 | .66 | .25 | .46\* | .13 | .26 | .10 | -.13 | .27 | -.08 | .60 | .42 | .28 |
| Daily average DET | .45 | .39 | .18 | .17 | .36 | .08 | .10 | .21 | .07 | -.10 | .21 | -.08 | .61 | .22 | .39\*\* | -.27 | .34 | -.13 |
| Daily average DIS | -.84 | .94 | -.16 | .36 | .87 | .08 | -.68 | .50 | -.24 | .68 | .50 | .27 | -.15 | .53 | -.05 | -.26 | .82 | -.06 |
| Daily average HOS | .97 | .87 | .19 | 1.00 | .81 | .23 | -.17 | .46 | -.06 | -.23 | .47 | -.09 | 1.24 | .49 | .40 | .93 | .76 | .23 |
| Age | -.08 | .03 | -.30\*\* | -.03 | .03 | -.15 | -.05 | .02 | -.35\*\* | .01 | .02 | .04 | -.04 | .02 | -.25\* | -.03 | .03 | -.12 |
| *R2*, *F* | .23, 3.54\*\* | | | .12, 1.68 | | | .26, 4.19\*\* | | | .08, .95 | | | .37, 6.96\*\*\* | | | .12, 1.61 | | |
| Model: Auto-regressive DET | .72 | .78 | .10 | .66 | .70 | .11 | -.70 | .40 | -.18+ | .39 | .41 | .11 | -.18 | .44 | -.04 | .44 | .67 | .08 |
| Daily average NA | .48 | .49 | .18 | -.08 | .44 | -.03 | .65 | .25 | .45\* | .15 | .26 | .12 | -.17 | .27 | -.10 | .54 | .42 | .25 |
| Daily average DET | .44 | .40 | .17 | .16 | .36 | .07 | .11 | .20 | .08 | -.10 | .21 | -.08 | .61 | .22 | .39\*\* | -.28 | .35 | -.13 |
| Daily average DIS | -.59 | .95 | -.11 | .41 | .86 | .09 | -.67 | .49 | -.24 | .63 | .50 | .25 | -.05 | .53 | -.02 | -.08 | .82 | -.02 |
| Daily average HOS | .74 | .88 | .15 | 1.03 | .79 | .24 | -.27 | .45 | -.10 | -.12 | .46 | -.05 | 1.09 | .49 | .35\* | .76 | .76 | .19 |
| Age | -.07 | .03 | -.25\* | -.03 | .03 | -.14 | -.05 | .02 | -.34 | .00 | .02 | .02 | -.04 | .02 | -.22\* | -.02 | .03 | -.08 |
| *R2*, *F* | .20, 2.98\* | | | .14, 1.84 | | | .29, 4.78\*\*\* | | | .07, .92 | | | .35, 6.33\*\*\* | | | .09, 1.23 | | |
| Model: Auto-regressive DIS | -2.01 | .92 | -.27\*\* | .05 | .86 | .01 | .33 | .49 | .08 | **.87** | **.49** | **.23** | -.03 | .53 | -.01 | .02 | .82 | .00 |
| Daily average NA | .86 | .50 | .32+ | -.08 | .47 | -.04 | .58 | .27 | .41\* | -.00 | .27 | -.00 | -.16 | .29 | -.20 | .54 | .45 | .25 |
| Daily average DET | .35 | .39 | .14 | .18 | .37 | .08 | .11 | .21 | .08 | -.05 | .21 | -.04 | .60 | .22 | .39\*\* | -.27 | .35 | -.13 |
| Daily average DIS | -.36 | .93 | -.07 | .37 | .87 | .08 | -.68 | .50 | -.24 | .50 | .50 | .20 | -.04 | .54 | -.01 | -.10 | .83 | -.02 |
| Daily average HOS | .56 | .86 | .11 | .99 | .80 | .23 | -.20 | .46 | -.07 | -.09 | .46 | -.04 | 1.10 | .49 | .36\* | .73 | .76 | .18 |
| Age | -.08 | .03 | -.31\*\* | -.03 | .03 | -.14 | -.05 | .02 | -.32\*\* | .01 | .02 | .05 | -.04 | .02 | -.22\* | -.02 | .03 | -.08 |
| *R2*, *F* | .25, 3.84\*\* | | | .12, 1.67 | | | .26, 4.20\*\* | | | .10, 1.32 | | | .35, 6.29\*\*\* | | | .09, 1.15 | | |
| Model: Auto-regressive HOS | .16 | .96 | .02 | .38 | .87 | .06 | .42 | .49 | .10 | 1.13 | .49 | .31\* | -.71 | .53 | -.15 | -1.37 | .81 | -.22 |
| Daily average NA | .48 | .49 | .18 | -.10 | .44 | -.04 | .61 | .25 | .43\* | .07 | .25 | .06 | -.12 | .27 | -.07 | .64 | .42 | .30 |
| Daily average DET | .45 | .40 | .18 | .18 | .36 | .08 | .09 | .21 | .07 | -.10 | .20 | -.08 | .61 | .22 | .39\*\* | -.27 | .34 | -.13 |
| Daily average DIS | -.57 | .99 | -.11 | .48 | .89 | .11 | -.52 | .51 | -.19 | .92 | .50 | .36+ | -.24 | .54 | -.07 | -.47 | .84 | -.11 |
| Daily average HOS | .62 | .98 | .12 | .82 | .88 | .19 | -.41 | .50 | -.15 | -.64 | .50 | -.26 | 1.42 | .54 | .46\* | 1.33 | ,83 | ,33 |
| Age | -.07 | .03 | -.26\* | -.03 | .03 | -.14 | -.05 | .02 | -.32\*\* | .01 | .02 | .04 | -.04 | .02 | -.24\* | -02 | .03 | -.10 |
| *R2*, *F* | .19, 2.81\* | | | .13, 1.71 | | | .27, 4.26\*\* | | | .13, 1.72 | | | .36, 6.76\*\*\* | | | .12, 1.68 | | |
| Model: Within-Degree Int | -.60 | .41 | -.16 | -.29 | .37 | -.09 | -.22 | .21 | -.11 | .18 | .22 | .10 | -.56 | .22 | -.24\* | -.32 | .36 | -.10 |
| Daily average NA | .46 | .48 | .17 | -.08 | .44 | -.04 | .64 | .25 | .44\* | .16 | .26 | .12 | -.19 | .26 | -.12 | .53 | .42 | .25 |
| Daily average DET | .54 | .40 | .21 | .22 | .37 | .10 | .12 | .21 | .09 | -.12 | .21 | -.10 | .68 | .22 | .44\*\* | -.22 | .35 | -.11 |
| Daily average DIS | -.61 | .94 | -.12 | .38 | .86 | .09 | -.63 | .49 | -.23 | .61 | .50 | .24 | -.03 | .51 | -.01 | -.09 | .82 | -.02 |
| Daily average HOS | .62 | .87 | .12 | .95 | .79 | .22 | -.25 | .45 | -.09 | -.13 | .46 | -.05 | 1.04 | .47 | .34\* | .69 | .76 | .17 |
| Age | -.08 | .03 | -.28\* | -.04 | .03 | -.16 | -.05 | .02 | -.35\*\* | .00 | .02 | .03 | -.04 | .02 | -.26\*\* | -.02 | .03 | -.10 |
| *R2*, *F* | .22, 3.25\*\* | | | .13, 1.78 | | | .27, 4.33\*\* | | | .07, .89 | | | .40, 7.95\*\*\* | | | .10, 1.30 | | |
| Model: Within-Degree Ext | .45 | .44 | .13 | .63 | .39 | .21 | .15 | .23 | .08 | .46 | .23 | .27\* | .01 | .25 | .01 | .11 | .38 | .16 |
| Daily average NA | .39 | .49 | .15 | -.22 | .44 | -.09 | .61 | .26 | .43\* | .05 | .26 | .04 | -.17 | .28 | -.10 | .52 | .43 | .24 |
| Daily average DET | .46 | .40 | .18 | .19 | .36 | .09 | .10 | .21 | .07 | -.08 | .21 | -.07 | .61 | .22 | .39\*\* | -.27 | .35 | -.13 |
| Daily average DIS | -.43 | .97 | -.08 | .64 | .86 | .14 | -.58 | .50 | -.21 | .80 | .50 | .32 | -.04 | .54 | -.01 | -.05 | .84 | -.01 |
| Daily average HOS | .33 | .95 | .07 | .48 | .84 | .11 | -.34 | .49 | -.13 | -.52 | .49 | -.21 | 1.10 | .53 | .36\* | .64 | .82 | .16 |
| Age | -.06 | .03 | -.22\* | -.02 | .03 | -.10 | -.05 | .02 | -.31\*\* | .01 | .02 | .07 | -.04 | .02 | -.22\* | -.02 | .03 | -.07 |
| *R2* , *F* | .20, 3.02\* | | | .16, 2.17+ | | | .26, 4.19\*\* | | | .11, 1.49 | | | .35,6.29\*\*\* | | | .09, 1.17 | | |
| Model: Between-Degree Ext & Int | **.54** | **.36** | **.16** | .64 | .32 | .23\* | -.01 | .19 | -.00 | -.28 | .19 | -.18 | .17 | .20 | .09 | .51 | .31 | .19 |
| Daily average NA | .57 | .48 | .21 | .02 | .43 | .10 | .64 | .25 | .45\* | .11 | .25 | .09 | -.14 | .27 | -.09 | .62 | .42 | .29 |
| Daily average DET | .44 | .40 | .17 | .16 | .35 | .07 | .10 | .21 | .07 | -.09 | .21 | -.07 | .60 | .22 | .39\*\* | -.28 | .34 | -.14 |
| Daily average DIS | -1.01 | .98 | -.19 | -.09 | .87 | -.02 | -.63 | .51 | -.23 | .82 | .52 | .32 | -.17 | .55 | -.05 | -.47 | .84 | -.11 |
| Daily average HOS | .85 | .88 | .17 | 1.18 | .78 | .27 | -.22 | .46 | -.08 | -.23 | .46 | -.10 | 1.16 | .49 | .38\* | .88 | .75 | .22 |
| Age | -.07 | .03 | -.25\* | -.03 | .03 | -.14 | -.05 | .02 | -.33\*\* | .00 | .02 | .01 | -.04 | .02 | -.22\* | -.02 | .03 | -.08 |
| *R2*, *F* | .22, 3.26\*\* | | | .17, 2.43\* | | | .26, 4.10\*\* | | | .09, 1.16 | | | .35, 6.47\*\*\* | | | .12, 1.65 | | |
| Note. + *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001. NA = negative affect. DET= detachment. DIS= disinhibition. HOS= hostility. Int= internalizing. Ext= externalizing. 11 models were run separately with a given personality disorder as the outcome (i.e., 11 models, one per network feature, with borderline symptom count as the outcome). In each model, one network feature served as the predictor, and there were five covariates including each of the daily levels of the four personality domains (i.e., negative affect, detachment, disinhibition, and hostility) and age. Bolded values represent beta weights that were significant in the full sample but not significant in this smaller sample (Supplemental Table 1). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



*Supplemental Figure 1.* Temporal network signature of avoidant symptomatology, including the resulting standardized beta weights of the associations between the six predictor variables (i.e., network feature: blue bar; average daily level of negative affect: orange bar; average daily level of detachment: grey bar; average daily level of disinhibition: yellow bar; average daily level of hostility: purple bar; age: green bar) and the criterion (i.e., PD symptom count). Shown are results for seven separate models (i.e., one model for each network feature, indicated by the vertical labels).



*Supplemental Figure 2.* Temporal network signature of schizotypal symptomatology, including the resulting standardized beta weights of the associations between the six predictor variables (i.e., network feature: blue bar; average daily level of negative affect: orange bar; average daily level of detachment: grey bar; average daily level of disinhibition: yellow bar; average daily level of hostility: purple bar; age: green bar) and the criterion (i.e., PD symptom count). Shown are results for seven separate models (i.e., one model for each network feature, indicated by the vertical labels).

References

BELTZ, A. M. & GATES, K. M. 2017. Network Mapping with GIMME. *Multivariate behavioral research,* 52**,** 789-804.

BELTZ, A. M. & MOLENAAR, P. C. 2015. A posteriori model validation for the temporal order of directed functional connectivity maps. *Frontiers in neuroscience,* 9.

BELTZ, A. M. & MOLENAAR, P. C. 2016. Dealing with multiple solutions in structural vector autoregressive models. *Multivariate behavioral research,* 51**,** 357-373.

BROWN, T. A. 2014. *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*, Guilford Publications.

HOPWOOD, C. J. 2018. Interpersonal dynamics in personality and personality disorders. *European Journal of Personality,* 32**,** 499-524.

JORESKOG, K. & SORBOM, D. 1992. LISREL VIII: Analysis of linear structural relations. *Mooresville, IN: Scientific Software*.

SÖRBOM, D. 1989. Model modification. *Psychometrika,* 54**,** 371-384.

WRIGHT, A. G., BELTZ, A. M., GATES, K. M., MOLENAAR, P. & SIMMS, L. J. 2015. Examining the dynamic structure of daily internalizing and externalizing behavior at multiple levels of analysis. *Frontiers in psychology,* 6**,** 1914.

WRIGHT, A. G. & EDERSHILE, E. A. 2018. Issues resolved and unresolved in pathological narcissism. *Current Opinion in Psychology,* 21**,** 74-79.

WRIGHT, A. G., STEPP, S. D., SCOTT, L. N., HALLQUIST, M. N., BEENEY, J. E., LAZARUS, S. A. & PILKONIS, P. A. 2017. The effect of pathological narcissism on interpersonal and affective processes in social interactions. *Journal of abnormal psychology,* 126**,** 898-910.