



Is there a common pathway to developing ASD and PTSD symptoms?

Hansen, M., Armour, C., Wittmann, L., Elklit, A., & Shevlin, M. (2014). Is there a common pathway to developing ASD and PTSD symptoms? *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 28(8), 865-872.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2014.09.019>

[Link to publication record in Ulster University Research Portal](#)

Published in:
Journal of Anxiety Disorders

Publication Status:
Published (in print/issue): 01/01/2014

DOI:
[10.1016/j.janxdis.2014.09.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2014.09.019)

Document Version
Author Accepted version

General rights

The copyright and moral rights to the output are retained by the output author(s), unless otherwise stated by the document licence.

Unless otherwise stated, users are permitted to download a copy of the output for personal study or non-commercial research and are permitted to freely distribute the URL of the output. They are not permitted to alter, reproduce, distribute or make any commercial use of the output without obtaining the permission of the author(s).

If the document is licenced under Creative Commons, the rights of users of the documents can be found at <https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/licenses/>.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Ulster University's institutional repository that provides access to Ulster's research outputs. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact pure-support@ulster.ac.uk

Table 2

Model fit statistics from baseline model to fully constrained model for common paths to ASD and PTSD severity.

Model	Chi2 (df) <i>p</i>	CFI	TLI	AIC	BIC	RMSEA	SRMR
Baseline model	337.56 (95) .0000	.92	.86	39419.96	39829.09	.076	.038
Single constraints							
Model 1 (a=b)	339.87 (95) .0000	.92	.86	39419.96	39825.01	.076	.038
Model 2 (c=d)	338.87 (95) .0000	.92	.86	39418.00	39823.03	.076	.038
Model 3 (e=f)	342.25 (95) .0000	.92	.86	39422.08	39827.12	.076	.038
Model 4 (g=h)	338.28 (95) .0000	.92	.86	39418.30	39823.34	.076	.038
Model 5 (i=j)	365.37 (95) .0000	.91	.85	39453.91	39858.95	.080	.042
Model 6 (k=l)	337.77 (95) .0000	.92	.86	39418.47	39823.51	.075	.038
Model 7 (m=n)	338.57 (95) .0000	.92	.86	39149.38	39824.42	.076	.038
Model 8 (o=p)	339.62 (95) .0000	.92	.86	39419.99	39825.03	.076	.038
Model 9 (q=r)	339.02 (95) .0000	.92	.86	39418.82	39823.86	.076	.038
Model 10 (s=t)	339.81 (95) .0000	.92	.86	39421.22	39826.26	.076	.038
Multiple constraints							
Model 11 – two constraints (c=d) (g=h)	339.58 (97) .0000	.92	.86	39416.34	39817.29	.075	.038
Model 12 – three constraints (c=d) (g=h) (k=l)	339.80 (98) .0000	.92	.87	39414.86	39811.72	.075	.038
Model – 13 four constraints	341.05 (99) .0000	.92	.87	39413.67	39806.43	.074	.038

(c=d) (g=h) (k=l) (q=r)								
Model 14 – four constraints	342.13 (100)	.0000	.92	.87	3913.09	39801.77	.074	.038
(c=d) (g=h) (k=l) (m=n) (q=r)								
Model 15 – five constraints	343.77 (101)	.0000	.92	.87	39412.36	39796.94	.074	.038
(a=b) (c=d) (g=h) (k=l) (m=n) (q=r)								
Model 16 – seven constraints	346.64 (102)	.0000	.92	.87	39413.30	39793.79	.074	.039
(a=b) (c=d) (g=h) (k=l) (m=n) (o = p) (q=r)								
Model 17 – eight constraints	345.27 (103)	.0000	.92	.87	39412.31	39788.71	.073	.039
(a=b) (c=d) (g=h) (k=l) (m=n) (o = p) (q=r) (s=t)								
Model 18 – nine constraints	350.46 (104)	.0000	.92	.87	39415.44	39787.71	.073	.039
(a=b) (c=d) (e=f) (g=h) (k=l) (m=n) (o=p) (q=r)								
(s=t)								
Fully constrained model	405.51 (105)	.0000	.90	.84	39484.57	39852.78	.080	.068
(a=b) (c=d) (e=f) (g=h) (i=j) (k=l) (m=n) (o=p)								
(q=r) (s=t)								

Note. CFI (Comparative Fit Index), TLI (Tucker-Lewis Fit Index), AIC (Akaike’s Information Criterion), BIC (Bayesian Information Criterion), RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation), and the SRMR (standardized root mean squared residual).