APPENDIX A — LIST OF MOST FREQUENT TERMS FOR ANXIETY AND DEPRESSION DISORDERS (DSM-5)

The tables A.1 and A.2 list the most frequent terms extracted from the description for Anxiety and Depression Disorders, respectively, according to the DSM-5 manual. The tables highlight in orange the 7 common in both disorders. In yellow, 4 terms of the same meaning are highlighted, but with different syntaxes.

Table A.1: Anxiety Disorders: List of Terms as described in DSM-5.

	Li	ist of most frequ	ent terms		
anxious	agoraphobia	apprehensive	arousal	attacks	avoid
avoidance	blank	clinging	control	crazy	crying
danger	depersonalization	difficult	discomfort	distress	escape
excessive	failure	falling	fear	feared	fearful
feelings	freezing	future	headache	help	humiliating
impairment	incapacitating	intense	interactions	irritability	losing
mind	mutism	nervios	neuroticism	palpitations	panic
paresthesias	persistent	phobia	restlessness	risk	screaming
shrinking	sleep	soreness	stress	tantrums	tension
thoughts	trembling	uncontrollable	unexpected	worry	

Table A.2: Depressive Disorders: List of Terms as described in DSM-5.

	Li	st of most frequ	ent terms		
aggression	angry	antidepressant	anxiety	appetite	behavioral
bereavement	bereavementrelated	capacity	careful	change	concentration
concerns	death	depressive	difficulty	disgust	displeasure
distress	disturbance	dyscontrol	dysphoric	dysregulation	dysthymia
empty	energy	explosive	extreme	facilitated	failure
fatigue	feelings	frustration	grief	guilt	hopelessness
hypersomnia	impairment	insomnia	interest	irritable	loss
mood	outbursts	overeating	pain	persistent	pleasure
retardation	sad	selfesteem	sleep	suffering	suicide
thoughts	timing	vulnerabilities	worse	worthlessness	

APPENDIX B — PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS: EXPERT CLASSIFIERS

In the experiment for the formation of specialist classifiers. the performance analysis compared the performance of these models when developed using the LSTM. CNN and Hybrid architectures by target condition. This experiment used a basic settings for each architecture. where all models use the same pre-trained GloVe 6B *embedding*. The results in terms of Average (AVG) and Standard Deviation (SD) for the repetitions of these experiments are presented in Table B.1. It should be noted that after this statistical analysis. for each target condition, new experiments were carried out to fine-tune the explored architectures resulting in the final performance presented in this article.

Table B.1 allows us to verify that, in general, the models maintain a regular performance through the repetitions, presenting a low standard deviation for the analyzed metrics. Among the models explored, it is noted that, in general, the CNN architecture presents the least variation, in terms of standard deviation, considering the metrics analyzed for all target conditions. An inverse behavior is observed for hybrid models, in all target conditions.

Table B.1: Expert Classifiers: Average (AVG) and e Standard Deviation (SD).

Mental Disorder	Architecture	Prec	ision	Red	call	F	1
Mental Disorder	Arcintecture	AVG	SD	AVG	SD	AVG	SD
	LSTM	0.77	0.03	0.73	0.05	0.75	0.02
Anxiety	CNN	0.71	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.75	0.00
	Hybrid	0.67	0.06	0.69	0.05	0.68	0.03
	LSTM	0.77	0.02	0.72	0.04	0.74	0.01
Depression	CNN	0.82	0.04	0.68	0.07	0.74	0.02
	Hybrid	0.68	0.08	0.77	0.06	0.72	0.04
	LSTM	0.73	0.02	0.66	0.02	0.69	0.01
Comorbidity	CNN	0.82	0.00	0.70	0.01	0.76	0.01
	Hybrid	0.58	0.08	0.73	0.05	0.64	0.04

Table B.2. presents the result of the statistical test in terms of textit p-value for each metric analyzed. The paired two-tailed Student T Test (alpha=0.5) was adopted to establish the performance comparison between two architectures. considering each target condition. It is worth remembering that, as a null hypothesis, there is no difference between two architectures compared for the task of classifying a given target condition. Thus, Table B.2 presents the p-value resulting from this comparison for the metrics Precision. Revocation and measure F (F1) between architecture combinations, by target condition.

The results presented in Table B.1 show that all performance comparisons performed between the architectures registered statistically significant differences for the task

Table B.2: Comparisons between Architectures: Result of the Student T-Test.

Mental Disorder	Architecture	P-	-Value	
Mental Disorder	Arcintecture	Precision	Recall	F1
	LSTM vs CNN	0.00	0.00	0.28
Anxiety	LSTM vs Hybrid	0.00	0.17	0.00
	CNN vs Hybrid	0.09	0.00	0.00
	LSTM vs CNN	0.00	0.20	0.87
Depression	LSTM vs Hybrid	0.01	0.04	0.05
	CNN vs Hybrid	0.00	0.01	0.08
	LSTM vs CNN	0.00	0.00	0.00
Comorbidity	LSTM vs Hybrid	0.00	0.00	0.00
	CNN vs Hybrid	0.00	0.12	0.00

of classifying the same mental condition. These results show that there is a difference in performance between the different architectures explored. which may result in a gain in variability for the proposed committee model. as the significant differences observed reflect a *trade-off* between accuracy and recall when considering comparisons between two architectures.

APPENDIX C — PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS: DAC STACKING E VARIATIONS

The quantitative analyzes presented compare the performance of the *DAC Stacking* models in terms of topology (homogeneous vs heterogeneous) and the proposed variations (Base, EXP and DIF). Tables C.1, C.2 and C.3 show the average repetition value resulting from the cross-validation training process, together with the standard deviation values, for the models *DAC Base* and its variations *EXP* and *DIF*, respectively.

To confirm whether the performance differences found were statistically significant, the paired two-tailed Student T-test (alpha = 0.5) was adopted. The results of this test for the performance comparisons between the models baseline and the models DAC Base and variations EXP and DIF are presented in Tables C.4, C.5, and C.6, respectively. Tables C.7, C.8, and C.9 present the statistical results for the performance comparisons, considering the topology variations (homogeneous vs heterogeneous) for the models DAC Base, DAC EXP and DAC DIF, respectively.

Finally, the table C.10 presents the performance comparison between the best result, *DAC Base C*, and the models given for each proposed variation *DAC EXP* and *DAC DIF*.

			SD	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02
		E	AVG S	0.45 0.	0.46 0.	0.46 0.	0.46 0.	0.32 0.	0.34 0.	0.35 0.
	ity				0.02 0.		0.05 0.			0.11 0.
	norbid	Recall	AVG SD	2 0.02	_	00.00		7 0.14	60.00	4 0.1
	Con			0 0.72	1 0.75	0 0.76 (2 0.79	1 0.37	1 0.36	0.50 0.04 0.30 0.02 0.44
		Precision	SD	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.0
		Pre	AVG	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.32	0.29	0.33	0.30
		F1	SD	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.11	0.09	0.04
		_	AVG	0.61	0.64	0.61	0.63	0.41	0.46	0.50
<u>~</u>	Jepression	all	SD	0.02	0.04	0.01	90.0	0.16	0.13	0.46 0.09
n (SI	Depre	Recall	AVG	99.0	0.72	0.67	0.71	0.35	0.37	0.46
iatio		sion	SD	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03
Dev		Precision	AVG	0.57	0.58	0.57	0.56	0.55	0.62	0.55
ndard			SD	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.10	90.0	80.0
l Star		FI	AVG	0.65	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.45	0.45	0.49
i) and	ety	=	$^{\mathrm{SD}}$	0.03	90.0	0.01	0.04	0.14	0.08	0.16
Table C.1: DAC Base: Average (AVG) and Standard Deviation (SD).	Anxiety	Recall	AVG	69.0	0.73	.74	0.81	0.39	0.36	0.04 0.47 0.16 0.49 0.08
rage (ion	SD	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.04
Ave		Precision	AVG	0.62	0.62	09.0	0.58	0.57	0.62	0.54 (
3ase:				0.00	0.01	0.03		0.04	0.24	0.05
AC I		FI	AVG SD	0.72	89.0	0.69 0.03	0.66 0.04	09.	0.53	0.54
.1: <i>L</i>	o.	=			0.03	.05	.07	0.03	0.28	0.13
ble (Control	Recal	AVG SD	0.77 0.01	0.63	9.	0.59	.63	0.48).52
Та		on	S SD	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.05	90.0	0.03
		Precision	AVG	0.67	0.74	0.75	0.75	0.57	0.73) 09.(
				0.00	0.00				0.03	.01
	bel	H	AVG SD	0.29	0.28	0.29 0.00	0.30 0.02	0.37	0.33	36 (
	Multi-label			0.00	0.01 0	0.02 0	0.02 0	0.04 0	0.12 0	04 0
	Z	EMR	AVG SD	0.46 0.	0.42 0.	0.42 0.	0.40 0.	33 0.		31 0.
			Α	7.0	0.4	7.0	0.4	L 0.33	C 0.2	Н 0
	Model	DAC	Base	J	ر	H	ГСН	Baseline L	Baseline C 0.28	Baseline H 0.31 0.04 0.36 0.01 0.60 0.03 0.52 0.13 0.54 0.05

Precision Recall F1 AVG SD AVG SD AVG SD	F1 Precis	Anxiety Recall F1 AVG SD AVG SD	Anxiety Recall AVG SD	Precision AVG SD	4	S	F1 AVG SD	ecall F1	Control Recall F1 AVG SD AVG SD	Control recision Recall F1 'G SD AVG SD AVG SD	Precision Recall AVG SD AVG SD	Precision Recall AVG SD AVG SD	Precision Recall AVG SD AVG SD	Control Precision Recall SD AVG SD AVG SD
0.72 0.00 0.61 0.01 0.69 0.02 0.65 0.00 0.57 0.01 0.64 0.60 0.02 0.03 0.01 0.71 0.03	0.00 0.57	0.02 0.65	0.69	0.01	19	0.00 0.61	0.72 0.00 0.61	3 0.02 0.72 0.00 0.61	1 0.78 0.02 0.72 0.00 0.61	57 0.01 0.78 0.02 0.72 0.00 0.61	00 0.67 0.01 0.78 0.02 0.72 0.00 0.61	29 0.00 0.67 0.01 0.78 0.02 0.72 0.00 0.61	1 0.29 0.00 0.67 0.01 0.78 0.02 0.72 0.00 0.61	0.46 0.01 0.29 0.00 0.67 0.01 0.78 0.02 0.72 0.00 0.61
0.02 0.71 0.05	0.04 0.58	0.09 0.65	99.0	3 0.02	9	0.03 0.6	0.69 0.03 0.6	9.0 60.0 69.0 90.0	0.66 0.06 0.69 0.03 0.6	74 0.01 0.66 0.06 0.69 0.03 0.6	0.74 0.01 0.66 0.06	0.74 0.01 0.66 0.06	0.74 0.01 0.66 0.06	0.42 0.01 0.28 0.01 0.74 0.01 0.66 0.06 0.69 0.03 0.6
0.02 0.69 0.05 0.62	0.01 0.56	0.04 0.67	0.76	0.01	9	0.02 0.60	0.70 0.02 0.60	90.	90.0 89.0	90.0 89.0	90.0 89.0	90.0 89.0	0.29 0.01 0.72 0.03 0.68 0.06	90.0 89.0
0.04 0.69 0.11 0.62	0.02 0.57 0	0.10 0.66	0.73	0.04	62	0.03 0.62	0.67 0.03 0.62	.05	0.61 0.05	0.61 0.05	0.75 0.01 0.61 0.05	0.75 0.01 0.61 0.05	0.29 0.02 0.75 0.01 0.61 0.05	0.75 0.01 0.61 0.05
0.01 0.35 0.16 0.41 0.11 0.29 0.01	0.10 0.55	0.14 0.45	0.39	0.01	57	0.04 0.57	0.60 0.04 0.57	3 0.03 0.60 0.04 0.57	5 0.63 0.03 0.60 0.04 0.57	57 0.05 0.63 0.03 0.60 0.04 0.57	33 0.57 0.05 0.63 0.03 0.00 0.04 0.57 0.01 0.39 0.14 0.45 0.10 0.55 0.01 0.35	37 0.03 0.57 0.05 0.63 0.03 0.60 0.04 0.57	4 0.37 0.03 0.57 0.05 0.63 0.03 0.60 0.04 0.57	0.37 0.03
0.02 0.37 0.13 (0.06 0.62	0.08 0.45	0.36	0.01	62	0.24 0.62	0.53 0.24 0.62	3 0.28 0.53 0.24 0.62	5 0.48 0.28 0.53 0.24 0.62	73 0.06 0.48 0.28 0.53 0.24 0.62	3 0.73 0.06 0.48 0.28 0.53 0.24 0.62	33 0.03 0.73 0.06 0.48 0.28 0.53 0.24 0.62	2 0.33 0.03 0.73 0.06 0.48 0.28 0.53 0.24 0.62	3aseline C 0.28 0.12 0.33 0.03 0.73 0.06 0.48 0.28 0.53 0.24 0.65 0.01 0.36 0.09 0.45 0.06 0.62 0.02 0.37 0.13 0.46 0.09 0.33 0.01 0.36 0.09
0.03 0.46 0.09 (0.08 0.55	0.16 0.49	0.47	0.04	54	0.05 0.54	0.54 0.05 0.54	0.13 0.54 0.05 0.54	3 0.52 0.13 0.54 0.05 0.54	50 0.03 0.52 0.13 0.54 0.05 0.54	0.60 0.03 0.52 0.13 0.54 0.05 0.54	36 0.01 0.60 0.03 0.52 0.13 0.54 0.05 0.54	4 0.36 0.01 0.60 0.03 0.52 0.13 0.54 0.05 0.54	3aseline H 0.31 0.04 0.36 0.01 0.60 0.03 0.52 0.13 0.54 0.05 0.54 0.04 0.47 0.16 0.49 0.08 0.55 0.03 0.46 0.09 0.50 0.04 0.30 0.02 0.44 0.11 0.35 0.02

			$^{\mathrm{SD}}$	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02
		FI	AVG	0.45	0.46	0.43	0.44	0.32	0.34	0.35
	bidity	all	$^{\mathrm{SD}}$	0.02	0.05	0.69 0.17	0.09	0.14	0.09	0.11
	Comorbidity	Recall	AVG SD	0.73	0.75	69.0	0.77	0.37	0.36	0.05 0.54 0.04 0.47 0.16 0.49 0.08 0.55 0.03 0.46 0.09 0.50 0.04 0.30 0.02 0.44 0.11
		Precision	AVG SD	0.00	0.01	0.03 0.60 0.02 0.76 0.09 0.66 0.03 0.58 0.05 0.69 0.16 0.62 0.06 0.32 0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
		Prec	AVG	0.32	0.33	0.32	0.31	0.29	0.33	0.30
		F1	AVG SD	0.00	0.01	90.0	0.01	0.11	0.09	0.04
		H		0.66 0.01 0.61 0.00	0.03 0.62 0.02 0.72 0.07 0.67 0.02 0.57 0.01 0.72 0.03 0.63 0.01	0.62	0.64	0.41	0.46	0.50
<u>~</u>	Depression	Recall	AVG SD	0.01	0.03	0.16	0.04	0.16	0.13	0.09
Fable C.3: DAC DIF: Average (AVG) and Standard Deviation (SD).	Depr	Re		99.0	0.72	69.0	0.76	0.35	0.37	0.46
iatio		Precision	AVG SD	0.57 0.00	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03
l Dev		Prec		0.57	0.57	0.58	0.55	0.55	0.62	0.55
ndarc		FI	$^{\mathrm{SD}}$	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.10	90.0	0.08
d Sta		H	AVG	99.0	0.67	99.0	99.0	0.45	0.45	0.49
3) an	iety	Recall	AVG SD	0.02	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.14	0.08	0.16
(AVC	Anx	Rec	AVG	0.71	0.72	92.0	92.0	0.39	0.36	0.47
rage)	Precision	AVG SD	0.61 0.01 0.71 0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.04
: Ave		Prec	AVG	0.61	0.62	09.0	0.59	0.57	0.62	0.54
DIF		1	SD	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.24	0.05
DAC		FI	AVG	0.72	69.0	0.67	99.0	09.0	0.53	0.54
C.3:	trol	Recall	SD	0.77 0.01 0.72	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.28	0.13
[able	Con	Rec	AVG SD AVG SD	0.77	0.28 0.01 0.73 0.01 0.65 0.05 0.69	0.62	09.0	0.63	0.48	0.52
		Precision	SD	0.68 0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.05	90.0	0.03
		Prec	AVG	89.0	0.73	0.74	0.74	0.57	0.73	09.0
		L	$^{\mathrm{SD}}$	0.29 0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.01
	-label	HL	AVG	0.29	0.28	0.29	0.30	0.37	0.33	0.36
	Multi-label	EMR	AVG SD AVG SD	0.46 0.00	0.42 0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.12	0.04
		EIV.	AVG	0.46	0.42	0.42	0.40 0.02 0.30 0.01 0.74 0.01 0.60 0.05 0.66 0.03 0.59 0.04 0.76 0.10 0.66 0.02 0.55 0.01 0.76 0.04 0.64 0.01 0.31 0.01 0.77 0.09	0.33	0.28	0.31
	Model	DAC	DIFF		C	LCH-LC 0.42 0.02 0.29 0.01 0.74 0.00 0.62 0.04 0.67	LCH-C	Baseline L 0.33 0.04 0.37 0.03 0.57 0.05 0.63 0.03 0.60	Baseline C 0.28 0.12 0.33 0.03 0.73 0.06 0.48 0.28 0.53	Baseline H 0.31 0.04 0.36 0.01 0.60 0.03 0.52 0.13 0.54

Table C.4: DAC Base: Statistical comparison with baselines.

Commonicon					S	Student T-Test: P-Value	T Tes	t: P-Va	lue					
Comparison Potences Modele	Multi-label	label	Ŭ	Control	_	4	Anxiety	_	Ď	Depression	on o	S	Comorbidity	ity
Signatura de la contra dela contra de la contra dela contra de la contra del la contra	(EMR) (HL)	(HL)	Ь	×	E	Ь	2	Ξ	Ь	2	F1	Ь	~	F1
DAC Base L vs Baseline L	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00 0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
DAC Base C vs Baseline C	0.05	0.03	0.94	0.94 0.27 0.23 0.69 0.00 0.00	0.23	69.0	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.00 0.01 0.23 0.00 0.00	0.00
DAC Base H vs Baseline H	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00 0.00 0.06 0.00 0.01 0.02 0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.28	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.28 0.01 0.00 0.02 0.00 0.00	0.00
DAC Base LCH vs Baseline L	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02 0.00 0.23 0.06 0.51 0.00 0.01 0.09 0.00 0.01 0.00	90.0	0.51	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00
DAC Base LCH vs Baseline C	0.09	0.05	0.51	0.05 0.51 0.42 0.27 0.08 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.02	0.27	80.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.33	0.00 0.00	0.00
DAC Base LCH vs Baseline H 0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.02	0.21	0.01	0.01	0.49	0.01	0.00	0.17	0.00 0.00 0.25 0.02 0.21 0.01 0.01 0.49 0.01 0.00 0.17 0.00 0.00	0.00

Table C.5: DAC EXP: Statistical comparison with baselines.

Componicon					S ₂	tudent	T-Tes	Student T-Test: P-Value	lue					
Companison Leterory Medals	Multi-label	label		Control	_	7	Anxiety		De	pressi	u	CO	Comorbidity	ity
Setween Models	(EMR) (HL)	(HIL)	Ь	~	F1 P	Ь	×	E	Ь	~	R F1	Ь	~	F1
DAC EXP L vs Baseline L	0.00	0.01		0.02 0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02 0.01	0.0	0.01	0.00	0.00
DAC EXP C vs Baseline C	0.05	0.02	0.94	0.19	0.18	0.34	0.00	0.0	0.04 0	0.00	0.0	0.70	0.00	0.00
DAC EXP H vs Baseline H	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00
DAC EXP LCH vs Baseline L	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.14	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.00
DAC EXP LCH vs Baseline C	60.0	90.0	0.63	0.38	0.25	0.90	0.01	0.00	90.0	0.02	0.02	0.82	0.01	0.00
DAC EXP LCH vs Baseline H	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.23	0.00 0.23 0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01 0.00	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00 0.02	0.00	0.00

Table C.6: DAC DIF: Statistical comparison with baselines.

Commonicon						Studer	it T-Te	Student T-Test: P-Value	/alue					
Companison Fotonom Models	Multi-label	label	Ū	Control	_	4	Anxiety		Ď	Depression	'n	Č	Comorbidity	lity
Detween Models	EMR	HL		P R F1 P R F1 P R F1	Ξ	Ь	~	Ξ	Ь	~	Ξ	Ь	P R F1	F1
DAC DIF L vs Baseline L	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00 0.01 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.01 0.00 0.02 0.02 0.00 0.01 0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00
DAC DIF C vs Baseline C	90.0	0.06 0.03 0.86 0.28 0.23 0.78 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.01 0.62 0.00 0.00	98.0	0.28	0.23	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.62	0.00	0.00
DAC DIF LCH-LC vs Baseline L 0.01 0.00 0.00 0.67 0.03 0.05 0.01 0.01 0.23 0.02 0.01 0.02 0.01 0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.67	0.03	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.23	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00
DAC DIF LCH-LC vs Baseline C 0.06 0.09 0.79 0.34 0.25 0.19 0.00 0.00 0.22 0.00 0.01 0.28 0.01 0.01	90.0	0.00	0.79	0.34	0.25	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.01	0.28	0.01	0.01
DAC DIF LCH-LC vs Baseline H	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.08	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02
DAC DIF LCH-C vs Baseline L 0.01 0.01 0.00 0.26 0.02 0.22 0.01 0.01 0.18 0.00 0.01 0.05 0.00 0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.26	0.02	0.22	0.01	0.01	0.18	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.01
DAC DIF LCH-C vs Baseline C 0.09 0.08 0.73 0.42 0.28 0.20 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.01 0.04 0.00 0.00	0.09	0.08	0.73	0.42	0.28	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.00
DAC DIF LCH-C vs Baseline H 0.01 0.00 0.00 0.19 0.01 0.05 0.00 0.00 0.73 0.00 0.00 0.26 0.00 0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.00

Table C.7: Statistical comparison between variations of DAC Base.

Comparison						Stude	nt T-Te	est: <i>P-</i> '	Value					
between Models	Multi-	label	(Contro	ol	1	Anxiet	y	De	epressi	on	Co	morbi	dity
DAC Base	EMR	HL	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
L vs C	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.21	0.09	0.47	0.02	0.01	0.21	0.14	0.03
L vs H	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.01	0.08	0.11	0.02	0.11	0.18	0.18	1.00	0.37	0.02	0.00
L vs LCH	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.00	0.02	0.14	0.05	0.00	0.37	0.03	0.21
C vs H	0.38	0.11	0.12	0.65	0.22	0.08	0.77	0.50	0.30	0.03	0.00	0.37	0.37	1.00
C vs LCH	0.06	0.11	0.02	0.18	0.32	0.09	0.08	0.85	0.08	0.54	0.14	0.23	0.11	0.59
H vs LCH	0.21	0.29	1.00	0.12	0.10	0.28	0.02	0.37	0.21	0.14	0.07	0.27	0.23	0.37

Table C.8: Statistical comparison between variations of DAC EXP.

Comparison						Stude	nt T-Te	est: <i>P-</i>	Value					
between Models	Multi-	label	(Contro	l	1	Anxiet	y	De	epressi	on	Co	morbi	dity
DAC EXP	EMR	HL	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
L vs C	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.11	0.02	0.71	0.90	0.34	0.01	0.00	0.19	0.79	0.47
L vs H	0.06	0.82	0.02	0.03	0.13	0.34	0.03	0.01	0.20	0.17	0.24	0.59	0.15	0.70
L vs LCH	0.00	0.57	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.61	0.53	0.28	0.92	0.40	0.29	0.58	0.55	0.23
C vs H	0.45	0.09	0.51	0.69	0.74	0.06	0.17	0.37	0.22	0.59	0.03	0.29	0.45	0.46
C vs LCH	0.27	0.47	0.24	0.40	0.50	0.61	0.56	0.57	0.82	0.76	0.24	1.00	0.75	0.18
H vs LCH	0.00	0.59	0.14	0.05	0.06	0.39	0.57	0.69	0.21	0.96	0.50	0.33	0.78	0.24

Table C.9: Statistical comparison between variations of DAC DIF.

Comparison	Student T-Test: P-Value													
between Models	Multi-	label	Control			Anxiety			Depression			Comorbidity		
DAC Stacking DIF	EMR	HL	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
L vs C	0.01	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.28	0.84	0.23	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.35	0.07
L vs LCH-LC	0.02	0.97	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.24	0.28	0.55	0.68	0.69	0.84	0.54	0.61	0.47
L vs LCH-C	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.26	0.29	0.51	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.14	0.36	0.18
C vs LCH-LC	0.90	0.40	0.11	0.45	0.60	0.17	0.39	0.87	0.71	0.76	0.58	0.46	0.54	0.19
C vs LCH-C	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.32	0.89	0.05	0.12	0.48	0.01	0.62	0.01
LCH-LC vs LCH-C	0.39	0.36	0.62	0.65	0.66	0.62	0.76	1.00	0.31	0.42	0.50	0.16	0.39	0.76

Table C.10: Statistical comparison between *DAC Base C* and Variations.

Comparison between		Student T-Test: P-Value												
DAC Base C (C) e	Multi-label		Control			Anxiety			Depression			Comorbidity		
Variations (EXP and DIF)	EMR	HL	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
C vs EXP L	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.23	0.04	0.62	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.00
C vs EXP C	0.79	0.47	1.00	0.43	0.35	0.37	0.12	0.12	0.79	0.78	0.75	0.70	0.42	0.29
C vs EXP H	0.46	0.06	0.54	0.27	0.15	0.04	0.44	0.75	0.06	0.07	0.00	0.15	0.69	0.08
C vs EXP LCH	0.18	0.51	0.07	0.49	0.88	0.81	1.00	0.33	0.88	0.54	0.24	0.90	0.94	0.59
C vs DIF L	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.63	0.20	0.62	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.28	0.00
C vs DIF C	0.78	0.72	0.43	0.45	0.39	1.00	0.83	0.63	0.69	0.76	0.37	1.00	0.94	1.00
C vs DIF LCH-LC	0.80	0.11	0.47	0.60	0.89	0.14	0.50	0.48	0.80	0.64	0.44	0.03	0.43	0.20
C vs DIF LCH-C	0.02	0.05	0.18	0.15	0.28	0.19	0.53	0.54	0.00	0.20	1.00	0.03	0.54	0.03