

## Supplementary Material

Supplementary Table 1. Available data per group per time-point (TP).

	TD	ASD	TOTAL
	n	n	N
<i>Internalizing</i>			
1 TP	33	11	44
2 TPs	22	8	30
3 TPs	42	40	82
<i>Externalizing</i>			
1 TP	33	11	44
2 TPs	23	8	31
3 TPs	41	40	81
Negative Emotion expression			
1 TP	29	11	40
2 TPs	21	7	28
3 TPs	47	41	88
Emotion recognition			
1 TP	29	11	40
2 TPs	20	7	27
3 TPs	48	41	59
Emotion vocabulary			
Basic			
1 TP	29	11	40
2 TPs	21	7	28
3 TPs	47	41	89
Mental states			
1 TP	29	11	40
2 TPs	21	7	28
3 TPs	47	41	89

## Supplementary Material

Supplementary Table 2. Internal consistency of measures per time point per group.

		Cronbach's $\alpha$	
	TD	ASD	
Time 1			
Internalizing	0.874	0.639	
Externalizing	0.868	0.962	
Negative emotion expression	0.787	0.633	
Positive emotion expression	0.655	0.673	
Emotion recognition	0.758	0.878	
Emotion vocabulary			
Basic	0.865	0.748	
Mental states	0.697	0.752	
Time 2			
Internalizing	0.874	0.882	
Externalizing	0.889	0.895	
Negative emotion expression	0.802	0.817	
Positive emotion expression	0.398	0.705	
Emotion recognition	0.764	0.908	
Emotion vocabulary			
Basic	0.749	0.831	
Mental states	0.827	0.824	
Time 3			
Internalizing	0.869	0.894	
Externalizing	0.887	0.919	
Negative emotion expression	0.679	0.825	
Positive emotion expression	0.600	0.780	
Emotion recognition	0.798	0.908	
Emotion vocabulary			
Basic	-0.360	0.792	
Mental states	0.134	0.811	

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Table 3. Model fit indices per model.

<i>Best fitting age-model</i>	Internalizing			Externalizing		
	AIC	BIC	X <sup>2</sup> statistic	AIC	BIC	X <sup>2</sup> statistic
Null Model	2055	2062	-	2391	2399	-
Linear Age-model	1976	1983	X <sup>2</sup> (1) = -79, <i>p</i> < .001	2315	2323	X <sup>2</sup> (1) = -67, <i>p</i> < .001
Quadratic Age-model	1985	1993	X <sup>2</sup> (1) = 10, <i>p</i> > .20	2324	2332	X <sup>2</sup> (1) = 9, <i>p</i> > .20
Cubic Age-model	1995	2003	X <sup>2</sup> (1) = 10, <i>p</i> > .20	2333	2340	X <sup>2</sup> (1) = 8, <i>p</i> > .20
<b>Linear Age x Group</b>	<b>1966</b>	<b>1974</b>	X <sup>2</sup> (2) = 29, <i>p</i> < .001	<b>2291</b>	<b>2299</b>	X <sup>2</sup> (2) = -41, <i>p</i> < .001
<i>Best fitting model including all predictors</i>						
Full model	<b>1878</b>	<b>1885</b>	X <sup>2</sup> (5) = 89, <i>p</i> < .001	2203	2211	X <sup>2</sup> (5) = -88, <i>p</i> < .001
Full model including interactions with Group	1868	1875	X <sup>2</sup> (5) = 10, <i>p</i> > .10	<b>2179</b>	<b>2186</b>	X <sup>2</sup> (5) = -25, <i>p</i> < .001

With  $\chi^2$  analyses we tested whether adding extra variables to the model improved model fit. We used the difference between the BIC values of the most parsimonious model with the next model, so null model – linear age-model (i.e., BIC (linear age-model) 1983 - BIC (null model) 2062 = 79). For the full model including all variables of emotion functioning (i.e., emotion expression, emotion recognition, and emotion vocabulary), we compared with the best age-model. We report the  $\chi^2$  statistic of model comparison of the BIC values, given that BIC values take the number of added variables into account. Note that BIC and AIC indices resulted in the same selection of best fitting models.