Psychiatric, Emotional, and Brain Volumetric Footprints of Childhood Conduct in Healthy Young Adults

AmirHussein Abdolalizadeh [a,b], Kamyar Moradi [a,b], Mohammad Amin Dabbagh Ohadi [a,b], FatemehSadat Mirfazeli [c,*], Reza Rajimehr [d]

a. *Interdisciplinary Neuroscience Research Program, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran*
b. *Students' Scientific Research Center, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran*
c. *Mental Health Research Center, Psychosocial Health Research Institute, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran*
d. *MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom*

***. Corresponding Author:** FatemehSadat Mirfazeli, M.D., Iran University of Medical Sciences, Hazrat Rasool-e-Akram Hospital, Sattarkhan Ave., Tehran, Iran. E-mail: Mirfazeli.f@iums.ac.ir, Phone No.: +989124245389

Abstract:

Background: Conduct Disorder (CD) is defined as aggressive, antisocial, and rule-breaking behavior during childhood. Despite being the major risk factor for developing an antisocial personality disorder, nearly half the patients return to a nearly normal and healthy status. We aimed to identify psychiatric, emotional, and brain volumetric footprints of childhood CD in healthy young adults with a prior history of CD.

Methods: We recruited 156 healthy young adults from the Human Connectome Project: 78 with a prior history of CD (CC) and 78 age-, gender-, and education-matched subjects with no history of CD (HC). Psychiatric, emotional, and personality assessments were based on the Adult Self Report, NIH toolbox emotion battery and Penn emotion recognition task, and NEO-Five Factor Inventory. We acquired MRI volumetric measures and hippocampal and amygdala segmentation values using FreeSurfer. Between-group differences and associations between the assessments and the hippocampal or amygdala nuclei were assessed statistically.

Results: After Benjamini-Hochberg correction, we found higher anger aggression, antisocial personality problems, aggressive and rule-breaking behaviors, externalizing, and lower agreeableness in the CC group. No differences between volumetric measures were noted. Interestingly, only in the CC group, better angry face recognition was associated with larger volumes of several hippocampal nuclei.

Discussion: Despite having no notable MRI volumetric differences, healthy young adults with a prior history of CD still exhibit some forms of antisocial-like behavior, without evidence of emotional recognition disturbances. Moreover, hippocampal-related learning may provide a compensatory mechanism for angry face recognition deficits in CD, playing a potential protective role.

Keywords: Conduct Disorder, Antisocial Personality, MRI, Hippocampus, Amygdala

1. Introduction

Conduct disorder (CD) is a serious neurodevelopmental disorder defined by a persistent pattern of violence and flouting rules and social norms that significantly impact the families and society [1, 2]. CD may accompany many psycho-developmental issues such as substance abuse, depression, anger problems, and lack of empathy, which is the hallmark for callous-unemotional (CU) traits. It is also a major risk factor for developing antisocial personality disorder (ASPD) [2, 3].

Similar patterns of functional or structural disturbances have been seen in both CD and ASPD. For example, functional MRI (fMRI) studies in patients with ASPD suggest significant deficits in the networks related to social cognition and responses to threats [4]. In line with this finding, reduced amygdala response in tasks involving emotions has also been seen in CD [5]. Structural MRI studies also supported a lack of social cognition and emotion in CD subjects. There is evidence of decreased gray matter in various parts of the brain associated with such responses, including lower volumes of left amygdala, right insula, left medial superior frontal gyrus, and left fusiform gyrus in CD patients [3, 6]. On the other hand, some studies observed increased gray matter of the orbitofrontal cortex while the others reported reduced volume comparing CD adults with healthy subjects [7, 8]. Also, voxel-based analysis of patients with ASPD revealed grey matter reduction in the left frontopolar cortex and the paralimbic region associated with memory and emotional problems in these subjects [9, 10].

Structural and functional changes in the orbitofrontal-paralimbic system and hippocampal-amygdala complex both in CD and ASPD suggest them as a possible prognostic neural marker for children with CD for developing into ASPD in the future [11, 12]. However, there is a lack of research regarding neural changes and socio-emotional profiles in healthy young adults with a history of CD in their childhood. In one of the few studies in this regard, women with prior history of CD have reduced grey matter volume in the hippocampus, associated with antisocial behavior [13].

Therefore, we aimed to investigate the psychiatric and socio-emotional aspects of current healthy adults who had a prior history of CD in their childhood, detecting any possible deviation

from normal psychiatric or emotional states. Moreover, we aimed to identify neural footprints of childhood CD by evaluating whole-brain volumetric measures, hippocampal subfields, and amygdala nuclei, and their respective associations with psychiatric and emotional evaluations. These measurements may lead us to identify the neural underpinnings of the different neurodevelopmental pathway which encourages the conversion of CD into healthy adults rather than developing ASPD.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Participants

We used the Human Connectome Project young adults (HCP; http://db.humanconnectome.org/) for the current study [14]. It includes young adults from 25 to 36 years old who have no current major psychiatric or neurologic disorders. They have acquired high-resolution structural, diffusion-weighted, and functional MRI data, plus several neuropsychological and cognitive tests and tasks. We identified 78 subjects who had a diagnosis of conduct disorder in their childhood (CC) based on the Semi-Structured Assessment for the Genetics of Alcoholism (SSAGA) questionnaire [15]: males reporting at least three and females reporting at least two conduct disorder-related symptoms during their childhood (SSAGA_ChildhoodConduct in the HCP data dictionary) [16]. We matched 78 control subjects from the remaining 1122 subjects who did not have a history of conduct (HC) to the CC group based on age, gender, and education using the *matchIt* [17] function in the R statistical package [18].

2.2. Evaluations

2.2.1. Emotional

We used the NIH Toolbox Emotion Battery (NIHTB-EB) [19] and Penn Emotion Recognition Task (ER40) [20] for evaluating the emotional aspects of the subjects. The NIHTB-EB includes a variety of tests evaluating negative affect (sadness, fear, anger), psychological well-being (positive affect, life satisfaction, meaning and purpose), social relationships (social support, companionship, social distress, positive social development), and stress and self-

efficacy (perceived stress, self-efficacy). In the ER40, each subject is asked about the emotion of a set of 40 faces in five categories: angry, sad, happy, fear, and neutral. The number of correct responses and median response time for the right answers is measured.

2.2.2. Psychiatric and Life Function

We used scores based on Achenbach Adult Self Report (ASR) [21] to evaluate the psychiatric and life function of the subjects. ASR has two components: the syndrome scale and the DSM-oriented scale [DSM: The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders]. We included the anxious/depressed scale, withdrawn, somatic complaints, thought problems, attention problems, aggressive behavior, rule-breaking behavior, intrusiveness, internalizing and externalizing behaviors, and total ASR scores from the syndrome scale. From the DSM-oriented scale, we included DSM depressive, anxiety, somatic, avoidant personality, attention-deficit/hyperactivity, and antisocial personality problems. We included all the ASR-based scores of the subjects in the current study as gender and age-adjusted T-scores.

2.2.3. Personality

Personality traits of subjects were acquired based on NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) [22]. This 60-item questionnaire can be used to study the personality construct of an individual to “agreeableness,” “openness,” “neuroticism,” “extraversion,” and “conscientiousness”.

2.3. Imaging

2.3.1. Acquisition and Preprocessing

High-resolution T1 and T2 scans were acquired using 3T Connectome Siemens Skyra with the following parameters: T1: 3D-MPRAGE, TR = 2400ms, TE = 2.14ms, TI = 1000ms, FOV = 224×224, Voxelsize = 0.7mm isotropic; T2: T2-SPACE, TR = 3200ms, TE = 565 ms, FOV = 224×224, Voxelsize = 0.7mm isotropic. We used the minimal preprocessed structural data, available as structural extended preprocessed [23]. The analysis pipeline, which resulted in the minimal preprocessed structural data, is briefly as follows: All structural acquisitions were first corrected for gradient distortion, aligned and averaged, skull stripped, corrected for readout distortion, and then fed to the *recon-all* pipeline of FreeSurfer [24], using both high-resolution

T1 and T2 weighted images for better identification of pial surfaces. Finally, morphometric measures of cortical parcellations and subcortical segmentations were calculated based on the Deskian-Killiany atlas [25].

2.3.2. Hippocampal/Amygdala Subnuclei Segmentation

We used segmentation of hippocampal subfields and nuclei of the amygdala implemented in FreeSurfer v7.1.1 [26, 27]. This automated approach provides the hippocampus and amygdala segmentation based on a high-resolution probabilistic atlas derived from fifteen autopsy samples. We used high-resolution (starting with hires_) T1 and T2 scans provided in the FreeSurfer output */mri* folder in structural extended preprocessed data by renaming the associated files as an input for *segmentHA_T2.sh* command (Figure 1). The analysis was run using the *parallel* command in Linux Ubuntu 18.04 to use all the CPU threads [28].



Figure 1. Hippocampal subfields and amygdala nuclei overlaid on sagittal (top) and coronal (bottom) high-resolution T1 scan of a CC subject using *segmentHA_T2.sh* script. Different areas are color-coded to be better identified. CA = Cornu Ammonis, GC-ML-DG = Granule Cell and Molecular Layer of Dentate Gyrus.

2.3. Statistical Analysis

We used Rstudio software based on R statistical package version 3.6.1 [18, 29]. Subject demographics and evaluations were compared between CC and HC, using chi-square, t-test, or Mann-Whitney test based on the type and distribution of the data. FreeSurfer generated whole-brain subcortical segmentation volumes and cortical parcellation thickness provided by HCP were included in a general linear model (GLM) to identify between-group differences. The same model was also applied for hippocampal and amygdala segmentation volumes. Moreover, we used a GLM evaluating the association between all the evaluations in part 2.2 and hippocampal and amygdala segmentation volumes for each study group. All the above-mentioned statistical models were adjusted for age, gender, education, and total intracranial volume. To overcome the multiple testing problem, we used the Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate (FDR) method to correct the *p*-values wherever applicable [30]. Corrected *p*-values equal to or less than 0.05 were considered to be statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Demographics

The demographics and their differences are shown in table 1. There were no differences between age, gender, or education between the two groups. Moreover, 145 subjects (71 HC and 74 CC) of these matched groups had their MRI data available. The repeated comparison in these 145 subjects showed no differences in these subjects either (HC vs. CC: Age (mean ± SD): 28.90 (3.61) vs. 28.91 (3.63), $p = 0.995$; Education Years (mean ± SD): 14.17 (1.96) vs. 14.31 (1.96), $p = 0.665$; Gender (M (%)): 31 (43.7) vs. 31 (41.9), $p = 0.962$).

3.2. Evaluations

3.2.1. Emotion

CC subjects had higher anger aggression (from NIHTB-EB) compared to HC (mean ± SD: 59.11 (9.79) vs. 50.76 (9.25), respectively; corrected $p < 0.001$). This measure evaluates aggression as the behavioral component of anger. There were no other significant differences in other components of NIHTB-EB or ER40 between the two groups (Table 1).

3.2.2. Psychiatric and Life Function

CC subjects had significantly greater antisocial personality problems and have reported higher aggressive and rule-breaking behaviors than HCs based on the age and gender-adjusted T-scores of those measures. Moreover, CC subjects had higher externalizing and ASR total T-scores as well. There were no other significant differences noted between the two groups (Table 1).

Table 1. Demographics, emotional, and psychiatric evaluations between 78 subjects with prior history of conduc disorder in childhood, and 78 age-, gender-, and education-matched subjects without history of conduct.

Variables	**HC n = 78**	**CC n = 78**	***p***	**Correcte *p***
Demographics				
Age (mean (SD))	29.05 (3.66)	29.01 (3.60)	0.947	
Gender (M (%))	35 (44.9)	34 (43.6)	1.000	
Years of Education (mean (SD))	14.24 (1.98)	14.24 (1.98)	1.000	
Emotion				
Penn Emotion Recognition Test				
Number of Correct Responses (mean (SD))	35.53 (2.89)	35.26 (2.84)	0.558	0.601
Correct Responses Median Response Time (ms) (mean (SD))	1945.77 (501.14)	1882.22 (358.28)	0.364	0.712
Number of Correct Anger Identifications (mean (SD))	6.83 (0.99)	6.86 (1.05)	0.875	0.889
Number of Correct Fear Identifications (mean (SD))	6.64 (1.57)	7.03 (1.08)	0.077	0.384
Number of Correct Happy Identifications (mean (SD))	7.97 (0.16)	7.94 (0.29)	0.312	0.601
Number of Correct Neutral Identifications (mean (SD))	7.21 (1.25)	6.78 (1.58)	0.065	0.279
Number of Correct Sad Identifications (mean (SD))	6.87 (0.96)	6.65 (1.27)	0.228	0.632
NIH Toolbox: Emotion Battery				
Anger Affect (mean (SD))	48.24 (7.67)	51.25 (8.84)	0.025	0.193
Anger Aggression (mean (SD))	50.76 (9.25)	59.11 (9.79)	<0.001	<0.001*
Anger Hostility (mean (SD))	49.94 (9.10)	53.62 (8.62)	0.01	0.193
Emotional Support (mean (SD))	49.91 (10.72)	50.09 (11.47)	0.919	0.889
Fear Affect (mean (SD))	49.98 (8.06)	51.81 (9.27)	0.19	0.417
Fear Somatic Symptoms (mean (SD))	51.02 (7.24)	53.92 (9.14)	0.03	0.193
Friendship (mean (SD))	50.73 (10.11)	47.52 (9.29)	0.04	0.371
Instrumental Support (mean (SD))	46.89 (9.72)	46.64 (11.48)	0.879	0.976
Life Satisfaction (mean (SD))	52.66 (9.92)	52.08 (9.50)	0.709	0.889
Loneliness (mean (SD))	50.77 (9.75)	52.61 (9.74)	0.24	0.384
Meaning and Purpose (mean (SD))	50.93 (9.64)	52.08 (8.72)	0.437	0.616
Perceived Hostility (mean (SD))	49.14 (9.39)	50.51 (8.32)	0.336	0.601
Perceived Rejection (mean (SD))	48.82 (10.02)	50.74 (9.34)	0.217	0.417
Perceived Stress (mean (SD))	48.99 (9.39)	51.34 (9.56)	0.124	0.371
Positive Affect (mean (SD))	50.56 (7.71)	48.71 (9.14)	0.176	0.384
Sadness (mean (SD))	46.05 (8.23)	48.67 (8.68)	0.054	0.279
Self-efficacy (mean (SD))	50.96 (8.46)	51.66 (9.98)	0.637	0.889

Psychiatry and Life Function				
DSM-Oriented Adult Self-Report				
Depressive Problems (mean (SD))	54.10 (5.22)	55.33 (7.11)	0.22	0.409
Antisocial Personality Problems (mean (SD))	53.04 (4.24)	56.68 (7.99)	0.001	0.005*
Anxiety Problems (mean (SD))	53.04 (4.82)	54.82 (6.33)	0.05	0.099
Somatic Problems (mean (SD))	54.95 (6.27)	55.55 (7.97)	0.6	0.882
Avoidant Personality Problems (mean (SD))	54.14 (5.88)	55.45 (7.19)	0.216	0.357
Syndrome Scale of Adult Self-Report				
Aggressive Behavior (mean (SD))	53.06 (4.34)	55.49 (7.43)	0.014	0.055*
Rule Breaking Behavior (mean (SD))	53.68 (4.48)	57.74 (7.85)	<0.001	0.001*
Intrusive (mean (SD))	53.73 (5.30)	55.85 (6.55)	0.028	0.095
ASR Total Score (mean (SD))	48.37 (8.70)	52.29 (10.14)	0.01	0.032*
Anxious/Depressed (mean (SD))	53.86 (6.61)	55.68 (7.66)	0.114	0.1
Withdrawn (mean (SD))	53.37 (4.87)	55.47 (8.15)	0.052	0.107
Somatic Complaints (mean (SD))	54.76 (6.36)	55.69 (8.21)	0.427	0.758
Thought Problems (mean (SD))	54.23 (5.91)	56.50 (7.86)	0.043	0.099
Attention Problems (mean (SD))	54.73 (4.66)	55.91 (6.89)	0.212	0.479
Internalizing (mean (SD))	48.87 (10.36)	51.86 (12.20)	0.101	0.239
Externalizing (mean (SD))	49.36 (8.66)	55.09 (9.48)	<0.001	0.002*

Significant differences marked with asterisks. HC = Healthy Controls with no History of Conduct, CC = Childhood Conduct History, M = Male, DSM = The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, ASR = Adult Self-Report.

3.2.3. Personality

Subjects in CC group had lower agreeableness compared to HC (mean ± SD: 30.69 (6.62) vs. 33.37 (6.16), respectively; $p = 0.01$). There were no significant differences in other NEO-FFI measurements between two groups, including neuroticism (HC vs. CC; mean ± SD: 17.15 (7.10) vs. 18.97 (7.58); $p = 0.12$), extraversion (HC vs. CC; mean ± SD: 30.15 (6.51) vs. 31.10 (5.56); $p = 0.33$), openness (HC vs. CC; mean ± SD: 28.12 (6.64) vs. 30.00 (6.41); $p = 0.07$), and conscientiousness (HC vs. CC; mean ± SD: 34.22 (6.09) vs. 34.37 (5.44); $p = 0.86$). Results are depicted in figure 2.



Figure 2. Personality construct measured by NEO-FFI and compared between study groups. Asterisk shows the significant difference ($p < 0.05$). CC = Childhood Conduct History, HC = No Prior History of Conduct.

3.3. Hippocampal Subfields and Amygdala Nuclei

3.3.1. Whole-Brain Volumetric Study

Using morphometric measures generated by FreeSurfer and provided by HCP, there were no differences between the thickness of cortical parcellations based on the Desikan-Killiany atlas (Supplementary Table 1). Moreover, we calculated volumes of each parcellation by multiplying thickness into the surface area. These volumes were concatenated with other "volume" data available (incl. subcortical and ventricle volumes), and the statistical model was applied with the addition of Total Intracranial volume as a covariate. There were no significant differences between CC and HC after Benjamini-Hochberg correction (Supplementary Table 2).

3.3.2. Hippocampal Subfields and Amygdala Nuclei

There were no differences between CC and HC in the volumes of hippocampal subfields and amygdala nuclei (Table 2). Of note, the total amygdala and hippocampal volumes obtained using the segmentation method used in this study and values given by HCP's FreeSurfer pipeline

were highly correlated (*r* for each volume: right amygdala = 0.88, left amygdala = 0.90, right hippocampus = 0.94, left hippocampus = 0.94; all *p*-values < 0.001).

Table 2. Volumes of hippocampal subfields and amygdala nuclei as cubic millimeters (mean (SD))

Volume	**HC (n = 71)**	**CC (n = 74)**	***p***	**Corrected *p***
Amygdala				
left Accessory Basal nucleus	273.83 (34.99)	273.13 (33.72)	0.917	0.962
left Anterior amygdaloid Area	57.94 (8.06)	58.81 (7.23)	0.350	0.801
left Basal nucleus	450.91 (56.74)	448.97 (52.55)	0.989	0.989
left Central nucleus	56.97 (9.69)	54.98 (10.44)	0.239	0.755
left Cortical nucleus	31.51 (4.57)	31.52 (4.94)	0.858	0.961
left Corticoamygdaloid transition	196.48 (26.07)	198.35 (26.69)	0.458	0.881
left Lateral nucleus	653.56 (79.79)	657.34 (78.83)	0.451	0.881
left Medial nucleus	29.77 (6.27)	28.44 (7.07)	0.243	0.755
left Paralaminar nucleus	51.49 (6.35)	51.30 (6.14)	0.977	0.989
left Whole amygdala	1802.47 (213.53)	1802.84 (204.69)	0.740	0.961
right Accessory Basal nucleus	269.57 (37.57)	267.74 (33.84)	0.875	0.961
right Anterior amygdaloid Area	62.33 (8.64)	62.86 (8.83)	0.484	0.881
right Basal nucleus	454.75 (57.14)	451.88 (55.14)	0.882	0.961
right Central nucleus	61.07 (10.80)	60.48 (11.28)	0.833	0.961
right Cortical nucleus	28.89 (6.19)	29.88 (5.14)	0.174	0.741
right Corticoamygdaloid transition	187.53 (24.85)	188.54 (25.49)	0.612	0.961
right Lateral nucleus	671.91 (78.28)	683.69 (84.36)	0.102	0.595
right Medial nucleus	29.30 (6.51)	29.82 (6.15)	0.496	0.881
right Paralaminar nucleus	50.12 (6.11)	50.17 (5.84)	0.741	0.961
right Whole amygdala	1815.47 (214.39)	1825.06 (214.17)	0.452	0.881
Hippocampus				
left CA1 body	125.46 (20.88)	126.94 (22.33)	0.643	0.961
left CA1 head	551.95 (80.00)	548.51 (75.99)	0.901	0.961
left CA3 body	83.73 (15.11)	86.15 (16.32)	0.342	0.801
left CA3 head	123.90	125.49	0.430	0.881

	(18.46)	(20.78)		
left CA4 body	116.58 (12.43)	120.07 (12.94)	0.043	0.518
left CA4 head	131.53 (18.57)	132.35 (17.61)	0.595	0.961
left fimbria	96.12 (21.77)	94.92 (22.16)	0.832	0.961
left GC-ML-DG body	136.42 (14.79)	140.67 (15.56)	0.036	0.518
left GC-ML-DG head	166.06 (24.12)	166.88 (22.28)	0.643	0.961
left HATA	61.42 (9.25)	63.08 (10.20)	0.169	0.741
left Hippocampal fissure	132.69 (23.95)	131.49 (21.55)	0.834	0.961
left Hippocampal tail	577.01 (62.13)	593.43 (63.74)	0.073	0.518
left molecular layer HP body	175.88 (22.38)	174.66 (21.44)	0.819	0.961
left molecular layer HP head	232.20 (37.58)	229.53 (35.63)	0.724	0.961
left parasubiculum	67.78 (11.73)	69.11 (11.34)	0.365	0.805
left presubiculum body	171.11 (24.64)	178.10 (26.36)	0.026	0.518
left presubiculum head	132.80 (17.63)	136.00 (22.78)	0.152	0.741
left subiculum body	260.06 (31.95)	269.45 (33.89)	0.022	0.518
left subiculum head	193.30 (37.27)	187.46 (31.60)	0.315	0.801
left Whole hippocampal body	1165.36 (113.99)	1190.96 (116.95)	0.046	0.518
left Whole hippocampal head	1660.94 (218.18)	1658.41 (212.07)	0.889	0.961
left Whole hippocampus	3403.32 (355.55)	3442.80 (358.25)	0.257	0.755
right CA1 body	138.39 (19.94)	142.06 (25.32)	0.227	0.755
right CA1 head	577.02 (87.74)	574.07 (81.08)	0.969	0.989
right CA3 body	94.39 (14.36)	98.09 (17.66)	0.117	0.626
right CA3 head	133.79 (20.81)	136.26 (22.05)	0.276	0.755
right CA4 body	119.98 (13.26)	123.51 (15.42)	0.052	0.518
right CA4 head	139.46 (20.53)	140.29 (20.54)	0.562	0.947
right fimbria	89.44 (21.68)	85.85 (20.94)	0.331	0.801
right GC-ML-DG body	137.49 (14.43)	141.31 (17.82)	0.070	0.518
right GC-ML-DG head	174.99 (26.23)	176.32 (25.62)	0.515	0.891

right HATA	61.51 (9.34)	61.64 (11.54)	0.819	0.961
right Hippocampal fissure	135.46 (34.82)	133.47 (23.33)	0.757	0.961
right Hippocampal tail	587.48 (62.46)	597.46 (71.70)	0.283	0.755
right molecular layer HP body	183.04 (25.45)	181.74 (23.53)	0.847	0.961
right molecular layer HP head	230.98 (38.18)	223.98 (32.59)	0.236	0.755
right parasubiculum	68.69 (13.34)	68.73 (13.31)	0.892	0.961
right presubiculum body	156.26 (22.52)	159.71 (26.30)	0.247	0.755
right presubiculum head	133.43 (17.51)	133.41 (20.46)	0.866	0.961
right subiculum body	249.86 (26.12)	256.56 (32.73)	0.066	0.518
right subiculum head	189.95 (33.03)	184.18 (28.60)	0.263	0.755
right Whole hippocampal body	1168.85 (107.58)	1188.82 (132.11)	0.100	0.595
right Whole hippocampal head	1709.83 (223.60)	1698.90 (217.16)	0.882	0.961
right Whole hippocampus	3466.16 (354.13)	3485.18 (390.16)	0.487	0.881

p-values are for a general linear model to identify between-group differences with age, gender, education, and total intracranial volumes as covariates. Corrected *p*-values are corrected using Benjamini-Hochberg method. CC = Childhood Conduct history, HC = No Childhood Conduct History, CA = Cornu Ammonis, GC-ML-DG = Granule Cell and Molecular Layer of Dentate Gyrus, HATA = Hippocampus-Amygdala Transition Area, HP = Hippocampus.

3.3.3. Association of Evaluations with Hippocampal Subfields and Amygdala Nuclei

In the HC group, only sadness was associated with right CA1 body volume (Estimate ± Std. Error = -0.176 ± 0.05, corrected p = 0.051), indicating higher sadness scores associated with smaller right CA1 solely in this group. No other association was noted between all evaluations and volumes in the HC group.

Interestingly, in CC group, number of correct responses for anger emotion in ER40 (ER40ANG) was significantly associated with right subiculum body (Estimate ± Std. Error = 0.02 ± 0.004, corrected p = 0.001), left subiculum body (Estimate ± Std. Error = 0.017 ± 0.004, corrected p = 0.004), right whole hippocampal body (Estimate ± Std. Error = 0.004 ± 0.001, corrected p = 0.03), and left presubiculum body (Estimate ± Std. Error = 0.018 ± 0.006, corrected

p = 0.04), indicating better angry face recognition associated with larger volumes of these regions only in the CC group (Figure 3). There were also associations between ER40ANG score and other measures of hippocampal subfields and amygdala nuclei with p-values less than 0.01; however, only the four regions mentioned remained significant after Benjamini-Hochberg correction.



Figure 3. Association between anger emotion recognition and volumes of left and right subiculum body, left presubiculum body, and right whole hippocampal body. ER40-Anger: Anger emotion recognition of Penn Emotion Recognition Task.

4. Discussion

In the present study, we provided novel evidence regarding the effect of the previous history of CD in childhood on behavioral, emotional, and neurobiological features of healthy adults. The behavioral parameters were systematically compared between CC and HC groups in three major domains: emotion, psychiatric and life functions, and personality. Significant

differences were reported as higher anger aggression, antisocial personality problems, aggressive and rule-breaking behaviors, externalizing and ASR total T-scores, and lower agreeableness in the CC group. From a neuroimaging perspective, the volume of none of the brain regions, hippocampal subfields, and amygdala nuclei were different between the two groups. Interestingly, better angry face recognition was associated with larger volumes of bilateral subiculum bodies, the right whole hippocampal body, and left presubiculum body solely in subjects with a history of child-onset CD. The differences between the groups cannot be attributed to the demographic characteristics since repeated comparisons showed similar features.

There is robust evidence regarding the significant association between child- and adolescent-onset CD and adulthood antisocial personality disorder [31]. However, childhood CD does not necessarily progress to antisocial disorder as a proportion of subjects with CD experience recovery, especially those with low psychopathic traits [32]. The improvement from CD to the normal condition has been attributed to various biological and environmental factors such as less initial severity of CD, higher child verbal intelligence, greater family socioeconomic status, and not having antisocial biological parents [33]. While this is probable for children with CD to improve to nearly normal and healthy status in case of receiving appropriate cares and treatments, surprisingly, to the best of our knowledge, no study has ever investigated the behavioral and neurobiological outcomes of this population in adulthood, and this study is considered the first of its kind in this topic. Our findings suggest that although subjects with CD-to-normal status reversion do not meet the criteria for adult-onset antisocial personality disorder, they still show some antisocial traits. Most of these traits are also evident in antisocial personality disorder, and the mere difference might be in the degree of the symptoms.

Callous-unemotional (CU) traits are a personality-related subgroup of psychopathic personality traits, characterized by low empathy, restricted affect, interpersonal callousness, and lack of motivation and are significantly associated with more severe and more persistent antisocial behaviors [34]. Our subjects probably had low levels of CU traits in their childhood due to their improvement over time in antisocial behaviors. Although subjects with the previous CD still exhibited some antisocial traits, the emotion and personality domains were found within almost normal range, confirming the low levels of CU traits in our participants.

Literature has addressed alterations in brain structure or structural connectivity of youths with CD, oppositional defiant disorder (ODD), and conduct problems [35]. Particularly, according to a meta-analysis of six studies, youths with child-onset conduct problems showed decreased grey matter volume in the left amygdala and anterior insula compared to typically developing ones [6]. Notably, all previous studies have investigated the alterations in brain structures in patients with current conduct problems. For the first time, this study showed that adults with prior history of childhood-onset CD and current healthy status exhibit a similar pattern in brain structure compared to individuals with no history of conduct problems during their lifetime. This finding might stem from several reasons. One explanation for this phenomenon could be the reversibility of CD effects on brain volume after recovery. One other justification might be due to the compensatory mechanisms in several of the brain regions in response to structural and functional abnormalities of CD whereby small volumetric alterations might be modified.

It has been indicated that patients with conduct problems show impairments in facial emotion recognition [36]; however, the etiology remains unclear. In this regard, Martin-Key and colleagues examined the function of eye fixation on emotionally informative face regions in CD subjects and found a minor effect for abnormalities in fixation behaviors; therefore, they attributed impaired recognition of facial expressions to problems in the comprehension of emotional signs [37]. Nonetheless, a recent simultaneous study of eye gaze patterns and functional brain responses during emotional face processing in adolescents with CD indicated atypical insula activation during facial emotion processing attenuated following the adjustment for gaze behavior [38]. The second factor that could affect recognition of emotion is the “experience” of the emotion throughout the lifespan in that simulation of emotion is associated with stronger recognition of it [39]. According to this theory, psychopaths with impaired experience of an emotion might be predisposed to deficits in recognizing that kind of emotion. The retrieval of emotional memories has been related to an interaction between the amygdala and hippocampus [40]. In this study, neither facial emotion recognition nor hippocampus and amygdala volumes differed between the CC and HC groups. Meanwhile, the size of several hippocampus and amygdala subregions was correlated with anger emotion processing before the Benjamini-Hochberg correction, showing the role of these two regions in emotional memory and its retrieval. After the correction, the volume of four hippocampal subnuclei remained associated

with facial anger recognition, which could mirror the prominence of these areas in the mediation of anger memory.

There is preliminary evidence regarding the bias of anger-prone and potentially aggressive individuals in recognizing facial expressions as they might interpret anger and hostility as vague and even clear non-hostile patterns [41]. In-line, Fairchild and colleagues showed impaired recognition of anger in facial expressions in male adolescents with early-onset CD compared to controls [42]. As our subjects in the CD group had higher anger aggression and aggressive behaviors, we also had expected to observe impaired facial anger recognition. Still, interestingly, we detected no difference between the groups. This issue is consistent with the reports of previous studies that facial emotion recognition is usually impaired in CD with high CU traits [43, 44]. However, young adults with childhood CD history showed a different anger processing, which was closely related to hippocampal volumes, possibly due to a compensatory learning-based mechanism. Maybe using anger morphed faces with higher sensitivity in anger detection [45] could show these subtle processing differences that can be the matter of future research. It should be kept in mind that externalizing behaviors have been associated with lower performance on recognition of anger facial expression in merely three of the seven (43%) studies that tested and reported it individually [46-48]. However, interestingly, Wegrzyn et al. presented fear-anger morphed faces to violent offenders and the general population and observed a lowered threshold to detect anger in the violent offenders group [49]. These behavioral traits and their associations with facial recognition seem interesting, and the role of other factors in aggressive behavior such as impaired delayed gratification [50] or impaired impulse control [51] warrants further exploration for future research.

Several limitations should be considered. First, the limited sample size restricted the generalizability of the results. Second, the cross-sectional setting of this study prevents us from understanding the specific disease course over subjects' lifetime. Studying the children with CD in a prospective cohort design could overcome this limitation. Third, herein, we provided data solely about the brain structure, while CD also gives rise to a notable change in the function of various regions of the brain [35], and fMRI studies appear necessary in this respect.

In conclusion, we, for the first time, evaluated the neuropsychological and emotional performance of healthy adults with a previous history of child-onset CD. Examining the brain

structural status in this population, we found a positive association between the size of several hippocampus subregions and facial anger recognition while all brain region volumes were similar to corresponding areas of those without any history of CD. This study suggests that despite brain recovery in CD subjects that did not progress to antisocial personality disorder, some antisocial traits remain in adulthood. Further studies are required to confirm our preliminary results.

Disclosures

Dr. Abdolalizadeh reported no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest. Dr. Moradi reported no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest. Mr. Dabbagh Ohadi reported no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest. Dr. Mirfazeli reported no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest. Dr. Rajimehr reported no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments

Data were provided by the Human Connectome Project, MGH-USC Consortium (Principal Investigators: Bruce R. Rosen, Arthur W. Toga and Van Wedeen; U01MH093765) funded by the NIH Blueprint Initiative for Neuroscience Research grant; the National Institutes of Health grant P41EB015896; and the Instrumentation Grants S10RR023043, 1S10RR023401, 1S10RR019307.

References:

1. Association, A.P., *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5®)*. 2013: American Psychiatric Pub.
2. von Polier, G.G., et al., *Neural Correlates of Empathy in Boys With Early Onset Conduct Disorder.* Frontiers in Psychiatry, 2020. **11**(178).
3. Gao, Y., et al., *Gray Matter Changes in the Orbitofrontal-Paralimbic Cortex in Male Youths With Non-comorbid Conduct Disorder.* Front Psychol, 2020. **11**: p. 843.
4. Dugré, J.R., et al., *Neurofunctional abnormalities in antisocial spectrum: A meta-analysis of fMRI studies on Five distinct neurocognitive research domains.* Neurosci Biobehav Rev, 2020. **119**: p. 168-183.
5. von Polier, G.G., et al., *Neural Correlates of Empathy in Boys With Early Onset Conduct Disorder.* Front Psychiatry, 2020. **11**: p. 178.
6. Rogers, J.C. and S.A. De Brito, *Cortical and Subcortical Gray Matter Volume in Youths With Conduct Problems: A Meta-analysis.* JAMA Psychiatry, 2016. **73**(1): p. 64-72.
7. Bayard, F., et al., *Distinct brain structure and behavior related to ADHD and conduct disorder traits.* Molecular Psychiatry, 2020. **25**(11): p. 3020-3033.
8. Fairchild, G., et al., *Brain structure abnormalities in adolescent girls with conduct disorder.* J Child Psychol Psychiatry, 2013. **54**(1): p. 86-95.
9. Aoki, Y., et al., *Neural bases of antisocial behavior: a voxel-based meta-analysis.* Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci, 2014. **9**(8): p. 1223-31.
10. de Oliveira-Souza, R., et al., *Psychopathy as a disorder of the moral brain: fronto-temporo-limbic grey matter reductions demonstrated by voxel-based morphometry.* Neuroimage, 2008. **40**(3): p. 1202-13.

11. Laakso, M.P., et al., *Psychopathy and the posterior hippocampus.* Behav Brain Res, 2001. **118**(2): p. 187-93.
12. Huebner, T., et al., *Morphometric brain abnormalities in boys with conduct disorder.* J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry, 2008. **47**(5): p. 540-547.
13. Budhiraja, M., et al., *Brain structure abnormalities in young women who presented conduct disorder in childhood/adolescence.* Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci, 2017. **17**(4): p. 869-885.
14. Van Essen, D.C., et al., *The Human Connectome Project: a data acquisition perspective.* Neuroimage, 2012. **62**(4): p. 2222-31.
15. Bucholz, K.K., et al., *A new, semi-structured psychiatric interview for use in genetic linkage studies: a report on the reliability of the SSAGA.* Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 1994. **55**(2): p. 149-158.
16. Dick, D.M., et al., *A genome-wide screen for genes influencing conduct disorder.* Molecular Psychiatry, 2004. **9**(1): p. 81-86.
17. Ho, D., et al., *MatchIt: Nonparametric Preprocessing for Parametric Causal Inference.* Journal of Statistical Software; Vol 1, Issue 8 (2011), 2011.
18. R Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.* 2019.
19. Gershon, R.C., et al., *Assessment of neurological and behavioural function: The NIH toolbox.* The Lancet Neurology, 2010. **9**(2): p. 138-139.
20. Kohler, C.G., et al., *Facial Emotion Recognition in Schizophrenia: Intensity Effects and Error Pattern.* American Journal of Psychiatry, 2003. **160**(10): p. 1768-1774.
21. Achenbach, T. and L. Rescorla, *Manual for the ASEBA adult forms & profiles*. 2003, Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth ….
22. Costa Jr, P.T. and R.R. McCrae, *The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R)*, in *The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment, Vol 2: Personality measurement and testing.* 2008, Sage Publications, Inc: Thousand Oaks, CA, US. p. 179-198.
23. Glasser, M.F., et al., *The minimal preprocessing pipelines for the Human Connectome Project.* NeuroImage, 2013. **80**: p. 105-124.
24. Fischl, B., *FreeSurfer.* Neuroimage, 2012. **62**(2): p. 774-81.
25. Desikan, R.S., et al., *An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest.* NeuroImage, 2006. **31**(3): p. 968-980.

26. Iglesias, J.E., et al., *A computational atlas of the hippocampal formation using ex vivo, ultra-high resolution MRI: Application to adaptive segmentation of in vivo MRI.* NeuroImage, 2015. **115**: p. 117-137.

27. Saygin, Z.M., et al., *High-resolution magnetic resonance imaging reveals nuclei of the human amygdala: manual segmentation to automatic atlas.* NeuroImage, 2017. **155**: p. 370-382.

28. Tange, O., *Gnu parallel 2018*. 2018: Lulu. com.

29. RStudio Team, *RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R.* 2016.

30. Benjamini, Y. and Y. Hochberg, *Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing.* 1995. **57**(1): p. 289-300.

31. Simonoff, E., et al., *Predictors of antisocial personality. Continuities from childhood to adult life.* Br J Psychiatry, 2004. **184**: p. 118-27.

32. Olino, T.M., J.R. Seeley, and P.M. Lewinsohn, *Conduct disorder and psychosocial outcomes at age 30: early adult psychopathology as a potential mediator.* Journal of abnormal child psychology, 2010. **38**(8): p. 1139-1149.

33. Lahey, B.B., et al., *Adolescent Outcomes of Childhood Conduct Disorder Among Clinic-Referred Boys: Predictors of Improvement.* Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 2002. **30**(4): p. 333-348.

34. Bégin, V., M. Déry, and Y. Le Corff, *Continuity and Change in Psychopathic Traits Among School-Aged Children with Conduct Problems.* Child Psychiatry & Human Development, 2019. **50**(4): p. 580-590.

35. Fairchild, G., et al., *Conduct disorder.* Nature Reviews Disease Primers, 2019. **5**(1): p. 1-25.

36. Cooper, S., C.W. Hobson, and S.H. van Goozen, *Facial emotion recognition in children with externalising behaviours: A systematic review.* Clin Child Psychol Psychiatry, 2020. **25**(4): p. 1068-1085.

37. Martin-Key, N.A., et al., *Facial emotion recognition and eye movement behaviour in conduct disorder.* J Child Psychol Psychiatry, 2018. **59**(3): p. 247-257.

38. Menks, W.M., et al., *Eye gaze patterns and functional brain responses during emotional face processing in adolescents with conduct disorder.* NeuroImage: Clinical, 2021. **29**: p. 102519.

39. Goldman, A.I. and C.S. Sripada, *Simulationist models of face-based emotion recognition.* Cognition, 2005. **94**(3): p. 193-213.

40. Buchanan, T.W., *Retrieval of emotional memories.* Psychological bulletin, 2007. **133**(5): p. 761-779.

41. Mellentin, A.I., et al., *Seeing enemies? A systematic review of anger bias in the perception of facial expressions among anger-prone and aggressive populations.* Aggression and Violent Behavior, 2015. **25**: p. 373-383.

42. Fairchild, G., et al., *Deficits in facial expression recognition in male adolescents with early-onset or adolescence-onset conduct disorder.* J Child Psychol Psychiatry, 2009. **50**(5): p. 627-36.

43. Dawel, A., et al., *Not just fear and sadness: meta-analytic evidence of pervasive emotion recognition deficits for facial and vocal expressions in psychopathy.* Neurosci Biobehav Rev, 2012. **36**(10): p. 2288-304.

44. Schwenck, C., et al., *Empathy in children with autism and conduct disorder: group-specific profiles and developmental aspects.* J Child Psychol Psychiatry, 2012. **53**(6): p. 651-9.

45. Schönenberg, M. and A. Jusyte, *Investigation of the hostile attribution bias toward ambiguous facial cues in antisocial violent offenders.* European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience, 2014. **264**(1): p. 61-69.

46. Singh, S.D., et al., *Recognition of facial expressions of emotion by children with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder.* Behav Modif, 1998. **22**(2): p. 128-42.

47. Chronaki, G., et al., *Emotion-recognition abilities and behavior problem dimensions in preschoolers: evidence for a specific role for childhood hyperactivity.* Child Neuropsychol, 2015. **21**(1): p. 25-40.

48. Kimonis, E.R., et al., *Can Callous-Unemotional Traits be Reliably Measured in Preschoolers?* J Abnorm Child Psychol, 2016. **44**(4): p. 625-38.

49. Wegrzyn, M., S. Westphal, and J. Kissler, *In your face: the biased judgement of fear-anger expressions in violent offenders.* BMC Psychology, 2017. **5**(1): p. 16.

50. Krueger, R.F., et al., *Delay of Gratification, Psychopathology, and Personality: Is Low Self-Control Specific to Externaiizing Problems?* Journal of Personality, 1996. **64**(1): p. 107-129.

51. Brady, K.T., H. Myrick, and S. McElroy, *The Relationship Between Substance Use Disorders, Impulse Control Disorders, and Pathological Aggression.* American Journal on Addictions, 1998. **7**(3): p. 221-230.