# A prospective study of time-dependent exposures to childhood adversity and DNA methylation in childhood and adolescence

**Authors:** Alexandre A. Lussier*[1,2,3], Yiwen Zhu[1,4], Brooke J. Smith[1], Janine Cerutti[1], Andrew J. Simpkin[5], Andrew D.A.C. Smith[6], Matthew J. Suderman[7], Esther Walton[8], Kerry J. Ressler[2,9], Erin C. Dunn**[1,2,3,10]

**Affiliations:**

[1] Psychiatric and Neurodevelopmental Genetics Unit, Centre for Genomic Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, 02114, USA.

[2] Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, 02115, USA.

[3] Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research, The Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT, Cambridge, MA, 02142, USA.

[4] Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, 02114, USA

[5] School of Mathematics, Statistics and Applied Mathematics, National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland.

[6] Mathematics and Statistics Research Group, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK.

[7] MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

[8] Department of Psychology, University of Bath, Bath, UK.

[9] McLean Hospital, Belmont, MA, 02478, USA.

[10] Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 02138, USA.

**Corresponding authors:**

*Alexandre A. Lussier: alussier[at]mgh.harvard.edu

**Erin C. Dunn: edunn2[at]mgh.harvard.edu

**Keywords:** ALSPAC, longitudinal, epigenetic, DNA methylation, childhood adversity, adolescence, trajectories.

**ABSTRACT**

**Background:** Childhood adversity influences long-term health, particularly if experienced during sensitive periods in development when physiological systems are more responsive to environmental influences. Although the underlying mechanisms remain unclear, prior studies suggest that DNA methylation (DNAm) may capture these time-dependent effects of childhood adversity. However, it remains unknown whether DNAm alterations persist into adolescence and how the timing of adversity might influence DNAm trajectories across development.

**Methods:** We examined the relationship between time-dependent adversity and genome-wide DNAm measured at three waves from birth to adolescence using prospective data from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. We first assessed the relationship between the timing of exposure to seven types of adversity (measured 5-8 times between ages 0-11) and DNAm at age 15 using a structured life course modeling approach. We also characterized the persistence into adolescence of associations identified from age 7 DNAm, as well as the influence of adversity on DNAm trajectories from ages 0-15.

**Results:** Adversity was associated with differences in age 15 DNAm at 24 loci (FDR<0.05). Most loci (19 of 24) were associated with adversity (i.e., physical/sexual abuse, one-adult households, caregiver abuse) that occurred between ages 3-5. Although no DNAm differences present at age 7 persisted into adolescence, we identified seven unique types of DNAm trajectories across development, which highlighted diverse effects of childhood adversity on DNAm.

**Conclusions:** Our results suggest that childhood adversity, particularly between ages 3-5, can influence the trajectories of DNAm across development, exerting both immediate and latent effects on the epigenome.

## INTRODUCTION

Childhood adversity, such as abuse or maltreatment (1, 2), family disruption or dysfunction (3, 4), or poverty (5, 6), is one of the most potent determinants of poor physical and mental health in both children and adults (7-9). While the mechanisms underlying the biological embedding of childhood adversity are not yet well understood, epigenetic processes, such as DNA methylation (DNAm), have emerged as one potential pathway to bridge genetic factors and life experiences (10). Large-scale population-based studies, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses have shown that DNAm signatures in humans are responsive to life experiences, including exposure to childhood adversity across the life course (11-16). However, prior studies on childhood adversity and DNAm have not fully explored two key dimensions of this relationship, which are critical to assess the biological risk posed by childhood adversity and to better target interventions for health promotion and disease prevention.

First, it remains unclear whether the timing of childhood adversity plays a role in shaping DNAm. Emerging evidence from human populations and animal models suggests there may be *sensitive periods* in epigenetic programming, when physiological and neurobiological systems may be primed for external influences, which can, in turn, impart more enduring effects on health (17-21). Few studies have investigated whether there are specific periods when childhood adversity may have greater effects on DNAm (15, 22), with no studies investigating epigenetic patterns in adolescence. Thus, it remains unknown whether there are sensitive periods during which adversity may exert greater influences on DNAm, and in turn on adolescent health.

Second, few studies have assessed the role of childhood adversity in relation to longitudinal measures of DNAm across development (i.e., DNAm trajectories). A recent review article argues that analyses examining DNAm at a single moment in development have limited capacity to identify robust associations with health outcomes due to the dynamic nature of epigenetic mechanisms (23). Rather, chrono-epigenetic patterns (i.e., the longitudinal dynamics of epigenetic processes) may more adequately predict the immediate and long-term effects of life experiences. To our knowledge, only six

48 studies have assessed the influence of early-life experiences on the trajectories of DNAm across
49 development. These have mainly focused on biological markers of prenatal environments, such as
50 gestational age and birthweight (24), or have examined early-life stressors individually, including
51 maternal pre-pregnancy BMI and gestational weight gain (25), prenatal maternal smoking (26), socio-
52 economic disadvantage during childhood (27, 28), and adolescent victimization (29). However, no
53 study has examined how the timing of multiple types of childhood adversity may influence DNAm
54 trajectories across development. Such knowledge would provide deeper insight into the molecular
55 underpinnings of human health, while also help identify those at greater risk for the negative effects of
56 adversity on health outcomes.

57 To address these gaps, we examined the longitudinal relationship between early-life adversity
58 and genome-wide DNAm across childhood and adolescence, using data collected over two decades
59 from a subsample of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) cohort. Here, we
60 examined the associations between exposure to seven types of childhood adversity, assessed repeatedly
61 between birth and age 11, and DNAm at age 15. Given the unique availability of three waves of DNAm
62 in this cohort (at birth, age 7, and age 15), we also examined DNAm trajectories from birth to
63 adolescence. Our aims were to: 1) determine whether adolescent DNAm captured the time-dependent
64 effects of childhood adversity; 2) characterize the developmental trajectories of DNAm linked to
65 adversity; and 3) evaluate the persistence of previously-identified associations between adversity and
66 DNAm in childhood (22). To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the time-dependent
67 influences of childhood adversity on adolescent DNAm and trajectories of DNAm across development.
68

69 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

70 **Sample**

71 Data came from the ALSPAC, a large population-based birth cohort from Avon, UK of 14,451
72 children followed from before birth through early adulthood (30, 31) (see **Supplemental Materials** for

details). The ALSPAC study website contains details of all the data available through a fully searchable data dictionary and variable search tool (http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/). Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ALSPAC Law and Ethics Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees. Consent for biological samples was collected in accordance with the Human Tissue Act (2004). Informed consent for the use of data collected via questionnaires and clinics was obtained from participants following the recommendations of the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee. All data are available by request from the ALSPAC Executive Committee for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data (http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/access/). Secondary analyses of ALSPAC data were approved with oversight by the Mass General Brigham Institutional Review Boards (IRB) (Protocol 2017P001110).

**Measures of childhood adversity**

We examined the effect of seven types of childhood adversity previously associated with DNAm (32-35): 1) caregiver physical or emotional abuse; 2) sexual or physical abuse (by anyone)(36-39); 3) maternal psychopathology; 4) one adult in the household; 5) family instability; 6) financial hardship; and 7) neighborhood disadvantage. These adversities were generated from maternal reports via mailed questionnaires, collected 5-8 times between birth and age 11 (**Figure 1**; see **Table S2** for a complete description of childhood adversities).

**DNAm data generation**

Blood-based DNAm profiles were generated at birth, age 7, and age 15 as part of the Accessible Resource for Integrated Epigenomics Studies (ARIES), a subsample of 1,018 mother-child pairs randomly selected from those with complete data across five or more waves of ALSPAC data collection (**Supplemental Materials**) (40). DNAm was measured at 485,577 CpG sites using the

98 Illumina Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip microarray (Illumina, San Diego, CA). DNA for
99 this assay was extracted from cord blood at birth, whole blood at age 7, and peripheral blood
100 leukocytes collected at age 15. Laboratory procedures, preprocessing analyses, and quality control
101 steps performed have been described previously (40).
102
103 **DNA methylation data pre-processing and normalization**
104 DNAm data were processed using the *meffil* package in R, which performs background
105 correction and functional normalization of DNAm data (41). Twins and samples with >10% of CpG
106 sites with a detection p-value >0.01 or a bead count <3 were removed, as were cross-hybridizing
107 probes and polymorphic probes. To remove possible outliers, we winsorized the beta values (i.e.,
108 values that represent the percent of methylation at each CpG site), setting the bottom 5% and top 5% of
109 values to the 5th and 95th quantile, respectively (42). Finally, we removed probes showing little
110 variability across individuals, defined as CpGs with <5% difference in DNAm between the $10^{th}$ and
111 $90^{th}$ percentile of values. The final analytic sample after pre-processing consisted of 966 youths and
112 302,581 CpGs with DNAm data measured at age 15. DNAm measured at age 0 and 7 were similarly
113 pre-processed and normalized (**Supplemental materials**).
114
115 **Covariates**
116 To account for potential confounding and be consistent with previous work on childhood
117 adversities (15), we included the following covariates: age of blood collection, sex, race/ethnicity,
118 maternal age at birth, maternal education at birth, birthweight, number of previous pregnancies,
119 maternal smoking during pregnancy, and cell type proportions estimated using the Houseman method
120 (43). See **Supplemental Materials** for variable coding.
121
122 **Analyses**

123 *Structured Life Course Modeling Approach (SLCMA)*

124 Our primary analyses focused on identifying time-dependent associations between each type of
125 childhood adversity and DNAm measured in adolescence (age 15). To identify these associations, we
126 used the structured life course modeling approach (SLCMA; pronounced "slick-mah"), which is a two-
127 stage method that simultaneously compares different *a priori-specified* hypotheses that explain
128 exposure-outcome relationships (44-46). The SLCMA uses variable selection to identify the life course
129 hypothesis explaining the greatest proportion of outcome variation. Estimates confidence intervals and
130 p-values are calculated for the selected life course hypothesis, using post-selective inference to remove
131 bias associated with multiple testing and variable selection. The SLCMA has been successfully applied
132 to high-dimensional DNAm data to identify sensitive periods in development that can influence
133 genome-wide DNAm patterns (15, 22, 47).

134 We tested time-dependent exposure to adversity for the timepoint shown in **Figure 1**. We
135 interpreted exposure to each adversity type through six separate life course hypotheses, including four
136 sensitive periods hypotheses that encoded exposure to each childhood adversity during: 1) very early
137 childhood (ages 0-2), 2) early childhood (ages 3-5), 3) middle childhood (ages 6-7), 4) late childhood
138 (ages 8-11); and two additive hypotheses: 5) total number exposures across childhood (accumulation),
139 and 6) total number of exposures weighted by age (recency), which allowed us to assess if more recent
140 exposures had a stronger impact than distal exposures.

141 We used selective inference to perform post-selection inference (48) and adjusted for covariates
142 using the Frisch-Waugh-Lovell theorem (49), which has been shown to improve statistical power in
143 penalized regression analyses (47, 50). Only complete cases (i.e., individuals with non-missing data on
144 covariates and exposures from ages 0-11) were analyzed for each adversity (**Figure 1**). We accounted
145 for multiple-testing using the Benjamini-Hochberg method to control the false-discovery rate at 5%
146 (FDR<0.05) (51), or a Bonferroni-corrected threshold of $p<1.65x10^{-7}$.

147

148 *Functional analyses of SLCMA results*

149 We investigated the biological implications of our findings from the SLCMA in four different
150 ways. First, we assessed the enrichment of regulatory elements in top loci compared to the all analyzed
151 loci using chi-squared tests. Second, we examined the correlation of DNAm at the top loci in blood and
152 four different brain regions using the Blood Brain DNA Methylation Comparison Tool (52). Third, we
153 analyzed the enrichment of biological processes in top loci using gene ontology (GO) terms from the
154 DAVID tool (53, 54). Fourth, we assessed the evolutionary constraint of genes linked to top loci using
155 data from the Exome Aggregation Consortium (55).

156

157 *Trajectories of DNAm response to childhood adversity*

158 The three waves of longitudinal DNAm data available for the ALSPAC cohort provide a unique
159 opportunity to investigate the developmental patterns of DNAm across development. Building from the
160 SLCMA findings, we pursued three additional sets of analyses.

161

162 Pre-existence of age 15 associations

163 First, we determined whether DNAm differences present at age 15 emerged earlier in
164 development. Using linear regression, we tested whether exposure to the adversity selected in the
165 SLCMA at age 15 was associated with DNAm at the same top loci at birth or age 7, while adjusting for
166 covariates.

167

168 Types of DNAm trajectories across development

169 Second, we investigated patterns of DNAm change beyond differences between single time
170 points, focusing on patterns of change and stability among the top loci identified from the SLCMA of
171 age 15 DNAm. Specifically, we examined the longitudinal DNAm patterns of individuals in three
172 distinct exposure groups: 1) adversity exposure *during* the period identified from the SLCMA (labeled

173 as exposed-SP); 2) adversity exposure *outside* the period identified from the SLCMA (exposed-other);
174 and 3) never exposed. We then performed an ANOVA of the statistical interaction between age at
175 DNAm collection and exposure group, controlling for DNAm repeated measures in the ANOVA as
176 fixed effects, which allowed us to determine whether any exposure group differed from another in its
177 longitudinal DNAm trajectory. Loci showing significant differences for group-by-age interactions
178 (FDR<0.05) were carried forward into the next stage, as they showed more granular differences
179 between exposure groups across development.

180 From these loci, we identified groupings of loci with similar longitudinal patterns (i.e., types of
181 DNAm trajectories). Similarities were defined in relation to three main distinguishing features: 1) mean
182 exposure group differences *across ages* 2) mean age differences *across exposure groups*, and 3)
183 exposure group differences *within* each age. These features were determined using Tukey *post-hoc*
184 analyses of the ANOVA described above. We then performed hierarchical clustering of these features
185 to identify homogeneous subsets of trajectories (**Supplemental materials**).

186

187 Persistence of childhood DNAm differences to adolescence

188 Third, we assessed whether DNAm alterations linked to childhood adversity, which we
189 previously identified at age 7 (22), persisted until adolescence. For these analyses, we performed linear
190 models between adversity and age 15 DNAm data for these 48 childhood loci only (**Supplemental**
191 **materials**).

192

193 **RESULTS**

194 **Sample characteristics and prevalence of exposure to adversity**

195 Demographic characteristics of the ARIES sample and subset of children with any exposure to
196 adversity between ages 0-11 can be found in **Table S1**. The prevalence of exposure to a given adversity
197 between the ages of 0-11 ranged from 15.1% (sexual/physical abuse) to 34.8% (maternal

198 psychopathology) (**Figure S1; Table S3**). The correlation of exposure within each adversity across
199 different developmental ages ranged from 0.36 (family instability) to 0.786 (one adult in the
200 household). The different types of adversity were weakly correlated with each other, ranging from an
201 average correlation of -0.04 (family instability) to 0.16 (maternal psychopathology), suggesting that
202 these measures of childhood adversity captured distinct exposures.
203
204 **Childhood adversity showed time-dependent associations with adolescent DNAm profiles**
205 Across all types of adversity, 24 loci showed significant associations between exposure to
206 adversity and DNAm levels at age 15 at FDR<0.05; 7 of these loci were also significant at a
207 Bonferroni-corrected p-value $<1.65 \times 10^{-7}$ (**Table 1**).
208 Among FDR-significant loci, sensitive period models were most often selected, with 21 loci
209 showing associations with childhood adversity that occurred during very early childhood (2 of 24),
210 early childhood (18 of 24), or late childhood (1 of 24) (**Figure 2A**). By contrast, only 3 loci showed
211 associations with the accumulation of adversity across development.
212 A large proportion of effects were for one-adult households in the FDR-significant loci (18 of
213 24 loci). We also identified associations with caregiver physical/emotional abuse (2 loci), sexual or
214 physical abuse by anyone (3 loci), and maternal psychopathology (1 locus). No associations were
215 observed with family instability or neighborhood disadvantage.
216 Exposure to adversity was most often associated with a decrease in DNAm levels (21 out of
217 24). On average, childhood adversity exposure was linked to a 3.6% absolute difference in DNA
218 methylation levels (range 1.5-10.4%). For the three loci associated with accumulated time with one
219 adult in the household, each additional timepoint with one adult was associated with a 1% difference in
220 DNAm (range 0.3-1.4%).
221
222 **Biological relevance of adolescent loci associated with time-dependent childhood adversity**

223 To further understand the biological implications of loci associated with childhood adversity,
224 we assessed their genomic context, relationship with brain DNA methylation levels, and functional
225 relevance at the biological and evolutionary level (**Table S4**).

226 From a genomic enrichment standpoint, the 24 FDR-significant loci were overrepresented in
227 enhancers ($\chi^2$=5.1; p=0.025) but not in gene promoters ($\chi^2$=2.1; p=0.15; **Figure S2A**) away from CpG
228 islands ('Open Sea') but not in CpG Islands, shores, or shelves ($\chi^2$=13.7; p=0.018; **Figure S2B**).
229 Overall, the top loci identified in adolescence tended to show higher representation in regions of lower
230 CpG density, suggesting these genomic regions may be more responsive to childhood adversity.

231 Most loci (19/24) had weak, but positive correlations between brain and blood (prefrontal
232 cortex $r_{avg}$=0.06, range=-0.19-0.65; entorhinal cortex $r_{avg}$=0.07, range=-0.23-0.60; superior temporal
233 gyrus $r_{avg}$ =0.06, range=-0.18-0.61; cerebellum $r_{avg}$=0.07, range=-0.13-0.54) (**Table S5**; **Figure S3**).
234 Thus, adversity-induced alterations to blood DNAm levels may reflect similar changes in the central
235 nervous system.

236 We also identified 6 distinct clusters of biological processes overrepresented in FDR-significant
237 loci (n=24 genes). Although none reached statistical significance, these clusters were broadly
238 implicated in muscle tissue development, cell adhesion, MAPK cascades, and cellular regulation of
239 biosynthetic processes (**Figure S4**). These results suggest that different types of childhood adversity
240 may act through diverse biological process to influence a multitude of downstream biological
241 processes, rather than through a concerted network of biological pathways.

242 Genes linked to FDR-significant loci showed little evidence of strong evolutionary conservation
243 overall, as measured by the intolerance to loss-of-function estimates (**Table S4; Figure S5**). However,
244 3 genes showed high probability of intolerance to genetic variation resulting in their loss-of-function
245 (pLI>0.9; *DSP*, *CUX2*, and *STK38L*), which were all linked to the accumulation of exposure to one

246 adult in the household. These findings highlight a potential role for genes influenced by parental and
247 social environment in human survival and evolution.

248

249 **DNAm differences at age 15 were not present earlier in childhood**

250 Among the 24 FDR-significant loci observed in DNAm at age 15, three associations were
251 observed with DNAm at birth (**Table S6**) and two with DNAm at age 7 ($p<0.05$) (**Table S7**). However,
252 none of these association survived adjustment for multiple tests (24 tests at FDR < 5%), and effect
253 estimates were considerably smaller at age 7 than at age 15 with consistent direction for less than half
254 (11 of 24) (**Figure 3A**).

255

256 **Childhood adversity was linked to distinct trajectories of DNAm across development**

257 Moving beyond single time points of DNAm, we found that 21 of the 24 FDR-significant loci
258 had significant adversity exposure group-by-age interactions (FDR<0.05), suggestive of more complex
259 patterns of change and stability across development. From these loci, we further identified six types of
260 longitudinal DNAm trajectories, which showed distinct differences in DNAm patterns across ages and
261 adversity exposure groups, both across and within specific ages (**Figure 3; Table 1; Figure S6; Table**
262 **S8**). For the three loci that did not show exposure group-by-age interactions, we identified slight
263 differences between exposed-SP and unexposed youths at age 7, which fully emerged by age 15 (i.e.,
264 stable). **Table 2** provides a full description of the patterns that distinguish these different types of
265 DNAm trajectories, as well as examples.

266

267 **Associations between adversity and childhood DNAm did not persist into adolescence**

268 We previously identified associations between time-varying adversity exposures before age 7
269 and DNAm at 48 CpG sites measured at age 7, which we assessed for persistence into adolescence at

270 age 15. Of these 48 CpG sites, only one showed an association between childhood adversity and
271 DNAm at age 15 ($p<0.05$; **Table S9**). However, this association did not survive adjustment for multiple
272 tests (48 tests at an FDR<0.05), with just over half showing consistent direction of effect (25/48)
273 (**Figure 3D**).

274 **DISCUSSION**

275 The main finding from this study is that childhood adversity has unique and time-dependent
276 associations with DNAm, which manifest through varying patterns of persistence and latency across
277 development. This work highlights the role of sensitive periods in development and their effects on
278 chrono-epigenetic patterns. To our knowledge, this is the first study to incorporate time-dependent
279 measures of adversity in the study of longitudinal epigenetic patterns.

280

281 Our findings point to early childhood (i.e., between the ages of 3 and 5) as a sensitive period for
282 the biological embedding of childhood adversity, as reflected by DNAm differences present in
283 adolescence. These findings are consistent with multiple prior studies in humans (13, 15) and animal
284 models (56, 57), which have shown that exposures earlier in life may have greater influence on
285 epigenetic patterns. This emphasis on sensitive periods, over other alternative life course hypotheses, is
286 also in line with previous analyses of childhood adversity and DNAm in the ALSPAC cohort, which
287 found that most sensitive period effects arose from exposures during early childhood (22). Early
288 childhood (between ages 3-5) is a critical time period when children begin rapidly developing
289 cognitive, social, emotional, linguistic, and regulatory skills (58). As developmental processes during
290 preschool ages provide an important foundation for future executive functioning (59), this period is ripe
291 for interventions that may limit or prevent the long-term effects of childhood adversity. Indeed, prior
292 studies on children exposed to domestic violence have shown that child-parent psychotherapy between
293 age 3-5 can improve PTSD and depressive symptoms, as well as child behavior problems (60, 61).

294 Recent evidence also suggests that interventions that promote executive function skills may help build
295 resilience among preschool children exposed to adversity and help build toward future success (62).
296
297 Of the seven types of adversity examined, exposure to single parent households had the greatest
298 number of associations in adolescence. By contrast, previous research on DNAm from the same
299 children at age 7 identified no associations with one-adult households, suggesting that these effects
300 may be adolescent-specific (22). Single parent family structures are associated with onset of puberty, as
301 well as other mental health outcomes such as self-esteem, depressive symptoms, and externalizing
302 behaviors, especially in girls (64-66) and when exposure occurs during the first few years of life (67).
303 This relationship may reflect an increased likelihood of children in one-adult household to form
304 maladaptive attachment styles (64), or result from the decreased emotional and material support that
305 can be provided by single parents due to societal and financial pressures. In turn, these gaps in expected
306 versus experienced inputs in early life could manifest during adolescence, a period of rapid maturation
307 for higher order functions. Our findings suggest the biological effects of one-adult households may
308 extend to the DNAm level, which could potentially influence developmental and health outcomes in
309 adolescence. Curiously, fewer associations were observed for other adversities, such as maternal
310 psychopathology and experiences of sexual, physical, or emotional abuse. These adversities may have
311 subtler influences on the adolescent epigenome, which require larger sample sizes or meta-analyses to
312 uncover associations. Of note, none of our top loci overlapped between different types of childhood
313 adversity, nor were they present in a previous study of DNAm trajectories and adolescent victimization
314 (29). These results provide additional insight into ongoing debate on the "lumping or splitting" of
315 childhood adversities in clinical research (68), showing that distinct dimensions of adversity may result
316 in unique epigenetic signatures. However, it remains unknown whether these subtypes of adversity
317 might have differential effects on downstream biological processes and vulnerability to disease,

318 highlighting the need for studies that compare and contrast the effects of adversity on both epigenetic
319 mechanisms and health outcomes.
320
321 Arguably the most novel set of findings from our study concerned the relationships of adversity
322 and patterns of stability and change in DNAm over time. Most DNAm trajectories showed primarily
323 latent effects of adversity, meaning they did not emerge until age 15 in youths exposed to adversity.
324 These findings are in line with previous longitudinal studies of genome-wide DNAm, which have
325 shown that early-life stressors, such as prenatal maternal smoking (26) and socio-economic
326 disadvantage during childhood (27, 28), can have both immediate and latent effects on DNAm during
327 childhood and adolescence. However, some trajectories also showed effects that emerged at earlier
328 ages, which may reflect a desynchronization of epigenetic patterns in response to childhood adversity
329 that became more apparent later in development. Importantly, Oh and Petronis recently suggested that
330 these "sleeper" temporal rhythms in DNAm may explain why complex diseases unfold over years of
331 development, rather than immediately after exposures or risk factors (23). Alternatively, these
332 alterations could reflect specific development windows when the impacts of adversity on biological
333 processes may begin to emerge. These findings suggest the effects of childhood adversity on the
334 epigenome may not instantly take effect, but rather remain latent or alter the developmental trajectories
335 of DNAm in subtle ways that evade immediate detection. As such, future research should investigate
336 whether these latent effects of childhood adversity on the epigenome persist into adulthood and
337 whether they are indeed more likely to influence physical and mental health than alterations that arise
338 earlier in development.
339 Similarly, the DNAm differences we had previously observed at age 7 did not persist into
340 adolescence (22). Studies on early-life stressors (27, 28) and markers of prenatal environments, such as
341 birthweight and gestational age (24), have revealed parallel insights, showing that DNAm differences
342 linked to early-life environments do not generally persist across developmental time. By contrast, some

343 DNAm signatures of prenatal smoking persist across development, suggesting that exposures with
344 more clearly delineated biological responses may induce more lasting consequences on the epigenome
345 (26). Although these findings suggest that early signatures of childhood adversity may fade from the
346 epigenome, these short-term alterations may alter the developmental trajectories of downstream
347 physiological systems or cellular pathways, which may not be reflected in the epigenome despite their
348 potential influences on health and disease (69). An alternative hypothesis is that the effects of adversity
349 may indeed resolve over time, suggestive of adaptive alterations to the epigenome across development,
350 without the need for focused interventions. Although these findings may have important ramifications
351 for the prevention and treatment of adversity-related health conditions, additional research is needed to
352 identify the true consequences of these differences and determine whether short- and/or long-term
353 DNAm changes mediate the link between childhood adversity and health outcomes.
354
355 Our study had several limitations. First, DNAm data were generated from slightly different
356 tissue types at each wave, which may have induced additional variability between ages. Although we
357 corrected for cell type composition using well-established bioinformatic methods, differences in
358 DNAm between waves may have been partially driven by tissue-based differences. As such, additional
359 research using consistent tissues for DNAm measurement across development are needed to fully parse
360 the longitudinal effects of adversity on DNAm. Furthermore, we were unable to assess the effects of
361 childhood adversity on the types of DNAm trajectories across development, as the timing of DNAm
362 and adversity overlapped. Future studies with additional waves of DNAm after the measurement of
363 childhood adversity may help untangle the role of adversity in shaping trajectories of DNAm, as would
364 the use of causal inference methods that can handle time-varying exposures and confounders (70).
365 Finally, our analytic subset was mainly composed of children from European descent and families with
366 socioeconomic privilege, limiting the generalizability of our findings to broader populations, given
367 existing disparities in distributions of childhood adversity and health outcomes (71). Our findings

368 should be replicated in more diverse cohorts to fully assess the impact of childhood adversity on
369 DNAm across development.
370
371 **CONCLUSIONS**
372 In sum, this study highlights the complex relationship between childhood adversity and
373 longitudinal DNAm trajectories across development, which vary not only based on the timing of
374 adversity, but also the age at which DNAm is measured. Our findings also provide further insight into
375 the sensitive periods that shape the biological embedding of experiences during early-life, while
376 placing further emphasis on the analysis of chrono-epigenetic patterns in the context of human health.
377 In particular, our results suggest that adversity during early childhood may alter the overall trajectory of
378 DNAm across development, which may, in turn, influence health across the life course. As such, future
379 studies should continue to investigate longitudinal measures of DNAm to identify the potential role of
380 latent and occasionally persistent epigenetic alterations in driving short- and long-term health
381 outcomes. Ultimately, this line of research will help guide intervention strategies and identify
382 individual who are at higher risk for physical and mental disorders arising from exposure to childhood
383 adversity.
384
385 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**
386 This work was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health
387 (grant number R01MH113930 awarded to ECD). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors
388 and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. Dr. Dunn and
389 Dr. Lussier were also supported by a grant from One Mind. We are extremely grateful to all the
390 families who took part in the ALSPAC study, the midwives for their help in recruiting them, and the
391 whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical
392 workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and nurses. The UK Medical Research

393 Council and Wellcome (Grant ref: 217065/Z/19/Z) and the University of Bristol provide core support
394 for ALSPAC. A comprehensive list of grants funding is available on the ALSPAC website
395 (http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf); This research was
396 specifically funded by grants from the BBSRC (BBI025751/1; BB/I025263/1), IEU
397 (MC_UU_12013/1; MC_UU_12013/2; MC_UU_12013/8), National Institute of Child and Human
398 Development (R01HD068437), NIH (5RO1AI121226-02), and CONTAMED EU (212502). This
399 publication is the work of the authors, whom will serve as guarantors for the contents of this paper.
400 Dr. Walton is funded by CLOSER, whose mission is to maximise the use, value and impact of
401 longitudinal studies (www.closer.ac.uk). CLOSER was funded by the Economic and Social Research
402 Council (ESRC) and the Medical Research Council (MRC) between 2012 and 2017. Its initial five-year
403 grant has since been extended to March 2021 by the ESRC (grant reference: ES/K000357/1). The
404 funders took no role in the design, execution, analysis or interpretation of the data or in the writing up
405 of the findings. Dr. Walton is also supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and
406 innovation programme (grant nº 848158).
407 Finally, we would also like to thank Dr. Garrett Fitzmaurice for his guidance in the characterization of
408 DNAm trajectories across development.
409

410 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

411 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

412 **REFERENCES**


413 1. Slopen N, Koenen KC, Kubzansky LD. Cumulative adversity in childhood and emergent risk factors for
414 long-term health. Journal of Pediatrics. 2014;164(3):631-8.
415 2. Widom CS, DuMont K, Czaja SJ. A prospective investigation of major depressive disorder and
416 comorbidity in abused and neglected children grown up. Archives of General Psychiatry. 2007;64:49-56.
417 3. Repetti RL, Taylor SE, Seeman TE. Risky families: Family social environments and the mental and
418 physical health of offspring. Psychological Bulletin. 2002;128(2):330-66.
419 4. Gilman SE, Kawachi I, Fitzmaurice GM, Buka SL. Family disruption in childhood and risk of adult
420 depression. American Journal of Psychiatry. 2003;160:939-46.
421 5. Brooks-Gunn J, Duncan GJ. Effects of poverty on children. The Future of Children. 1997;7(2):55-71.
422 6. McLeod JD, Shanahan MJ. Trajectories of poverty and children's mental health. Journal of Health and
423 Social Behavior. 1996;37(3):207-20.
424 7. McLaughlin KA, Green JG, Gruber MJ, Sampson NA, Zaslavsky AM, Kessler RC. Childhood adversities
425 and adult psychiatric disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication II: Associations with
426 persistence of DSM-IV disorders. Archives of General Psychiatry. 2010;67(2):124-32.
427 8. McLaughlin KA, Green JG, Gruber MJ, Sampson NA, Zaslavsky AM, Kessler RC. Childhood adversities
428 and first onset of psychiatric disorders in a national sample of US adolescents. JAMA Psychiatry.
429 2012;69(11):1151-60.
430 9. Gilman SE, Ni MY, Dunn EC, Breslau J, McLaughlin KA, Smoller JW, et al. Contributions of the social
431 environment to first-onset and recurrent mania. Mol Psychiatry. 2015;20(3):329-36.
432 10. Aristizabal MJ, Anreiter I, Halldorsdottir T, Odgers CL, McDade TW, Goldenberg A, et al. Biological
433 embedding of experience: A primer on epigenetics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
434 2020;117(38):23261.
435 11. Cecil CAM, Zhang Y, Nolte T. Childhood maltreatment and DNA methylation: A systematic review.
436 Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews. 2020;112:392-409.
437 12. Parade SH, Huffhines L, Daniels TE, Stroud LR, Nugent NR, Tyrka AR. A systematic review of
438 childhood maltreatment and DNA methylation: candidate gene and epigenome-wide approaches.
439 Translational Psychiatry. 2021;11(1):134.
440 13. Essex MJ, Boyce WT, Hertzman C, Lam LL, Armstrong JM, Neumann SM, et al. Epigenetic vestiges of
441 early developmental adversity: childhood stress exposure and DNA methylation in adolescence. Child
442 Development. 2013;84(1):58-75.
443 14. Yang BZ, Zhang H, Ge W, Weder N, Douglas-Palumberi H, Perepletchikova F, et al. Child abuse and
444 epigenetic mechanisms of disease risk. Am J Prev Med. 2013;44(2):101-7.
445 15. Dunn EC, Soare TW, Zhu Y, Simpkin AJ, Suderman MJ, Klengel T, et al. Sensitive periods for the effect
446 of childhood adversity on DNA methylation: results from a prospective, longitudinal study. Biological
447 Psychiatry. 2019;85(10):838-49.
448 16. Klengel T, Mehta D, Anacker C, Rex-Haffner M, Pruessner JC, Pariante CM, et al. Allele-specific FKBP5
449 DNA demethylation mediates gene-childhood trauma interactions. Nat Neurosci. 2013;16(1):33-41.
450 17. Bornstein MH. Sensitive periods in development: Structural characteristics and causal interpretations.
451 Psychological Bulletin. 1989;105(2):179-97.
452 18. Ben-Shlomo Y, Kuh D. A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology: conceptual models,
453 empirical challenges, and interdisciplinary perspectives. Int J Epidemiol. 2002;31(2):285-93.
454 19. Knudsen E. Sensitive periods in the development of the brain and behavior. J Cogn Neurosci.
455 2004;16:1412-25.
456 20. Shonkoff JP, Boyce WT, McEwen BS. Neuroscience, molecular biology, and the childhood roots of
457 health disparities. JAMA. 2009;301(21):2252-9.
458 21. Zeanah CH, Gunnar MR, McCall RB, Kreppner JM, Fox NA. Sensitive periods. Monogr Soc Res Child
459 Dev. 2011;76(4):147-62.
460 22. Lussier AA, Zhu Y, Smith BJ, Simpkin AJ, Smith ADAC, Suderman MJ, et al. Updates to data versions
461 and analytic methods influence the reproducibility of results from epigenome-wide association studies.
462 bioRxiv. 2021:2021.04.23.441014.
463 23. Oh ES, Petronis A. Origins of human disease: the chrono-epigenetic perspective. Nat Rev Genet. 2021.

24. Simpkin AJ, Hemani G, Suderman M, Gaunt TR, Lyttleton O, McArdle WL, et al. Prenatal and early life influences on epigenetic age in children: a study of mother–offspring pairs from two cohort studies. Human Molecular Genetics. 2016;25(1):191-201.
25. Sharp GC, Lawlor DA, Richmond RC, Fraser A, Simpkin A, Suderman M, et al. Maternal pre-pregnancy BMI and gestational weight gain, offspring DNA methylation and later offspring adiposity: findings from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. Int J Epidemiol. 2015;44(4):1288-304.
26. Richmond RC, Simpkin AJ, Woodward G, Gaunt TR, Lyttleton O, McArdle WL, et al. Prenatal exposure to maternal smoking and offspring DNA methylation across the lifecourse: findings from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). Hum Mol Genet. 2015;24(8):2201-17.
27. Alfano R, Guida F, Galobardes B, Chadeau-Hyam M, Delpierre C, Ghantous A, et al. Socioeconomic position during pregnancy and DNA methylation signatures at three stages across early life: epigenome-wide association studies in the ALSPAC birth cohort. Int J Epidemiol. 2019;48(1):30-44.
28. Laubach ZM, Perng W, Cardenas A, Rifas-Shiman SL, Oken E, DeMeo D, et al. Socioeconomic status and DNA methylation from birth through mid-childhood: a prospective study in Project Viva. Epigenomics. 2019;11(12):1413-27.
29. Kandaswamy R, Hannon E, Arseneault L, Mansell G, Sugden K, Williams B, et al. DNA methylation signatures of adolescent victimization: analysis of a longitudinal monozygotic twin sample. Epigenetics. 2020:1-18.
30. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, Boyd A, Golding J, Davey Smith G, et al. Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. Int J Epidemiol. 2013;42(1):97-110.
31. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, et al. Cohort Profile: the 'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. Int J Epidemiol. 2013;42(1):111-27.
32. Cunliffe VT. The epigenetic impacts of social stress: how does social adversity become biologically embedded? Epigenomics. 2016;8(12):1653-69.
33. Vaiserman AM, Koliada AK. Early-life adversity and long-term neurobehavioral outcomes: epigenome as a bridge? Human genomics. 2017;11(1):34.
34. Eachus H, Cunliffe VT. Biological Embedding of Psychosocial Stress Over the Life Course. Epigenetics of Aging and Longevity: Elsevier; 2018. p. 251-70.
35. McLaughlin KA. Future directions in childhood adversity and youth psychopathology. Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology. 2016;45(3):361-82.
36. Provenzi L, Giorda R, Beri S, Montirosso R. SLC6A4 methylation as an epigenetic marker of life adversity exposures in humans: a systematic review of literature. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews. 2016;71:7-20.
37. Ramo-Fernández L, Schneider A, Wilker S, Kolassa IT. Epigenetic alterations associated with war trauma and childhood maltreatment. Behavioral sciences & the law. 2015;33(5):701-21.
38. Tomassi S, Tosato S. Epigenetics and gene expression profile in First-Episode Psychosis: the role of Childhood Trauma. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews. 2017.
39. Tyrka AR, Ridout KK, Parade SH. Childhood adversity and epigenetic regulation of glucocorticoid signaling genes: Associations in children and adults. Development and psychopathology. 2016;28(4pt2):1319-31.
40. Relton CL, Gaunt T, McArdle W, Ho K, Duggirala A, Shihab H, et al. Data Resource Profile: Accessible Resource for Integrated Epigenomic Studies (ARIES). Int J Epidemiol. 2015;44(4):1181-90.
41. Min JL, Hemani G, Davey Smith G, Relton C, Suderman M. Meffil: efficient normalization and analysis of very large DNA methylation datasets. Bioinformatics (Oxford, England). 2018;34(23):3983-9.
42. Tukey JW. The Future of Data Analysis. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics. 1962;33(1):1-67.
43. Houseman EA, Molitor J, Marsit CJ. Reference-free cell mixture adjustments in analysis of DNA methylation data. Bioinformatics. 2014;30.
44. Mishra G, Nitsch D, Black S, De Stavola B, Kuh D, Hardy R. A structured approach to modelling the effects of binary exposure variables over the life course. Int J Epidemiol. 2009.
45. Smith ADAC, Hardy R, Heron J, Joinson CJ, Lawlor DA, Macdonald-Wallis C, et al. A structured approach to hypotheses involving continuous exposures over the life course. Int J Epidemiol. 2016.

46. Smith ADAC, Heron J, Mishra G, Gilthorpe MS, Ben-Shlomo Y, Tilling K. Model Selection of the Effect of Binary Exposures over the Life Course. Epidemiology. 2015.
47. Zhu Y, Simpkin AJ, Suderman MJ, Lussier AA, Walton E, Dunn EC, et al. A Structured Approach to Evaluating Life Course Hypotheses: Moving Beyond Analyses of Exposed Versus Unexposed in the Omics Context. Am J Epidemiol. 2020.
48. Tibshirani RJ, Taylor J, Lockhart R, Tibshirani R. Exact Post-Selection Inference for Sequential Regression Procedures. Journal of the American Statistical Association. 2016;111(514):600-20.
49. Frisch R, Waugh VF. Partial Time Regressions as Compared with Individual Trends. Econometrica. 1933.
50. Yamada H. The Frisch–Waugh–Lovell theorem for the lasso and the ridge regression. Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods. 2017;46(21):10897-902.
51. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological). 1995;57(1):289 - 300.
52. Hannon E, Lunnon K, Schalkwyk L, Mill J. Interindividual methylomic variation across blood, cortex, and cerebellum: implications for epigenetic studies of neurological and neuropsychiatric phenotypes. Epigenetics. 2015;10(11):1024-32.
53. Huang da W, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. Systematic and integrative analysis of large gene lists using DAVID bioinformatics resources. Nat Protoc. 2009;4(1):44-57.
54. Huang da W, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. Bioinformatics enrichment tools: paths toward the comprehensive functional analysis of large gene lists. Nucleic Acids Res. 2009;37(1):1-13.
55. Lek M, Karczewski KJ, Minikel EV, Samocha KE, Banks E, Fennell T, et al. Analysis of protein-coding genetic variation in 60,706 humans. Nature. 2016;536(7616):285-91.
56. Curley JP, Champagne FA. Influence of maternal care on the developing brain: Mechanisms, temporal dynamics and sensitive periods. Frontiers in neuroendocrinology. 2016;40:52-66.
57. Pena CJ, Neugut YD, Champagne FA. Developmental timing of the effects of maternal care on gene expression and epigenetic regulation of hormone receptor levels in female rats. Endocrinology. 2013;154(11):4340-51.
58. Shonkoff JP, Phillips DA. From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 2000.
59. Shonkoff JP, Richter L, van der Gaag J, Bhutta ZA. An integrated scientific framework for child survival and early childhood development. Pediatrics. 2012;129(2):e460-72.
60. Lieberman AF, Ghosh Ippen C, Van Horn P. Child-Parent Psychotherapy: 6-Month Follow-up of a Randomized Controlled Trial. Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry. 2006;45(8):913-8.
61. Ghosh Ippen C, Harris WW, Van Horn P, Lieberman AF. Traumatic and stressful events in early childhood: Can treatment help those at highest risk? Child Abuse & Neglect. 2011;35(7):504-13.
62. Masten AS, Barnes AJ. Resilience in Children: Developmental Perspectives. Children (Basel). 2018;5(7).
63. Purewal Boparai SK, Au V, Koita K, Oh DL, Briner S, Burke Harris N, et al. Ameliorating the biological impacts of childhood adversity: A review of intervention programs. Child Abuse & Neglect. 2018;81:82-105.
64. Aghaee S, Deardorff J, Greenspan LC, Quesenberry CP, Kushi LH, Kubo A. Early life household intactness and timing of pubertal onset in girls: a prospective cohort study. BMC Pediatrics. 2020;20(1):464.
65. Daryanani I, Hamilton JL, Abramson LY, Alloy LB. Single Mother Parenting and Adolescent Psychopathology. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology. 2016;44(7):1411-23.
66. Alami A, Khosravan S, Sadegh Moghadam L, Pakravan F, Hosseni F. Adolescents' self-esteem in single and two-parent families. Int J Community Based Nurs Midwifery. 2014;2(2):69-76.
67. Ellis BJ. Timing of pubertal maturation in girls: an integrated life history approach. Psychol Bull. 2004;130(6):920-58.
68. Smith KE, Pollak SD. Rethinking Concepts and Categories for Understanding the Neurodevelopmental Effects of Childhood Adversity. Perspectives on psychological science : a journal of the Association for Psychological Science. 2021;16(1):67-93.

69. Walton E. Epigenome-wide Associations With Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder in Adults: The Need for a Longitudinal Life Course Approach in Epigenetic Psychiatry. Biological Psychiatry. 2019;86(8):570-2.
70. Chiu YH, Rifas-Shiman SL, Kleinman K, Oken E, Young JG. Effects of intergenerational exposure interventions on adolescent outcomes: An application of inverse probability weighting to longitudinal pre-birth cohort data. Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol. 2020;34(3):366-75.
71. Slopen N, Shonkoff JP, Albert MA, Yoshikawa H, Jacobs A, Stoltz R, et al. Racial Disparities in Child Adversity in the U.S.: Interactions With Family Immigration History and Income. Am J Prev Med. 2016;50(1):47-56.

## Table 1. Top associations between time-dependent exposure to adversity and DNA methylation at age 15.

| Adversity | Timing | Age at adversity (years) | CpG | DNAm unexp.[1] | DNAm exp. SP[2] | Δ DNAm[3] | Effect estimate[4] | SE* | R-squared | P-value | FDR | Nearest gene | Trajectory class |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Caregiver physical or emotional abuse | Early childhood | 5 | **cg15454534** | **0.885** | **0.867** | **-0.018** | **-0.018** | **0.003** | **0.045** | **9.52E-08** | **1.44E-02** | **OR2T1** | **Latent graded** |
| | | | **cg14855874** | **0.091** | **0.123** | **0.032** | **0.032** | **0.006** | **0.046** | **4.89E-08** | **1.44E-02** | **BANK1** | **Emergent** |
| Sexual or physical abuse (by anyone) | Early childhood | 3.5 | cg17928317 | 0.681 | 0.785 | 0.104 | 0.076 | 0.015 | 0.041 | 2.06E-07 | 2.08E-02 | MAGEC3 | Primed |
| | | | cg15723468 | 0.822 | 0.779 | -0.043 | -0.045 | 0.009 | 0.041 | 1.89E-07 | 2.08E-02 | GALNT2 | Latent sensitive period |
| | | | **cg26970800** | **0.902** | **0.847** | **-0.055** | **-0.055** | **0.010** | **0.044** | **8.51E-08** | **2.08E-02** | **CBLIF** | **Emergent** |
| Maternal psychopathology | Very early childhood | 2.75 | **cg16813552** | **0.898** | **0.883** | **-0.015** | **-0.015** | **0.003** | **0.045** | **7.11E-08** | **2.15E-02** | **OGA** | **Stable** |
| One adult in the household | Very early childhood | 1.75 | cg05491478 | 0.908 | 0.880 | -0.028 | -0.027 | 0.006 | 0.038 | 7.33E-07 | 2.81E-02 | DUSP10 | Overcompensation |
| | Early childhood | 3.9 | **cg01060989** | **0.824** | **0.794** | **-0.031** | **-0.031** | **0.005** | **0.047** | **6.73E-08** | **6.78E-03** | **LRRFIP1** | **Latent graded** |
| | | | cg06711254 | 0.686 | 0.631 | -0.055 | -0.056 | 0.012 | 0.036 | 2.15E-06 | 3.98E-02 | FSIP2 | Flat emergent |
| | | | **cg08818094** | **0.847** | **0.798** | **-0.048** | **-0.050** | **0.008** | **0.051** | **8.79E-09** | **1.33E-03** | **TBC1D19** | **Latent sensitive period** |
| | | | cg19096460 | 0.845 | 0.821 | -0.024 | -0.024 | 0.005 | 0.035 | 2.89E-06 | 4.85E-02 | HERC3 | Latent graded |
| | | | cg15817130 | 0.794 | 0.759 | -0.036 | -0.038 | 0.007 | 0.037 | 1.83E-06 | 3.69E-02 | MYO10 | Latent graded |
| | | | cg02584161 | 0.661 | 0.603 | -0.057 | -0.058 | 0.011 | 0.038 | 1.28E-06 | 3.42E-02 | | Latent graded |
| | | | **cg16907527** | **0.853** | **0.824** | **-0.030** | **-0.032** | **0.005** | **0.060** | **4.17E-10** | **1.26E-04** | **DSP** | **Flat emergent** |
| | | | cg11811897 | 0.758 | 0.711 | -0.047 | -0.047 | 0.010 | 0.037 | 1.68E-06 | 3.64E-02 | VEGFA | Latent sensitive period |
| | | | cg15864691 | 0.907 | 0.889 | -0.018 | -0.018 | 0.004 | 0.038 | 8.36E-07 | 2.81E-02 | PKD1L1 | Overcompensation |
| | | | cg04036644 | 0.882 | 0.855 | -0.027 | -0.026 | 0.005 | 0.037 | 1.36E-06 | 3.42E-02 | HOXA10 | Latent sensitive period |
| | | | cg15783822 | 0.868 | 0.848 | -0.021 | -0.021 | 0.004 | 0.039 | 8.08E-07 | 2.81E-02 | LOC286083 | Latent graded |
| | | | cg02810291 | 0.840 | 0.818 | -0.022 | -0.023 | 0.005 | 0.037 | 1.35E-06 | 3.42E-02 | CUX2 | Overcompensation |
| | | | cg15814750 | 0.723 | 0.684 | -0.039 | -0.040 | 0.009 | 0.039 | 6.57E-07 | 2.81E-02 | STK38L | Latent graded |
| | Late childhood | 10 | cg12096528 | 0.890 | 0.874 | -0.016 | -0.016 | 0.003 | 0.036 | 2.24E-06 | 3.98E-02 | PRR4 | Overcompensation |
| | Accumulation | | cg10420609 | 0.559 | 0.522 | -0.037 | -0.014 | 0.003 | 0.039 | 7.71E-07 | 2.81E-02 | AKAP13 | Latent graded |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| cg00807464 | 0.052 | 0.057 | 0.006 | 0.003 | 0.001 | 0.040 | 7.56E-07 | 2.81E-02 | WDR72 | Stable |
| cg14579651 | 0.634 | 0.605 | -0.028 | -0.012 | 0.002 | 0.037 | 1.68E-06 | 3.64E-02 | SLC25A41 | Stable |

[1]DNAm unexp. = mean DNA methylation levels in individuals with no exposure to adversity from ages 0 to 11.
[2]DNAm exp. SP = mean DNA methylation levels in individuals with exposure to adversity that occurred during the selected sensitive period (SP). Accumulation hypotheses show the mean DNA methylation levels in those with at least one exposure to adversity.
[3]ΔDNAm= difference in mean DNA methylation levels between individuals exposed to adversity during the selected sensitive period and individuals unexposed to adversity (i.e., DNAm exp. SP – DNAm unexp.)
[4]Effect estimates were calculated using linear regression of exposure to adversity from the theoretical model and DNA methylation, correcting for the covariates described in the methods.
* SE = standard error; bolded loci passed a Bonferroni threshold of $p<1.65x10^{-7}$; Very early childhood = 0-3 years, Early childhood = 3-5 years; Late childhood = 8-11 years.

**Table 2. Types of DNAm trajectories and response to childhood adversity.**

| Trajectory number | Trajectory name | # of loci[1] | Sample trajectory[2] | Primary characteristics |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Emergent | 2 |  | Mean DNAm values stayed the same after age 7, with differences in the exposed-SP group that appeared in childhood and fully emerged by age 15. |
| 2 | Flat emergent | 2 |  | Mean DNAm values were the same from age 0 to 7, with differences in the exposed-SP group that remained small throughout childhood and fully emerged by age 15. |
| 3 | Overcompensation | 4 |  | Mean DNAm values varied between timepoints, but not between exposure groups. Cross-over effects between exposed-SP and other groups were present from age 7 to age 15. |
| 4 | Latent graded | 8 |  | Mean DNAm values varied between timepoints, and the exposed-other group showed graded differences in DNAm compared to other groups. The effects of childhood adversity during sensitive periods only fully emerged at age 15. |
| 5 | Latent sensitive period | 4 |  | Mean DNAm values varied between timepoints, the exposed-SP group showed differences from other groups, but the exposed-other group did not differ from the unexposed group. The effects of childhood adversity during sensitive periods only fully emerged at age 15. |
| 6 | Primed | 1 |  | Mean DNAm values were the same from ages 0 to 7, and no mean differences were observed between exposed-SP and exposed-other. Exposed-other were different from unexposed at age 0 and 7, while exposed-SP were different from both groups at age 15. |
| Stable (no group-by-age interaction) | | 3 |  | Slight differences were present between exposed-SP and unexposed individuals at age 7, which fully emerged by age 15. |

[1]Othe top 24 loci identified in the SLCMA of adversity between ages 0-11 and adolescent DNA methylation.

[2]Sample trajectories show the DNA methylation (DNAm) levels on the y-axis and the age at DNAm collection on the x-axis. Red trajectories represent the mean DNAm of those exposed to adversity during the period identified in the SLCMA (exposed-SP). Blue trajectories represent the mean DNAm of those exposed to adversity outside the period identified in the SLCMA (exposed-other). Black trajectories represent the mean DNAm of those with no exposure to adversity across development (unexposed).




**Figure 1. Summary of exposures and outcomes in the present study.**

Seven types of childhood adversity were assessed between 5-8 times between the ages of 0 and 11. Individuals with complete cases across all timepoints and covariates were included in the present study (N = 609 to 665). Each filled cell represents the timepoint when the adversity was collected, along with the prevalence of individuals exposed to adversity. Colors represent the different four sensitive periods that were used to define time-dependent exposure to adversity, very early childhood (age 0-3), early childhood (age 3-5), middle childhood (age 5-7), and late childhood (age 8-11). The additional life course models used in this study were accumulation and recency, which reflect the total number of exposures across development and exposure to adversity weighted by time, respectively. Genome-wide DNA methylation (DNAm) data were collected at age 0, 7, and 15.




**Figure 2. Theoretical models selected for top loci at age 15.**

Theoretical models were split by sensitive periods (i.e., exposure to adversity during specific childhood periods) or additive models (i.e., accumulation or recency of exposures). Colors represent the different types of adversity. The distribution of theoretical models for top loci was significantly different than random chance, with exposure to adversity during sensitive periods more frequently predicting DNA methylation levels. **A)** 24 loci were identified at a false-discovery rate (FDR) <0.05. Most loci were associated with exposure to one adult households during early childhood. **B)** 7 loci were identified at a Bonferroni-corrected p-value threshold ($q<0.05$; $p<1.65\times10^{-7}$), mainly showing associations with adversity occurring during early childhood.




**Figure 3. Trajectories of DNA methylation across development**

**A)** The effect estimates of associations between childhood adversity and DNAm at age 7 or age 15 generally showed different directions of effect for the significant loci identified from the SLCMA of age 15 DNAm (12 concordant and 13 non-concordant directionality). Effect estimates for age 7 DNAm data were also smaller than those at age 15, suggesting that these loci showed latent responses to adversity.

**B)** Hierarchical clustering of age 15 loci using Tukey summary statistics for group-by-age interactions revealed six distinct types of longitudinal DNAm patterns (number shown at each fork and by colors of the branch), which ranged from 1 to 8 CpGs in size.

**C)** Summary of the significant Tukey summary statistics used to differentiate between the six types of DNAm trajectories. The fraction of loci with a significant contrast for each type of trajectory is shown (lighter = more loci). The summary statistics on the y-axis show whether the contrast was significant for: 1) mean differences between ages (age 0, age 7, age 15), 2) mean exposure group differences *across* all ages (exposed during the period identified from the SLCMA [exposed$_{SP}$]; exposed during other period [exposed$_{other}$], or unexposed), and 3) exposure group differences *within* each age. The corresponding number for each type of trajectory from panel B is in parentheses on the x-axis.

**D)** The effect estimates of associations between childhood adversity and DNAm at age 7 or age 15 generally showed different directions of effect for the significant loci identified in a previous study of age 7 DNAm (25 concordant and 23 non-concordant directionality). Effect estimates for age 15 DNAm data were also smaller than those at age 7, suggesting that these loci showed early responses to adversity that resolved by adolescence.