Investigating childhood maltreatment as a modifier of genetic risk for cardiovascular disease in the UK Biobank

Helena Urquijo, BSc[1,2] Ana Gonçalves Soares, PhD[1,2], Abigail Fraser, PhD[1,2], Laura D Howe PhD[1,2], Alice R Carter, PhD[1,2]

1) MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol

2) Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol

Corresponding Author:

Helena Urquijo

helena.urquijo@bristol.ac.uk

MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit

University of Bristol

Oakfield House

Oakfield Grove

BS8 2BN, Bristol

United Kingdom

Main text word count (excluding Title Page, Abstract, References, Tables and Figures Legends):

3622

Abstract

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is influenced by genetic and environmental factors. Childhood maltreatment is associated with CVD and may modify genetic susceptibility to cardiovascular risk factors. We used genetic and phenotypic data from 100,833 White British UK Biobank participants (57% female; mean age = 55.9 years). We regressed nine cardiovascular risk factors/diseases (alcohol consumption, body mass index [BMI], low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, lifetime smoking behaviour, systolic blood pressure, atrial fibrillation, coronary heart disease, type 2 diabetes, and stroke) on their respective polygenic scores (PGS) and self-reported exposure to childhood maltreatment. Effect modification was tested on the additive and multiplicative scales by including a product term (PGS*maltreatment) in regression models.

On the additive scale, childhood maltreatment accentuated the effect of genetic susceptibility to higher BMI. Individuals not exposed to childhood maltreatment had an increase in BMI of 0.12 SD (95% CI: 0.11, 0.13) per SD increase in BMI PGS, compared to 0.17 SD (95% CI: 0.14, 0.19) in those exposed to all types of childhood maltreatment. On the multiplicative scale, similar results were obtained for BMI though these did not withstand to Bonferroni correction. There was little evidence of effect modification by childhood maltreatment in relation to other outcomes, or of sex-specific effect modification.

Our study suggests the effects of genetic susceptibility to a higher BMI may be moderately accentuated in individuals exposed to childhood maltreatment. However, gene*environment interactions are likely not a major contributor to the excess CVD burden experienced by childhood maltreatment victims.

41 ## Abbreviations and Acronyms

42 AF – Atrial fibrillation

43 BMI – Body mass index

44 CHD – Coronary heart disease

45 CVD – Cardiovascular disease

46 GWAS – Genome-wide association studies

47 LDL-C – Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol

48 PC – Principal components

49 PGS – Polygenic score

50 RCT – Randomised control trials

51 SBP – Systolic blood pressure

52 SEP – Socioeconomic position

53 SNP – Single nucleotide polymorphism

54 T2DM – Type-2 diabetes mellitus

55

56 # Introduction

57 Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death worldwide.[1] Many CVD subtypes have
58 complex aetiologies, affected by both genetic and environmental factors.[2,3] This suggests that
59 genetic and environmental factors may interact with each other and modify susceptibility to disease.

60 Childhood maltreatment increases the risk of a number of CVD subtypes and related diseases,
61 including coronary heart disease (CHD), stroke and type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM).[4,5] Evidence also
62 suggests there is a dose-response relationship between childhood maltreatment and CVD, with
63 disease risk increasing according to the number of types of maltreatment experienced by an
64 individual.[6–13] While this growing body of evidence indicates childhood maltreatment is associated
65 with higher CVD risk, it is unknown whether this risk is disproportionate in genetically susceptible
66 individuals.

67 Single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) detected in genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have
68 been used to construct polygenic scores (PGSs) for a trait or disease. These estimate the genetic risk
69 carried by an individual by adding the effects of all relevant variants in the genome. The polygenic
70 nature of many diseases, including CVD, suggests these scores may be more informative when
71 investigating interactions or effect modification by environmental factors, in comparison to using a
72 single associated gene.[14] PGSs have previously been employed to assess gene*environment
73 interactions or effect modifications for cardiovascular traits, including for educational achievement,
74 neighbourhood and obesogenic environments.[15–17] Identifying these effects may help to understand
75 the relationship between early life environmental exposures and CVD risk in adult life.

76 This study aims to investigate whether childhood maltreatment modifies genetic susceptibility to a
77 range of cardiovascular risk factors and CVD subtypes, using data from the UK Biobank cohort.
78 Where two risk factors are associated with the outcome, evidence of effect modification is expected
79 on either the additive or the multiplicative scale, or on both scales.[18,19] Therefore, in this analysis we
80 investigate both scales. Of greatest relevance to public health is the direction and magnitude of any

81 interaction. We hypothesise that childhood maltreatment accentuates the effect of polygenic

82 predisposition to CVD subtypes and risk factors. We also investigate whether any potential effect

83 modification differs according to sex, as some studies have detected differences in the association

84 between childhood maltreatment and cardiovascular risk[13,20–23]

85

Methods

UK Biobank

UK Biobank recruited 503,317 adults aged 37-73 years at baseline, between 2006 and 2010.[24] At baseline, data was collected on health and lifestyle information, physical measurements and biological samples. Some follow-up questionnaires and clinics have taken place, including an online mental health questionnaire in 2016, which asked about childhood maltreatment. This was sent to participants who provided an email address (N=339,092) and 157,366 (46.4%) responses were obtained. This analysis includes 100,833 participants of White British ancestry who completed questions on childhood maltreatment and had genetic information. Some individuals were missing CVD risk factor information and thus sample sizes for analyses ranged from n=93,001 to n=100,833 (Table 1).

Childhood maltreatment

The types of maltreatment assessed comprised of emotional neglect, physical neglect, emotional abuse, physical abuse and sexual abuse.[25,26] A summary score of childhood maltreatment was calculated as per the Childhood Trauma Screener,[25] reflecting the cumulative number of maltreatment types experienced by an individual, spanning from 0 to 5 (Table S1).

Cardiovascular risk factors and diseases

This study included 3 CVD subtypes and 6 risk factors for CVD. Risk factors were considered if there is evidence for a causal association with CVD from randomised control trials (RCT) or Mendelian randomisation studies (see Table S2) - a statistical approach using randomly allocated genetic variants as instrumental variables [27] - and have GWAS information with summary statistics available.

Quantitative traits (body mass index (BMI), alcohol consumption measured as drinks per week, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), lifetime smoking behaviour and systolic blood pressure (SBP)

109 were determined at baseline through physical or biological measurements, or self-reported for
110 alcohol and smoking behaviours.

111 Incidence of CVD subtypes (atrial fibrillation (AF), CHD and stroke) and of risk factor T2DM were
112 determined through linked mortality data, hospital episode statistics and Scottish morbidity and
113 mortality records (SMR), defined using ICD-9 and ICD-10 codes (Table S3).

114 The period of follow-up occurred between the date of baseline assessment (between 2006 and
115 2010) and the most recent available linked hospital inpatient data, from May 2017.

116 Polygenic scores

117 Summary statistics were obtained from the most recent GWAS (Table 2). Where the most recent
118 GWAS included UK Biobank participants, the next most suitable study was used to avoid estimate
119 inflation through sample overlap. PGSs were calculated by multiplying the number of effect alleles
120 by the relative effect estimate of the SNP on the phenotype and summing together the alleles.

121 PGSs were generated at P value thresholds of $<5x10^{-8}$ (genome-wide significance), <0.05 and <0.5.
122 The greater the P value threshold for SNPs, the greater the variance explained by the score (Table
123 S4), but the greater the chance of capturing pleiotropic effects. Resulting PGSs were standardised,
124 reflecting a one standard deviation increase in PGS.

125 Full details of the derivation of PGSs, GWAS studies used and generation of phenotypic measures
126 can be found in the Supplement.

127 Exclusion criteria

128 Quality control of UK Biobank genetic data was performed in accordance with the MRC-IEU Quality
129 Control pipeline, as previously described.[28] In brief, participants with sex mismatch (comparing
130 genetic sex with reported sex) and those with sex chromosome aneuploidy were excluded from the
131 study. Participants of White British ancestry were those who self-reported as “White British” and

132 supported by genetic principal component (PC) analysis. Related participants were excluded
133 according to kinship coefficients provided by the UK Biobank until no related pairs remained.[28]

134 Individuals missing age, sex, genetic data or who did not have complete information for childhood
135 maltreatment were excluded from the sample (Figure 1). Individuals missing risk factor or disease
136 data were excluded from relevant analyses. To prevent the detection of effects caused by reverse
137 causality, participants were excluded if they experienced any diagnosis of AF, T2DM, CHD or stroke
138 prior to baseline. Prevalent cases were ascertained by comparing the date of diagnosis in the linked
139 hospital inpatient data to the date of baseline visit.

140 Statistical analysis

141 Statistical analyses were carried out using Stata16-MP. Analysis code is available at
142 github.com/helenaurquijo/gxe_cvd_maltreatment. Study data used will be archived with UK Biobank
143 and was carried out under project 19278.

144 *Association of childhood maltreatment with outcomes*

145 Multivariable linear and logistic regression models, adjusting for sex and age, were used to estimate
146 the association between the childhood maltreatment score and each of the nine risk
147 factors/diseases.

148 *Effect modification of childhood maltreatment on genetic susceptibility*

149 For continuous traits, the association of childhood maltreatment score and each PGS with the
150 respective trait was estimated on the additive scale via multivariable linear regression. On the
151 multiplicative scale, the association was estimated via multivariable linear regression for the natural
152 log of the trait. For binary traits, the association of childhood maltreatment score and each PGS with
153 the respective disease trait was estimated on the additive scale via multivariable linear regression.
154 On the multiplicative scale, the association was estimated via multivariable logistic regression. All
155 regressions were adjusted for sex, age and 40 genetic PCs. Continuous phenotypic measures of traits

were standardised to reflect a change in SD of trait per 1 SD increase in PGS. Coefficients for binary traits reflect a change in risk per SD increase in PGS.

To test for effect modification of genetic predisposition by exposure to childhood maltreatment, the same regression models were run including a product of the PGS and maltreatment score as an interaction term. Effect modification was evaluated by the size and precision of the coefficient for effect modification, and the P value for the effect modification coefficient considering Bonferroni correction.

To address the risk of type 1 error due to multiple comparisons, a Bonferroni correction was applied by dividing the standard 0.05 P value threshold by the number of outcomes we considered in each analysis (nine), yielding a threshold of P=0.006. The use of this correction approach was conservative as the considered traits were not independent from each other.

Secondary analyses

Sex-stratified analyses were carried out, and a 3-way interaction term (i.e. PGS*maltreatment*sex) on the respective risk factor or CVD subtype was included.

Main analyses were repeated using PGSs generated with less stringent P value thresholds at 0.05 and 0.5, as described previously.

Finally, sensitivity analyses were performed by replicating the main analyses with adjustments for covariate interactions (e.g. sex*PGS, age*maltreatment…) to avoid specification error.[14] Separately, maternal smoking and number of siblings (proxies of childhood socioeconomic position), which may confound associations between childhood maltreatment and CVD, were included in the adjustment.

177 # Results

178 ## UK Biobank sample

179 Eligible participants had a mean age at baseline of 56 years (SD: 8.0 years) and 57% were female.
180 Most participants (55%) reported no exposure to any type of childhood maltreatment. The most
181 frequently reported type of maltreatment was emotional neglect (21%) and sexual abuse was the
182 least reported (8%) (Table 1). Our study sample did not differ from the rest of the UK Biobank in
183 terms of exposure to maltreatment, cardiovascular risk and cases of CVD.

184 With the genome-wide significance threshold ($P<5x10^{-8}$), variance explained by the PGSs ranged
185 between 0.06% (smoking) and 15% (systolic blood pressure) (Table S4).

186 ## Association of childhood maltreatment with cardiovascular risk factors and disease

187 Childhood maltreatment score was associated with higher BMI (β: 0.07 SD; 95% CI: 0.06, 0.07) and
188 lifetime smoking, as well as with T2DM and CHD incidence (Table S5). However, childhood
189 maltreatment was negatively associated with systolic blood pressure (β: -0.011 SD; 95% CI: -0.017, -
190 0.005). Childhood maltreatment was positively associated with all other outcomes, but the
191 confidence intervals spanned the null.

192 ## Effect modification by childhood maltreatment

193 On the additive scale, there was little evidence that childhood maltreatment modified the effect of
194 the PGSs for all risk factors/diseases except for BMI (Table S6 and Figure 2). The effect of genetic
195 susceptibility to higher BMI was accentuated by childhood maltreatment score by 0.009 SD (95% CI:
196 0.003, 0.014; $P_{effect\ modification}$: 0.003). This indicates, in those unexposed to childhood maltreatment,
197 each SD increase in the BMI PGS was associated with 0.12 SD higher BMI (95% CI: 0.11, 0.13), whilst
198 in those with a maltreatment score of 5, each SD increase in the PGS was associated with 0.17 SD

199 higher BMI (95% CI: 0.14, 0.19). All other interaction effect estimates were positive, with the
200 exception of SBP, and extremely small.

201 On the multiplicative scale, similar yet less precise results were obtained (Table S7 and Figure 3). The
202 effect of genetic susceptibility to higher log BMI was accentuated by childhood maltreatment,
203 through an increase of 0.007 SD (95% CI 0.001, 0.013) per unit increase in maltreatment score.
204 Nonetheless, the interaction estimate did not withstand Bonferroni correction ($P_{\text{effect modification}}$:
205 0.015). The coefficient for effect modification was in the positive direction for alcohol consumption,
206 LDL-C, smoking, AF and stroke, and in the negative direction for SBP, CHD and T2DM. However, for
207 all outcomes the estimates were close to the null and confidence intervals were narrow.

208

209 Secondary analyses

210 Sex was not found to modify the effects observed in the main analyses on either the additive or the
211 multiplicative scale (Tables S8 and S9).

212 Analyses repeated with PGSs generated at P value thresholds of P≤0.05 and P≤0.5 found childhood
213 maltreatment score to accentuate the effect of genetic susceptibility to higher BMI and greater
214 lifetime smoking, on both the additive and multiplicative scale (Tables S10 and S11).

215 Analyses adjusting for covariate (age, sex and genetic PCs) interactions with childhood maltreatment
216 score and PGSs yielded similar results, though the interaction coefficients for BMI became less
217 precise, decreasing the strength of evidence for effect modification on the multiplicative scale (Table
218 S12).

219 Analyses adjusting for maternal smoking and number of siblings yielded similar results to main
220 analyses (Table S13).

221

222 # Discussion

223 We found evidence that childhood maltreatment accentuates the effect of polygenic susceptibility
224 to BMI on observed BMI but no other cardiovascular risk factors or outcomes considered. Effects
225 were consistent across the additive and multiplicative scales, though evidence of effect modification
226 for BMI was weaker on the multiplicative scale. Additionally, we found no evidence of sex
227 differences in these effects.

228 ## Results in context

229 Few studies have investigated whether childhood maltreatment interacts with, or modifies the
230 effect of genetic susceptibility to a range of cardiovascular risk factors/outcomes. In a candidate
231 gene approach, Gooding and colleagues found no association between childhood maltreatment and
232 hypertension in young adulthood, nor the presence of effect modification by the SLC64A genotype.[29]
233 In our study of adults, we found a negative association between childhood maltreatment and SBP. In
234 a study with 161 individuals with major depression, Opel and colleagues also found childhood
235 maltreatment modified polygenic susceptibility to BMI but in the opposite direction, with exposure
236 to maltreatment reducing the effect of polygenic susceptibility on BMI.[30] These opposing findings
237 could be due to different definitions of maltreatment (binary versus continuous score), or different
238 study populations (depressive patients versus population cohort).

239 We expected to detect effect modification for all outcomes given (a) the association between PGSs
240 and respective phenotypes and (b) the positive associations between childhood maltreatment and
241 CVD subtypes present in our study sample (see Table S4 and interpreting interactions section
242 below). It is difficult to determine whether the lack of effect modification for most outcomes is truly
243 null, underpowered, or due to other factors such as the definition used for risk factors. We have
244 used drinks per week to measure alcohol intake, while previous studies have used units of alcohol
245 per week.[31] For drinking and smoking, misclassification bias may occur, which may be differential

246 misclassification if this differs between participants with and without exposure to maltreatment.
247 Integrating the five types of childhood maltreatment into a score, while relevant in the light of dose-
248 response relationships between childhood maltreatment and CVD, may miss maltreatment type-
249 specific effects.

250 Reports of sex differences in the association between childhood maltreatment subtypes and CVD
251 have been mixed,[6,13,32–35] however we did not identify any sex-specific differences. Replication and
252 validation using other cohorts may elucidate whether we missed modification and sex-specific
253 effects due to lack of statistical power.

254 Positive associations between childhood maltreatment and CVD subtypes and BMI have been
255 reported extensively [5,36] but associations with other CVD risk factors such as blood pressure and
256 lipids are less established.[36] We replicated previously observed associations between maltreatment
257 increasing BMI [32–34], smoking behaviour [6,37], and decreasing SBP.[38,39]

258 Interpretability of interactions and effect modifications

259 Interaction and effect modification are terms commonly used interchangeably despite representing
260 subtly different concepts. The underlying statistical model is identical.[40]

261 In an interaction, the effects of two causal and independent risk factors are studied, to assess
262 whether their joint exposure leads to a different outcome compared with their independent
263 associations. In effect modification, the effect of one exposure differs (or is modified) according to
264 the value of a second exposure. These exposures are not necessarily causal.[18] Both interaction and
265 effect modification can be estimated on the additive or the multiplicative scale. If two exposures are
266 associated with the outcome, an interaction should be detected on at least one of the scales given
267 sufficient statistical power.

268 In the case of childhood maltreatment, although consistent associations with CVD exist, causality is
269 difficult to assess and therefore the term effect modification better reflects the model considered

here. We investigated whether the effect of polygenic susceptibility to a certain trait differed according to values of the childhood maltreatment score. Previous studies have typically only tested the additive scale for interaction.[15,16,19,30] Because effect modification can occur on either the additive scale or the multiplicative scale, we analysed both scales.[18,19]

Relevance for public health

The size of the interaction terms of the few effect modifications detected in this study were very small, even for models employing PGSs with SNPs included using a less stringent significance thresholds. This implies that the clinical impact of these effect modifications is very low, suggesting gene*environment effect modifications are not a major contributor to the excess burden of cardiovascular disease experienced by people who have experienced child maltreatment.

Strengths and limitations

The major strength of our study is the use of a single large cohort, the UK Biobank, giving a large sample size and homogenous measures for our variables. While many studies rely on self-reported measures of phenotypes or disease outcomes, we used hospital and mortality records for CVD and calibrated physical measurements to define phenotypes. Reverse causality can bias analyses, whereby the diagnosis of CVD may lead to medical treatment or altered lifestyle behaviours altering the relative importance of the genotype on disease risk. We therefore excluded all participants with prevalent cases of CVD.

Another strength of this study lies in the use of PGSs rather than a single candidate gene approach, where candidate gene interactions have been shown to be spurious.[41] We also repeated analyses using PGSs generated at different significance thresholds, as PGSs including variants detected at less stringent P value thresholds may be more predictive of disease.[42] Finally, PGSs are not subject to the same confounding as environmental exposures because they are determined at conception, though they may be affected by population structure. All models were adjusted for all 40 genetic PCs calculated by the UK Biobank to mitigate this bias.

295 A number of limitations remain. Participation in the mental health questionnaire, an inclusion
296 criterion for our study, has been associated with lower BMI, higher socioeconomic position, and
297 having no T2DM or depression, compared to the rest of the UK Biobank cohort.[43] Estimates may be
298 biased by selection bias, where UK Biobank participants are more likely to be female, of higher
299 socioeconomic position, less likely to be obese, to smoke, to drink alcohol on a frequent basis and to
300 experience CVD compared to the rest of the population.[24]

301 Childhood maltreatment was determined using self-reported retrospective measures, which could
302 introduce recall bias. An alternative approach would be verifying self-reports with records from
303 social services or other child protecting entities. However, only a fraction of maltreatment cases are
304 reported [44] and thus many cases might be missed. Another limitation is that despite the adjustment
305 for maternal smoking and number of siblings, these might not be the most comprehensive indicators
306 of childhood SEP. Maternal smoking may not be a robust indicator of SEP for this study's participants
307 as the social patterning of maternal structure was different in the time these participants were born
308 in comparison to current day. This means residual confounding, by childhood SEP or other
309 unmeasured sources, may have biased our findings.

310 We applied a Bonferroni correction when considering the effect modification P values to address the
311 risk of type 1 error due to multiple tests. This may be overly conservative as cardiovascular risk
312 factors/diseases are correlated phenotypes. However, considering a less stringent P value threshold
313 of $P<0.05$, there was still little evidence of an interaction between childhood maltreatment and any
314 outcome other than BMI.

315 Finally, there are caveats with PGSs. Residual confounding by population structure may remain even
316 after adjusting for 40 genetic PCs [45]. While our study only included participants of White British
317 Ancestry and used summary statistics from similar populations, some of the PGSs explained a low
318 proportion of the trait's variance. More so, our findings have limited generalizability to non-White
319 European populations, as PGSs have been found to have very limited portability across ancestries [46].

320 The disproportionate scrutinising of a single ancestral background is an impediment in our
321 understanding of CVD aetiology and the clinical application of PGSs. Indeed, 83% of GWASs released
322 between 2005 and 2018 were on individuals of White European Ancestry [47], underscoring the
323 importance of the need for trans-ethnic GWASs and the replication of studies such as ours in other
324 populations.

325 Conclusion

326 In this analysis on White British individuals from the UK Biobank, we exposure to childhood
327 maltreatment can moderately exacerbate the effects of a genetic propensity to higher BMI.
328 However, we found little evidence that childhood maltreatment modified the effects of other
329 cardiovascular polygenic scores. Our results suggest gene*environment interactions are not a major
330 contributor to the excess burden of CVD experienced by people who have experienced child
331 maltreatment.

Acknowledgements

Quality Control filtering of the UK Biobank data was conducted by R.Mitchell, G.Hemani, T.Dudding, L.Corbin, S.Harrison, L.Paternoster as described in the published protocol (doi: 10.5523/bris.1ovaau5sxunp2cv8rcy88688v). The MRC IEU UK Biobank GWAS pipeline was developed by B.Elsworth, R.Mitchell, C.Raistrick, L.Paternoster, G.Hemani, T.Gaunt (doi: 10.5523/bris.pnoat8cxo0u52p6ynfaekeigi).

Sources of funding

No funding body has influenced data collection, analysis or its interpretations. This research was conducted using the UK Biobank Resource using application 19278. HU is funded by a PhD studentship from the British Heart Foundation (FS/17/60/33474). HU, ALGS, AF, LDH and ARC all work in a unit that receives core funding from the UK Medical Research Council and University of Bristol (MC_UU_00011/1, MC_UU_00011/4 and MC_UU_00011/6). ARC is additionally supported by the University of Bristol British Heart Foundation Accelerator Award (AA/18/7/34219). ALGS is supported by the study of Dynamic longitudinal exposome trajectories in cardiovascular and metabolic non-communicable diseases (H2020-SC1-2019-Single-Stage-RTD, project ID 874739). AF is supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre based at University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation and the University of Bristol. LDH is funded by a Career Development Award from the UK Medical Research Council (MR/M020894/1). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health.

Disclosures

The authors declare no competing interests.

Author contributions

HU cleaned and analysed the data, interpreted the results, wrote and revised the manuscript. ALGS and ARC had access to the data and assisted in data preparation. ALGS, AF, LDH and ARC all designed the study, interpreted the results, critically reviewed and revised the manuscript and provided supervision for the project. HU and ARC serve as guarantors of the paper. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

362 # References

363 1. Wang H, Naghavi M, Allen C, et al. Global, regional, and national life expectancy, all-cause
364 mortality, and cause-specific mortality for 249 causes of death, 1980-2015: a systematic
365 analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10053):1459-1544.
366 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31012-1

367 2. Delles C, McBride MW, Padmanabhan S, Dominiczak AF. The genetics of cardiovascular
368 disease. *Trends Endocrinol Metab*. 2008;19(9):309-316. doi:10.1016/j.tem.2008.07.010

369 3. Bhatnagar A. Environmental Determinants of Cardiovascular Disease. *Circ Res*.
370 2017;121(2):162-180. doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.117.306458

371 4. Suglia SF, Koenen KC, Boynton-Jarrett R, et al. Childhood and Adolescent Adversity and
372 Cardiometabolic Outcomes: A Scientific Statement from the American Heart Association.
373 *Circulation*. 2018;137(5):e15-e28. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000536

374 5. Basu A, McLaughlin KA, Misra S, Koenen KC. Childhood Maltreatment and Health Impact: The
375 Examples of Cardiovascular Disease and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Adults. *Clin Psychol Sci*
376 *Pract*. 2017;24(2):125-139. doi:10.1111/cpsp.12191

377 6. Dong M, Giles WH, Felitti VJ, et al. Insights into causal pathways for ischemic heart disease:
378 Adverse childhood experiences study. *Circulation*. 2004;110(13):1761-1766.
379 doi:10.1161/01.CIR.0000143074.54995.7F

380 7. Felitti VJ, Anda RF, Nordenberg D, et al. Relationship of Childhood Abuse and Household
381 Dysfunction to Many of the Leading Causes of Death in Adults. *Am J Prev Med*.
382 1998;14(4):245-258. doi:10.1016/S0749-3797(98)00017-8

383 8. Campbell JA, Walker RJ, Egede LE. Associations Between Adverse Childhood Experiences,
384 High-Risk Behaviors, and Morbidity in Adulthood. *Am J Prev Med*. 2016;50(3):344-352.
385 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2015.07.022

386 9. Scott KM, Von Korff M, Angermeyer MC, et al. Association of childhood adversities and early-
387 onset mental disorders with adult-onset chronic physical conditions. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*.
388 2011;68(8):838-844. doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.77

389 10. Wilson RS, Boyle PA, Levine SR, et al. Emotional neglect in childhood and cerebral infarction
390 in older age. *Neurology*. 2012;79(15):1534-1539. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e31826e25bd

391 11. Friedman EM, Montez JK, Sheehan CM, Guenewald TL, Seeman TE. Childhood Adversities and
392 Adult Cardiometabolic Health. *J Aging Health*. 2015;27(8):1311-1338.
393 doi:10.1177/0898264315580122

394 12. Ho FK, Celis-Morales C, Celis-Morales C, et al. Child maltreatment and cardiovascular disease:
395 Quantifying mediation pathways using UK Biobank. *BMC Med*. 2020;18(1):1-10.
396 doi:10.1186/s12916-020-01603-z

397 13. Soares ALG, Hammerton G, Howe LD, Rich-Edwards J, Halligan S, Fraser A. Sex differences in
398 the association between childhood maltreatment and cardiovascular disease in the UK
399 Biobank. *Heart*. Published online 2020:1310-1316. doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2019-316320

400 14. Domingue BW, Trejo S, Armstrong-Carter E, Tucker-Drob EM. Interactions between polygenic
401 scores and environments: Methodological and conceptual challenges. *Sociol Sci*. 2020;7:465-
402 486. doi:10.15195/V7.A19

403 15. Tyrrell J, Wood AR, Ames RM, et al. Gene–obesogenic environment interactions in the UK
404 Biobank study. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017;46(2):559-575. doi:10.1093/ije/dyw337

405 16. Mason KE, Palla L, Pearce N, Phelan J, Cummins S. Genetic risk of obesity as a modifier of
406 associations between neighbourhood environment and body mass index: an observational
407 study of 335 046 UK Biobank participants. *BMJ Nutr Prev Heal*. Published online October 5,
408 2020:bmjnph-2020-000107. doi:10.1136/bmjnph-2020-000107

409 17. Carter AR. Strengthening causal inference in educational inequalities in cardiovascular
410 disease. Published online 2021.

411 18. VanderWeele TJ. On the Distinction Between Interaction and Effect Modification.
412 *Epidemiology*. 2009;20(6):863-871. doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181ba333c

413 19. Van Der Weele TJ, Knol MJ. A tutorial on interaction. *Epidemiol Method*. 2014;3(1):33-72.
414 doi:10.1515/em-2013-0005

415 20. Goodwin RD, Stein MB. Association between childhood trauma and physical disorders among
416 adults in the United States. *Psychol Med*. 2004;34(3):509-520.
417 doi:10.1017/S003329170300134X

418 21. Widom CS, Czaja SJ, Bentley T, Johnson MS. A Prospective Investigation of Physical Health
419 Outcomes in Abused and Neglected Children: New Findings From a 30-Year Follow-Up. *Am J*
420 *Public Health*. 2012;102(6):1135-1144. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300636

421 22. Fuller-Thomson E, Bejan R, Hunter JT, Grundland T, Brennenstuhl S. The link between
422 childhood sexual abuse and myocardial infarction in a population-based study. *Child Abuse*
423 *Negl*. 2012;36(9):656-665. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2012.06.001

424 23. Duncan AE, Auslander WF, Bucholz KK, Hudson DL, Stein RI, White NH. Relationship Between
425 Abuse and Neglect in Childhood and Diabetes in Adulthood: Differential Effects By Sex,
426 National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2015;12:140434.
427 doi:10.5888/pcd12.140434

428 24. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, et al. Comparison of Sociodemographic and Health-Related
429 Characteristics of UK Biobank Participants with Those of the General Population. *Am J*
430 *Epidemiol*. 2017;186(9):1026-1034. doi:10.1093/aje/kwx246

431 25. Glaesmer H, Schulz A, Häuser W, Freyberger H, Brähler E, Grabe H-J. Der Childhood Trauma
432 Screener (CTS) - Development and Validation of Cut-Off-Scores for Classificatory Diagnostics.
433 *Psychiatr Prax*. 2013;40(04):220-226. doi:10.1055/s-0033-1343116

434 26. Davis KAS, Coleman JRI, Adams M, et al. Mental health in UK Biobank – development,
435 implementation and results from an online questionnaire completed by 157 366 participants:
436 a reanalysis. *BJPsych Open*. 2020;6(2):e18. doi:10.1192/bjo.2019.100

437 27. Smith GD, Ebrahim S. “Mendelian randomization”: Can genetic epidemiology contribute to
438 understanding environmental determinants of disease? *Int J Epidemiol*. 2003;32(1):1-22.
439 doi:10.1093/ije/dyg070

440 28. Mitchell, R., Hemani, G., Dudding, T., Corbin, L., Harrison, S., Paternoster L. UK Biobank
441 Genetic Data: MRC-IEU Quality Control, version 2 - Datasets - data.bris. *DataBris*. Published
442 online 2018.

443 29. Gooding HC, Milliren C, McLaughlin KA, et al. Child maltreatment and blood pressure in young
444 adulthood. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2014;38(11):1747-1754. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.08.019

445 30. Opel N, Redlich R, Repple J, et al. Childhood maltreatment moderates the influence of genetic
446 load for obesity on reward related brain structure and function in major depression.
447 *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2019;100(July 2018):18-26. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2018.09.027

448 31. Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, et al. Association studies of up to 1.2 million individuals yield new
449 insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and alcohol use. *Nat Genet*. 2019;51(2):237-244.
450 doi:10.1038/s41588-018-0307-5

451 32. O'Neill A, Beck K, Chae D, Dyer T, He X, Lee S. The pathway from childhood maltreatment to
452 adulthood obesity: The role of mediation by adolescent depressive symptoms and BMI. *J*
453 *Adolesc*. 2018;67:22-30. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2018.05.010

454 33. Ruiz AL, Font SA. Role of childhood maltreatment on weight and weight-related behaviors in
455 adulthood. *Heal Psychol Off J Div Heal Psychol Am Psychol Assoc*. 2020;39(11):986-996.
456 doi:10.1037/hea0001027

457 34. Sokol RL, Gottfredson NC, Poti JM, et al. Sensitive Periods for the Association Between
458 Childhood Maltreatment and BMI. *Am J Prev Med*. 2019;57(4):495-502.
459 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2019.05.016

460 35. Afifi TO, Mota N, MacMillan HL, Sareen J. Harsh Physical Punishment in Childhood and Adult
461 Physical Health. *Pediatrics*. 2013;132(2):e333--e340. doi:10.1542/peds.2012-4021

462 36. Lang J, Kerr DM, Petri-Romão P, et al. The hallmarks of childhood abuse and neglect: A
463 systematic review. Salinas-Miranda A, ed. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(12):e0243639.
464 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0243639

465 37. Anda RF, Croft JB, Felitti VJ, et al. Adverse Childhood Experiences and Smoking During
466 Adolescence and Adulthood. *JAMA*. 1999;282(17):1652-1658. doi:10.1001/jama.282.17.1652

467 38. Li L, Pinto Pereira SM, Power C. Childhood maltreatment and biomarkers for cardiometabolic
468 disease in mid-adulthood in a prospective British birth cohort: associations and potential
469 explanations. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(3):e024079. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024079

470 39. van Reedt Dortland AKB, Giltay EJ, van Veen T, Zitman FG, Penninx BWJH. Personality traits
471 and childhood trauma as correlates of metabolic risk factors: The Netherlands Study of
472 Depression and Anxiety (NESDA). *Prog Neuro-Psychopharmacology Biol Psychiatry*.
473 2012;36(1):85-91. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2011.10.001

474 40. Lawlor DA. Biological interaction: Time to drop the term? *Epidemiology*. 2011;22(2):148-150.
475 doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e3182093298

476 41. Duncan LE, Keller MC. A Critical Review of the First 10 Years of Candidate Gene-by-
477 Environment Interaction Research in Psychiatry. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2011;168(10):1041-1049.
478 doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2011.11020191

42. Choi SW, Mak TSH, O'Reilly PF. Tutorial: a guide to performing polygenic risk score analyses. *Nat Protoc*. 2020;15(9):2759-2772. doi:10.1038/s41596-020-0353-1

43. Tyrrell J, Zheng J, Beaumont R, et al. Genetic predictors of participation in optional components of UK Biobank. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):886. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-21073-y

44. Moody G, Cannings-John R, Hood K, Kemp A, Robling M. Establishing the international prevalence of self-reported child maltreatment: A systematic review by maltreatment type and gender. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18(1):1-15. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-6044-y

45. Haworth S, Mitchell R, Corbin L, et al. Apparent latent structure within the UK Biobank sample has implications for epidemiological analysis. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10(1):333. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-08219-1

46. Martin AR, Kanai M, Kamatani Y, Okada Y, Neale BM, Daly MJ. Clinical use of current polygenic risk scores may exacerbate health disparities. *Nat Genet*. 2019;51(4):584-591. doi:10.1038/s41588-019-0379-x

47. Mills MC, Rahal C. A scientometric review of genome-wide association studies. *Commun Biol*. 2019;2(1):9. doi:10.1038/s42003-018-0261-x

48. Locke AE, Kahali B, Berndt SI, et al. Genetic studies of body mass index yield new insights for obesity biology. *Nature*. 2015;518(7538):197-206. doi:10.1038/nature14177

49. Willer CJ, Schmidt EM, Sengupta S, et al. Discovery and refinement of loci associated with lipid levels. *Nat Genet*. 2013;45(11):1274-1285. doi:10.1038/ng.2797

50. Wootton RE, Richmond RC, Stuijfzand BG, et al. Evidence for causal effects of lifetime smoking on risk for depression and schizophrenia: A Mendelian randomisation study. *Psychol Med*. 2020;50(14):2435-2443. doi:10.1017/S0033291719002678

51. Carter AR, Gill D, Davies NM, et al. Understanding the consequences of education inequality on cardiovascular disease: Mendelian randomisation study. *BMJ*. 2019;365:1-12. doi:10.1136/bmj.l1855

52. Ellinor PT, Lunetta KL, Albert CM, et al. Meta-analysis identifies six new susceptibility loci for atrial fibrillation. *Nat Genet*. 2012;44(6):670-675. doi:10.1038/ng.2261

53. Nikpay M, Goel A, Won HH, et al. A comprehensive 1000 Genomes-based genome-wide association meta-analysis of coronary artery disease. *Nat Genet*. 2015;47(10):1121-1130. doi:10.1038/ng.3396

54. Scott RA, Scott LJ, Mägi R, et al. An Expanded Genome-Wide Association Study of Type 2 Diabetes in Europeans. *Diabetes*. 2017;66(11):2888-2902. doi:10.2337/db16-1253

55. Malik R, Chauhan G, Traylor M, et al. Multiancestry genome-wide association study of 520,000 subjects identifies 32 loci associated with stroke and stroke subtypes. *Nat Genet*. 2018;50(4):524-537. doi:10.1038/s41588-018-0058-3

516 ## Figures and figure legends



517

518 ***Figure 1: Study exclusion criteria***. **CVD = stroke, atrial fibrillation, coronary heart disease or risk*

519 *factor type 2 diabetes. **Participants can be missing more than one variable, so the total excluded is*

520 *less than the sum of the missing data of all traits.*





Figure 2: Effect modification by exposure to childhood maltreatment on genetic predisposition to cardiovascular risk factors and disease on the additive scale at $P<5x10^{-8}$. *Analyses were adjusted for age, sex and 40 genetic principal components. Traits are grouped according to whether they are binary or continuous. BMI=body mass index; LDL-C=low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; SBP=systolic blood pressure; PGS=polygenic score.*



Figure 3: Effect modification by exposure to childhood maltreatment on genetic predisposition to cardiovascular risk factors and disease on the multiplicative scale at $P<5x10^{-8}$. *Analyses were adjusted for age, sex and 40 genetic principal components. Traits are grouped according to whether they are binary or continuous. BMI=body mass index; LDL-C=low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; SBP=systolic blood pressure; PGS=polygenic score.*

Tables

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of study sample and entire Biobank sample (excluding withdrawn participants). *For maltreatment types, exposure is determined according to cut-off criteria described in Table S1.*

Variable	**Analysis sample N = 100833**			**Full UK Biobank N = 502 493**		
Continuous	**N**	**Mean (SD)**		**N**	**Mean (SD)**	
Age	100833	55.88 (7.67)		502493	56.53 (8.10)	
BMI	100659	26.57 (4.38)		499389	27.43 (4.80)	
Drinks per week	100529	8.38 (8.66)		498251	7.79 (9.05)	
LDL cholesterol	95809	3.64 (0.82)		468696	3.56 (0.87)	
Lifetime smoking	95845	0.25 (0.55)		318071	0.34 (0.67)	
Systolic blood pressure	93001	136.37 (18.08)		456954	137.78 (18.63)	
Number of siblings	99629	1.78 (1.47)		492858	2.23 (2.00)	
Categorical	**N**	**Frequency (%)**		**N**	**Frequency (%)**	
Sex	100833	Female	57 641 (57)	502493	Female	273 378 (54)
Maternal smoking	88907	No	63 353 (71)	434357	No	307 274 (71)
Atrial fibrillation (incident)	100833	Control	98 735 (97)	496107	Control	480 339 (97)
		Case	2 098 (2)		Case	15 768 (3)
Type 2 Diabetes (incident)	100833	Control	99 449 (99)	493064	Control	47 2429 (96)
		Case	1 384 (1)		Case	20 635 (4)
Coronary Heart Disease (incident)	100833	Control	97 801 (97)	481868	Control	45 9019 (95)
		Case	3 032 (3)		Case	22 849 (5)
Stroke (incident)	100833	Control	99 838 (99)	497488	Control	48 7421 (98)
		Case	995 (1)		Case	10 067 (2)
Physical abuse	100833	Yes	17 530 (17)	156982	Yes	29 793 (19)
Emotional abuse			14 535 (14)	156886		24 544 (16)
Sexual abuse			8 191 (8)	155488		13 646 (9)
Physical neglect			15 286 (15)	156266		25 723 (16)
Emotional neglect			21 189 (21)	156712		35 290 (23)
Childhood maltreatment score	100833	0	55 910 (55)	153625	0	82 398 (54)
		1	25 570 (25)		1	39 207 (26)
		2	10 846 (11)		2	17 482 (11)
		3	5 299 (5)		3	8 801 (6)
		4	2 468 (2)		4	4 390 (3)
		5	740 (1)		5	1 347 (1)

540

541 ***Table 2: Summary characteristics for each GWAS used to derive external weights in polygenic***

542 ***scores.***

Phenotype	**Author/consortium**	**Population**	**Sample Size (cases)**	**Unit**
Alcohol consumption	GWAS and Sequencing Consortium of Alcohol and Nicotine use [31]	European (Summary statistics excluding UK Biobank)	630 154	Drinks per week
Body mass index	Genetic Investigation of Anthropometric Traits [48]	European ancestry	339 224	SD (kg/m^2)
Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol	Global Lipids Genetics consortium [49]	European ancestry	188 578	SD (circulating lipids)
Smoking	Wootton *et al* [50]	White British (split sample GWAS of UK Biobank, see Supplementary Methods)	318 147	SD (Lifetime smoking index)
Systolic blood pressure	Carter *et al* [51]	White British (split sample GWAS of UK Biobank, see Supplementary Methods)	318 147	SD (mm/Hg)
Atrial fibrillation	Ellinor *et al* [52]	European ancestry	59 133 (6 707)	Log odds ratio
Coronary heart disease	CARDIoGRAMplusC4D [53]	Predominantly European (77%)	184 305 (60 801)	Log odds ratio
Type 2 diabetes	DIAbetes Genetics Replication And Meta-analysis [54]	European ancestry	159 208 (26 276)	Log odds ratio
Stroke	MEGASTROKE [55]	Predominantly European (85%)	521 612 (67 162)	Log odds ratio

543