The impact of poverty on mental illness: Emerging evidence of a causal relationship

Mattia Marchi [1,2,3], Anne Alkema [3], Charley Xia [4,5], Chris H. L. Thio [6], Li-Yu Chen [3], Winni Schalkwijk [3], Gian M. Galeazzi [1,2], Silvia Ferrari [1,2], Luca Pingani [1,2], Hyeokmoon Kweon[7], Sara Evans-Lacko [8], W. *David Hill [4,5], Marco P. Boks[3]*

[1]Department of Biomedical, Metabolic and Neural Sciences, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Via Giuseppe Campi, 287 – 41125 Modena, Italy
[2]Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, Azienda USL-IRCCS di Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy
[3]Department of Psychiatry, Brain Center University Medical Center Utrecht, University Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands
[4]Lothian Birth Cohort studies, University of Edinburgh, 7 George Square, Edinburgh EH8 9JZ, UK
[5]School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences, Department of Psychology, University of Edinburgh, 7 George Square, Edinburgh, EH8 9JZ, UK
[6]Department of Epidemiology, University of Groningen, University Medical Centre Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands
[7]Department of Economics, School of Business and Economics, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1081 HV Amsterdam, Netherlands
[8]Care Policy and Evaluation Centre, London School of Economics and Political Science, UK

**Correspondence:*
Marco P. Boks
Department of Psychiatry, Brain Center University Medical Center Utrecht, University Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands
Mail: m.p.m.boks@umcutrecht.nl

Abstract

Introduction: The link between poverty and mental illness has sparked discussions about the role of poverty as a risk factor for mental health. If poverty is indeed confirmed as a causal factor for mental illness, it would have profound implications for our comprehension of mental well-being and guide efforts to address the growing occurrence of mental health disorders.
Methods: Building on the recent breakthrough discovery of heritability of poverty traits and utilizing large-scale genome-wide association studies of mental illness, we used Mendelian randomization (MR) and Genomic structural equation modeling to investigate evidence of causality of the relationship between poverty and mental illness. We examined nine distinct mental disorders, namely attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), anorexia nervosa (AN), anxiety disorders (ANX), autism spectrum disorders (ASD), bipolar disorder (BD), major depressive disorder (MDD), obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and schizophrenia (SZ). Joint measures of poverty derived from household income (HI), occupational income (OI), and social deprivation (SD) were examined while accounting for the influence of cognitive ability (CA).
Results: Our analysis highlights HI as the most pertinent poverty measure when compared to OI and SD. Bidirectional MR investigations of the poverty common factor was consistent with the existing paradigm that mental illness leads to poverty. New was evidence that poverty increases the likelihood of developing ADHD (Inverse Variance Weighted Odds Ratio [IVW OR]=4.26[95%CI:3.42-5.29]), MDD (IVW OR=1.49[95%CI:1.29-1.72]), and SZ (IVW OR=1.53[95%CI:1.35-1.73]), while decreasing the risk of AN (IVW OR=0.50[95%CI:0.40-0.62]). This support for a causal relation held strong after adjusting for CA, albeit with reduced effect sizes.
Conclusion: Our research indicates that poverty plays a causal role in the development of SZ, MDD, and ADHD, while resulted inversely associated to risk of AN. Notably, CA explains a significant portion of the impact of poverty, echoing prior reports highlighting the contribution of impaired cognitive function to severe mental illnesses. Given that income and education are malleable factors in the population, our study provides compelling evidence to examine income-based policies as a means of promoting better mental health outcomes in the population. This underscores the importance of developing targeted interventions that address the root causes of mental illness and advance health equity.

Keyworks: poverty; deprivation; cognitive ability; mental illness; Mendelian randomization

Introduction

The association between mental illness and social class was first demonstrated in a 1958 study by Hollingshead and Redlich, who found that those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds had a higher incidence of severe and persistent mental illness and received less adequate treatment [1]. After more than fifty years from their work, the societal conditions the authors draw attention to still persist. Epidemiological studies throughout the world have demonstrated an inverse relationship between mental illness and socio-economic status (SES) [2,3]. Psychiatric disorders are more common among people from lower social classes [4,5]. Besides evidence from observational studies, studies focusing on income changes confirmed a relation between poverty and mental health [6,7].

Although the association between poverty and mental illness is strong across these studies, there is limited evidence to support a causal relationship. Several factors, such as reverse causation and residual confounding, make it difficult to determine whether poverty causes mental illness or if it is the other way around. However, understanding the causality of the relationship between poverty and mental illness may be crucial for public health policies as they may target essential aspects of poverty and improve public mental health [8].

To date, uncertainty remains with respect to the direction of the association between poverty and mental illness and two explanatory hypotheses compete: social causation and social selection [9]. According to the social causation theory, the greater socio-economic adversity characteristic of lower-social classes living conditions precipitates mental illness in vulnerable individuals potentially via mediators such as lack of shelter, substance use and stress. Conversely, the social selection theory suggests that the excess of low socio-economic status among people with mental illness is mainly attributable to individuals who drifted down the occupational and social scale as a consequence of the impairment linked to poor mental health.[10].

Unfortunately, conducting randomized controlled trials to determine causality is not always feasible or ethical [11]. One alternative method to investigate causality is Mendelian Randomization (MR), which uses genetic data from genome-wide association studies (GWAS) to examine whether a risk factor fits in a causal model for an outcome [12]. This method takes advantage of the fact that genetic variants are randomly allocated during gamete formation and are thus not susceptible to the confounding effects that make results from observational studies difficult to interpret [11]. Some studies so far exploited genetic data from GWAS to investigate the relations between indicators of SES and mental illness [12–14], but none of these used MR.

Important for studies on poverty is that it is often defined by one-dimensional measures, usually based on income, either as household or individual income. Or is operationalized as the employment status of an individual, measured by the occupational income [6,10]. Yet, no single indicator can capture the multiple dimensions of poverty, such as lack of education, inadequate living standards, disempowerment, poor quality of work, the threat of violence, and living in areas that are environmentally hazardous, among others [15]. For that purpose, sometimes a social deprivation index is used but that also has its limitations. In the UK a widely used multidimensional measure of deprivation is the Townsend Deprivation Index [16].

In this study, we used MR to estimate the causal effect of a multidimensional poverty factor derived from a combination of household income (HI), occupational income (OI), and social deprivation (SD). We investigated the relation with nine mental illnesses: attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), anorexia nervosa (AN), anxiety disorder (ANX), autism spectrum disorder (ASD), bipolar disorder (BD), major depressive disorder (MDD), obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and

schizophrenia (SZ). To account for potential confounding effects, we also extended the MR analyses to include cognitive abilities (CA).

Methods

Study design and data sources

We conducted a two-sample MR study, using summary-level GWAS data, most were publicly available. Ethical approval was obtained in all original studies.

MR relies on three main assumptions on the validity of the genetic instrument variable, which are: relevance, independence, and exclusion restriction [17]. These imply that the genetic variant must be related to the exposure (i.e., only SNPs that reach genome-wide significance in the association with the exposure, that is 5e-8, are used), it is not correlated with exposure–outcome relationship confounders and affects the outcome only through the risk factor (i.e., "no pleiotropy" rule).

Poverty instruments

Data on HI, SD, and CA were obtained from the results of their respective GWAS, all from UK Biobank. A total of 379,598 participants of European ancestry had genotype data and data on their level of HI before tax. HI was primarily analyzed as a continuous variable. To investigate if the relation between HI and mental illness is particularly strong at any specific level of income, we further categorized HI as a dichotomous variable, defining the cases in the following way: (1) low HI: being less than £18,000; (2) low-mid HI: being less than £29,999; (3) mid-high HI: being more than £52,000; (4) high HI: being more than £100,000. A total of 440,350 individuals of European ancestry had genotype data and data on their level of SD, measured with Townsend Deprivation index, and it was analyzed as a continuous variable. Finally, GWAS summary data on cognitive ability in 248,482 individuals was included [18]. The CA measure was derived using multiple cohorts that each had administered a battery of cognitive tests to their participants. Correlations between tests of CA are high with estimates between r = 0.8 and r = 1.0 being reported [19,20]. In order to increase the power of this dataset meta-analysis using datasets genetically correlated with cognitive ability was conducted. The genetic correlation between this CA data set and earlier CA data sets is rg = 1. CA was analyzed as a continuous variable.

Results from a meta-analysis of two OI GWAS [21], including UK Biobank and Health and Retirement Study the latter involving participants from White American ancestry, were used to generate the instruments for OI which were analyzed as continuous variable.

Finally, we estimated a latent factor GWAS of poverty (P) by jointly modelling cross-trait liability of HI, OI, and SD, using Genomic structural equation modeling (Genomic SEM). This common factor poverty GWAS was bult using as unit of identification HI. To allow estimation of poverty - instead of income – in the MR analyses, the regression coefficients have been reversed.

Mental illness instruments

Results from the most updated GWAS of ADHD [22], AN [23], ANX [24], ASD [25], BD [26], MDD [27], OCD [28], PTSD [29], and SZ [30] were obtained. Two-samples MR method requires minimal sample overlap between exposure and outcome GWAS [31]; therefore, mental illness summary-level data were obtained mainly from Psychiatric Genomic Consortium (PGC) excluding UK Biobank participants. The GWAS of the mental illness traits considered were provided and analyzed as case/control. The effective sample size across the cohorts contributing to the GWAS meta-analysis was calculated for each trait and ranged from 320k (for SZ) to 10k (for OCD). SNPs selection and harmonization were then performed as described for poverty instruments. Table 1 summarizes GWAS information.

Table 1: GWAS information for each phenotype

Trait	N	N cases	Consortium	First author, Year
ADHD	55,374	20,183	PGC	Demontis et al., 2019
AN	72,517	16,992	PGC	Watson et al., 2019
ANX	21,761	7,016	PGC	Otowa et al., 2016
ASD	46,350	18,381	PGC	Grove et al., 2019
BD	413,466	41,917	PGC	Mullins et al., 2021
CA	248,482	NA	UKB	Hill et al., 2018
HI	379,598	NA	UKB	NA
MDD	138,884	43,204	PGC	Howard et al., 2019
OCD	9,725	2,688	PGC	Arnold et al., 2018
OI	282,963	NA	NA	Kweon et al., 2020
PTSD	206,655	32,428	PGC	Nievergelt et al., 2019
SD	440,350	NA	UKB	NA
SZ	320,404	76,755	PGC	Trubetskoy et al., 2022

Legend: Traits are presented in alphabetical order.
Abbreviations: N: number (e.g., sample size); ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; AN: anorexia nervosa; ANX: anxiety disorder; ASD: autism spectrum disorders; BD: bipolar disorder; CA: cognitive abilities; HI: household income; MDD: major depressive disorder; OCD: obsessive-compulsive disorder; OI: occupational income; PTSD: post-traumatic stress disorder; SD: social deprivation; SZ: schizophrenia; PGC: Psychiatric Genomics Consortium; NA: not applicable; UKB: UK Biobank.

Mendelian Randomization

To ensure independent instruments, we applied a clumping procedure (LD $r^2 < 0.001$ within 10 Mb). Following that, SNPs instrument for each of the poverty measure considered, where harmonized with the corresponding outcome data to before running MR.

We conducted bidirectional univariable MR between each poverty measure and mental illness. The inverse variance weighted method (IVW) was used to estimate effects in the primary analyses [32] and the results were presented using forest plots. The weighted median (WM) [33], MR Egger regression (MR-Egger) [34], and MR pleiotropy residual sum and outlier (MR-PRESSO) [35] methods were used as sensitivity analyses, because each method makes different assumptions regarding instrument validity. Specifically, MR-Egger and MR-PRESSO can provide more robust estimates in case of deviation from the assumption of no horizontal pleiotropy. In addition to MR-Egger and MR-PRESSO, we accounted for false positives due to horizontal pleiotropy using Causal Analysis Using Summary Effect Estimates (CAUSE) [36]. Further information on MR-PRESSO and CAUSE is available in the Supplement File 1.

We primarily presented the results of MR analyses as unstandardized regression coefficients (Beta [B]) with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95%CI). When the outcome of the analysis was binary (i.e., mental illness and HI strata) we also provided conversion to Odds Ratio (OR) with corresponding 95%CI.

We also investigated whether the instruments represent the correct causal direction using Steiger analyses, including Steiger test and Steiger filtering [37], and conducted leave-one-out analyses to investigate if the effects are driven by one or a subset of the SNPs.

Since we hypothesized that CA is likely to be involved in the causal pathway linking poverty and mental illness, we used multivariable MR (MVMR) [17] to estimate the effect of poverty on mental illness independent of CA. For this purpose, we clumped the full list of SNPs from each poverty proxy GWAS (to ensure only independent SNPs are included) and restricted it

to those SNPs found in the outcome GWAS, and then ran the analyses on each instruments-mental illness set.
Instrument strength was quantified using the mean F statistic (F-stat) within the univariable IVW analyses, considering a value of F-stats<20 as indicative of weak instruments [38].

All the analyses were done in R [39], using the packages Twosample MR [40], CAUSE [36], and GenomicSEM [41]. The threshold for significant results was p<0.05. Since there is only one relationship that is tested - that between poverty and mental illness – we did not apply multiple testing correction to p-values.

Results

Latent poverty-factor estimation

To analyze the joint genetic architecture of poverty we ran a multivariate GWAS for which a common factor defined by genetic indicators is regressed on a SNP. This allows for estimation of a set of summary statistics for the common factor that represent the SNP effects on the common factor. The multivariable GWAS of the latent poverty factor (P) was modelled from three indicators: household income, social deprivation, and occupational income. Specifically, indicators were ordered such that the phenotype with the largest, unstandardized loading on the common factor is listed first, that led to set household income as the unit load identification.
Mean chi2, LDSC intercept, and h2 for the common factor GWAS and GWAS of HI, SD, and OI are presented in Table 2, see also Supplementary Table 1-2 for the rg between the common factor and each indicator and the factor loading of each indicator.

Table 2: summary statistics of the common factor poverty household income, social deprivation, and occupational income

	Genotype-Phenotype strength of association (Mean Chi^2)	**Genetic correlation and heritability (LDSC intercept [SE])**	**Heritability (Z-score h^2 %, [Observed scale h^2 SE])**
HI	1.5669	1.0426 (0.0099)	22.6 (0.0031) p<5e-8
SD	1.3379	1.0423 (0.0081)	20.5 (0.0015) p<5e-8
OI	1.5145	1.0015 (0.0092)	22.8 (0.004) p<5e-8
Common factor: P	1.7301	0.9883 (0.0108)	27.3 (0.0031) p<5e-8

Abbreviations: LDSC: Linkage Disequilibrium Score Regression; SE: standard error; P: poverty; HI: household income; SD: social deprivation; OI: occupational income.
Legend: Mean Chi^2 measures the overall strength of association between genetic variants and the phenotype of interest; a high Mean Chi^2 value indicates that there are many genetic variants that are strongly associated with the trait. Linkage Disequilibrium Score Regression (LDSC) intercept represents the contribution of unmeasured genetic factors, such as rare variants, structural variants, or epigenetic modifications, to the heritability of the trait; it is used to assess the quality of GWAS data to distinguish between true genetic effects and confounding factors, because a higher LDSC intercept value may indicate the presence of confounding factors that inflate the estimates of heritability. Narrow sense heritability (h^2) is a measure of the proportion of phenotypic variation that is attributable to genetic variation.

The GWAS of the latent poverty factor identified 99 SNPs significantly associated with the trait at GWAS threshold (p-value≤5e-8), as displayed in Figure 1 (see also Supplementary File 2 for the lead SNPs list). The full GWAS summary statistics are available upon reasonable request to the lead author (MM).



Figure 1: Manhattan plot of the latent poverty factor.
Legend: The x-axis indicates chromosomal position and the y-axis is the significance of association (−log10(p-value)). The red line represents genome-wide significance level (5×10−8).

The rg between P and CA resulted 0.74. Running bidirectional MR of CA against P, we found stronger evidence supporting the causal effect of CA on P (IVW $B_{CA \rightarrow P}$=-0.390 [95%CI: -0.408; -0.372]) rather than vice versa (IVW $B_{P \rightarrow CA}$=-0.987 [95%CI: -1.03; -0.939]), as suggested by the results of Steger's test (p<0.001; p=0.811, respectively). The full results are presented in Supplementary Table 3 and Supplementary Figures 1-4.

Bidirectional univariable MR of common factor poverty against mental illness
Within the univariable analyses, mean F statistics ranged from 35.3 to 45.6, indicating that the estimates were not likely subject to weak instrument bias.
Forward IVW analysis of P against the considered mental illnesses showed significant causal effect of P on ADHD (B=1.45 [95%CI: 1.23; 1.66]), ANX (B=0.831 [95%CI: 0.377; 1.28]), MDD (B=0.398 [95%CI: 0.254; 0.542]), PTSD (B=0.629 [95%CI: 0.395; 0.863]), SZ (B=0.425 [95%CI: 0.300; 0.550]), and with opposite direction on AN (B=-0.697 [95%CI:-0.918; -0.477]) and OCD (B=-0.676 [95%CI: -1.22; -0.137]). The estimate of the causal effect using WM method, was confirmed for ADHD (B=1.23 [95%CI: 0.878; 1.58]), AN (B=-0.691 [95%CI: -1.05; -0.337]), MDD (B=0.300 [95%CI: 0.071; 0.528]), PTSD (B=0.460 [95%CI: 0.100; 0.820]), and SZ (B=0.457 [95%CI: 0.193; 0.720]), but not for ANX (B=0.590 [95%CI: -0.095; 1.27]) and OCD (B=-0.484 [95%CI:- 1.29; 0.327]). We did not identify any significant causal effect of P on BD and ASD.

Backward IVW analysis of mental illness against P showed significant causal effect of ADHD (B=0.094 [95%CI: 0.076; 0.112]), BD (B=-0.026 [95%CI: -0.037; -0.014]), and SZ (B=0.023 [95%CI: 0.017; 0.029]) on P. The estimate of the causal effect using WM method, was confirmed for both ADHD (B=0.087 [95%CI: 0.057; 0.118]) and SZ (B=0.014 [95%CI: 0.004; 0.025]), but not for BD (B=-0.004 [95%CI: -0.025; 0.017]).
The results are displayed in Table 3 and Figure 2 (see also scatterplots displayed in Supplementary Figures 5-13 and Supplementary Figures 23-26), and we reported conversion to OR for all forward analyses in Supplementary Table 4.

Table 3: Results of univariable bidirectional Mendelian randomization analysis of poverty against mental illnesses

Forward MR analysis				*Backward analysis*			
MR: method	**N SNP**	**B (95% CI)**	**p-value**	**MR: method**	**N SNP**	**B (95% CI)**	**p-value**
P → ADHD:	87			ADHD → P:	8		
IVW		1.45 (1.23; 1.66)	<0.001	IVW		0.094 (0.076; 0.112)	<0.001
WM		1.23 (0.878; 1.58)	<0.001	WM		0.087 (0.057; 0.118)	<0.001
MR-Egger		-0.934 (-2.20; 0.328)	0.150	MR-Egger		-0.007 (-0.123; 0.109)	0.907
P → AN:	85			AN → P:	2		
IVW		-0.697 (-0.918; -0.477)	<0.001	IVW		-0.001 (-0.038; 0.035)	0.947
WM		-0.691 (-1.05; -0.337)	<0.001	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-1.29 (2.74; 0.160)	0.085	MR-Egger		NR	NR
P → ANX:	85			ANX → P:	0		
IVW		0.831 (0.377; 1.28)	<0.001	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.590 (0.095; 1.27)	0.091	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.054 (-2.41; 2.30)	0.964	MR-Egger		NR	NR
P → ASD:	87			ASD → P:	0		
IVW		-0.018 (-0.239; 0.203)	0.873	IVW		NR	NR
WM		-0.074 (-0.426; 0.279)	0.682	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-1.79 (-3.23; -0.348)	0.017	MR-Egger		NR	NR
P → BD:	87			BD → P:	36		
IVW		-0.032 (-0.181; 0.118)	0.678	IVW		-0.026 (-0.037; -0.014)	<0.001
WM		-0.048 (-0.302; 0.206)	0.713	WM		-0.004 (-0.025; 0.017)	0.732
MR-Egger		-0.727 (1.90; 0.449)	0.229	MR-Egger		-0.016 (-0.179; 0.147)	0.847
P → MDD:	86			MDD → P:	0		
IVW		0.398 (0.254; 0.542)	<0.001	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.300 (0.071; 0.528)	0.010	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.126 (-0.964; 0.713)	0.770	MR-Egger		NR	NR
P → OCD:	86			OCD → P:	0		
IVW		-0.676 (-1.22; -0.137)	0.014	IVW		NR	NR
WM		-0.484 (-1.29; 0.327)	0.242	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		0.516 (-1.91; 2.95)	0.678	MR-Egger		NR	NR
P → PTSD:	87			PTSD → P:	0		
IVW		0.629 (0.395; 0.863)	<0.001	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.460 (0.100; 0.820)	0.012	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.526 (-1.72; 0.667)	0.390	MR-Egger		NR	NR
P → SZ:	87			SZ → P:	176		
IVW		0.425 (0.300; 0.550)	<0.001	IVW		0.023 (0.017; 0.029)	<0.001
WM		0.457 (0.193; 0.720)	0.001	WM		0.014 (0.004; 0.025)	0.006
MR-Egger		-0.160 (-1.44; 1.12)	0.808	MR-Egger		0.002 (-0.043; 0.047)	0.922

Abbreviations: MR: Mendelian randomization; SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism; B: unstandardized regression coefficient; 95% CI: 95% confidence intervals; P: poverty; ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; AN: anorexia nervosa; ANX: anxiety disorder; ASD: autism spectrum disorders; BD: bipolar disorder; MDD: major depressive disorder; OCD: obsessive-compulsive disorder; PTSD: post-traumatic stress disorder; SZ: schizophrenia; IVW: inverse variance weighted (fixed effect); WM: weighted median; NR: not reported because not enough SNP to perform MR.
Legend: Poverty is a latent variable built using household income as unit identification, therefore an increase in the indicator's load stands for increased income, therefore the regression coefficients have been reversed to facilitate interpretation of the effect of poverty.



Figure 2: Forest plot of the results of univariable bidirectional Mendelian randomization analysis of poverty against mental illness (Panel A: forward analysis; Panel B: backward analysis)
Abbreviations: Fw: forward MR analysis; Bw: backward MR analysis; P: poverty; ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; AN: anorexia nervosa; ANX: anxiety disorder; ASD: autism spectrum disorders; BD: bipolar disorder; MDD: major depressive disorder; OCD: obsessive-compulsive disorder; PTSD: post-traumatic stress disorder; SZ: schizophrenia; MR: mendelian randomization; SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism; IVW: inverse variance weighted (fixed effect); 95% CI: 95% confidence interval.
Legend: Poverty is a latent variable built using household income as unit identification, therefore an increase in the indicator's load stands for increased income, therefore the regression coefficients have been reversed to facilitate interpretation of the effect of poverty.

Steiger test indicated that the causal direction between the exposure and outcome was correct in all the analyses, with weaker significance for the effect of P on ADHD (p=0.049). MR-Egger showed not significant causal effect for all the analyses except for the effect of P on ASD (B=-1.79 [95%CI: -3.23; -0.348], Egger's intercept p=0.015), which was not significant in IVW and WM models. MR-PRESSO did not detect bias in the estimates due to horizontal pleiotropy in all the estimates. The full results of the MR analyses are presented in Supplementary Table 5. CAUSE analysis confirmed the causal effect of P on ADHD bidirectionally, and unidirectionally on AN, MDD, and PTSD. Not significant difference between the sharing and the causal model was found for the effect of P on SZ bidirectionally. The results of CAUSE are presented in Supplementary Table 6.
Leave-one-out analyses, both in forward and backward directions, showed that the direction of the effect of each SNP is consistent with the direction of the overall causal estimate. In

addition, for most of the analyses, a change in the estimations of less than 10% was obtained by leaving out each SNP, suggesting that any of the genetic variants were not playing as outliers. Exceptions were for the effect of BD on P whereby leaving out rs2693698 or rs13195401 the causal effect estimates became statistically significant (respectively: B=0.029 [95%CI: 0.001; 0.058], p=0.046; and B=0.031 [95%CI: 0.001; 0.061], p=0.041), and of P on OCD where excluding rs1906252 the estimate increased of 15%. The results of leave-one-out analyses are available as Supplementary Figures 14-22 and Supplementary Figures 27-29. Finally, to test if our results were robust to bias due to reverse causality, we repeated the MR analyses on a subset of SNPs selected through Steiger filtering. This sensitivity analysis confirmed the results of the main analysis, except for the effect of P on OCD that was no longer significant after Steiger filtering (B=-0.037 [95%CI: -0.702; 0.628]). The results are presented in Supplementary Table 7.

To assess whether the effect of poverty on mental illness is driven by specific indicators, we performed bidirectional univariable MR using each of the poverty indicator (i.e., HI, OI, and SD) as the exposure. The results are presented in Figure 3, Supplementary Tables 8-9 (HI), 12-13 (OI), 16-17 (SD), and Supplementary Figures 30-107. HI GWAS resulted more powerful than OI and SD ones, as supported by the number of SNPs selected for the analyses (~50, ~30, and ~10, respectively).



Figure 3: Forest plot of the results of univariable bidirectional Mendelian randomization analysis for each poverty measure against mental illness (Panel A: forward analysis; Panel B: backward analysis)

Abbreviations: Fw: forward MR analysis; Bw: backward MR analysis; P: poverty; ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; AN: anorexia nervosa; ANX: anxiety disorder; ASD: autism spectrum disorders; BD: bipolar disorder; MDD: major depressive disorder; OCD: obsessive-compulsive disorder; PTSD: post-traumatic stress disorder; SZ: schizophrenia; MR: mendelian randomization; SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism; IVW: inverse variance weighted (fixed effect); 95% CI: 95% confidence interval.
Legend: To have a consistent direction of the effect, social deprivation effect has been reversed.

Overall, the direction of the associations obtained using the poverty common factor was confirmed, corroborating the bidirectional causal effects of poverty on some mental illnesses. Specifically, using HI as a poverty measure, we found evidence of bidirectional effect on ADHD (B=-0.889 [95%CI: -1.13; -0.643]; B=-0.073 [95%CI: -0.092; -0.055], IVW forward and backward respectively) and SZ (B=-0.415 [95%CI: -0.565; -0.265]; B=-0.031 [95%CI: -0.037; -0.024], IVW forward and backward respectively), and unidirectional causal effect to MDD (B=-0.422 [95%CI: -0.589; -0.255]) and AN (B=0.448 [95%CI: 0.191; 0.704]). The bidirectional effect of poverty on ADHD (B=-1.08 [95%CI: -1.35; -0.807]; B=-0.076 [95%CI: -0.100; -0.053], IVW forward and backward respectively) and unidirectionally to AN (B=-0.187 [95%CI: -0.344; -0.030]) and MDD (B=-0.322 [95%CI: -0.502; -0.143]) were confirmed also using OI as a measure of poverty. The effect of OI on SZ was also confirmed bidirectionally (B=-0.187 [95%CI: -0.344; -0.030]; B=-0.010 [95%CI: -0.017; -0.003]), but sensitivity analyses using CAUSE and Steiger filtering selection detected potential bias due to pleiotropy in the forward analysis. Backward analyses using OI as the outcome, confirmed the effect of BD on poverty using IVW but not WM methods (B=0.042 [0.028; 0.057]; B=0.020 [95%CI: -0.005; 0.046], IVW and WM respectively) as found using the common factor poverty; but novel evidence was found to the causal effect of AN to OI (B=0.045 [95%CI: 0.011; 0.080]), not replicated using the poverty common factor or other measures of poverty. Finally, using SD as a measure of poverty, the bidirectional effect on ADHD (B=0.800 [95%CI: 0.536; 1.06]; B=0.204 [95%CI: 0.159; 0.249], IVW forward and backward respectively) and SZ (B=0.213 [95%CI: 0.046; 0.380]; B=0.042 [95%CI: 0.026; 0.058], IVW forward and backward respectively) were confirmed, as well as the unidirectional effect to AN (B=-0.352 [95%CI: -0.618; -0.087]). Interestingly, by applying Steiger filtering selection, none of the effects were still significant, consistent with a pleiotropic effect of the genetic instrument on SD and mental illness (for the CAUSE and Steiger filtering MR results see Supplementary Tables 10-11 [HI], 14-15 [OI], 18-19 [SD]).

In addition, we explored if the poverty indicators (i.e., HI, OI, SD) may capture unique risk of mental illness not captured by the common factor of poverty. In other words, the MR using the common factor was testing the variance common across HI, SD, and OI for a causal association with mental illness. Instead, by using Multivariable MR (MVMR) of the poverty common factor and each poverty indicator, allowed us to examine the variance that is shared across the indicators, plus the variance unique to that indicator, for a causal effect on mental illness. The results of these analyses are presented in Supplementary Tables 20-22, showing that the power of each indicator is, as expected, less than that of the common factor, and more importantly, the direction of the effects was consistent with the univariable analyses, although some associations (such as SZ with HI and P, or AN with HI, OI, SD, and P) resulted no longer statistically significant likely due to collinearity between the independent variables. Overall, this is suggesting that the variance that is unique to each indicator did not have a

different risk/protective effect on mental illness than the variance that is shared in the common factor.

Bidirectional univariable MR of HI category against mental illness

To explore the shape of the relationship between HI and mental health, and specifically to answer the question whether there is a particular HI threshold at which the effect of HI on mental health kicks-in, we categorized HI according to 5 strata and investigated the differential effect of each stratum on the considered mental illnesses. That led to the creation of 4 dichotomous dummy variables, consisting of: (1) low HI (LHI): cases were those less than £18,000; (2) low-mid HI (LMHI): cases were those less than £29,999; (3) mid-high HI (MHHI): cases were those more than £52,000; (4) high HI (HHI): cases were those more than £100,000. For each of these bidirectional univariable MR was ran.

As can be seen in Table 4 and Figure 4, we found a significant causal effect of being in the lowest HI stratum on ANX (B=0.628 [95%CI: 0.095; 1.16]), BD (B=0.306 [95%CI: 0.125; 0.487]), MDD (B=0.351 [95%CI: 0.189; 0.513]), PTSD (B=0.506 [95%CI: 0.253; 0.759]), and bidirectionally on ADHD (forward, B=0.600; [95%CI: 0.373; 0.828]; backward, B=0.113 [95%CI: 0.069; 0.158]) and SZ (forward, B=0.648 [95%CI: 0.488; 0.808]; backward, B=0.082 [95%CI: 0.066; 0.098]). In the LMHI stratum, the direction of the associations observed in the LHI level was maintained, and interestingly, the effect size decreased, consistent with our leading hypothesis of more deleterious effect of poverty on mental health at very low levels of income. Exceptions were AN, ASD, and OCD for which being in the LMHI stratum resulted to be protective (B=-0.309 [95CI: -0.526; -0.091], B=-0.268 [95%CI: -0.488; -0.047], B=-0.774 [95%CI: -1.34; -0.212], respectively). The analyses in the higher strata, namely MHHI and HHI, overall confirmed that AN and ASD - but not OCD - are causally associated with higher incomes, with stronger evidence for AN ($B_{MHHI \rightarrow AN}$=0.371 [95%CI: 0.193; 0.550]; $B_{MHHI \rightarrow ASD}$=0.480 [95%CI: 0.303; 0.658]; $B_{HHI \rightarrow AN}$=0.333 [95%CI: 0.065; 0.600]; $B_{HHI \rightarrow ASD}$=0.094 [95%CI: -0.121; 0.308]), whereas the association with ADHD, MDD, PTSD, and SZ resulted with opposite sign, confirming the causal relationship with lower income. Notably, ADHD and SZ showed a consistent bidirectional pattern across all these analyses, whereby these resulted causally related to lower incomes, and resulted also causal factors for lower incomes. This evidence is supporting a vicious circle between poverty and severe mental illness that reiterates.

BD showed an odd distribution across HI levels, resulting causally associated with both low and high HI ($B_{LHI \rightarrow BD}$=0.306 [95%CI:0.125; 0.487]; $B_{MHHI \rightarrow BD}$=0.179 [95%CI: 0.053; 0.304]; $B_{HHI \rightarrow BD}$=0.608 [95%CI: 0.423; 0.792] with this last estimate based on only 2 SNPs). These associations were not replicated using the WM method, and MR-PRESSO detected significant distortion in the estimate due to pleiotropy in the relationship between BD and MHHI, with outlier adjusted causal estimates (OACE) resulting not significant (OACE=0.002 [95%CI: -0.039; 0.042]).

The estimate of the causal effect using WM method, was confirmed for LHI to ADHD and SZ forward and backward ($B_{LHI \rightarrow ADHD}$=0.415 [95%CI: 0.089; 0.742] and $B_{ADHD \rightarrow LHI}$=0.119 [95%CI: 0.057; 0.182]; $B_{LHI \rightarrow SZ}$=0.400 [95%CI: 0.102; 0.699] and $B_{SZ \rightarrow LHI}$=0.071 [95%CI: 0.045; 0.098]), ANX (B=0.700 [95%CI: 0.016; 1.38]), MDD (B=0.398 [95%CI: 0.058; 0.558]), PTSD (B=0.511 [95%CI: 0.167; 0.855]), and for MHHI and HHI to ASD (B=0.393 [95%CI: 0.093; 0.692] and B=0.509 [95%CI: 0.163; 0.855]).

Steiger test indicated that the causal direction between the exposure and outcome was correct in all the analyses except those on ASD (p=0.994 and p=0.057 respectively for the association with MLHI and MHHI). MR-Egger showed significant causal effect and significant intercept only for the relationship between MHHI and BD (B=1.69 [95%CI: 0.376; 3.00]; Egger's intercept p=0.033), for the others, both forward and backward MR-Egger analyses showed not

significant causal effect and not significant intercept. The full results of the MR analyses across HI levels are shown in Supplementary Tables 23-26, conversion to OR is reported in Supplementary Table 27.

Table 4: Results of univariable bidirectional Mendelian randomization analysis of household income levels against mental illnesses

Forward MR analysis				*Backward analysis*			
MR: method	**N SNP**	**B (95% CI)**	**p-value**	**MR: method**	**N SNP**	**B (95% CI)**	**p-value**
LHI → ADHD:	12			ADHD → LHI:	10		
IVW		0.600 (0.373; 0.828)	<0.001	IVW		0.113 (0.069; 0.158)	<0.001
WM		0.415 (0.089; 0.742)	0.013	WM		0.119 (0.057; 0.182)	<0.001
MR-Egger		0.865 (-0.325; 2.05)	0.185	MR-Egger		0.034 (-0.206; 0.275)	0.786
LMHI → ADHD:	17			ADHD → LMHI:	10		
IVW		0.417 (0.198; 0.636)	<0.001	IVW		0.132 (0.094; 0.171)	<0.001
WM		0.305 (-0.009; 0.619)	0.057	WM		0.128 (0.067; 0.189)	<0.001
MR-Egger		-0.659 (-3.47; 2.15)	0.652	MR-Egger		0.034 (-0.221; 0.290)	0.799
MHHI → ADHD:	19			ADHD → MHHI:	10		
IVW		-0.245 (-0.424; -0.066)	0.007	IVW		-0.121 (-0.164; -0.078)	<0.001
WM		-0.082 (-0.336; 0.172)	0.527	WM		-0.117 (-0.175; -0.059)	<0.001
MR-Egger		-0.408 (-1.31; 0.495)	0.388	MR-Egger		-0.114 (-0.331; 0.104)	0.336
HHI → ADHD:	3			ADHD → HHI:	10		
IVW		-0.201 (-0.415; 0.013)	0.066	IVW		-0.189 (-0.270; -0.108)	<0.001
WM		-0.267 (-0.546; 0.012)	0.061	WM		-0.183 (-0.285; -0.081)	<0.001
MR-Egger		-0.805 (-2.18; 0.569)	0.456	MR-Egger		-0.207 (-0.617; 0.202)	0.350
LHI → AN:	11			AN → LHI:	4		
IVW		-0.092 (-0.333; 0.148)	0.452	IVW		0.026 (-0.049; 0.100)	0.500
WM		0.018 (-0.329; 0.365)	0.919	WM		0.016 (-0.073; 0.106)	0.725
MR-Egger		-0.094 (-1.58; 1.39)	0.904	MR-Egger		-0.519 (-1.52; 0.484)	0.417
LMHI → AN:	17			AN → LMHI:	4		
IVW		-0.309 (-0.526; -0.091)	0.005	IVW		0.026 (-0.038; 0.090)	0.426
WM		-0.222 (-0.542; 0.099)	0.176	WM		0.023 (-0.056; 0.102)	0.564
MR-Egger		-1.35 (-4.23; 1.53)	0.373	MR-Egger		-0.652 (-1.29; -0.014)	0.183
MHHI → AN:	20			AN → MHHI:	4		
IVW		0.371 (0.193; 0.550)	<0.001	IVW		-0.009 (-0.081; 0.062)	0.803
WM		0.281 (-0.018; 0.581)	0.066	WM		0.036 (-0.052; 0.124)	0.425
MR-Egger		1.05 (-0.224; 2.33)	0.123	MR-Egger		0.314 (-0.811; 1.44)	0.639
HHI → AN:	2			AN → HHI:	4		
IVW		0.333 (0.065; 0.600)	0.015	IVW		-0.043 (-0.177; 0.092)	0.535
WM		NR	NR	WM		-0.036 (-0.196; 0.125)	0.663
MR-Egger		NR	NR	MR-Egger		-0.113 (-1.36; 1.13)	0.875
LHI → ANX:	10			ANX → LHI:	0		
IVW		0.628 (0.095; 1.16)	0.021	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.700 (0.016; 1.38)	0.045	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		0.300 (-3.08; 3.68)	0.866	MR-Egger		NR	NR
LMHI → ANX:	17			ANX → LMHI:	0		
IVW		0.376 (-0.078; 0.831)	0.105	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.189 (-0.387; 0.765)	0.520	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.884 (-4.80; 3.03)	0.664	MR-Egger		NR	NR
MHHI → ANX:	20			ANX → MHHI:	0		
IVW		-0.320 (-0.694; 0.053)	0.093	IVW		NR	NR
WM		-0.098 (-0.583; 0.389)	0.694	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.951 (-3.27; 1.36)	0.431	MR-Egger		NR	NR
HHI → ANX:	2			ANX → HHI:	0		
IVW		-0.101 (-0.641; 0.440)	0.715	IVW		NR	NR
WM		NR	NR	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		NR	NR	MR-Egger		NR	NR
LHI → ASD:	12			ASD → LHI:	0		
IVW		0.177 (-0.053; 0.408)	0.132	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.228 (-0.145; 0.602)	0.231	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		0.407 (-1.82; 2.63)	0.727	MR-Egger		NR	NR
LMHI → ASD:	18			ASD → LMHI:	0		
IVW		-0.268 (-0.488; -0.047)	0.017	IVW		NR	NR
WM		-0.374 (-0.753; 0.005)	0.053	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-2.15 (-5.04; 0.746)	0.165	MR-Egger		NR	NR
MHHI → ASD:	21			ASD → MHHI:	0		
IVW		0.480 (0.303; 0.658)	<0.001	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.393 (0.093; 0.692)	0.010	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		0.345 (-0.763; 1.45)	0.549	MR-Egger		NR	NR
HHI → ASD:	3			ASD → HHI:	0		
IVW		0.094 (-0.121; 0.308)	0.392	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.509 (0.163; 0.855)	0.004	WM		NR	NR

MR-Egger		-4.07 (-6.29; 1.85)	0.173	MR-Egger		NR	NR
LHI → BD:	9			BD → LHI:	36		
IVW		0.306 (0.125; 0.487)	0.001	IVW		-0.001 (-0.032; 0.032)	0.983
WM		0.159 (-0.108; 0.427)	0.243	WM		0.029 (-0.023; 0.081)	0.275
MR-Egger		-0.545 (-1.42; 0.332)	0.263	MR-Egger		0.125 (-0.158; 0.407)	0.394
LMHI → BD:	16			BD → LMHI:	36		
IVW		-0.099 (-0.251; 0.053)	0.201	IVW		-0.030 (-0.058; -0.003)	0.032
WM		-0.067 (-0.352; 0.217)	0.643	WM		-0.030 (-0.076; 0.017)	0.208
MR-Egger		-2.40 (-5.36; 0.553)	0.133	MR-Egger		-0.001 (-0.302; 0.301)	0.999
MHHI → BD:	19			BD → MHHI:	36		
IVW		0.179 (0.053; 0.304)	0.005	IVW		0.040 (0.009; 0.071)	0.011
WM		0.028 (-0.208; 0.264)	0.816	WM		0.030 (-0.020; 0.081)	0.239
MR-Egger		1.69 (0.376; 3.00)	0.022	MR-Egger		0.025 (-0.308; 0.357)	0.885
HHI → BD:	2			BD → HHI:	36		
IVW		0.608 (0.423; 0.792)	<0.001	IVW		0.076 (0.017; 0.134)	0.011
WM		NR	NR	WM		0.066 (-0.026; 0.159)	0.158
MR-Egger		NR	NR	MR-Egger		0.065 (-0.443; 0.573)	0.803
LHI → MDD:	10			MDD → LHI:	0		
IVW		0.351 (0.189; 0.513)	<0.001	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.398 (0.058; 0.558)	0.016	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		0.880 (0.082; 1.68)	0.006	MR-Egger		NR	NR
LMHI → MDD:	17			MDD → LMHI:	0		
IVW		0.224 (0.077; 0.371)	0.003	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.204 (-0.004; 0.411)	0.054	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.159 (-1.39; 1.07)	0.803	MR-Egger		NR	NR
MHHI → MDD:	21			MDD → MHHI:	0		
IVW		-0.123 (-0.238; -0.008)	0.036	IVW		NR	NR
WM		-0.070 (-0.245; 0.105)	0.433	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		0.474 (-0.178; 1.13)	0.171	MR-Egger		NR	NR
HHI → MDD:	2			MDD → HHI:	0		
IVW		0.013 (-0.163; 0.188)	0.889	IVW		NR	NR
WM		NR	NR	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		NR	NR	MR-Egger		NR	NR
LHI → OCD:	10			OCD → LHI:	0		
IVW		-0.108 (-0.738; 0.522)	0.737	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.293 (-0.536; 1.12)	0.488	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		0.593 (-2.60; 3.78)	0.725	MR-Egger		NR	NR
LMHI → OCD:	17			OCD → LMHI:	0		
IVW		-0.774 (-1.34; -0.212)	0.007	IVW		NR	NR
WM		-0.833 (-1.57; -0.097)	0.027	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.350 (-4.75; 4.05)	0.878	MR-Egger		NR	NR
MHHI → OCD:	21			OCD → MHHI:	0		
IVW		-0.079 (-0.511; 0.353)	0.720	IVW		NR	NR
WM		-0.065 (-0.679; 0.549)	0.836	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.399 (-2.63; 1.83)	0.729	MR-Egger		NR	NR
HHI → OCD:	2			OCD → HHI:	0		
IVW		0.199 (-0.469; 0.866)	0.560	IVW		NR	NR
WM		NR	NR	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		NR	NR	MR-Egger		NR	NR
LHI → PTSD:	12			PTSD → LHI:	0		
IVW		0.506 (0.253; 0.759)	<0.001	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.511 (0.167; 0.855)	0.004	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		0.412 (-0.769; 1.59)	0.510	MR-Egger		NR	NR
LMHI → PTSD:	17			PTSD → LMHI:	0		
IVW		0.283 (0.045; 0.521)	0.020	IVW		NR	NR
WM		0.285 (-0.071; 0.640)	0.117	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.485 (-2.89; 1.92)	0.537	MR-Egger		NR	NR
MHHI → PTSD:	21			PTSD → MHHI:	0		
IVW		-0.233 (-0.421; -0.044)	0.016	IVW		NR	NR
WM		-0.195 (-0.471; 0.080)	0.165	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.080 (-1.06; 0.900)	0.874	MR-Egger		NR	NR
HHI → PTSD:	3			PTSD → HHI:	0		
IVW		-0.190 (-0.425; 0.046)	0.114	IVW		NR	NR
WM		-0.157 (-0.453; 0.139)	0.300	WM		NR	NR
MR-Egger		-0.887 (-2.40; 0.626)	0.456	MR-Egger		NR	NR
LHI → SZ:	9			SZ → LHI:	176		
IVW		0.648 (0.488; 0.808)	<0.001	IVW		0.082 (0.066; 0.098)	<0.001
WM		0.400 (0.102; 0.699)	0.009	WM		0.071 (0.045; 0.098)	<0.001
MR-Egger		-0.151 (-2.16; 1.86)	0.887	MR-Egger		0.115 (0.016; 0.214)	0.024
LMHI → SZ:	16			SZ → LMHI:	176		
IVW		0.270 (0.138; 0.401)	<0.001	IVW		0.045 (0.031; 0.059)	<0.001
WM		0.117 (-0.132; 0.366)	0.357	WM		0.041 (0.018; 0.063)	<0.001
MR-Egger		-0.273 (-3.42; 2.87)	0.867	MR-Egger		0.032 (-0.052; 0.117)	0.455
MHHI → SZ:	20			SZ → MHHI:	176		

IVW		-0.098 (-0.201; 0.005)	0.063	IVW		-0.046 (-0.061; -0.030)	<0.001
WM		-0.171 (-0.376; 0.033)	0.100	WM		-0.039 (-0.066; -0.012)	0.005
MR-Egger		-0.236 (-1.60; 1.12)	0.738	MR-Egger		0.018 (-0.077; 0.112)	0.707
HHI → SZ:	2			SZ → HHI:	176		
IVW		0.030 (-0.121; 0.182)	0.693	IVW		-0.013 (-0.042; 0.016)	0.395
WM		NR	NR	WM		0.002 (-0.049; 0.052)	0.950
MR-Egger		NR	NR	MR-Egger		0.095 (-0.051; 0.242)	0.205

Abbreviations: MR: Mendelian randomization; SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism; B: unstandardized regression coefficient; 95% CI: 95% confidence intervals; HI: household income; ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; AN: anorexia nervosa; ANX: anxiety disorder; ASD: autism spectrum disorders; BD: bipolar disorder; MDD: major depressive disorder; OCD: obsessive-compulsive disorder; PTSD: post-traumatic stress disorder; SZ: schizophrenia; IVW: inverse variance weighted (fixed effect); WM: weighted median; NR: not reported because not enough SNP to perform MR.
Legend: LHI: low household income, cases were those less than £18,000; LMHI: low-mid HI, cases were those less than £29,999; MHHI: mid-high HI, cases were those more than £52,000; HHI: high HI, cases were those more than £100,000.



Figure 4: Forest plot of the results of univariable bidirectional Mendelian randomization analysis of household income levels against mental illnesses (Panel A: forward analysis; Panel B: backward analysis)
Abbreviations: Fw: forward MR analysis; Bw: backward MR analysis; LHI: low household income; LMHI: low-mid household income; MHHI: mid-high household income; HHI: high household income; ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; AN: anorexia nervosa; ANX: anxiety disorder; ASD: autism spectrum disorders; BD: bipolar disorder; MDD: major depressive disorder; OCD: obsessive-compulsive disorder; PTSD: post-traumatic stress disorder; SZ: schizophrenia; MR: mendelian randomization; SNP: single nucleotide

polymorphism; IVW: inverse variance weighted (fixed effect); 95% CI: 95% confidence interval.
Legend: LHI: low household income, cases were those less than £18,000; LMHI: low-mid HI, cases were those less than £29,999; MHHI: mid-high HI, cases were those more than £52,000; HHI: high HI, cases were those more than £100,000.

Finally, to test if our results were robust to bias due to reverse causality, we repeated the MR analyses on a subset of SNPs selected through Steiger filtering. This sensitivity analysis confirmed a stronger causal effect played by the lowest HI level on ADHD, MDD, PTSD, and SZ. The protective effect of MHHI on ASD also was confirmed. Interestingly, the effect observed in the main analysis were not confirmed for BD and AN. The results can be found in Supplementary Table 28.

MVMR of poverty factor and CA against mental illness
MVMR was used to estimate the effect of poverty on each mental illness, while controlling for cognitive abilities. First, bidirectional univariable MR of CA on mental illness was performed, finding evidence supporting bidirectional inverse causal relationship between CA and ADHD (B=-0.699 [95%CI:-0.814; -0.584]; B=-0.102 [95%CI:-0.128; -0.076], forward and backward direction, respectively) and SZ (B=-0.297 [95%CI:-0.365; -0.228]; B=-0.055 [95%CI:-0.063; -0.047], forward and backward direction, respectively), unidirectional negative causal effect of CA on MDD and PTSD (B=-0.140 [95%CI:-0.215; -0.065] and B=-0.139 [95%CI:-0.264; -0.013], respectively) and unidirectional causal effect of CA on AN and ASD (B=0.306 [95%CI:0.190; 0.422] and B=0.310 [95%CI:0.193; 0.427], respectively). The results are displayed in Supplementary Tables 29-32, and Supplementary Figures 108-133. MVMR analysis yielded results supporting a causal effect of P on ADHD, AN, ANX, MDD, OCD, PTSD, and SZ, above and beyond CA. Still, the effect of P on mental illness decreased when including CA in the model. These results suggest that whilst genetic variation that impacts on poverty through CA has a causal effect on mental illness, other pathways and heritable phenotypes that act on poverty independently of CA are also evident. The results of MVMR are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Multivariable Mendelian Randomization results of poverty and cognitive abilities on mental illness

MVMR	**N SNP**	**IVW (95% CI)**	**p-value**
Outcome: ADHD	213		
Exposure 1: P		0.977 (0.704; 1.25)	<0.001
Exposure 2: CA		-0.564 (-0.726; -0.402)	<0.001
Outcome: AN	213		
Exposure 1: P		-0.406 (-0.668; -0.144)	0.002
Exposure 2: CA		0.158 (0.003; 0.313)	0.046
Outcome: ANX	213		
Exposure 1: P		0.411 (0.024; 0.798)	0.038
Exposure 2: CA		-0.290 (-0.518; -0.062)	0.013
Outcome: ASD	216		
Exposure 1: P		0.127 (-0.147; 0.401)	0.363
Exposure 2: CA		0.208 (0.045; 0.370)	0.012

Outcome: BD Exposure 1: P Exposure 2: CA	216	 0.057 (-0.165; 0.280) -0.005 (-0.137; 0.128)	 0.614 0.947
Outcome: MDD Exposure 1: P Exposure 2: CA	216	 0.266 (0.102; 0.429) -0.093 (-0.190; 0.004)	 0.001 0.060
Outcome: OCD Exposure 1: P Exposure 2: CA	216	 -0.682 (-1.17; -0.196) 0.304 (0.015; 0.594)	 0.006 0.040
Outcome: PTSD Exposure 1: P Exposure 2: CA	216	 0.477 (0.253; 0.701) -0.159 (-0.293; -0.025)	 <0.001 0.020
Outcome: SZ Exposure 1: P Exposure 2: CA	216	 0.345 (0.082; 0.609) -0.306 (-0.464; -0.148)	 0.010 <0.001

Abbreviations: MVMR: multivariable Mendelian randomization; SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism; IVW: multivariable mendelian randomization via inverse variance weighted method (random effects); 95% CI: 95% confidence intervals; ADHD: attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; P: poverty; CA: cognitive abilities; AN: anorexia nervosa; ANX: anxiety disorder; ASD: autism spectrum disorder; BD: bipolar disorder; MDD: major depressive disorder; OCD: obsessive-compulsive disorder; PTSD: post-traumatic stress disorder; SZ: schizophrenia
Legend: Poverty is a latent variable built using household income as unit identification, therefore an increase in the indicator's load stands for increased income, therefore the regression coefficients have been reversed to facilitate interpretation of the effect of poverty.

It is interesting to note that by changing the poverty measure, the results of MVMR markedly changed. Using the MVMR model including HI and CA yielded no significant causal effect played by HI on mental illness. MVMR of OI and CA showed a significant causal effect of OI on ADHD, but not on the other mental illnesses. Finally, the MVMR model of SD and CA found evidence for a causal effect of SD on AN but not on other mental illnesses. The results of these additional MVMR models are shown in Supplementary Tables 33-35. Taken together, these findings confirm that the relationship between poverty and mental illness is largely confounded by CA and support the advantage of using the poverty common factor, over one-dimensional measures, such as income.

Discussion

Building on data of 14 GWAS studies larger than 40,000, this study provided support of a causal relationship between poverty and mental illness. Jointly modeling different indicators of poverty using Genomic structural equation modeling and Mendelian randomization provided convergent evidence supporting the bidirectional causal effect of poverty on ADHD and SZ, of poverty on MDD unidirectionally, and of inverse causal relationship between poverty and AN.

These findings complement previous evidence of social inequalities in mental health from various countries, sample sizes, and study designs [2,6,10,42,43]. The current study is the first using genetic variants as instrumental variables to estimate evidence of a causal effect of poverty on mental illness. Despite the use of genetic data of GWAS studies of poverty it is very unlikely that there are direct genetic effects on income and poverty. Genetic variants

found in associations with income, are likely associated with phenotypes that are relevant to income or poverty. In that context, MR can best be viewed as a way to approximate randomly assign heritable traits that give rise to income differences. Two key candidates of such underlying traits are intelligence and personality. For example, intelligence may lead to both educational advantage and socioeconomic success as well as more healthy behaviors and lead to good mental health [44–46]. In this study we adjusted for the cognitive abilities, finding that genetic variation that impacts on poverty through CA had causal effect on mental illness. Also, other pathways and heritable phenotypes that lead to poverty independently of CA are evident. Of note is the vast literature showing that health characteristics such as obesity, physical appearance, and mental state can influence economic outcomes including employment opportunities or wages [47–49]. Therefore, our results of a causal effect of poverty on mental illness should not be taken as proof supporting genetic determinism, but rather as epidemiological evidence of the detrimental effects of poverty and socio-economic inequalities on mental health, whatever the mechanisms.

The causal relationship between poverty and mental illness is likely to involve material, psychological, behavioral, and biological pathways. For example, the level of development of the welfare system may be a material mediator to the health-damaging effects of income losses [50,51]. Psychosocial mechanisms are a result of the interaction between people's social environment and their feelings: living on low income is stressful, and at the same time people in disadvantaged situations may have fewer resources to cope with difficult circumstances. Increasingly, biological research is providing evidence showing how experiences such as social defeat cause biochemical changes in the body and brain and increase the risk of developing mental health problems [52,53]. Another contributing factor to the relation between poverty and mental illness are the negative health behaviors that are more prevalent in socially disadvantaged groups [54] likely as a consequence of the higher cost of healthy behaviors. For example, a healthy diet is more expensive than processed foods, and joining a gym or sporting clubs can be costly. Moreover, unhealthy behaviors such as smoking or drinking alcohol may be used as coping strategy for stressful situations [55].

Previous quasi-experimental research using natural experiments, such as on the lottery winner population, provided supportive evidence for causal relations between SES and mental health, although with small effect sizes [56]. The effect sizes in this study were moderate for the effect of poverty on ADHD, and small for the other relations.

ADHD

Considering that ADHD is generally considered a neurodevelopmental disorder, our finding of moderate size causal association with poverty is in line with previous evidence suggesting poverty to have a greater effect on the development of mental illness in children and adolescents [57]. The finding of bidirectional causality between poverty and ADHD support also intergenerational deleterious effects of poverty whereby parents' income influencing children's health and children's ill health may influence educational outcomes and so on [58].

Anorexia nervosa

Limited studies suggest that the prevalence of AN is higher among affluent Western cultures [59]. A recent cohort study in Denmark discovered that high parental SES was associated with an increased risk of AN among offspring [60], in line with the results of our study. In the same study, the association of parental SES with Bulimia Nervosa and unspecified eating disorders was much weaker, suggesting that parental SES has different influential mechanisms in offspring on AN than on other eating disorders [60] or eating disorders as a whole[61,62]. A recent review of the literature found that industrialization and urbanization served as contributing

factors to the rise of eating disorders in Asia [63]. Altogether the current evidence is consistent with a model whereby higher income play a role in the etiology of AN.

Major depressive disorder

The literature on the relationship between poverty and depression is relatively extensive. Most studies suggest low income as a risk factor for depression [64–66], in line with the causal effect of poverty on MDD here reported. Other poverty aspects like food insecurity, no former education, unemployment, and social-economic deprivation are also associated with depression [67,68]. However, analysis of SD on MDD risk in this study yielded no significant results. That may be due to the composition of the Townsend deprivation index used to measure deprivation in the UK Biobank. Interestingly, quasi-experimental studies on cash transfer programs and antipoverty programs effectively reduced symptoms of depression, providing more support for a causal effect in addition to prevalence or observational studies [69,70].

Schizophrenia

The existing literature suggests positive associations between SZ and lower income [71–74], lower SES [75], lower employment rate [71,75,76], and lower educational level [71,75]. According to a longitudinal cohort study in Denmark, the amount of time spent in low-income conditions during childhood is associated with an increased risk of SZ [72]. The same study also revealed an increased risk of SZ for those who experienced a decrease in the parental income during childhood, whereas lower SZ risk was observed for those with upward parental income mobility, regardless of the baseline parental income at birth [72]. All this evidence provides further support of causal effects of poverty, deprivation, and low HI and OI on SZ. The causal effect of CA on SZ also echoes previous evidence of inequalities in educational attainment and cognitive performance among people with schizophrenia [77]. In addition, consistent with a reverse causal effect of SZ on poverty found in the current study, previous research detected a low employment rate among individuals suffering from SZ, particularly after being diagnosed with the disorder, for these people income transfer payments are usually the main source of income [76]. Low income and deprivation were also acknowledged as severe psychological and physiological stressors able to worsen SZ symptoms [73], which sustain a negative circle of bidirectional causality.

Other disorders

For the other disorders, the level of consistency across the analyses and previous literature is much lower. The literature on the relationship between poverty and PTSD is very scarce, overall confirming that low income and material hardship are associated with the development of PTSD among those exposed to traumatic events [78–80]. In contrast to the evidence of causal relations between poverty and MDD, SZ, AN and ADHD, evidence for causal effects of poverty on ANX, ASD, BD, and OCD was absent and showed low consistency across sensitivity analyses potentially due to lower power of the GWAS of those mental disorders and to possible competing mechanisms and pleiotropic confounders.

Limitations

This study yielded consistent results; however, they should be interpreted considering some limitations. First, for ANX, ASD, MDD, OCD, and PTSD the strength of the GWAS for performing MR against poverty indicators, may not be sufficient. Future, more powerful GWAS on these conditions may yield instruments that are suitable for MR. A second limitation lies in the fact that most of the genetic studies were conducted in populations of European ancestry, limiting the generalizability of findings [81]. That leaves questions about the

specificity of the effects of poverty on mental health unanswered and leaves the question whether the reported effects are only present in Western Countries and the nature of these relations in other cultures and societies with different political and societal systems.
Third, due to the heterogeneity and complexity of psychiatric phenotypes, each risk factor alone explained only a small amount of variance in risk. Given this general limitation of MR in psychiatry, the finding of moderate effect size for the causal association of poverty on ADHD is noteworthy. Finally, other limitations of MR concern temporality and linearity, therefore MR provides estimates of lifetime risk and linear effects. Although the use of MR on HI thresholds and the inclusion of mental illness with onsets across the whole person's lifespan (e.g., ranging from ADHD and ASD to MDD and ANX) may have mitigated these limitations, future studies should particularly focus on assessing if there are critical windows or acute reactions to poverty exposure.

Implications for research and practice
To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to provide evidence of a causal effect of poverty on mental illness, using MR [9]. This is a highly relevant message for public health and policy because it provides actionable targets for public health policies to improve mental health. The choice of which action to take to address the problem is a political matter, but attention is warranted considering increasing income inequalities worldwide [82], as well as increasing incidence of mental illness [83,84].
Previous studies examining antipoverty programs reported positive and sustained effects on mental health, including reduction of depression and suicide rate [10,85,86]. For example, a recent RCT found that cash incentives provided to low-income individuals led to meaningful improvements in depression [87]. Additionally, specific economic interventions such as family assets, employment support, and rental assistance may be effective in enhancing the mental health of program beneficiaries [88,89]. However, it is important to note that certain aspects of these interventions, such as the perception of receiving money as a debt or burdensome responsibility [90,91], may contribute to increased stress [92,93]. Therefore, further research is necessary to identify the factors within economic support interventions (e.g., microcredit, loans, personal health budgets) that influence mental health outcomes. Combining antipoverty interventions, such as financial incentives and financial mentoring programs, appeared more effective in improving mental health compared to providing financial incentives alone [86]. Thus, policymakers should consider supplementing cash transfer programs with training in financial management or income-generating activities when implementing antipoverty policies. These measures can be beneficial both for individuals living in poverty and those living with severe mental illness.
A key finding of this study is the evidence of the effect of cognitive abilities in the causal pathway from poverty to mental illness. CA, including education, is related to occupational status (therefore, mutatis mutandis, to income) and to mental illness [44,46,94]. Overall education and occupation may be targets for interventions and providing individuals with more psychosocial resources to engage in education and employment, may lead to better mental health [7,95].

Conclusions
This study presents evidence supporting causal effects of poverty on mental illness particularly for SZ, MDD, and ADHD. Conversely, AN was found in an inverse causal relationship with poverty, suggesting increased risk of AN among less poor people. Taken together with previous literature this research points to new possibilities for public mental health improvement, a possibility that should be welcomed in an era with increasing health inequalities.

Acknowledgement
Thanks to Prof. Maria Cristina Murari from University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, for the help with HPC.
Thanks to all R packages' developers for making available such useful tools.

Data availability statement
The lead SNPs list and summary statistics of the common factor poverty GWAS is available as Supplementary File 2. The full GWAS summary statistics is available upon reasonable request to the lead author (MM).
The codes for replicating the analyses can be accessed here:
https://github.com/MattiaMarchi/Common-factor-GWAS---MR

References
1. Hollingshead AB, Redlich FC. Social class and mental illness: Community study. *Social class and mental illness: Community study*. Published online February 14, 1958. doi:10.1037/10645-000
2. Chung RYN, Chung GKK, Gordon D, et al. Deprivation is associated with worse physical and mental health beyond income poverty: a population-based household survey among Chinese adults. *Qual Life Res*. 2018;27(8):2127-2135. doi:10.1007/S11136-018-1863-Y
3. Torquati L, Mielke GI, Brown WJ, Burton NW, Kolbe-Alexander TL. Shift Work and Poor Mental Health: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Studies. *Am J Public Health*. 2019;109(11):E13-E20. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2019.305278
4. Price JH, Khubchandani J, Webb FJ. Poverty and Health Disparities: What Can Public Health Professionals Do? *Health Promot Pract*. 2018;19(2):170-174. doi:10.1177/1524839918755143
5. Vaalavuo M. Deterioration in health: What is the role of unemployment and poverty? *Scand J Public Health*. 2016;44(4):347-353. doi:10.1177/1403494815623654
6. Thomson RM, Igelström E, Purba AK, et al. How do income changes impact on mental health and wellbeing for working-age adults? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Public Health*. 2022;7(6):e515-e528. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(22)00058-5
7. Ribeiro WS, Bauer A, Andrade MCR, et al. Income inequality and mental illness-related morbidity and resilience: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2017;4(7):554-562. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30159-1
8. Park AL, Rinaldi M, Brinchmann B, et al. Economic analyses of supported employment programmes for people with mental health conditions: A systematic review. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2022;65(1). doi:10.1192/J.EURPSY.2022.2309
9. Murali V, Oyebode F. Poverty, social inequality and mental health. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*. 2004;10(3):216-224. doi:10.1192/APT.10.3.216
10. Ridley M, Rao G, Schilbach F, Patel V. Poverty, depression, and anxiety: Causal evidence and mechanisms. *Science*. 2020;370(6522). doi:10.1126/SCIENCE.AAY0214
11. Burgess S, Foley CN, Allara E, Staley JR, Howson JMM. A robust and efficient method for Mendelian randomization with hundreds of genetic variants. *Nature Communications 2020 11:1*. 2020;11(1):1-11. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-14156-4
12. Swartz JR, Hariri AR, Williamson DE. An epigenetic mechanism links socioeconomic status to changes in depression-related brain function in high-risk adolescents. *Molecular Psychiatry 2017 22:2*. 2016;22(2):209-214. doi:10.1038/mp.2016.82

13. Andreu-Bernabeu Á, Díaz-Caneja CM, Costas J, et al. Polygenic contribution to the relationship of loneliness and social isolation with schizophrenia. *Nature Communications 2022 13:1*. 2022;13(1):1-11. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-27598-6
14. Marees AT, Smit DJA, Abdellaoui A, et al. Genetic correlates of socio-economic status influence the pattern of shared heritability across mental health traits. *Nature Human Behaviour 2021 5:8*. 2021;5(8):1065-1073. doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01053-4
15. Alkire, S., Foster, J. E., Seth, S., Santos, M. E., Roche, J. M., and Ballon P. *Multidimensional Poverty Measurement and Analysis*.; 2015.
16. Townsend P, Phillimore P, Beattie Alastair. Health and deprivation : inequality and the North. Published online 1988:211.
17. Burgess S, Thompson SG. Multivariable Mendelian randomization: the use of pleiotropic genetic variants to estimate causal effects. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2015;181(4):251-260. doi:10.1093/AJE/KWU283
18. Hill WD, Marioni RE, Maghzian O, et al. A combined analysis of genetically correlated traits identifies 187 loci and a role for neurogenesis and myelination in intelligence. *Molecular Psychiatry 2018 24:2*. 2018;24(2):169-181. doi:10.1038/s41380-017-0001-5
19. Johnson W, Nijenhuis J te, Bouchard TJ. Still just 1 g: Consistent results from five test batteries. *Intelligence*. 2008;36(1):81-95. doi:10.1016/J.INTELL.2007.06.001
20. Johnson W, Bouchard TJ, Krueger RF, McGue M, Gottesman II. Just one g: consistent results from three test batteries. *Intelligence*. 2004;32(1):95-107. doi:10.1016/S0160-2896(03)00062-X
21. Kweon H, Burik CAP, Linner RK, et al. Genetic Fortune: Winning or Losing Education, Income, and Health. Published online December 1, 2020. Accessed December 3, 2022. https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:tin:wpaper:20200053
22. Demontis D, Walters RK, Martin J, et al. Discovery of the first genome-wide significant risk loci for attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Nat Genet*. 2019;51(1):63-75. doi:10.1038/S41588-018-0269-7
23. Watson HJ, Yilmaz Z, Thornton LM, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies eight risk loci and implicates metabo-psychiatric origins for anorexia nervosa. *Nat Genet*. 2019;51(8):1207-1214. doi:10.1038/S41588-019-0439-2
24. Otowa T, Hek K, Lee M, et al. Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies of anxiety disorders. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2016;21(10):1391-1399. doi:10.1038/MP.2015.197
25. Grove J, Ripke S, Als TD, et al. Identification of common genetic risk variants for autism spectrum disorder. *Nat Genet*. 2019;51(3):431-444. doi:10.1038/S41588-019-0344-8
26. Mullins N, Forstner AJ, O'Connell KS, et al. Genome-wide association study of more than 40,000 bipolar disorder cases provides new insights into the underlying biology. *Nat Genet*. 2021;53(6):817-829. doi:10.1038/S41588-021-00857-4
27. Howard DM, Adams MJ, Clarke TK, et al. Genome-wide meta-analysis of depression identifies 102 independent variants and highlights the importance of the prefrontal brain regions. *Nat Neurosci*. 2019;22(3):343-352. doi:10.1038/S41593-018-0326-7
28. Arnold PD, Askland KD, Barlassina C, et al. Revealing the complex genetic architecture of obsessive-compulsive disorder using meta-analysis. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2018;23(5):1181-1188. doi:10.1038/MP.2017.154
29. Nievergelt CM, Maihofer AX, Klengel T, et al. International meta-analysis of PTSD genome-wide association studies identifies sex- and ancestry-specific genetic risk loci. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10(1). doi:10.1038/S41467-019-12576-W

30. Trubetskoy V, Pardiñas AF, Qi T, et al. Mapping genomic loci implicates genes and synaptic biology in schizophrenia. *Nature 2022 604:7906*. 2022;604(7906):502-508. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-04434-5
31. Burgess S, Davies NM, Thompson SG. Bias due to participant overlap in two-sample Mendelian randomization. *Genet Epidemiol*. 2016;40(7):597-608. doi:10.1002/GEPI.21998
32. Lawlor DA, Harbord RM, Sterne JAC, Timpson N, Smith GD. Mendelian randomization: using genes as instruments for making causal inferences in epidemiology. *Stat Med*. 2008;27(8):1133-1163. doi:10.1002/SIM.3034
33. Bowden J, Davey Smith G, Haycock PC, Burgess S. Consistent Estimation in Mendelian Randomization with Some Invalid Instruments Using a Weighted Median Estimator. *Genet Epidemiol*. 2016;40(4):304-314. doi:10.1002/GEPI.21965
34. Bowden J, Smith GD, Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2015;44(2):512-525. doi:10.1093/IJE/DYV080
35. Verbanck M, Chen CY, Neale B, Do R. Detection of widespread horizontal pleiotropy in causal relationships inferred from Mendelian randomization between complex traits and diseases. *Nature Genetics 2018 50:5*. 2018;50(5):693-698. doi:10.1038/s41588-018-0099-7
36. Morrison J, Knoblauch N, Marcus JH, Stephens M, He X. Mendelian randomization accounting for correlated and uncorrelated pleiotropic effects using genome-wide summary statistics. *Nature Genetics 2020 52:7*. 2020;52(7):740-747. doi:10.1038/s41588-020-0631-4
37. Hemani G, Tilling K, Davey Smith G. Orienting the causal relationship between imprecisely measured traits using GWAS summary data. *PLoS Genet*. 2017;13(11). doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PGEN.1007081
38. Bowden J, Fabiola Del Greco M, Minelli C, Smith GD, Sheehan NA, Thompson JR. Assessing the suitability of summary data for two-sample Mendelian randomization analyses using MR-Egger regression: the role of the I2 statistic. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2016;45(6):1961-1974. doi:10.1093/IJE/DYW220
39. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R. Published online 2022. http://www.rstudio.com/
40. Hemani G, Zheng J, Elsworth B, et al. The MR-Base platform supports systematic causal inference across the human phenome. *Elife*. 2018;7. doi:10.7554/ELIFE.34408
41. Grotzinger AD, Rhemtulla M, de Vlaming R, et al. Genomic SEM Provides Insights into the Multivariate Genetic Architecture of Complex Traits. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2019;3(5):513. doi:10.1038/S41562-019-0566-X
42. Lee J. Maternal Economic Well-Being and Mental Health among Young Adult Children: Race/Ethnicity. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(11). doi:10.3390/IJERPH18115691
43. Lin B, Okyere MA. Multidimensional Energy Poverty and Mental Health: Micro-Level Evidence from Ghana. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 2020, Vol 17, Page 6726*. 2020;17(18):6726. doi:10.3390/IJERPH17186726
44. Singh-Manoux A, Ferrie JE, Lynch JW, Marmot M. The role of cognitive ability (intelligence) in explaining the association between socioeconomic position and health: evidence from the Whitehall II prospective cohort study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2005;161(9):831-839. doi:10.1093/AJE/KWI109
45. Batty GD, Deary IJ, Gottfredson LS. Premorbid (early life) IQ and later mortality risk: systematic review. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2007;17(4):278-288. doi:10.1016/J.ANNEPIDEM.2006.07.010

46. Batty GD, Deary IJ. Early life intelligence and adult health: Associations, plausible mechanisms, and public health importance are emerging. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*. 2004;329(7466):585. doi:10.1136/BMJ.329.7466.585
47. Han E, Norton EC, Stearns SC. Weight and wages: fat versus lean paychecks. *Health Econ*. 2009;18(5):535-548. doi:10.1002/HEC.1386
48. Judge TA, Hurst C, Simon LS. Does It Pay to Be Smart, Attractive, or Confident (or All Three)? Relationships Among General Mental Ability, Physical Attractiveness, Core Self-Evaluations, and Income. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2009;94(3):742-755. doi:10.1037/A0015497
49. Brouwers EPM. Social stigma is an underestimated contributing factor to unemployment in people with mental illness or mental health issues: position paper and future directions. *BMC Psychol*. 2020;8(1). doi:10.1186/S40359-020-00399-0
50. Morris JN, Donkin AJM, Wonderling D, Wilkinson P, Dowler EA. A minimum income for healthy living. *J Epidemiol Community Health (1978)*. 2000;54(12):885-889. doi:10.1136/JECH.54.12.885
51. Evans GW, Kantrowitz E. Socioeconomic status and health: the potential role of environmental risk exposure. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2002;23:303-331. doi:10.1146/ANNUREV.PUBLHEALTH.23.112001.112349
52. Evans GW, English K. The environment of poverty: multiple stressor exposure, psychophysiological stress, and socioemotional adjustment. *Child Dev*. 2002;73(4):1238-1248. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00469
53. Montagud-Romero S, Miñarro J, Rodríguez-Arias M. Unravelling the Neuroinflammatory Mechanisms Underlying the Effects of Social Defeat Stress on Use of Drugs of Abuse. *Curr Top Behav Neurosci*. 2022;54:153-180. doi:10.1007/7854_2021_260
54. Mackenbach JP, Stirbu I, Roskam AJR, et al. Socioeconomic inequalities in health in 22 European countries. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358(23):2468-2481. doi:10.1056/NEJMSA0707519
55. Raphael D, Macdonald J, Colman R, Labonte R, Hayward K, Torgerson R. Researching income and income distribution as determinants of health in Canada: gaps between theoretical knowledge, research practice, and policy implementation. *Health Policy*. 2005;72(2):217-232. doi:10.1016/J.HEALTHPOL.2004.08.001
56. Cesarini Erik Lindqvist Robert DO, Bjö rn Wallace stling, Benjamin D, et al. Wealth, Health, and Child Development: Evidence from Administrative Data on Swedish Lottery Players. *Q J Econ*. 2016;131(2):687-738. doi:10.1093/QJE/QJW001
57. Marryat L, Thompson L, Minnis H, Wilson P. Primary schools and the amplification of social differences in child mental health: a population-based cohort study. *J Epidemiol Community Health (1978)*. 2018;72(1):27-33. doi:10.1136/JECH-2017-208995
58. Duncan GJ, Morris PA, Rodrigues C. Does money really matter? Estimating impacts of family income on young children's achievement with data from random-assignment experiments. *Dev Psychol*. 2011;47(5):1263-1279. doi:10.1037/A0023875
59. Qian J, Wu Y, Liu F, et al. An update on the prevalence of eating disorders in the general population: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eat Weight Disord*. 2022;27(2):415-428. doi:10.1007/S40519-021-01162-Z
60. Koch SV, Larsen JT, Plessen KJ, Thornton LM, Bulik CM, Petersen LV. Associations between parental socioeconomic-, family-, and sibling status and risk of eating disorders in offspring in a Danish national female cohort. *Int J Eat Disord*. 2022;55(8):1130-1142. doi:10.1002/EAT.23771

61. Hay P, Girosi F, Mond J. Prevalence and sociodemographic correlates of DSM-5 eating disorders in the Australian population. *J Eat Disord*. 2015;3(1). doi:10.1186/S40337-015-0056-0
62. Presskreischer R, Steinglass JE, Anderson KE. Eating disorders in the U.S. Medicare population. *Int J Eat Disord*. 2022;55(3):362-371. doi:10.1002/EAT.23676
63. Pike KM, Dunne PE. The rise of eating disorders in Asia: a review. *J Eat Disord*. 2015;3(1). doi:10.1186/S40337-015-0070-2
64. Melchior M, Chastang JF, Walburg V, Arseneault L, Galéra C, Fombonne E. Family income and youths' symptoms of depression and anxiety: a longitudinal study of the French GAZEL Youth cohort. *Depress Anxiety*. 2010;27(12):1095-1103. doi:10.1002/DA.20761
65. Hakulinen C, Musliner KL, Agerbo E. Bipolar disorder and depression in early adulthood and long-term employment, income, and educational attainment: A nationwide cohort study of 2,390,127 individuals. *Depress Anxiety*. 2019;36(11):1080-1088. doi:10.1002/DA.22956
66. Dismuke CE, Egede LE. Association between major depression, depressive symptoms and personal income in US adults with diabetes. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. 2010;32(5):484-491. doi:10.1016/J.GENHOSPPSYCH.2010.06.004
67. Kinyanda E, Woodburn P, Tugumisirize J, Kagugube J, Ndyanabangi S, Patel V. Poverty, life events and the risk for depression in Uganda. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2011;46(1):35-44. doi:10.1007/S00127-009-0164-8
68. Huddleston-Casas C, Charnigo R, Simmons LA. Food insecurity and maternal depression in rural, low-income families: a longitudinal investigation. *Public Health Nutr*. 2009;12(8):1133-1140. doi:10.1017/S1368980008003650
69. Powell-Jackson T, Pereira SK, Dutt V, Tougher S, Haldar K, Kumar P. Cash transfers, maternal depression and emotional well-being: Quasi-experimental evidence from India's Janani Suraksha Yojana programme. *Soc Sci Med*. 2016;162:210-218. doi:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2016.06.034
70. Ozer EJ, Fernald LCH, Weber A, Flynn EP, VanderWeele TJ. Does alleviating poverty affect mothers' depressive symptoms? A quasi-experimental investigation of Mexico's Oportunidades programme. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2011;40(6):1565-1576. doi:10.1093/IJE/DYR103
71. Hakulinen C, McGrath JJ, Timmerman A, et al. The association between early-onset schizophrenia with employment, income, education, and cohabitation status: nationwide study with 35 years of follow-up. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2019;54(11):1343-1351. doi:10.1007/S00127-019-01756-0
72. Hakulinen C, Webb RT, Pedersen CB, Agerbo E, Mok PLH. Association Between Parental Income During Childhood and Risk of Schizophrenia Later in Life. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2020;77(1):17-24. doi:10.1001/JAMAPSYCHIATRY.2019.2299
73. Schneider M, Müller CP, Knies AK. Low income and schizophrenia risk: A narrative review. *Behavioural brain research*. 2022;435. doi:10.1016/J.BBR.2022.114047
74. Yu YH, Peng MM, Bai X, et al. Schizophrenia, social support, caregiving burden and household poverty in rural China. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2020;55(12):1571-1580. doi:10.1007/S00127-020-01864-2
75. Cohen CI. Poverty and the course of schizophrenia: implications for research and policy. *Hosp Community Psychiatry*. 1993;44(10):951-957. doi:10.1176/PS.44.10.951
76. Hakulinen C, Elovainio M, Arffman M, et al. Employment Status and Personal Income Before and After Onset of a Severe Mental Disorder: A Case-Control Study. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2020;71(3):250-255. doi:10.1176/APPI.PS.201900239

77. Crossley NA, Alliende LM, Czepielewski LS, et al. The enduring gap in educational attainment in schizophrenia according to the past 50 years of published research: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2022;9(7):565-573. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(22)00121-3
78. Holmes SC, Callinan L, Facemire VC, Williams MT, Ciarleglio MM, Smith M V. Material hardship is associated with posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms among low-income Black women. *J Trauma Stress*. 2021;34(5):905-916. doi:10.1002/JTS.22741
79. Lenart EK, Bee TK, Seger CP, et al. Youth, poverty, and interpersonal violence: a recipe for PTSD. *Trauma Surg Acute Care Open*. 2021;6(1). doi:10.1136/TSACO-2021-000710
80. Marchi M, Magarini FM, Chiarenza A, et al. Experience of discrimination during COVID-19 pandemic: the impact of public health measures and psychological distress among refugees and other migrants in Europe. *BMC Public Health*. 2022;22(1). doi:10.1186/S12889-022-13370-Y
81. Mills MC, Rahal C. A scientometric review of genome-wide association studies. *Communications Biology 2019 2:1*. 2019;2(1):1-11. doi:10.1038/s42003-018-0261-x
82. Schorrocks A, Davies JB LR. *Global Wealth Report 2022*.; 2022. https://www.credit-suisse.com/media/assets/corporate/docs/about-us/research/publications/global-wealth-report-2020-en.pdf
83. The WHO special initiative for mental health (2019-2023): universal health coverage for mental health. Accessed January 27, 2023. https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/310981
84. Global, regional, and national burden of 12 mental disorders in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2022;9(2):137-150. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00395-3
85. Bauer A, Garman E, McDaid D, et al. Integrating youth mental health into cash transfer programmes in response to the COVID-19 crisis in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2021;8(4):340-346. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30382-5
86. Ohrnberger J, Fichera E, Sutton M, Anselmi L. The effect of cash transfers on mental health-new evidence from South Africa. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1-13. doi:10.1186/S12889-020-08596-7/TABLES/4
87. Bradley CJ, Saunders HG. Impact of cash incentives for low-income individuals to seek a primary care visit on mental health outcomes: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial. *Soc Sci Med*. 2020;265. doi:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2020.113515
88. Denary W, Fenelon A, Schlesinger P, Purtle J, Blankenship KM, Keene DE. Does rental assistance improve mental health? Insights from a longitudinal cohort study. *Soc Sci Med*. 2021;282. doi:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2021.114100
89. Cavazos-Rehg P, Byansi W, Doroshenko C, et al. Evaluating potential mediators for the impact of a family-based economic intervention (Suubi+Adherence) on the mental health of adolescents living with HIV in Uganda. *Soc Sci Med*. 2021;280:113946. doi:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2021.113946
90. Micai M, Gila L, Caruso A, et al. Benefits and challenges of a personal budget for people with mental health conditions or intellectual disability: A systematic review. *Front Psychiatry*. 2022;13:1733. doi:10.3389/FPSYT.2022.974621/BIBTEX
91. Ibrahim F, McHugh N, Biosca O, Baker R, Laxton T, Donaldson C. Microcredit as a public health initiative? Exploring mechanisms and pathways to health and wellbeing. *Soc Sci Med*. 2021;270:113633. doi:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2020.113633

92. Fernald LCH, Hamad R, Karlan D, Ozer EJ, Zinman J. Small individual loans and mental health: A randomized controlled trial among South African adults. *BMC Public Health*. 2008;8(1):1-14. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-8-409/FIGURES/2
93. Plagerson S, Patel V, Harpham T, Kielmann K, Mathee A. Does money matter for mental health? Evidence from the Child Support Grants in Johannesburg, South Africa. *https://doi.org/101080/174416922010516267*. 2010;6(7):760-776. doi:10.1080/17441692.2010.516267
94. Batty GD, Der G, Macintyre S, Deary IJ. Does IQ explain socioeconomic inequalities in health? Evidence from a population based cohort study in the west of Scotland. *BMJ*. 2006;332(7541):580-583. doi:10.1136/BMJ.38723.660637.AE
95. Nations U. 70/1. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Preamble. Published online 2030.