The association between childhood income and mental health: can sibling comparison designs help resolve this research question?

Linda Ejlskov, PhD[1], Buket Öztürk Esen, PhD[1], Christian Hakulinen, PhD[2,3], Nanna Weye, PhD[1,4], Tomas Formanek, MA[5,6], John J. McGrath, MD, PhD[7,8,9], Carsten Bøcker Pedersen, PhD[7,10.11,12], Oleguer Plana-Ripoll, PhD[1,6*]

[1]Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University and Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark

[2]Department of Psychology and Logopedics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki 00100, Finland

[3]Welfare State Research and Reform Unit, Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland.

[4]Department of Disease Burden, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Norway

[5]Department of Public Mental Health, National Institute of Mental Health, Klecany, Czechia,

[6]Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

[7]National Centre for Register-Based Research, Aarhus University, 8210 Aarhus V, Denmark

[8]Queensland Centre for Mental Health Research, The Park Centre for Mental Health, Brisbane, Queensland 4076, Australia

[9]Queensland Brain Institute, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia

[10]Centre for Integrated Register-based Research, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

[11]Big Data Centre for Environment and Health, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

[12]The Lundbeck Foundation Initiative for Integrative Psychiatric Research, iPSYCH, Aarhus, Denmark

***Corresponding author:**

Oleguer Plana-Ripoll, opr@clin.au.dk

Abstract

Background In previous studies, null results from sibling comparison designs have been used to infer that no causal association exists between childhood family income and subsequent risk of mental disorders. The aim of our study is to replicate the findings from previous studies and propose three alternative explanations based on i) variability in income and mental health between siblings, ii) life course models, and iii) detailed descriptive statistics.

Methods We followed a nationwide Danish cohort born from 1986 to 1996 (n = 643,814, including 404,179 siblings) from age 15 until diagnosis of severe mental disorders or censoring. Adjusted hazard ratios (aHR) were estimated between childhood family income and subsequent mental disorders, accompanied by comprehensive descriptive statistics and triangulation analyses that help in interpreting the findings.

Results We observed an association between a $15,000 increase in family income and severe mental disorders (0.78; 0.76-0.81), but the sibling comparison design showed null results (1.02; 0.94-1.11). Siblings were typically born three years apart, with a difference in monthly average income at age 14 of $496 (interquartile range: $150-$641). A pseudo-sibling cohort also indicated null results (0.93; 0.85-1.01), although siblings were not family members. Family income measured yearly demonstrated comparable estimates across ages 1-14 (from 0.67 to 0.82).

Conclusion Our investigation suggests that the null associations between childhood income and mental health estimated through sibling comparison designs may be explained by the fact that siblings are close together in age and residing within the same family income environment with only minor income fluctuations. Additionally, a sibling comparison design is useful to test a critical/sensitive period, but our analyses suggest that no age posits a critical risk age for this research question. This raises caution on the current practice of relying on sibling comparison designs to estimate the association between childhood income and mental health.

Background

Growing up in a financially disadvantaged environment is associated with increased risks of various adverse outcomes[1], including mental disorders.[2,3] While there is strong observational evidence of the association between income and health, the causal nature of this relationship is still debated.[4]

In any observational study, potential unmeasured confounding factors limit the causal interpretation of results. As an alternative, some researchers have turned to sibling comparison designs to evaluate the causal association between income and health outcomes.[5] At first glance, this is an elegant alternative because, as the family remains the same, any association found between income and health in the sibling comparison must be free from confounding factors that are constant between siblings.[6] It is not unusual that studies implementing a sibling comparison design in such a setting find (a) robust associations between increases in income and decreases in risk of adverse outcomes using traditional regression approaches in the full cohort, and (b) attenuated associations when using sibling comparison designs, in which each individual is compared only to their siblings.[7–9] For example, in a register-based study by Sariaslan et al.[10], the authors found an association between family income levels and later mental disorders, which was completely attenuated in a sibling comparison design. Such results were followed by the interpretation that the association between income and mental health observed in the full cohort might be fully explained by unmeasured confounders and is thus not consistent with a causal interpretation.[10] However, similar to other researchers,[6,11–13] we believe caution should be made when using sibling comparison designs in such a setting. As family income is the same for all siblings at any given time, the sibling comparison design relies on imperfect overlap – i.e. age differences – in the sibling life course.[11] Thus, such results must be interpreted considering further analyses.

In the present study, we use data from a nationwide Danish cohort to investigate the association between family income and the risk of subsequently developing severe mental disorders. We conduct a series of analyses accompanied by a sibling comparison design similar to the methods used by Sariaslan et al.,[10] enriched by in-depth descriptive statistics and triangulation of different additional analyses. We argue that these additional analyses – based on the three considerations listed in Figure 1 – are necessary for a better interpretation of the results from a sibling comparison design.

First, several studies[14–16] have used simulations to show that estimates obtained from sibling comparison designs are more affected by unmeasured confounders than estimates from regular designs from the full cohort when the correlation of the exposure within siblings is larger than that of the confounders. Second, it is important to consider what the most appropriate life course model is when testing the association of interest. As stated previously, siblings live within the same family environment at the exact same time but at different ages. Thus, in order to detect an association with a sibling comparison design, there must be a noticeable difference between experiencing a family environment at one specific age compared to another – also called a critical/sensitive period hypotheses within life course epidemiology.[17] Third, results from a sibling comparison design are contingent the underlying distribution of characteristics of the investigated siblings, as e.g. differences in the exposure (i.e. family income) between siblings. Such underlying characteristics must be taken into account when interpreting results.

Figure 1. Schematic illustrating a sibling comparison design (within family) with a list of questions to be considered before inferring causality.



Methods

The protocol for this study was pre-registered before any analyses were commenced.[18] We designed a population-based cohort study including all individuals who were: i) born in Denmark between January 1st, 1986 and December 31st, 1996, ii) alive and residing in Denmark on 15th birthday, and iii) possible to link to both parents to enable identification of full siblings. The Danish Civil Registration System[19,20] maintains continuously updated information such as sex, date of birth, emigration, and death of all residents. Everyone living in Denmark is given a unique personal identification number enabling the linkage of relevant information across the Danish registries.[19,20] We identified the first diagnosis of severe mental disorder (schizophrenia-spectrum disorder and bipolar disorder) after 15th birthday using the Psychiatric Central Research Register (see appendix page 2 for the specific diagnostic codes following Pedersen et al.[21]). The study cohort was followed from 15th birthday until they were diagnosed with a severe mental disorder, emigrated, died or end of follow-up on December 31st, 2018, with the longest possible follow-up being 18 years (i.e., followed until age 33 years).

Family income was measured using information on equated disposable household income obtained from the Income Statistics Register.[22] This measure subtracts expenses

such as taxes and interest expenses from taxable income while also correcting for the difference in family size using the OECD modified scale.[23] Family income was measured the year before the start of follow-up (age 14) for each cohort member in the main analyses and at each year during childhood (0-13 years) for additional analyses. The measure was inflation-adjusted and represented in 2022 US dollar ($) values using the average exchange rate from Danish kroner to $ in 2022.[24] Due to some very extreme income values, we chose to exclude individuals in the lowest and highest percentiles (see appendix page 3 and Figure S1 for more detailed information and Figure S2 for a detailed study flowchart.) The final study cohort consisted of 643 814 individuals (98% of the eligible study cohort). Information on sociodemographic factors (birth order, origin, parental education, urbanicity) and markers of family function and dysfunction (parental incarceration, parental psychiatric disorders, family cohabitation status) were identified through annual population registers and based on information until the individual's 15th birthday (see appendix page 4 for more information on covariates).

Statistical analyses

First, we performed an analysis similar to that done by Sariaslan et al. using Finnish data.[10] The association between family income at age 14 and subsequent risk of developing severe mental disorders was estimated through adjusted hazard ratios (aHRs) using Cox proportional hazards models with age as the underlying time scale. We fitted a model in the full cohort adjusting for sex, birth year, birth order, origin, urbanicity, family cohabitation, parental psychiatric disorders, and parental incarceration (model 1). We explored potential nuances in the association between disposable family income and the development of severe mental disorders by re-running the model with family income divided in quintiles, divided in deciles, and as the mean income over the whole early life course (0-14 years). Second, we performed a sibling comparison design by fitting a stratified Cox regression model (stratifying on

family) adjusting for the same variables allowing for a comparison of changes in family income and subsequent risk of developing severe mental disorders solely between siblings (model 2).[14]

Additional analyses to address the considerations listed in Figure 1

First, to understand the variability in family income and unmeasured confounders between siblings, we (i) estimated the correlation in family income between siblings in each family, and (ii) created a simulated cohort in which different individuals were grouped into pseudo-family clusters at random (pseudo-sibling cohort). In this simulated cohort, one sibling of each family was linked to random individuals who had similar characteristics to the real siblings in terms of sex, birth year, birth order, number of siblings, and family income, but who were not family members. In this simulated cohort, we then performed a full cohort and a sibling comparison analysis, just as in the original cohort. Given that families in the pseudo-sibling cohort were created at random, one would expect to find similar estimates in the full cohort and in the sibling comparison analysis (if the estimates were not affected by unmeasured confounding due to the high correlation of income between pseudo-siblings).[14,15] To examine the fact that the pseudo-sibling cohort might be just adjusting for measured confounders (despite not being family members) and that a full cohort and a sibling comparison design might be estimating different parameters,[5] we created two additional simulated pseudo-sibling cohorts: one that ignored income when assigning random families (but used all other characteristics described above), and one that created pseudo-families completely at random (see Appendix page 5 for more details on the creation of the simulated cohorts and Table S1 for an overview of the three different cohorts used in the study). Second, to assess whether specific ages had particularly strong or weak associations with the later risk of being diagnosed with a severe mental disorder, we performed a range of separate adjusted analyses in the full cohort (i.e. model 1), but

with family income measured at all other ages during childhood (0 through 13) as the main exposure of interest. Third, to investigate the underlying sibling characteristics, we performed several descriptive analyses to understand the differences between siblings within each family.

All data analyses were performed in the statistical program R version 1.4.1106.

Results

We followed 643 814 individuals for a total of 7.8 million person-years, with 14 637 (2.3%) developing a severe mental disorder during the follow-up period. Table 1 presents the descriptive characteristics of the entire study cohort.

Figure 2 presents the results for the association between annual disposable family income and subsequent risk of developing severe mental disorders (model 1). On average, for each $15,000 increase in disposable family income measured at age 14 years, the risk of developing a severe mental disorder was reduced by 22% (aHR=0.78; 0.76-0.81). A similar pattern was found when investigating family income grouped as quintiles and deciles (Table S2, Figure S3 and S4). When comparing the same risk solely within siblings exposed to different levels of disposable family income at age 14 (model 2), the association was entirely attenuated (aHR=1.02; 0.94-1.11). Results from a sensitivity analysis running a regular Cox regression model but only using those from the sibling cohort showed similar results to the main analysis (Figure S4).

Table 1. Sociodemographic chatacteristics of the study cohort (n = 643 814)

Variable	n	Mental disorder diagnosis	Disposable family income median (IQR)
Sex			
Female	313 844	7 078 (2.2%)	$30 310 ($24 211 : $37 097)
Male	329 970	7 559 (2.2%)	$30 432 ($24 362 : $37 205)
Number of children			
One child	239 635	5 721 (2.3%)	$31 594 ($25 248 : $38 730)
Two children	311 264	6 732 (2.1%)	$30 638 ($24 837 : $37 049)
Three children	81 327	1 891 (2.3%)	$27 147 ($21 588 : $33 299)
Four children or more	11 588	293 (2.5%)	$21 781 ($17 242 : $27 227)
Birthorder			
First-born	425 194	10 157 (2.3%)	$30 381 ($24 367 : $37 172)
Second-born	185 559	3 820 (2.0%)	$30 576 ($24 466 : $37 291)
Third-born	29 927	590 (1.9%)	$29 461 ($22 807 : $36 506)
Fourth-born or higher	3 134	70 (2.2%)	$24 535 ($19 395 : $31 177)
Parental psychiatric history			
No	583 577	11 855 (2.0%)	$30 812 ($24 819 : $37 557)
Yes	60 237	2 782 (4.4%)	$25 794 ($20 410 : $32 365)
Parental incarceration			
No	613 035	13 309 (2.1%)	$30 749 ($24 772 : $37 488)
Yes	30 779	1 328 (4.1%)	$22 578 ($18 081 : $28 012)
Origin			
Parents born in Denmark	559 998	12 367 (2.2%)	$31 008 ($25 183 : $37 663)
Parent/s born abroad	82 864	2 251 (2.6%)	$25 110 ($19 386 : $32 526)
Missing	952	19 (2.0%)	$26 356 ($20 662 : $33 143)
Family cohabitation			
Cohabiting/married	506 247	9 663 (1.9%)	$32 122 ($26 400 : $38 712)
Single	129 293	4 362 (3.3%)	$24 611 ($20 599 : $29 400)
Single living alone	7 485	579 (7.2%)	$2 379 ($1 096 : $3 414)
Missing	789	33 (4.0%)	$20 097 ($12 017 : $31 242)
Parental Education			
Low	46 191	1 606 (3.4%)	$23 523 ($18 999 : $28 692)
Middle	342 365	7 334 (2.1%)	$29 488 ($24 065 : $35 276)
High	213 532	4 321 (2.0%)	$34 826 ($28 564 : $42 472)
Missing	41 726	1 376 (3.2%)	$24 346 ($18 922 : $30 972)

Figure 2. Adjusted hazard ratios (aHR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of being diagnosed with severe mental disorders for each $15,000 increase in disposable family income. The estimates were obtained from full cohort analyses and sibling comparison designs for the original cohort (models 1 and 2) and the simulated pseudo-sibling cohorts (models 3-8).

Model	aHR (95%CI)
Original cohort	
Model 1: Adjusted	0.78 (0.76-0.81)
Model 2: Sibling stratified	1.02 (0.94-1.11)
Simulated pseudo-sibling cohort:	
Pseudo-siblings chosen completely at random	
Model 3: Adjusted	0.76 (0.73-0.79)
Model 4: Sibling stratified	0.76 (0.72-0.80)
Pseudo-siblings with same characteristics on sex, birth year, birth order and family size as original sibling	
Model 5: Adjusted	0.78 (0.75-0.80)
Model 6: Sibling stratified	0.76 (0.72-0.80)
Pseudo-siblings with same characteristics on sex, birth year, birth order and family size and income as original sibling	
Model 7: Adjusted	0.77 (0.74-0.80)
Model 8: Sibling stratified	0.93 (0.85-1.01)



Both the *adjusted model* and the *sibling stratified model* are adjusted for sex, birth order, birth year, origin, parental incarceration, parental psychiatric history, urbanicity and family cohabitation status. The *sibling stratified model* has a baseline hazard stratified by family ID.

First consideration: variability within siblings

The correlation in family income at age 14 years between siblings in each family was 0.67. Models 3 through 8 in Figure 2 show the results from the simulated cohorts where pseudo-siblings were created at random using individuals with similar characteristics as the original siblings. For the pseudo-sibling cohort based on a range of characteristics including income (models 7 and 8), the correlation in income between siblings was 0.65 and we found a comparable estimate to the main analysis when using the full cohort (aHR = 0.77; 0.74-0.80). However, when using the sibling comparison design, the associations were attenuated (aHR = 0.93; 95%CI: 0.85-1.01), although these individuals did not belong to the same families. The two pseudo-sibling cohorts that were not based on family income showed no correlation in income between siblings (0.01 and 0.04) and similar estimates in both the full cohort and sibling comparison design (Figure 2; models 3 to 6).

Second consideration: Ages of disposable family income measurement

The associations in the full cohort varied slightly according to the ages at which family income was measured, with aHR ranging from 0.67 to 0.82, and the aHR for the average family income across the entire childhood period (age 1 through age 14) being 0.62 (95%CI: 0.60-0.65) (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Adjusted hazard ratios (aHR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) between disposable family income measured across ages 1–14 years (in units of $15,000) and subsequent severe mental disorders. The estimates were obtained from full cohort analyses in the original population (model 1).



Note: All models were adjusted for sex, birth order, birth year, origin, parental incarceration, parental psychiatric history, urbanicity and family cohabitation status.

Third consideration: Sibling characteristics

Table 2 shows characteristics of the sibling cohort (i.e., those who had at least one sibling in the cohort) by family income decile grouping. The average (standard deviation [sd]) age difference between siblings was 3.2 years (1.5) and the average annual disposable family income at age 14 was $30 712 (IQR=$24 310 : $35 741). The average difference in income between siblings increased with higher family income, while the risk of mental disorders decreased. In total, 84% of the sibling cohort had changes in annual disposable income between siblings below $10 000, and only 1.2% of the sibling cohort had differences larger than $30 000 (80% of them belonging to families in the three highest disposable family income deciles) (Table S4). For more details and distributions of sibling characteristics see Appendix, Figures S5-S9, and Tables S2-S4.

Table 2. Family characteristics for 404 179 individuals included in the sibling cohort (i.e., they had at least one sibling in the cohort) by disposable family income deciles.

					Income difference	
	n	Severe mental disorder(%)	Number of children (sd)	Age difference (sd)	Mean	Median (IQR)
Overall	404 179	8 916 (2.2%)	2.3 (0.5)	3.2 (1.5)	$5 957	$3 945 ($1 807 : $7 701)
Disposable family income decile						
Lowest decile	42 068	1 648 (3.9%)	2.5 (0.7)	2.9 (1.5)	$6 296	$3 561 ($1 662 : $8 259)
2	42 507	1 355 (3.2%)	2.4 (0.6)	3.1 (1.5)	$4 923	$3 481 ($1 741 : $6 235)
3	43 029	1 117 (2.6%)	2.3 (0.5)	3.2 (1.5)	$4 856	$3 540 ($1 695 : $6 372)
4	43 405	927 (2.1%)	2.3 (0.5)	3.2 (1.4)	$4 826	$3 494 ($1 634 : $6 476)
5	42 810	857 (2.0%)	2.3 (0.5)	3.3 (1.4)	$5 005	$3 598 ($1 682 : $6 721)
6	42 139	758 (1.8%)	2.2 (0.4)	3.3 (1.4)	$5 179	$3 680 ($1 700 : $7 061)
7	40 792	667 (1.6%)	2.2 (0.4)	3.4 (1.5)	$5 439	$3 844 ($1 724 : $7 363)
8	38 820	605 (1.6%)	2.2 (0.4)	3.4 (1.5)	$6 174	$4 267 ($1 860 : $8 359)
9	36 072	515 (1.4%)	2.1 (0.4)	3.4 (1.5)	$7 355	$4 968 ($2 195 : $9 711)
Highest decile	32 537	467 (1.4%)	2.1 (0.4)	3.3 (1.5)	$10 932	$7 572 ($3 256 : $15 125)

Discussion

This study showed an association between increases in disposable family income and reduced risk of subsequently developing severe mental disorders, but the association disappeared when using a sibling comparison design. These results are similar to those reported by Sariaslan et al.[10] However, this type of results should be accompanied by the additional descriptive statistics and triangulation of analyses we have performed in order to assess whether a sibling comparison design is suitable in this setting. We will go through the three listed questions presented in Figure 1 below.

First consideration: is the variability in the exposure and confounders within siblings appropriate for employing a sibling comparison design?

Previous studies have shown that, if siblings are less similar in relation to non-shared unmeasured confounders than to the exposure under study, then the estimate from the sibling comparison analysis will always be more affected by confounding than the estimate from the full cohort analysis.[14,15] In the case when most siblings have similar exposure (as is the case of the present study of familial income and the study by Sariaslan et al.[10]), then siblings that differ in exposure are also more likely to differ on some non-shared factors that might affect the exposure. In other words, there must be other factors that caused the siblings to differ in their family income. If these factors also affect the outcome, then confounding will be larger among siblings that differ in exposure than in the entire population. In this study, we evaluated the 'sharedness' of family income by calculating the correlation of family income among siblings, which was 0.67 (most siblings had a difference in annual family income below $10,000). While it is not possible to empirically calculate the correlation of unmeasured confounders, the large observed correlation in family income makes it plausible that there are unmeasured confounders that are less shared between siblings (e.g. the correlation in genetic factors would be expected to be 0.50). This possibility was reinforced by the

results from the simulated pseudo-sibling cohort, in which different individuals were grouped into families at random but maintaining the original characteristics in terms of income and other factors. In this cohort, the pseudo-sibling model provided attenuated associations too, although these individuals did not actually belong to the same families. However, in additional pseudo-sibling cohorts that did not consider income to create the pseudo-families (but did include the other factors), the estimates from the full cohort and the sibling comparison design were very similar. This is a clear indication that the high correlation in exposure between siblings is problematic. For example, in the extreme case in which the exposure is perfectly correlated between siblings, then it would not be even technically possible to perform a sibling comparison design.

Second consideration: What is the appropriate life course model?

The purpose of the sibling comparison design is to examine whether siblings differ in their risk of developing severe mental disorders based on differences in the family disposable income at age 14. That is, sibling comparisons designs are useful to assess whether experiencing a specific family income at some specific age (as opposed to the age when the sibling/s experiences the same family income) affects health. In this study, the descriptive statistics revealed that siblings on average were born around three years apart. Thus, the sibling comparison analyses in this study examine whether experiencing a specific level of family income at different ages during childhood (e.g., age 14 versus age 11) affects severe mental disorders. Within this setting, a sibling comparison design can help assess evidence of whether there exists a critical or sensitive period during which lower or higher family incomes have a particularly strong influence on the risk of developing mental disorders.[25] Previous studies using sibling comparison designs have not considered the underlying assumption on life course mechanisms.[9,10] We observed that family income at each age during childhood (ages 1 through 14) was associated with the development of a severe mental disorder,

showing fairly similar associations at different ages. This is a novel finding important for the interpretation of results from the sibling comparison design. Our results support the accumulating risk model and not the critical/sensitive period model, which is in line with the findings from a previous study.[26] Thus, the results may indicate that the timing of a specific family income level (which is what the sibling comparison design is testing) is not important. Instead, it is the prolonged exposure to deprivation or wealth during the childhood period that influences the risk of severe mental disorders.

Third consideration: What are the sibling characteristics and how does it inform the results?

When considering the demographic and income characteristics of the sibling cohort, it becomes clear that the sibling comparison design is comparing the risk of developing severe mental disorders for siblings who are on average relatively close together in age, that already live within a family environment with a sufficient disposable family income and where changes in income at age 14 between siblings is generally minor. The average monthly disposable family income in this study was $2560 with a median change between siblings of $329 per month. The Danish Financial Supervisory Authority recommends that a family of two adults with two children have a monthly disposable family income of around $2300.[27] Thus, since the average siblings already reside in a family environment that has an adequate disposable income to cover basic needs, it must be questioned whether a minor change in income will have any impact on the family environment and risk of developing a severe mental disorder. In other words, is it plausible that minor fluctuations in income will affect one sibling's propensity to develop a mental disorder and not the other sibling (who is a few years younger/older)? Engzell and Hällsten[11] argue that transitory income fluctuations can be seen as a form of measurement error. To justify using a sibling comparison design to study the effects of family income, we must imagine families where such minor

fluctuations in income affect differential parental practices and allocation of resources towards siblings. A more probable scenario may be that differential parenting practices towards siblings are based on factors unrelated to minor income fluctuations and instead on aspects such as age, birth order, genetics, etc.[29] For example, a Danish study showed that complex sibling characteristics (age difference, birth order, number of younger siblings, number of older siblings) influenced schizophrenia risk demonstrating that siblings are less comparable than indirectly anticipated in sibling comparison studies.[30] Additionally, the families with the highest changes in income and therefore also those weighing the most in the analyses resided in the highest income families. These families also had the lowest rates of mental disorders overall.

In summary

The further analyses performed in this study revealed a high correlation in family income between siblings, that the estimates from a sibling comparison design might be more affected by unmeasured confounders that are less correlated between siblings than the exposure, and that a sibling comparison design tests a critical/sensitive period life course model which is not an appropriate representation of the effect that income has on mental health. Additionally, the sibling comparison design is comparing the risk of developing severe mental disorders for siblings who are on average relatively close together in age, that already live within a family environment with a sufficient disposable family income and where changes in income at age 14 between siblings is generally minor. Considering these points, even though sibling comparison designs have the ability to reduce unmeasured parental genetic and shared familial factors, we do not recommend using sibling comparison designs for investigating the effects of family income on mental health. However, if utilized, we recommend that the researchers at the very least assess the three considerations we have listed in this paper. We believe that observational studies should be accompanied by other types of study

designs, e.g. quasi-experimental designs[3] or comparing adoptees to biologically born children.[31] These studies provide evidence that there indeed is a causal association between income and health. Finally, while we have chosen severe mental disorders as the adverse health outcome in this study, we believe that the same logic can be applied to any other adverse health outcomes. In addition, the findings suggest that sibling comparison designs using exposures that have a high correlation among siblings are likely to end up having similar problems.

Ethics approval

This study has been approved by the Danish National Board of Health, and the Danish Data Protection Agency. No informed consent is needed for a register-based study based on de-identified data in Denmark.

Data availability

The individual-level data used for this study are not publicly available but can be obtained by application to Statistics Denmark and the Danish Health Data Authority.

Supplementary data

Supplementary data are available

Author contributions

LE and OP-R designed and conceptualized the study and drafted the first version of the analyses plan. BÖE, CH, TF and CBP revised the analyses plan and approved the final version. LE did the analyses with input from OP-R. NW checked the R-syntax for potential errors. OP-R supervised the study. LE and OP-R prepared the original draft of the manuscript with input from BÖE and JJM. All other authors provided feedback and suggestions for additional analyses, and reviewed and edited the manuscript. All authors approved the final version.

Funding

This work was supported by a grant from Independent Research Fund Denmark (grant 1030-00085B). Oleguer Plana-Ripoll is also supported by a Lundbeck Foundation Fellowship (R345-2020-1588) and Independent Research Fund Denmark (grant 2066-00009B). Carsten Bøcker Pedersen is supported by the Big Data Centre for Environment and Health funded by the Novo Nordisk Foundation Challenge Programme (grant NNF17OC0027864). Christian Hakulinen was supported by the European Union (ERC, MENTALNET, 101040247).

The funders of the study had no role in developing the methodology, study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

Conflict of interest

None declared

References

1. Katikireddi SV, Niedzwiedz CL, Dundas R, Kondo N, Leyland AH, Rostila M. Inequalities in all-cause and cause-specific mortality across the life course by wealth and income in Sweden: a register-based cohort study. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020;49(3):917-925. doi:10.1093/ije/dyaa053

2. Foverskov E, White JS, Norredam M, et al. Neighbourhood socioeconomic disadvantage and psychiatric disorders among refugees: a population-based, quasi-experimental study in Denmark. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. Published online May 21, 2022. doi:10.1007/s00127-022-02300-3

3. Foverskov E, White JS, Frøslev T, Sørensen HT, Hamad R. Risk of Psychiatric Disorders Among Refugee Children and Adolescents Living in Disadvantaged Neighborhoods. *JAMA Pediatrics*. Published online September 12, 2022. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2022.3235

4. Kawachi I, Adler NE, Dow WH. Money, schooling, and health: Mechanisms and causal evidence: Money, schooling, and health. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 2010;1186(1):56-68. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.05340.x

5. Petersen AH, Lange T. What Is the Causal Interpretation of Sibling Comparison Designs? *Epidemiology*. 2020;31(1):75-81. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000001108

6. Frisell T. Invited Commentary: Sibling-Comparison Designs, Are They Worth the Effort? *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2021;190(5):738-741. doi:10.1093/aje/kwaa183

7. Grätz M, Lang V, Diewald M. The Effects of Parenting on Children's Noncognitive Skills in Adolescence: Evidence from a Sample of Twins in Germany. Published online April 28, 2020. doi:10.31235/osf.io/8c6r7

8. Sariaslan A, Larsson H, D'Onofrio B, Långström N, Lichtenstein P. Childhood family income, adolescent violent criminality and substance misuse: Quasi-experimental total population study. *British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2014;205(4):286-290. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.113.136200

9. Sariaslan A, Långström N, D'Onofrio B, Hallqvist J, Franck J, Lichtenstein P. The impact of neighbourhood deprivation on adolescent violent criminality and substance misuse: A longitudinal, quasi-experimental study of the total Swedish population. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2013;42(4):1057-1066. doi:10.1093/ije/dyt066

10. Sariaslan A, Mikkonen J, Aaltonen M, Hiilamo H, Martikainen P, Fazel S. No causal associations between childhood family income and subsequent psychiatric disorders, substance misuse and violent crime arrests: a nationwide Finnish study of >650 000 individuals and their siblings. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2021;50(5):1628-1638. doi:10.1093/ije/dyab099

11. Engzell P, Hällsten M. A Caution on the Discordant Parenting Design. Published online March 28, 2022. doi:10.31235/osf.io/rx4z6

12. Rod NH, Lange T, Petersen AH. Do sibling comparisons answer the causal question? In response to 'No causal associations between childhood family income and subsequent psychiatric disorders, substance misuse and violent crime arrests.' *International Journal of Epidemiology*. Published online November 9, 2021:dyab235. doi:10.1093/ije/dyab235

13. Ledberg A, Rajaleid K, Modin B. Are there really no causal associations between childhood family income and subsequent outcomes? *International Journal of Epidemiology*. Published online February 13, 2022:dyac016. doi:10.1093/ije/dyac016

14. Frisell T, Öberg S, Kuja-Halkola R, Sjölander A. Sibling Comparison Designs: Bias From Non-Shored Confounders and Measurement Error. *Epidemiology*. 2012;23(5):713-720.

15. Esen BÖ. *Studies of Antidepressant Use in Pregnancy. Biases and How to Address Them*. Aarhus University; 2022.

16. Sjölander A, Frisell T, Öberg S. Sibling Comparison Studies. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*. 2022;9(1):71-94. doi:10.1146/annurev-statistics-040120-024521

17. Kuh D, Ben-Shlomo Y, Lynch J, Hallqvist J, Power C. Life course epidemiology. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2003;57(10):778-783. doi:10.1136/jech.57.10.778

18. Ejlskov L, Hakulinen C, Esen BÖ, Formánek T, Pedersen CB, Plana-Ripoll O. Are sibling designs a bad choice of method when inferring causality about changes in childhood social exposures such as income in relation to adverse mental health outcomes? A nationwide Danish study. Published online October 25, 2022. https://osf.io/w3jdg/

19. Pedersen CB. The Danish civil registration system. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*. 2011;39(7):22-25. doi:10.1177/1403494810387965

20. Schmidt M, Pedersen L, Sørensen HT. The Danish Civil Registration System as a tool in epidemiology. *European Journal of Epidemiology*. 2014;29(8):541-549. doi:10.1007/s10654-014-9930-3

21. Pedersen CB, Mors O, Bertelsen A, et al. A comprehensive nationwide study of the incidence rate and lifetime risk for treated mental disorders. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2014;71(5):573-581. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2014.16

22. Baadsgaard M, Quitzau J. Danish registers on personal income and transfer payments. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*. 2011;39(7_suppl):103-105. doi:10.1177/1403494811405098

23. TIMES variabel - FAMAEKVIVADISP_13. Accessed March 30, 2022. https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/dokumentation/Times/familieindkomst/famaekvivadisp-13

24. US Dollar to Danish Krone Spot Exchange Rates for 2022. Accessed October 23, 2022. https://www.exchangerates.org.uk/USD-DKK-spot-exchange-rates-history-2022.html

25. Jones NL, Gilman SE, Cheng TL, Drury SS, Hill CV, Geronimus AT. Life Course Approaches to the Causes of Health Disparities. *Am J Public Health*. 2019;109(Suppl 1):S48-S55. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2018.304738

26. Dunn EC, Soare TW, Raffeld MR, et al. What life course theoretical models best explain the relationship between exposure to childhood adversity and psychopathology symptoms: recency, accumulation, or sensitive periods? *Psychol Med*. 2018;48(15):2562-2572. doi:10.1017/S0033291718000181

27. Danish Financial Supervisory Authority, Danish Consumer Ombudsman. *The Danish Financial Supervisory Authority's and the Danish Consumer Ombudsman's Guidelines on Creditworthiness Assessment*.; 2021.

28. 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. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2022;7(6):e515-e528. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(22)00058-5

29. Breinholt A, Conley D. Child-Driven Parenting: Differential Early Childhood Investment by Offspring Genotype. Published online December 2020. doi:10.3386/w28217

30. Pedersen CB, Mortensen PB. Sibship Characteristics during Upbringing and Schizophrenia Risk. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2004;160(7):652-660. doi:10.1093/aje/kwh254

31. Kinge JM, Øverland S, Flatø M, et al. Parental income and mental disorders in children and adolescents: prospective register-based study. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2021;50(5):1615-1627. doi:10.1093/ije/dyab066

Appendix

The association between income and mental health: can sibling comparison designs help resolve this research question?

Contents

ICD codes to identify severe mental disorder **2**

Study population - Income misclassification and outliers **3**

Covariates **4**

Creation of simulated cohorts **5**

Figures **6**

Figure S1. Distribution of annual disposable family income. Panels A and B show the density distribution and disposable income by the amount of family assets for the full cohort. Panels C and D show the same measures after excluding those below the first percentile and those above the 99th percentile . . . 6

Figure S2. Study flowchart . . . 7

Figure S3. Adjusted hazard ratios (aHR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of being diagnosed with severe mental disorders for each $15 000 increase in disposable family income, grouping disposable family income as quintiles and deciles, respectively. . . . 8

Figure S4. Adjusted hazard ratios (aHR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of being diagnosed with severe mental disorders for each $15 000 increase in disposable family income, based on the entire cohort and the sibling cohort, respectively . . . 9

Figure S5. Distribution of age difference between siblings in years with mean and interquartile range (IQR) (n = 404,177) . . . 10

Figure S6. Annual disposable family income distribution with indication of income decile groupings with mean, median and interquartile range (IQR) (n = 404,177) . . . 11

Figure S7. Overall (left) and absolute (right) annual disposable family income differences between siblings measured at age 14 with mean, median and interquartile range (IQR) (n = 404,177) 11

Figure S8. Disposable family income distribution comparing the sibling cohort according to parental educational levels . . . 12

Figure S9. Disposable family income distribution comparing the sibling cohort with and without a first-born child diagnosed with severe mental disorders . . . 12

Tables **13**

Table S1. Overview over the three cohorts used in this study . . . 13

Table S2. Person-time at risk, number of cases and rates per 1000 person-years among individuals born in Denmark 1986-1996 and followed up until 31 December 2018 . . . 14

Table S3. Comparison between individuals with and without siblings . . . 15

Table S4. Comparison of characteristics of families with large versus small differences in disposable family income between siblings at age 14 . . . 16

ICD codes to identify severe mental disorder

	ICD 10-DCR codes	Equivalent ICD-8 codes
Severe mental disorder		
Schizophrenia and related disorders	F20-F29	295.x9, 296.89, 297.x9, 298.29-298.99, 299.04, 299.05, 299.09, 301.83
Bipolar disorder	F30-F31	296.19, 296.39, 298.19

Study population - Income misclassification and outliers

Figure S1 shows the distribution of annual disposable family income measured at age 14 for the entire study cohort (top row) and the 98%-tile (bottom row) in $. Panels A and C shows the family income distribution while panels B and D shows the amount of family assets for the various disposable family incomes.

As panel A illustrates, there are some very extreme annual taxable income values reported. As we are including family income as a continuous variable in the analyses, this issue is especially pertinent in this study. Especially for the very low/negative reported taxable income, there is an issue of misclassification. Families reporting negative values are often citizens who have stocks, companies or other assets that makes it possible for them to subtract from other incomes and thus report less taxable income. Panel B shows the relationship between the amount of family disposable income and corresponding amount of family assets. Panel B illustrates that as the disposable family income nears zero, the amount of family assets starts to rise drastically with lower reported taxable family incomes, demonstrating the issue that taxable income may not be a good measure to classify the socioeconomic position of these individuals. To ensure that extreme positive or negative values do not weigh too much in the analyses, the lowest and highest 1% of the family income values are removed from the analyses reported in this study. Thus, those persons with an annual disposable family income below $56 and above $85,641 have been excluded from the analyses. The distribution of the 98%-tile cohort shown in plot C and disposable family income plotted by the corresponding amount of family assets is shown in plot D.

All analyses conducted in this report are based on the 98%-tile unless otherwise stated.

Covariates

Parental educational attainment

Information on parental educational attainment was delineated at the year of the cohort members's 1st birthday. It was defined at the maximum of maternal and paternal educational attainment. It was categorised into three groups:

- **Low**: Mandatory school, corresponding to a maximum length of education of seven years for persons born before January 1, 1958, and nine years for persons born on or after that date
- **Middle**: Secondary school and vocational education and short-cycle higher education, which approximated to a maximum of 10-12 years of schooling
- **Higher**: Medium- or long cycle higher education, approximately over 12 years of education

Family cohabitation status

Family's cohabitant status in the year before cohort member's 15th birthday was defined and categorized as

1. Cohabiting or married
2. Single
3. Single, living alone

Origin

Defined as parents' country of birth

1. Both parents born in Denmark
2. One or both parents born abroad

Urbanicity

Measure for urbanization was delineated using population density.

1. Capital
2. Capital suburb
3. Provincial city
4. Provincial towns
5. Rural area

Parental psychiatric history

Defined as either parent having received a psychiatric diagnosis in the Psychiatric Central Research Register (ICD-10 F-chapter [F00-F99] and equivalent ICD-8 codes [290-315]) before cohort member's 15th birthday.

Parental incarceration

Defined as either parent being convicted with a custodial sentence between cohort member's birth and 15th birthday.

Creation of simulated cohorts

To explore whether there is enough variability in disposable family income between siblings within the same family, we created a simulated cohort. Here, we group individuals into families at random. First we considered the 404 179 person (62.8% of the cohort) across 185 558 families (43.6% of the families) who had a least one full sibling in the full cohort (and were thus included in the sibling comparison design). For each of the 185 558 families, we picked one the siblings at random (n = 185 558) and each remaining sibling (n = 218 620) was replaced by a random individual (from the sibling cohort of n = 404 179) who had a similar family disposable income, the same sex, birth year, and birth order, and who came from a family with the same number of siblings. The difference in disposable income between the original sibling and the replaced random one was below $100 for 213 315 (97.6%) of the individuals, ($100-$200 for 2 783 (1.3%) of the individuals), $200-$500 for 1 611(0.7%), and above $500 for 911 (0.04%) of the individuals. We created a simulated cohort where one sibling of each of the 186 588 families was linked to random individuals with similar characteristics of the real sibling, but who were not family members.To examine whether the regular cohort and the sibling comparison design might be estimating different parameters, we also created two additional simulated cohort. The first in which the replaced siblings were similar to the real ones in all parameters (sex, birth year, birth order and number of sibling) but were not restricted to have a similar income. In the second the pseudo-sibling were chosen completely at random. In these two simulated cohorts, one would expect to find similar estimates in the entire cohort and in the sibling comparison design. The results are shown in the below table.

Table. Adjusted hazard ratios (aHR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of being diagnosed with severe mental disorders for each $15 000 increase in disposable family income for different criteria for pseudo-sibling selection.

Sibling population with simulated families	**Full cohort analysis aHR (95%CI)**	**Sibling comparison analysis aHR (95%CI)**
Pseudo-siblings chosen completely at random	0.76 (0.73-0.79)	0.76 (0.72-0.80)
Pseudo-siblings with same characteristics on sex, birth year, birth order and family size as original sibling	0.78 (0.75-0.80)	0.76 (0.72-0.80)
Pseudo-siblings with same characteristics on sex, birth year, birth order and family size and ***income*** as original sibling	0.77 (0.74-0.80)	0.93 (0.85-1.01)

Figures

***Figure S1*. Distribution of annual disposable family income. Panels A and B show the density distribution and disposable income by the amount of family assets for the full cohort. Panels C and D show the same measures after excluding those below the first percentile and those above the 99th percentile**



***Figure S2*. Study flowchart**



***Figure S3*. Adjusted hazard ratios (aHR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of being diagnosed with severe mental disorders for each $15 000 increase in disposable family income, grouping disposable family income as quintiles and deciles, respectively.**

Model	HR (95%CI)
Family income quintiles	
Lowest quintile	Ref (−)
2	0.86 (0.82−0.91)
3	0.72 (0.68−0.76)
4	0.66 (0.63−0.71)
Highest quintile	0.62 (0.58−0.66)
Family income deciles	
Lowest decile	Ref (−)
2	0.94 (0.88−1.00)
3	0.83 (0.78−0.90)
4	0.73 (0.68−0.79)
5	0.69 (0.64−0.74)
6	0.65 (0.60−0.70)
7	0.62 (0.57−0.67)
8	0.58 (0.53−0.62)
9	0.56 (0.52−0.61)
Highest decile	0.49 (0.45−0.54)



Note: The *Adjusted model* is adjusted for sex, birth order, birth year, origin, parental incarceration, parental psychiatric history, parental educational attainment, urbanicity and family cohabitation status.

Figure S4. **Adjusted hazard ratios (aHR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of being diagnosed with severe mental disorders for each $15 000 increase in disposable family income, based on the entire cohort and the sibling cohort, respectively**



Note: The *Adjusted model* is adjusted for sex, birth order, birth year, origin, parental incarceration, parental psychiatric history, parental educational attainment, urbanicity and family cohabitation status.

***Figure S5*. Distribution of age difference between siblings in years with mean and interquartile range (IQR) (n = 404,177)**



Mean (IQR)
3.2 (2.2 : 3.9)

Figure S6. **Annual disposable family income distribution with indication of income decile groupings with mean, median and interquartile range (IQR) (n = 404,177)**



Mean (IQR)
$30,712 ($24,310 : $35,741)

Figure S7. **Overall (left) and absolute (right) annual disposable family income differences between siblings measured at age 14 with mean, median and interquartile range (IQR) (n = 404,177)**



	Overall	Absolute
Mean	$1,873	$5,957
Median	$1,495	$3,945
IQR	-$1544 : $5,211	$1,807 : $7,701

***Figure S8*. Disposable family income distribution comparing the sibling cohort according to parental educational levels**



	Family income for parental education levels			Difference between siblings for parental education levels		
	Low	**Middle**	**High**	**Low**	**Middle**	**High**
Mean	$23,267	$29,451	$35,584	$5,565	$5,798	$6,301
Median	$23,045	$28,827	$34,089	$3,703	$3,892	$4,131
IQR	$18,597 : $28,021	$23,607 : $34,397	$28,100 : $41,295	$1,801 : $7,175	$1,788 : $7,511	$1,846 : $8,169

-

***Figure S9*. Disposable family income distribution comparing the sibling cohort with and without a first-born child diagnosed with severe mental disorders**



	Family income		Difference between siblings	
	Diagnosed	**Not diagnosed**	**Diagnosed**	**Not diagnosed**
Mean	$26,675	$30,757	$6,444	$5,951
Median	$25,897	$29,732	$4,224	$3,943
IQR	$20,329 : $32,107	$23,830 : $36,246	$1,824 : $8,598	$1,806 : $7,692

Tables

***Table S1*. Overview over the three cohorts used in this study**

	Original cohort	**Original cohort**	**Simulated cohort**
	Full cohort	Sibling cohort	Pseudo-sibling cohort
Cohort members	All individuals born in Denmark between 1986-1996	Individuals with at least one sibling in the full cohort	One sibling from each family from the sibling cohort (chosen at random). Other sibling were randomly replaced by other individuals from the sibling cohort with similar characteristics
N (individuals)	643 814	404 179	404 179
N (families)	425 193	185 558	185 558
Standard Cox analysis	Model 1[a]	Model 5[a]	Model 3[a]
Sibling comparison design	-	Model 2	Model 4

[a] T*he Standard Cox analyses* are Cox proportional hazard models with age as the underlying time scale and adjusted for sex, birth order, birth year, origin, parental incarceration, parental psychiatric history, parental educational attainment, urbanicity and family cohabitation status.

[b] *The Sibling comparison designs* are the standard Cox analyses described above but with the baseline hazard stratified by family.

Table S2. **Person-time at risk, number of cases and rates per 1000 person-years among individuals born in Denmark 1986-1996 and followed up until 31 December 2018**

	Number of diagnoses	**Person-time at risk (years)**	**Rate per 1000 person-years**
Overall	14,637	7,787,305	1.88
Disposable family income decile			
Lowest decile	2,560	775,055	3.30
2	2,116	786,620	2.69
3	1,760	790,372	2.23
4	1,461	793,067	1.84
5	1,323	792,339	1.67
6	1,211	790,724	1.53
7	1,159	782,903	1.48
8	1,055	771,973	1.37
9	1,054	758,926	1.39
Highest decile	938	745,325	1.26

***Table S3*. Comparison between individuals with and without siblings**

	n	Severe mental disorder(%)	Disposable family income	
			Mean	**Median (IQR)**
No	239 635	5 721 (2.4%)	$32,766	$31,594 ($25,248 : $38,730)
Yes	404 179	8 916 (2.2%)	$30,712	$29,816 ($24,310 : $35,741)

***Table S4*. Comparison of characteristics of families with large versus small differences in disposable family income between siblings at age 14**

Variable	$0 - $5,000	$5,001 - $10,000	$10,001 - $15,000	$15,000 - $30,000	$30,001 - $45,000	Above $45,000
Overall	238 924 (59.1%)	96 579 (23.9%)	35 962 (8.9%)	27 728 (6.9%)	4 112 (1%)	874 (0.2%)
Parental Educational level						
Low	19282 (8.1%)	7158 (7.4%)	2521 (7%)	2070 (7.5%)	169 (4.1%)	30 (3.4%)
Middle	128453 (53.8%)	51771 (53.6%)	18677 (51.9%)	13454 (48.5%)	1978 (48.1%)	422 (48.3%)
High	76756 (32.1%)	32278 (33.4%)	12830 (35.7%)	10437 (37.6%)	1699 (41.3%)	372 (42.6%)
Missing	14433 (6%)	5372 (5.6%)	1934 (5.4%)	1767 (6.4%)	266 (6.5%)	50 (5.7%)
Disposable family income decile						
Lowest decile	25654 (10.7%)	7813 (8.1%)	3313 (9.2%)	4897 (17.7%)	391 (9.5%)	0 (-)
2	27959 (11.7%)	9891 (10.2%)	2767 (7.7%)	1561 (5.6%)	329 (8%)	0 (-)
3	27921 (11.7%)	10400 (10.8%)	3051 (8.5%)	1464 (5.3%)	157 (3.8%)	36 (4.1%)
4	28122 (11.8%)	10439 (10.8%)	3204 (8.9%)	1490 (5.4%)	108 (2.6%)	42 (4.8%)
5	26985 (11.3%)	10713 (11.1%)	3318 (9.2%)	1606 (5.8%)	149 (3.6%)	39 (4.5%)
6	26063 (10.9%)	10494 (10.9%)	3513 (9.8%)	1874 (6.8%)	160 (3.9%)	35 (4%)
7	24707 (10.3%)	9936 (10.3%)	3744 (10.4%)	2198 (7.9%)	166 (4%)	41 (4.7%)
8	21655 (9.1%)	9837 (10.2%)	4076 (11.3%)	2845 (10.3%)	346 (8.4%)	61 (7%)
9	18130 (7.6%)	9249 (9.6%)	4201 (11.7%)	3691 (13.3%)	675 (16.4%)	126 (14.4%)
Highest decile	11728 (4.9%)	7807 (8.1%)	4775 (13.3%)	6102 (22%)	1631 (39.7%)	494 (56.5%)