Relationships between wellbeing polygenic scores, brain structure, and psychopathology in children

Christian K. Tamnes[1,2*], Andreas Dahl[3,4], Dennis van der Meer[4,5], Ingrid Agartz[2,6,7], Dag Alnaes[3,4], Ole A. Andreassen[4,8], Kathryn L. Mills[1,9], Linn B. Norbom[1], Geneviève Richard[4], Ronald E. Dahl[10], Espen Røysamb[1,11] Lars T. Westlye[3,4,8], Lia Ferschmann[1,12]

[1] PROMENTA Research Center, Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

[2] Division of Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Diakonhjemmet Hospital, Oslo, Norway

[3] Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

[4] Section for Precision Psychiatry, Division of Mental Health and Addiction, Oslo University Hospital & Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

[5] School of Mental Health and Neuroscience, Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences, Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands

[6] Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

[7] Centre for Psychiatry Research, Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet & Stockholm Health Care Services, Stockholm Region, Stockholm, Sweden

[8] K.G Jebsen Center for Neurodevelopmental Disorders, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

[9] Department of Psychology, University of Oregon, USA

[10] Institute of Human Development, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, United States

[11] Department of Child Health and Development, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway

[12] Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, Norway, Oslo, Norway

[*] Corresponding author: Christian K. Tamnes, Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, P.O. box 1094 Blindern, 0317 Oslo, Norway. c.k.tamnes@psykologi.uio.no

Abstract

Wellbeing is shaped by an interplay of genetic and environmental factors and is associated with both health and functioning. It remains unclear whether genetic influences on wellbeing are linked to brain structure and, in turn, early-life psychopathology. Here, we investigated associations between wellbeing polygenic scores (PGS), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)-derived measures of brain structure, and parent-reported measures of child psychopathology in a large cross-sectional sample of children from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study (n = 10,471; 8.9-11.1 years old). Preregistered analyses revealed no significant associations between wellbeing PGS and regional cortical surface area, cortical thickness, or subcortical volumes, while an exploratory analysis identified a small positive association with intracranial volume (ICV; $\beta = 0.03$, $p<.001$). Preregistered analyses showed small negative associations between wellbeing PGS and general psychopathology ($\beta = -0.08$, $p<.001$) and both internalizing ($\beta = -.08$, $p<.001$) and externalizing problems ($\beta = -0.07$, $p<.001$). ICV partially mediated the relationships between wellbeing PGS and psychopathology, accounting for 3-7% of these relationships. The findings suggest that while wellbeing PGS have limited associations with regional brain structure in children, they exhibit small protective effects against psychopathology.

Keywords: ABCD Study; brain structure; children; intracranial volume; MRI; polygenic scores; psychopathology; wellbeing

1. Introduction

The importance of socioeconomic factors (Jebb et al., 2018), social bonds and prosociality (Helliwell & Aknin, 2018), and major life events (Luhmann et al., 2012) for human wellbeing is established. In recent years, it has also become evident that, like for most complex traits and conditions, individual differences in wellbeing are partly heritable and polygenic (Røysamb & Nes, 2019). Wellbeing refers to a multifaceted phenomenon of thinking of and experiencing life in positive ways and as worthwhile and rewarding, and includes both emotional responses and cognitive judgments (Diener et al., 2018). Higher levels of wellbeing have consistently been associated with better physical and mental health, as well as enhanced social and occupational functioning (Bartels et al., 2013; Diener et al., 2018). Still, establishing direct causal effects remains challenging (Rohrer & Lucas, 2020). Furthermore, family-based studies (Bartels, 2015; Røysamb et al., 2018; Røysamb & Nes, 2018) and genome-wide association studies (GWAS) (Baselmans, Jansen, et al., 2019; Okbay et al., 2016) have identified both genetic and phenotypic correlations between subjective wellbeing and life satisfaction, positive affect, neuroticism, and depressive symptoms, collectively referred to as the wellbeing spectrum.

The brain integrates a vast array of genetic and environmental influences that shape our wellbeing. However, few studies have examined the associations between phenotypic variation in wellbeing or closely associated concepts and brain structure. Early magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) voxel-based morphometry studies primarily identified positive associations of wellbeing with regional gray matter volume (Kong et al., 2015; Lewis et al., 2014; Matsunaga et al., 2016; Sato et al., 2015; Yang et al., 2013), although some studies also reported negative associations (Kong et al., 2015; Takeuchi et al., 2014). More recent findings have linked subjective wellbeing (Van ‘t Ent et al., 2017) and trait positive affect (Dennison et al., 2015) to greater hippocampal volumes, and life satisfaction to thinner lateral prefrontal cortical regions (Zhu et al., 2018). The largest study to date, involving 38,982 adult UK Biobank participants, found small significant associations between higher levels of wellbeing and greater total and regional cortical surface area, predominantly thinner regional cortex, and greater volume of several cerebellar and subcortical structures (Jamshidi et al., 2022). In contrast, extensive research on neuroticism (Bjørnebekk et al., 2013; Ferschmann et al., 2018; Holmes et al., 2012; Riccelli et al., 2017) and depression (MacSweeney et al., in press; Schmaal et al., 2016, 2017; Shen et al., 2021) have consistently found negative associations with global or regional cortical surface area, regional cortical thickness, and hippocampal volumes.

The relationship between the genetic propensity of wellbeing, measured as the cumulative signal across a large number of common variants as revealed by GWAS, a polygenic score (PGS), and the brain remains poorly understood. Among the few wellbeing PGS-brain structure studies, Song et al. (2019) found positive associations with cortical thickness in the right superior temporal gyrus and volume in the right insula in young adults, while Jamshidi et al. (2022) found positive associations with supramarginal cortical surface area and cerebellar volumes in middle-aged and older adults. Investigating associations between wellbeing PGS and brain biology already in childhood could be crucial, as genetic influences on neurodevelopmental processes may set the stage for or protect against the development of mental health problems typically emerging in adolescence, such as mood disorders, certain anxiety disorders, eating disorders, substance abuse, psychosis, and personality disorders (Blakemore, 2019; Dalsgaard et al., 2020; Whiteford et al., 2013).

To better understand the complex relationships between genetic influences on the wellbeing spectrum, brain structure, and psychopathology at the brink of adolescence, we conducted preregistered secondary analyses using data from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study (Jernigan & Brown, 2018). Our research aimed to address three key research questions (RQ). RQ1: Is variation in wellbeing PGS associated with differences in brain structure in children? RQ2: Are there relationships between wellbeing PGS and phenotypic measures of psychopathology in children? RQ3: Are the relationships between wellbeing PGS and psychopathology mediated by brain structure? Corresponding to these RQs, we formulated the following hypotheses based on previous research (H). H1: Wellbeing PGS will be positively associated with cortical surface area and thickness in prefrontal, insular and temporal regions, as well as hippocampal volume. H2: Wellbeing PGS will be negatively associated with parent-reported general psychopathology (p-factor) and internalizing problems specifically. H3: Differences in brain structure will partly mediate the associations between wellbeing PGS and psychopathology. This study's research questions, hypotheses, and statistical analyses were preregistered (https://osf.io/wrkdu), and all deviations from the preregistration are detailed in section 2.3.3.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Participants and procedures

The current research utilized cross sectional baseline data from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study (https://nda.nih.gov/abcd) using the curated annual release 3.0. The ABCD

Study data are stored in the NIMH Data Archive Collection #2573 and are available for approved users (Request #7474, PI: Westlye). The 3.0 release will be permanently available as a persistent data set defined in the NDA Study 901 (DOI 10.15154/1519007). The ABCD Study is an ongoing study of approximately 11,800 youths recruited at age 9-11 years in 2016-2018 across multiple sites in the United States of America, planned as a 10-year longitudinal study (Jernigan & Brown, 2018). The full protocol, including recruitment methods, exclusion criteria, and ethical approvals are described in full elsewhere (D. B. Clark et al., 2018; Garavan et al., 2018; Volkow et al., 2018). The present study was conducted in line with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Norwegian Regional Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics (REK 2019/943).

From 11,883 available participants, we excluded 647 due to missing or poor quality MRI data (as described below), 759 due to missing genetic data, 1 due to missing scanner serial information, and 5 duplicates. The final sample thus included a total of 10,471 participants (47.2% females) aged 8.9-11.1 years, including 602 monozygotic twins and 1025 dizygotic twins and siblings (Table 1). For analyses involving parent-reported child psychopathology data, 3 of these participants had missing data. For the interaction analyses, 598 had missing data on parental education and 516 had missing data on financial adversity. Sensitivity analyses were performed on different subsamples and details regarding sample sizes in the sensitivity analyses are described below.

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Genetic data

Using summary statistics from a GWAS of wellbeing spectrum scores in adults, we estimated wellbeing PGS (Baselmans, Jansen, et al., 2019) using PRSice v2 (Choi & O'Reilly, 2019) and standard quality control procedures, including the filtering of genetic variants that are poorly imputed (INFO<.5), have high missingness (>.05), or with low minor allele frequency (MAF<.05). We based the PGS on variants passing a p=.05 significance threshold.

2.2.2. Neuroimaging data

MRI data were collected across 22 sites and 29 scanners using an optimized acquisition protocol harmonized across three different types of 3T MRI scanners: Siemens Prisma, General Electric 750, and Philips. The T1-weighted image was an inversion prepared RF-spoiled gradient echo scan, using prospective motion correction when available, and with 1 mm isotropic voxel resolution. Detailed

descriptions of the MRI protocol, acquisition parameters, and care and safety procedures implemented for scanning of children are presented elsewhere (Casey et al., 2018).

T1-weighted data were processed with FreeSurfer (http://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu), which performs volumetric segmentation and cortical surface reconstructions (Dale et al., 1999; Fischl et al., 1999, 2002). The image processing in the ABCD Study is described further elsewhere (Hagler et al., 2019). The images were screened for incidental findings by a neurologist, and the ABCD Study team performed manual and automated quality control (QC) of all the raw imaging data, as well as the postprocessing cortical surface reconstructions for all participants. We included the T1-weighthed data recommended by the ABCD Study team, specifically 1) no serious MRI findings, 2) T1 series passed raw QC, and 3) FreeSurfer QC not failed.

The present study used tabulated measures of cortical surface area and cortical thickness in each region of the Desikan-Killiany Atlas (2x34 variables) (Desikan et al., 2006) and volume of the following structures: accumbens, amygdala, caudate, hippocampus, pallidum, putamen, thalamus, cerebral white matter, cerebellum gray matter, and cerebellum white matter (10 variables) (Fischl et al., 2002). Measures from each hemisphere were averaged. Total intracranial volume (ICV) as estimated by FreeSurfer (Buckner et al., 2004) was used as both a covariate (in analyses on area or volume) and in exploratory analyses as an additional outcome variable.

Imaging data were harmonized across scanners prior to statistical analyses using the R package ComBat (Fortin et al., 2017, 2018; Johnson et al., 2007). This empirical Bayesian method has been adopted from genomics and applied to various brain metrics to remove unwanted sources of scan variability such as differences in MRI-scanner manufacturer while preserving biological associations in the data (Fortin et al., 2017, 2018). To ensure that biological variability was preserved during the harmonization process, the model matrix used included the following covariates: age, sex, and wellbeing PGS.

2.2.3. Parent-reported child psychopathology

Child psychopathology variables included in the current study were measures of general psychopathology, internalizing problems, and externalizing problems (3 variables), calculated based on a model reported elsewhere (D. A. Clark et al., 2021). Specifically, we used a higher order factor model with scale-level input and the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) a priori scales (model number GFP-13 in

(D. A. Clark et al., 2021)), calculated based on the ABCD baseline assessment of the parent-rated CBCL data (Achenbach & Ruffle, 2000). The single general factor of psychopathology (p-factor) accounts for covariation across symptoms and captures nonspecific risk for many forms of psychopathology (Caspi et al., 2014; Caspi & Moffitt, 2018; Michelini et al., 2019), whereas the lower order factors of internalizing and externalizing capture unresidualized clusters of risk for a narrower range of symptoms (D. A. Clark et al., 2021).

2.2.4. Socioeconomic status

Socioeconomic status was assessed as i) highest parental education which was the highest attained education reported in number of years by at least one of the caretakers, and ii) financial adversity measured by the Parent-Reported Financial Adversity Questionnaire (PRFQ) (Diemer et al., 2013) which yields a sum score reflecting experiences of financial difficulties in the past 12 months.

2.3. Statistical analyses

2.3.1. Main analyses

All statistical analyses were performed in R (R Core Team, 2021) Version 4.3.2, in RStudio (RStudio Team, 2020). Pearson's correlation was used to assess associations among variables of interest. To address RQ1 and RQ2 examining the associations between wellbeing PGS and i) brain structure, and ii) measures of psychopathology, respectively, we employed a series of linear regression models.

Specifically, to address RQ1, each brain region of interest was regressed on wellbeing PGS, sex, age, 20 population components, and genotype batch. ICV was included as additional covariates in analyses where the dependent variable was cortical surface area or brain volume. Since analyses were ran with 78 outcome variables, we employed Matrix Spectral Decomposition (matSpD, https://research.qut.edu.au/sgel/software/matspd-local-version) to correct for multiple comparisons. MatSpD estimates the number of independent variables in the dataset based on the eigenvalues of the observed correlation matrix. The higher the correlation between the included measures, the lower the number of independent observations. MatSpD yields an adjusted p-value required to keep Type I Error Rate at 5%. The estimated number of independent variables was 22.973.

To address RQ2, three separate analyses were performed where psychopathology (p-factor, internalizing, externalizing) were regressed on wellbeing PGS, sex, age, 20 population components, and genotype batch. Bonferroni correction, i.e. 0.05/3 = 0.0167, was applied to correct for multiple comparisons.

To address RQ3, the R package *mediation* (Tingley et al., 2014) version 4.5.0 was used to explore whether brain structure mediated the associations between wellbeing PGS and child psychopathology. In line with the preregistration, this was only done for brain features with significant associations in RQ1. The indirect effect of wellbeing PGS on psychopathology was calculated as the product of two standardized regression coefficients extracted from a) an equation regressing psychopathology on wellbeing PGS and b) an equation regressing psychopathology on wellbeing PGS and brain structure. The same covariates were included in the equations as when testing RQ1 and RQ2. To obtain confidence intervals and test the statistical significance of the indirect effect, we applied a nonparametric bootstrapping method with 5000 iterations. We report Average Causal Mediation Estimates (ACME), and Proportion Mediated estimate, that reflects the mediation effect size. The robustness of the findings was assessed by performing a sensitivity analysis using the *medsens* function. This function measures how robust the ACME estimates are to unobserved confounders. Specifically, this analytical step identifies the sensitivity parameter rho (ρ) at which ACME = 0, with small ρ indicating that a statistically significant ACME is not robust and would not be statistically significant in the presence of a unobserved confounder causing even a small correlation between errors for the mediator and the outcome models (Chi et al., 2022).

Finally, as preregistered, exploratory analyses were performed to examine whether the strength of the associations identified in RQ1 and RQ2 varied as a function of parental education and financial adversity. In separate analyses we tested for interactions between wellbeing PGS and parental education and financial adversity on child brain structure and psychopathology, with sex, age, 20 population components, and genotype batch as covariates.

2.3.2. Sensitivity analyses

As preregistered, sensitivity analyses were performed for our main RQs on a subset of participants who reported to be Non-Hispanic White (n = 5681) because of the sample compositions of the discovery GWAS and evidence that polygenic scores do not necessarily generalize across ancestries (Martin et al.,

2019). As described below, we also performed sensitivity analyses where we only retained one participant per family.

2.3.3. Deviations from preregistration

First, contrary to the preregistration, mixed-effects models were not used to explore RQ1 and RQ2. Mixed-effect models control for between-pair variance in twins and siblings, leaving us with within-pair variance. Within-pair variance is of interest when exploring environmental predictors which generate differences between twins/siblings. However, the current study focuses on a genetic predictor (wellbeing PGS) and between-pair variance is therefore of interest (fully for monozygotic twins and partially for dizygotic twins and siblings). Therefore, we instead employed linear regression including all available participants in the analyses. Still, to probe these associations, we also included sensitivity analyses where we only retained one participant per family (n = 8844). For each model, we extracted residuals and assessed whether the linear regression model assumptions were satisfied. When investigating RQ2, it was necessary to transform the outcome variables (internalizing, externalizing and p-factor) and log transformation yielded results that best met the linear regression model assumptions.

Second, we did not include site as a random factor because literature on longitudinal modeling suggests that it is not likely that units of nesting such as site or individual scanners in multisite imaging studies such as the ABCD Study meet the theoretical assumption of a random factor (McCormick et al., 2023; McNeish et al., 2017). Instead, ComBat (Fortin et al., 2017, 2018) was used to remove non-biological variance originating from differences among MRI scanners. Third, we did not include categorical ethnicity variables as covariates since we did not have a justifiable reason to do so (Cardenas-Iniguez & Gonzalez, 2024). Finally, in addition to the preregistered analyses where ICV was included as a covariate, we extended RQ1 to also include ICV as an outcome. ICV is a heritable trait (Stein et al., 2012) which has been considered a general marker of neurodevelopment (Walhovd et al., 2022) and associated with externalizing problems in adolescents (Bashford-Largo et al., 2024).

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive statistics

Sample descriptive statistics are provided in Table 1 and density plots of study variables are shown in Figure 1. Pearson's correlations among variables are reported in Table 2 and showed small negative

associations between wellbeing PGS and psychopathology scores (range r = -.04 to -.08) and strong positive associations between the psychopathology scores (range r = .58 to .92). Moreover, wellbeing PGS was positively associated with parental education (r = .24) and negatively associated with financial adversity (r = -.14).

3.2. Associations between wellbeing PGS and brain structure

Controlling for age, sex, 20 population components, genetic batch, and ICV (for analyses on area and volume measures), a series of preregistered analyses showed no significant associations between wellbeing PGS and regional cortical thickness, surface area, or subcortical volumes after correcting for multiple comparisons (Tables 3-4). In a non-preregistered analysis, we found a corrected positive association between wellbeing PGS and ICV (β = 0.03, 95% CI [0.02-0.05], $p < 0.001$ (MatSpD computed the corrected significance threshold required to keep Type I Error Rate at 5% to be 0.0036)).

In a follow-up sensitivity analysis on a subset of participants who reported to be Non-Hispanic White (n = 5681), the association between wellbeing PGS and ICV was of similar strength, but not significant after correction for multiple comparison (β = 0.03, 95% CI [0.01-0.06], $p = 0.006$ (in the reduced sample, MatSpD computed the corrected significance threshold required to keep Type I Error Rate at 5% to be 0.0034)). In sensitivity analyses where only one randomly selected individual per family was included in the analyses (n = 8844), the association between wellbeing PGS and ICV was of similar strength and significant after correction for multiple comparisons (β = 0.04, 95% CI [0.02-0.06], $p = 0.001$ (MatSpD computed the corrected significance threshold required to keep Type I Error Rate at 5% to be 0.0034)). Additionally, wellbeing PGS was negatively associated with surface area of the parahippocampal cortex (β = -0.03, 95% CI [-0.05 - -0.01], $p = .002$).

3.3. Associations between wellbeing PGS and child psychopathology

Controlling for age, sex, 20 population components, and genetic batch, wellbeing PGS was negatively associated with the p-factor (β = -0.08, 95% CI [-0.10 - -0.06], $p < .001$), internalizing problems (β = -0.08, 95% CI [-0.10 - -0.05], $p < .001$), and externalizing problems (β = -0.07, 95% CI [-0.09 - -0.04], $p < .001$). All associations were significant after Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Sensitivity analyses with the subsample consisting of participants who reported to be Non-Hispanic White yielded similar results for p-factor (β = -.09, 95% CI [-0.11 - -0.06], $p < .001$), internalizing (β = -.08, 95% CI [-0.10 - -0.05], $p < .001$), and externalizing (β = -.07, 95% CI [-0.10 - -0.05], $p < .001$). Results were also similar in

sensitivity analyses that included only one randomly chosen individual per family; p-factor (β = -.09, 95% CI [-0.11 - -0.06], *p* < .001), internalizing (β = -.09, 95% CI [-0.12 - -0.06], *p* < .001), and externalizing (β = -.07, 95% CI [-0.10 - -0.05], *p* < .001).

3.4. Brain structure as the mediator between wellbeing PGS and psychopathology

Since wellbeing PGS in the main analyses was significantly associated only with ICV, mediation analyses were performed only with ICV as a potential mediator of the associations between wellbeing PGS and child psychopathology. The results of the mediation analyses (Figure 2) showed that there was an indirect effect of wellbeing PGS through ICV on p-factor (ACME = 0.004 , 95% CI [0.002,0.01], p < .001), internalizing problems (ACME = 0.002, 95% CI [0.001, 0.00], *p* = 0.012), and externalizing problems (ACME = 0.004, 95% CI [0.002,0.01], p < .001). The mediating effect (proportion mediated) of ICV explained 6% of the association between wellbeing PGS and p-factor, 3% of the relationship between wellbeing PGS and internalizing problems, and 7% of the relationship between wellbeing PGS and externalizing problems. Sensitivity analyses suggested that the ACME estimates were robust to unobserved confounders, with sensitivity parameter rho (*ρ*) at which ACME = 0 being 0.95 for p-factor and internalizing and externalizing problems. The same analyses were also repeated in the unrelated sample where positive associations between wellbeing PGS and ICV were identified. These analyses suggested indirect effect of wellbeing PGS through ICV on p-factor (ACME = 0.005, 95% CI [0.003,0.01], p < .001), internalizing problems (ACME = 0.003, 95% CI [0.001, 0.01], p = 0.011), and externalizing problems (ACME = 0.005, 95% CI [0.003,0.01], p < .001). The mediating effect (proportion mediated) of ICV explained 6% of the association between wellbeing PGS and p-factor, 3% of the relationship between wellbeing PGS and internalizing problems, and 7% of the relationship between wellbeing PGS and externalizing problems.

3.5. Interactions with parental education and financial adversity

As preregistered, we tested whether significant associations between wellbeing PGS and outcomes of interests differed as a function of parental education and financial adversity. We found significant interactions of wellbeing PGS and parental education on ICV (β = 0.02 , 95% CI [0.005 – 0.04], p-factor (β = -0.03 , 95% CI [-0.05 - -0.01], p = 0.003), p = 0.012), internalizing problems (β =-0.03, 95% CI [-0.05 - -0.01], p = 0.003), and externalizing problems (β =-0.03 , 95% CI [-0.05 - -.004], p = 0.019). Significant interactions of wellbeing PGS and financial adversity were only found for ICV (β = -.02, 95% CI [-0.04 - -0.005], p = .013). Higher parental education was associated with a stronger positive association between

wellbeing PGS and ICV and a stronger negative association between wellbeing PGS and child psychopathology, while financial adversity was associated with a weaker positive association between wellbeing PGS and ICV (Figure 3).

4. Discussion

This study examined the relationships between genetic predispositions for wellbeing, brain structure, and psychopathology in a large sample of children and revealed several notable findings. First, preregistered analyses showed no significant associations between wellbeing PGS and regional cortical surface area, cortical thickness, or subcortical volumes. However, an exploratory analysis identified a significant positive association with ICV. Second, preregistered analyses showed that wellbeing PGS were associated with less parent-reported psychopathology in children. Third, ICV emerged as a significant mediator of the relationship between wellbeing PGS and psychopathology phenotypes. Together, these findings suggest that a genetic propensity for wellbeing provides modest protective effects against early-life psychopathology, partially mediated through general neurodevelopmental processes.

We examined the associations between wellbeing spectrum PGS—derived from a multivariate analysis of life satisfaction, positive affect, neuroticism, and depressive symptoms (Baselmans, Jansen, et al., 2019)—and regional variation in typically assessed features of brain macrostructure in children. Based on previous studies of brain structural correlates of wellbeing and related concepts (De Vries et al., 2023; Jamshidi et al., 2022), neuroticism (Bjørnebekk et al., 2013; Riccelli et al., 2017), or depression (MacSweeney et al., in press; Schmaal et al., 2020), as well as a small number of genetically informed wellbeing-brain structure studies (Jamshidi et al., 2022; Song et al., 2019; Van ‘t Ent et al., 2017), we hypothesized that wellbeing PGS would be positively associated with cortical surface area and thickness in prefrontal, insular and temporal regions, as well as hippocampal volume. However, our preregistered analyses revealed no significant associations with regional cortical thickness, surface area, or subcortical volumes, and did thus not support this hypothesis. These results contrast with prior studies in adults that have reported positive associations between wellbeing PGS and cortical thickness in the right superior temporal gyrus and volume in the right insula (Song et al., 2019) and supramarginal cortical surface area and cerebellar volumes (Jamshidi et al., 2022). Our findings do however align with studies that have found only limited associations between neuroticism or depression PGS and brain structure in healthy children (Fernandez-Cabello et al., 2022; Norbom et al., 2020; Pine et al., 2023).

In an exploratory analysis, however, we identified a small but significant positive association between wellbeing PGS and ICV. Sensitivity analyses restricted to participants who reported to be Non-Hispanic White and in only unrelated participants showed similar effect sizes, although the association was only marginally significant after correction for multiple comparisons in the former group. The observed association with ICV indicates that wellbeing PGS exert a small general effect on neurodevelopment, as ICV development stabilizes in adolescence (Mills et al., 2016).

The limited associations between wellbeing PGS and brain structure in children may be explained by several factors. First, other genetic (Fernandez-Cabello et al., 2022; Grasby et al., 2020; Merz et al., 2022) and environmental (Alnæs et al., 2020; Lindseth et al., 2024; Norbom et al., 2024) factors likely play greater roles in shaping child brain structure. Second, the genetic signal captured by the wellbeing spectrum PGS (Baselmans, Jansen, et al., 2019) explains only small proportions of the heritability of the related complex traits, approximately in the 1-2% range, limiting its ability to detect associations with brain structure. Third, it is possible that associations between PGS and brain structure emerge later in life through dynamic interactions between genetic predispositions and the environment (Tucker-Drob et al., 2013).

Consistent with our second hypothesis, higher wellbeing PGS were associated with lower parent-reported psychopathology scores, also in sensitivity analyses considering Non-Hispanic White and unrelated participants only. However, while we hypothesized that the association would be strongest for internalizing problems, the results showed similar effect sizes for p-factor, externalizing problems, and internalizing problems. These findings extend previous results in adults (Baselmans, Van De Weijer, et al., 2019), and suggest that wellbeing PGS confer small, non-specific negative associations with general psychopathology in children.

Further, ICV mediated the associations between wellbeing PGS and psychopathology scores, accounting for 3-7% of these relationships. This supports our hypothesis that neurodevelopmental processes partially mediate the link between wellbeing PGS and psychopathology, albeit not through the hypothesized regional brain measures. This finding is consistent with recent studies showing that global brain volume metrics indirectly link polygenic liability to conduct problems (Lahey et al., 2024), attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (Mooney et al., 2021), and psychotic-like experiences (Karcher et al., 2022). The current cross-sectional findings should however be interpreted with caution. The causal

pathways remain to be characterized in longitudinal analyses, and neurodevelopmental and disease processes may exert bidirectional effects.

Finally, exploratory analyses revealed that parental education level and financial adversity moderated the associations between wellbeing PGS and key outcomes. Higher parental education was linked to a stronger positive association between wellbeing PGS and ICV, as well as stronger negative associations between wellbeing PGS and child psychopathology, while financial adversity was associated with a weaker positive association between wellbeing PGS and ICV. These findings align with the idea that enriched environments, often associated with higher socioeconomic status (e.g., higher parental education), provide more opportunities for genetic potentials to manifest through transactional processes (Tucker-Drob et al., 2013). Conversely, the weaker association observed between wellbeing PGS and ICV in context of financial adversity may reflect a more constrained developmental environment where genetic influences are limited. It is however important to note that the limited variance in some of the socioeconomic measures, especially financial adversity, within the ABCD Study sample constrains the generalizability of these findings to broader populations.

In summary, this study provides novel insights into the relationships between genetic predispositions for wellbeing, brain structure, and childhood psychopathology. While preregistered analyses showed no associations between wellbeing PGS and regional brain structure, exploratory findings suggest a modest link to global neurodevelopmental processes, as reflected in ICV. Further, the protective effects of wellbeing PGS against psychopathology appear partially mediated by ICV and are moderated by environmental factors such as parental education and financial adversity.

CRediT authorship contribution statement: **Christian K. Tamnes:** Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization, Funding acquisition. **Andreas Dahl:** Writing – review & editing, Formal analysis. **Dennis van der Meer:** Writing – review & editing, Formal analysis. **Ingrid Agartz:** Writing – review & editing. **Dag Alnaes:** Writing – review & editing. **Ole A. Andreassen:** Writing – review & editing. **Kathryn L. Mills:** Writing – review & editing. **Linn B. Norbom:** Writing – review & editing. **Geneviève Richard:** Writing – review & editing. **Ronald E. Dahl:** Writing – review & editing, Funding acquisition. **Espen Røysamb:** Writing – review & editing. **Lars T. Westlye:** Writing – review & editing. **Lia Ferschmann:** Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Formal analysis, Visualization.

Declarations of interest: OAA is consultant to Precision Health AS and Cortechs.ai, and received speaker's honorarium from Lundbeck, Janssen, Lilly and Otsuka.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process: During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT 4o to improve readability and language. After using this tool, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Acknowledgments: Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development℠ (ABCD) Study (https://abcdstudy.org), held in the NIMH Data Archive (NDA). This is a multisite, longitudinal study designed to recruit more than 10,000 children age 9-10 and follow them over 10 years into early adulthood. The ABCD Study® is supported by the National Institutes of Health and additional federal partners under award numbers U01DA041048, U01DA050989, U01DA051016, U01DA041022, U01DA051018, U01DA051037, U01DA050987, U01DA041174, U01DA041106, U01DA041117, U01DA041028, U01DA041134, U01DA050988, U01DA051039, U01DA041156, U01DA041025, U01DA041120, U01DA051038, U01DA041148, U01DA041093, U01DA041089, U24DA041123, U24DA041147. A full list of supporters is available at https://abcdstudy.org/federal-partners.html. A listing of participating sites and a complete listing of the study investigators can be found at https://abcdstudy.org/consortium_members/. ABCD consortium investigators designed and implemented the study and/or provided data but did not necessarily participate in the analysis or writing of this report. This manuscript reflects the views of the authors and may not reflect the opinions or views of the NIH or ABCD consortium investigators.

Funding: This work was supported by The Peder Sather Center for Advanced Study (to CKT and RED), the Research Council of Norway (#223273, #288083, #323951, #324252, #324499), the South-Eastern Norway Regional Health Authority (#2019069, #2021070, #2023012, #500189), and Nordforsk (#164218).

Data availability: Qualified researchers can request access to ABCD shared data from the NIMH Data Archive (NDA).

References

Achenbach, T. M., & Ruffle, T. M. (2000). The Child Behavior Checklist and Related Forms for Assessing Behavioral/Emotional Problems and Competencies. *Pediatrics in Review*, *21*(8), 265–271. https://doi.org/10.1542/pir.21-8-265

Alnæs, D., Kaufmann, T., Marquand, A. F., Smith, S. M., & Westlye, L. T. (2020). Patterns of sociocognitive stratification and perinatal risk in the child brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *117*(22), Article 22. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2001517117

Bartels, M. (2015). Genetics of Wellbeing and Its Components Satisfaction with Life, Happiness, and Quality of Life: A Review and Meta-analysis of Heritability Studies. *Behavior Genetics*, *45*(2), 137–156. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-015-9713-y

Bartels, M., Cacioppo, J. T., van Beijsterveldt, T. C. E. M., & Boomsma, D. I. (2013). Exploring the Association Between Well-Being and Psychopathology in Adolescents. *Behavior Genetics*, *43*(3), 177–190. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-013-9589-7

Baselmans, B. M. L., Jansen, R., Ip, H. F., van Dongen, J., Abdellaoui, A., van de Weijer, M. P., Bao, Y., Smart, M., Kumari, M., Willemsen, G., Hottenga, J.-J., BIOS consortium, Social Science Genetic Association Consortium, Boomsma, D. I., de Geus, E. J. C., Nivard, M. G., & Bartels, M. (2019). Multivariate genome-wide analyses of the well-being spectrum. *Nature Genetics*, *51*(3), 445–451. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-018-0320-8

Baselmans, B. M. L., Van De Weijer, M. P., Abdellaoui, A., Vink, J. M., Hottenga, J. J., Willemsen, G., Nivard, M. G., De Geus, E. J. C., Boomsma, D. I., & Bartels, M. (2019). A Genetic Investigation of the Well-Being Spectrum. *Behavior Genetics*, *49*(3), 286–297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-019-09951-0

Bashford-Largo, J., Blair, R. J. R., Blair, K. S., Dobbertin, M., Elowsky, J., Dominguez, A., Hatch, M., & Bajaj, S. (2024). Cortical volume alterations in the limbic network in adolescents with high reactive aggression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579424000750

Bjørnebekk, A., Fjell, A. M., Walhovd, K. B., Grydeland, H., Torgersen, S., & Westlye, L. T. (2013). Neuronal correlates of the five factor model (FFM) of human personality: Multimodal imaging in a large healthy sample. *NeuroImage*, *65*, 194–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.10.009

Blakemore, S.-J. (2019). Adolescence and mental health. *The Lancet*, *393*(10185), 2030–2031. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31013-X

Buckner, R. L., Head, D., Parker, J., Fotenos, A. F., Marcus, D., Morris, J. C., & Snyder, A. Z. (2004). A unified approach for morphometric and functional data analysis in young, old, and demented adults using automated atlas-based head size normalization: Reliability and validation against manual measurement of total intracranial volume. *NeuroImage*, *23*(2), 724–738. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.06.018

Cardenas-Iniguez, C., & Gonzalez, M. R. (2024). Recommendations for the responsible use and communication of race and ethnicity in neuroimaging research. *Nature Neuroscience*, *27*(4), 615–628. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-024-01608-4

Casey, B. J., Cannonier, T., Conley, M. I., Cohen, A. O., Barch, D. M., Heitzeg, M. M., Soules, M. E., Teslovich, T., Dellarco, D. V., Garavan, H., Orr, C. A., Wager, T. D., Banich, M. T., Speer, N. K., Sutherland, M. T., Riedel, M. C., Dick, A. S., Bjork, J. M., Thomas, K. M., … Dale, A. M. (2018). The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study: Imaging acquisition across 21 sites. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*, 43–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.03.001

Caspi, A., Houts, R. M., Belsky, D. W., Goldman-Mellor, S. J., Harrington, H., Israel, S., Meier, M. H., Ramrakha, S., Shalev, I., Poulton, R., & Moffitt, T. E. (2014). The p Factor: One General Psychopathology Factor in the Structure of Psychiatric Disorders? *Clinical Psychological Science*, *2*(2), 119–137. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702613497473

Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2018). All for One and One for All: Mental Disorders in One Dimension. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *175*(9), 831–844. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.17121383

Chi, W. E., Huang, S., Jeon, M., Park, E. S., Melguizo, T., & Kezar, A. (2022). A Practical Guide to Causal Mediation Analysis: Illustration With a Comprehensive College Transition Program and Nonprogram Peer and Faculty Interactions. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.886722

Choi, S. W., & O'Reilly, P. F. (2019). PRSice-2: Polygenic Risk Score software for biobank-scale data. *GigaScience*, *8*(7), giz082. https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giz082

Clark, D. A., Hicks, B. M., Angstadt, M., Rutherford, S., Taxali, A., Hyde, L., Weigard, A. S., Heitzeg, M. M., & Sripada, C. (2021). The General Factor of Psychopathology in the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study: A Comparison of Alternative Modeling Approaches. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 216770262095931. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702620959317

Clark, D. B., Fisher, C. B., Bookheimer, S., Brown, S. A., Evans, J. H., Hopfer, C., Hudziak, J., Montoya, I., Murray, M., Pfefferbaum, A., & Yurgelun-Todd, D. (2018). Biomedical ethics and clinical oversight in multisite observational neuroimaging studies with children and adolescents: The ABCD experience. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*, 143–154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2017.06.005

Dale, A. M., Fischl, B., & Sereno, M. I. (1999). Cortical Surface-Based Analysis. *NeuroImage*, *9*(2), 179–194. https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.1998.0395

Dalsgaard, S., Thorsteinsson, E., Trabjerg, B. B., Schullehner, J., Plana-Ripoll, O., Brikell, I., Wimberley, T., Thygesen, M., Madsen, K. B., Timmerman, A., Schendel, D., McGrath, J. J., Mortensen, P. B., & Pedersen, C. B. (2020). Incidence Rates and Cumulative Incidences of the Full Spectrum of Diagnosed Mental Disorders in Childhood and Adolescence. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *77*(2), 155. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.3523

De Vries, L. P., Van De Weijer, M. P., & Bartels, M. (2023). A systematic review of the neural correlates of well-being reveals no consistent associations. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *145*, 105036. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2023.105036

Dennison, M., Whittle, S., Yücel, M., Byrne, M. L., Schwartz, O., Simmons, J. G., & Allen, N. B. (2015). Trait positive affect is associated with hippocampal volume and change in caudate volume across adolescence. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, *15*(1), 80–94. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-014-0319-2

Desikan, R. S., Ségonne, F., Fischl, B., Quinn, B. T., Dickerson, B. C., Blacker, D., Buckner, R. L., Dale, A. M., Maguire, R. P., Hyman, B. T., Albert, M. S., & Killiany, R. J. (2006). An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *NeuroImage*, *31*(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.01.021

Diemer, M. A., Mistry, R. S., Wadsworth, M. E., López, I., & Reimers, F. (2013). Best Practices in Conceptualizing and Measuring Social Class in Psychological Research. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *13*(1), 77–113. https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12001

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L. (2018). Advances in subjective well-being research. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *2*(4), 253–260. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0307-6

Fernandez-Cabello, S., Alnæs, D., Van Der Meer, D., Dahl, A., Holm, M., Kjelkenes, R., Maximov, I. I., Norbom, L. B., Pedersen, M. L., Voldsbekk, I., Andreassen, O. A., & Westlye, L. T. (2022). Associations between brain imaging and polygenic scores of mental health and educational attainment in children aged 9–11. *NeuroImage*, *263*, 119611. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2022.119611

Ferschmann, L., Fjell, A. M., Vollrath, M. E., Grydeland, H., Walhovd, K. B., & Tamnes, C. K. (2018). Personality Traits Are Associated With Cortical Development Across Adolescence: A Longitudinal Structural MRI Study. *Child Development*, *89*(3), 811–822. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13016

Fischl, B., Salat, D. H., Busa, E., Albert, M., Dieterich, M., Haselgrove, C., van der Kouwe, A., Killiany, R., Kennedy, D., Klaveness, S., Montillo, A., Makris, N., Rosen, B., & Dale, A. M. (2002). Whole Brain Segmentation. *Neuron*, *33*(3), 341–355. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(02)00569-X

Fischl, B., Sereno, M. I., & Dale, A. M. (1999). Cortical Surface-Based Analysis. *NeuroImage*, *9*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.1998.0396

Fortin, J.-P., Cullen, N., Sheline, Y. I., Taylor, W. D., Aselcioglu, I., Cook, P. A., Adams, P., Cooper, C., Fava, M., McGrath, P. J., McInnis, M., Phillips, M. L., Trivedi, M. H., Weissman, M. M., & Shinohara, R. T. (2018). Harmonization of cortical thickness measurements across scanners and sites. *NeuroImage*, *167*, 104–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.11.024

Fortin, J.-P., Parker, D., Tunç, B., Watanabe, T., Elliott, M. A., Ruparel, K., Roalf, D. R., Satterthwaite, T. D., Gur, R. C., Gur, R. E., Schultz, R. T., Verma, R., & Shinohara, R. T. (2017). Harmonization of multi-site diffusion tensor imaging data. *NeuroImage*, *161*, 149–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.08.047

Garavan, H., Bartsch, H., Conway, K., Decastro, A., Goldstein, R. Z., Heeringa, S., Jernigan, T., Potter, A., Thompson, W., & Zahs, D. (2018). Recruiting the ABCD sample: Design considerations and procedures. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*, 16–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.04.004

Grasby, K. L., Jahanshad, N., Painter, J. N., Colodro-Conde, L., Bralten, J., Hibar, D. P., Lind, P. A., Pizzagalli, F., Ching, C. R. K., McMahon, M. A. B., Shatokhina, N., Zsembik, L. C. P., Thomopoulos, S. I., Zhu, A. H., Strike, L. T., Agartz, I., Alhusaini, S., Almeida, M. A. A., Alnæs, D., … Medland, S. E. (2020). The genetic architecture of the human cerebral cortex. *Science*, *367*(6484), Article 6484. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay6690

Hagler, D. J., Hatton, SeanN., Cornejo, M. D., Makowski, C., Fair, D. A., Dick, A. S., Sutherland, M. T., Casey, B. J., Barch, D. M., Harms, M. P., Watts, R., Bjork, J. M., Garavan, H. P., Hilmer, L., Pung, C. J., Sicat, C. S., Kuperman, J., Bartsch, H., Xue, F., … Dale, A. M. (2019). Image processing and analysis methods for the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study. *NeuroImage*, *202*, 116091. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116091

Helliwell, J. F., & Aknin, L. B. (2018). Expanding the social science of happiness. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *2*(4), 248–252. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0308-5

Holmes, A. J., Lee, P. H., Hollinshead, M. O., Bakst, L., Roffman, J. L., Smoller, J. W., & Buckner, R. L. (2012). Individual Differences in Amygdala-Medial Prefrontal Anatomy Link Negative Affect, Impaired Social Functioning, and Polygenic Depression Risk. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *32*(50), 18087–18100. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2531-12.2012

Jamshidi, J., Park, H. R. P., Montalto, A., Fullerton, J. M., & Gatt, J. M. (2022). Wellbeing and brain structure: A comprehensive phenotypic and genetic study of image-derived phenotypes in the UK Biobank. *Human Brain Mapping*, *43*(17), 5180–5193. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.25993

Jebb, A. T., Tay, L., Diener, E., & Oishi, S. (2018). Happiness, income satiation and turning points around the world. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *2*(1), 33–38. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0277-0

Jernigan, T. L., & Brown, S. A. (2018). Introduction. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.02.002

Johnson, W. E., Li, C., & Rabinovic, A. (2007). Adjusting batch effects in microarray expression data using empirical Bayes methods. *Biostatistics*, *8*(1), 118–127. https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxj037

Karcher, N. R., Paul, S. E., Johnson, E. C., Hatoum, A. S., Baranger, D. A. A., Agrawal, A., Thompson, W. K., Barch, D. M., & Bogdan, R. (2022). Psychotic-like Experiences and Polygenic Liability in the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, *7*(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2021.06.012

Kong, F., Ding, K., Yang, Z., Dang, X., Hu, S., Song, Y., & Liu, J. (2015). Examining gray matter structures associated with individual differences in global life satisfaction in a large sample of young adults. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *10*(7), 952–960. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsu144

Lahey, B. B., Durham, E. L., Brislin, S. J., Barr, P. B., Dick, D. M., Moore, T. M., Pierce, B. L., Tong, L., Reimann, G. E., Jeong, H. J., Dupont, R. M., & Kaczkurkin, A. N. (2024). Mapping potential pathways from polygenic liability through brain structure to psychological problems across the transition to adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *65*(8), 1047–1060. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13944

Lewis, G. J., Kanai, R., Rees, G., & Bates, T. C. (2014). Neural correlates of the 'good life': Eudaimonic well-being is associated with insular cortex volume. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *9*(5), 615–618. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nst032

Lindseth, L. R. S., Beck, D., Westlye, L. T., Tamnes, C. K., & Norbom, L. B. (2024). *Linking Pre- and Perinatal Risk Factors to a Multivariate Fusion of Child Cortical Structure*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.29.620834

Luhmann, M., Hofmann, W., Eid, M., & Lucas, R. E. (2012). Subjective well-being and adaptation to life events: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(3), 592–615. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025948

MacSweeney, N., Toenders, Y. J., & Tamnes, C. K. (in press). Neuroimaging insights into adolescent depression risk and development: Lessons learned and ways forward. *Nature Mental Health*.

Martin, A. R., Kanai, M., Kamatani, Y., Okada, Y., Neale, B. M., & Daly, M. J. (2019). Clinical use of current polygenic risk scores may exacerbate health disparities. *Nature Genetics*, *51*(4), 584–591. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0379-x

Matsunaga, M., Kawamichi, H., Koike, T., Yoshihara, K., Yoshida, Y., Takahashi, H. K., Nakagawa, E., & Sadato, N. (2016). Structural and functional associations of the rostral anterior cingulate cortex with subjective happiness. *NeuroImage*, *134*, 132–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.04.020

McCormick, E. M., Byrne, M. L., Flournoy, J. C., Mills, K. L., & Pfeifer, J. H. (2023). The Hitchhiker's guide to longitudinal models: A primer on model selection for repeated-measures methods. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *63*, 101281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2023.101281

McNeish, D., Stapleton, L. M., & Silverman, R. D. (2017). On the unnecessary ubiquity of hierarchical linear modeling. *Psychological Methods*, *22*(1), 114–140. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000078

Merz, E. C., Strack, J., Hurtado, H., Vainik, U., Thomas, M., Evans, A., & Khundrakpam, B. (2022). Educational attainment polygenic scores, socioeconomic factors, and cortical structure in children and adolescents. *Human Brain Mapping*, *43*(16), 4886–4900. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.26034

Michelini, G., Barch, D. M., Tian, Y., Watson, D., Klein, D. N., & Kotov, R. (2019). Delineating and validating higher-order dimensions of psychopathology in the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study. *Translational Psychiatry*, *9*(1), 261. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-019-0593-4

Mills, K. L., Goddings, A.-L., Herting, M. M., Meuwese, R., Blakemore, S.-J., Crone, E. A., Dahl, R. E., Güroğlu, B., Raznahan, A., Sowell, E. R., & Tamnes, C. K. (2016). Structural brain development between childhood and adulthood: Convergence across four longitudinal samples. *NeuroImage*, *141*, 273–281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.07.044

Mooney, M. A., Bhatt, P., Hermosillo, R. J. M., Ryabinin, P., Nikolas, M., Faraone, S. V., Fair, D. A., Wilmot, B., & Nigg, J. T. (2021). Smaller total brain volume but not subcortical structure volume related to common genetic risk for ADHD. *Psychological Medicine*, *51*(8), 1279–1288. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291719004148

Norbom, L. B., Rokicki, J., Eilertsen, E. M., Wiker, T., Hanson, J., Dahl, A., Alnæs, D., Fernández-Cabello, S., Beck, D., Agartz, I., Andreassen, O. A., Westlye, L. T., & Tamnes, C. K. (2024). Parental education and income are linked to offspring cortical brain structure and psychopathology at 9–11 years. *JCPP Advances*, *4*(1), e12220. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcv2.12220

Norbom, L. B., Rokicki, J., van der Meer, D., Alnæs, D., Doan, N. T., Moberget, T., Kaufmann, T., Andreassen, O. A., Westlye, L. T., & Tamnes, C. K. (2020). Testing relationships between multimodal modes of brain structural variation and age, sex and polygenic scores for neuroticism in children and adolescents. *Translational Psychiatry*, *10*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-020-00931-1

Okbay, A., Baselmans, B. M. L., De Neve, J.-E., Turley, P., Nivard, M. G., Fontana, M. A., Meddens, S. F. W., Linnér, R. K., Rietveld, C. A., Derringer, J., Gratten, J., Lee, J. J., Liu, J. Z., Vlaming, R. de, Ahluwalia, T. S., Buchwald, J., Cavadino, A., Frazier-Wood, A. C., Furlotte, N. A., … Cesarini, D. (2016). Genetic variants associated with subjective well-being, depressive symptoms, and neuroticism identified through genome-wide analyses. *Nature Genetics*, *48*(6), 624–633. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3552

Pine, J. G., Paul, S. E., Johnson, E., Bogdan, R., Kandala, S., & Barch, D. M. (2023). Polygenic Risk for Schizophrenia, Major Depression, and Post-traumatic Stress Disorder and Hippocampal Subregion Volumes in Middle Childhood. *Behavior Genetics*, *53*(3), 279–291. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-023-10134-1

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing* [Computer software]. https://www.R-project.org/

Riccelli, R., Toschi, N., Nigro, S., Terracciano, A., & Passamonti, L. (2017). Surface-based morphometry reveals the neuroanatomical basis of the five-factor model of personality. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, nsw175. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw175

Rohrer, J. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2020). *Causal Effects of Well-Being on Health: It's Complicated* [Preprint]. PsyArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/wgbe4

Røysamb, E., & Nes, R. B. (2018). The genetics of wellbeing. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L. Tay (Eds.), *Handbook of well-being*. DEF Publishers.

Røysamb, E., & Nes, R. B. (2019). The role of genetics in subjective well-being. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *3*(1), 3–3. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0494-1

Røysamb, E., Nes, R. B., Czajkowski, N. O., & Vassend, O. (2018). Genetics, personality and wellbeing. A twin study of traits, facets and life satisfaction. *Scientific Reports*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-29881-x

RStudio Team. (2020). *RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio* (Version 4.1.1717) [Computer software]. RStudio, PBC. http://www.rstudio.com/.

Sato, W., Kochiyama, T., Uono, S., Kubota, Y., Sawada, R., Yoshimura, S., & Toichi, M. (2015). The structural neural substrate of subjective happiness. *Scientific Reports*, *5*(1), 16891. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep16891

Schmaal, L., Hibar, D. P., Sämann, P. G., Hall, G. B., Baune, B. T., Jahanshad, N., Cheung, J. W., van Erp, T. G. M., Bos, D., Ikram, M. A., Vernooij, M. W., Niessen, W. J., Tiemeier, H., Hofman, A., Wittfeld, K., Grabe, H. J., Janowitz, D., Bülow, R., Selonke, M., … Veltman, D. J. (2017). Cortical abnormalities in adults and adolescents with major depression based on brain scans from 20 cohorts worldwide in the ENIGMA Major Depressive Disorder Working Group. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *22*(6), 900–909. https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2016.60

Schmaal, L., Pozzi, E., C. Ho, T., Van Velzen, L. S., Veer, I. M., Opel, N., Van Someren, E. J. W., Han, L. K. M., Aftanas, L., Aleman, A., Baune, B. T., Berger, K., Blanken, T. F., Capitão, L., Couvy-Duchesne, B., R. Cullen, K., Dannlowski, U., Davey, C., Erwin-Grabner, T., … Veltman, D. J. (2020). ENIGMA MDD: Seven years of global neuroimaging studies of major depression through worldwide data sharing. *Translational Psychiatry*, *10*(1), 172. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-020-0842-6

Schmaal, L., Veltman, D. J., van Erp, T. G. M., Sämann, P. G., Frodl, T., Jahanshad, N., Loehrer, E., Tiemeier, H., Hofman, A., Niessen, W. J., Vernooij, M. W., Ikram, M. A., Wittfeld, K., Grabe, H. J., Block, A., Hegenscheid, K., Völzke, H., Hoehn, D., Czisch, M., … for the ENIGMA-Major Depressive Disorder Working Group. (2016). Subcortical brain alterations in major depressive disorder: Findings from the ENIGMA Major Depressive Disorder working group. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *21*(6), 806–812. https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2015.69

Shen, X., MacSweeney, N., Chan, S. W. Y., Barbu, M. C., Adams, M. J., Lawrie, S. M., Romaniuk, L., McIntosh, A. M., & Whalley, H. C. (2021). Brain structural associations with depression in a large early adolescent sample (the ABCD study®). *EClinicalMedicine*, *42*, 101204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101204

Song, L., Meng, J., Liu, Q., Huo, T., Zhu, X., Li, Y., Ren, Z., Wang, X., & Qiu, J. (2019). Polygenic Score of Subjective Well-Being Is Associated with the Brain Morphology in Superior Temporal Gyrus and Insula. *Neuroscience*, *414*, 210–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2019.05.055

Stein, J. L., Medland, S. E., Vasquez, A. A., Senstad, R. E., Hibar, D. P., EPIGEN Consortium, the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI), IMAGEN Consortium, Saguenay Youth Study Group (SYS), Cohorts for Heart and Aging Research in Genomic Epidemiology (CHARGE) Consortium, for the Enhancing Neuro Imaging Genetics through Meta-Analysis (ENIGMA) Consortium, Winkler, A. M., Toro, R., Appel, K., Bartecek, R., Bergmann, Ø., Bernard, M., Brown, A. A., Cannon, D. M., …

Thompson, P. M. (2012). Identification of common variants associated with human hippocampal and intracranial volumes. *Nature Genetics*, *44*(5), 552–561. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.2250

Takeuchi, H., Taki, Y., Nouchi, R., Hashizume, H., Sassa, Y., Sekiguchi, A., Kotozaki, Y., Nakagawa, S., Nagase, T., Miyauchi, C. M., & Kawashima, R. (2014). Anatomical correlates of quality of life: Evidence from voxel-based morphometry: Brain Structure and QOL. *Human Brain Mapping*, *35*(5), 1834–1846. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22294

Tingley, D., Yamamoto, T., Hirose, K., Keele, L., & Imai, K. (2014). mediation: R Package for Causal Mediation Analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *59*(5). https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v059.i05

Tucker-Drob, E. M., Briley, D. A., & Harden, K. P. (2013). Genetic and Environmental Influences on Cognition Across Development and Context. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *22*(5), 349–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721413485087

Van ‘t Ent, D., den Braber, A., Baselmans, B. M. L., Brouwer, R. M., Dolan, C. V., Hulshoff Pol, H. E., de Geus, E. J. C., & Bartels, M. (2017). Associations between subjective well-being and subcortical brain volumes. *Scientific Reports*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-07120-z

Volkow, N. D., Koob, G. F., Croyle, R. T., Bianchi, D. W., Gordon, J. A., Koroshetz, W. J., Pérez-Stable, E. J., Riley, W. T., Bloch, M. H., Conway, K., Deeds, B. G., Dowling, G. J., Grant, S., Howlett, K. D., Matochik, J. A., Morgan, G. D., Murray, M. M., Noronha, A., Spong, C. Y., … Weiss, S. R. B. (2018). The conception of the ABCD study: From substance use to a broad NIH collaboration. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*, 4–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2017.10.002

Walhovd, K. B., Fjell, A. M., Wang, Y., Amlien, I. K., Mowinckel, A. M., Lindenberger, U., Düzel, S., Bartrés-Faz, D., Ebmeier, K. P., Drevon, C. A., Baaré, W. F. C., Ghisletta, P., Johansen, L. B., Kievit, R. A., Henson, R. N., Madsen, K. S., Nyberg, L., R Harris, J., Solé-Padullés, C., … Brandmaier, A. M. (2022). Education and Income Show Heterogeneous Relationships to Lifespan Brain and Cognitive Differences Across European and US Cohorts. *Cerebral Cortex*, *32*(4), 839–854. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhab248

Whiteford, H. A., Degenhardt, L., Rehm, J., Baxter, A. J., Ferrari, A. J., Erskine, H. E., Charlson, F. J., Norman, R. E., Flaxman, A. D., Johns, N., Burstein, R., Murray, C. J., & Vos, T. (2013). Global burden of disease attributable to mental and substance use disorders: Findings from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The Lancet*, *382*(9904), 1575–1586. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61611-6

Yang, J., Wei, D., Wang, K., & Qiu, J. (2013). Gray matter correlates of dispositional optimism: A voxel-based morphometry study. *Neuroscience Letters*, *553*, 201–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2013.08.032

Zhu, X., Wang, K., Chen, L., Cao, A., Chen, Q., Li, J., & Qiu, J. (2018). Together Means More Happiness: Relationship Status Moderates the Association between Brain Structure and Life Satisfaction. *Neuroscience*, *384*, 406–416. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2018.05.018

Figures



Figure 1. Density plots of study variables for males (blue) and females (pink).



Figure 2. Mediation analyses exploring ICV as a mediator of the association between wellbeing PGS and child psychopathology (p-factor, internalizing problems, and externalizing problems). Significance was tested using a bootstrapping procedure with 5000 iterations. ACME = Average causal mediation effect (indirect effect). ADE = average direct effect. 95% confidence intervals are depicted for ACME, ADE, and total effect.



Figure 3. Interactions analyses between wellbeing PGS and parental education and financial adversity on ICV and child psychopathology. Linear regression analyses were performed with continuous measures of parental education and financial adversity, and with sex, age, 20 population components, and genotype batch as covariates. For illustration purposes, the sample was split into three groups based on standard deviations in parental education and financial adversity.

Tables

Variable	n	Mean (SD)	Min-max
Age in years	10471	9.9 (0.6)	8.9-11.1
P-factor	10468	6.5 (7.0)	0.0-55.6
Internalizing	10468	3.7 (4.2)	0.0-38.0
Externalizing	10468	4.1 (5.3)	0.0-43.8
Parental education	9873	17.3 (2.5)	3-21
Financial adversity	9955	0.5 (1.2)	0-7

Table 1. Sample descriptive statistics. N = sample size, SD = standard deviation.

Variable	Age	Sex	Wellbeing PGS	P-factor	Internalizing	Externalizing	Parental education	Financial adversity
Age	-							
Sex	-.02	-						
Wellbeing PGS	.01	< -.01	-					
P-factor	-.02	-.07	-.07	-				
Internalizing	< .01	-.01	-.04	.86	-			
Externalizing	-.03	-.11	-.08	.92	.58	-		
Parental education	.01	< -.01	.24	-.09	-.04	-.11	-	
Financial adversity	-.01	< .01	-.14	.19	.16	.19	-.30	-

Table 2. Correlations between study variables.

	Surface area		Thickness	
Cortical region	**B**	**p**	**B**	**p**
Bankssts	-0.817	.613	0.002	.155
Caudalanteriorcingulate	-0.893	.504	0.002	.289
Caudalmiddlefrontal	0.974	.820	<-0.001	.988
Cuneus	-1.696	.396	0.002	.130
Entorhinal	1.335	.089	-0.001	.814
Fusiform	2.929	.041	0.001	.449
Inferiorparietal	-1.943	.078	0.002	.194
Inferiortemporal	0.965	.827	0.002	.347
Isthmuscingulate	1.290	.437	-0.002	.376
Lateraloccipital	0.424	.943	0.001	.515
Lateralorbitofrontal	2.565	.336	0.004	.025
Lingual	-3.620	.355	<0.001	.823
Medialorbitofrontal	3.276	.097	0.003	.146
Middletemporal	1.242	.768	0.003	.165
Parahippocampal	-2.764	.015	0.003	.219
Paracentral	-0.597	.767	0.002	.123
Parsopercularis	-3.790	.142	0.002	.254
Parsorbitalis	0.504	.544	0.005	.030
Parstriangularis	-0.542	.817	0.003	.094
Pericalcarine	-1.876	.428	0.002	.234
Postcentral	-3.698	.476	-0.002	.274
Posteriorcingulate	0.370	.835	<0.001	.952
Precentral	3.621	.533	0.002	.139
Precuneus	-1.803	.684	<0.001	.570
Rostralanteriorcingulate	1.040	.378	0.002	.363
Rostralmiddlefrontal	9.767	.226	0.002	.146
Superiorfrontal	8.388	.301	0.001	.389
Superiorparietal	3.272	.637	0.001	.504
Superiortemporal	0.472	.913	0.001	.539
Supramarginal	9.760	.098	0.001	.473
Frontalpole	0.230	.545	0.003	.338
Temporalpole	0.576	.282	<-0.001	.992
Transversetemporal	0.142	.816	-0.002	.386
Insula	4.922	.018	0.002	.133

Table 3. Beta values (unstandardized) and p-values for wellbeing PGS effects on regional cortical surface area and thickness, controlling for sex, age, 20 population components, genotype batch, and intracranial volume (for analyses on area).

Subcortical region	B	p
Accumbens	1.270	.219
Amygdala	1.147	.557
Caudate	-6.973	.182
Hippocampus	3.998	.271
Pallidum	-0.904	.639
Putamen	-3.409	.582
Thalamus	7.169	.163
Cerebral white matter	112.835	.513
Cerebellum gray matter	69.375	.152
Cerebellum white matter	2.719	.892

Table 4. Beta values (unstandardized) and p-values for wellbeing PGS effects on brain volumes, controlling for sex, age, 20 population components, genotype batch, and intracranial volume.