**Socioeconomic context influences the heritability of child cortical structure**

Linn B. Norbom, PhD[a], Espen M. Eilertsen, PhD[a], Andreas Dahl, MPhil[b,d], Valerie Karl, MS[a], Lars T. Westlye, PhD[b,c,d], Christian K. Tamnes, PhD[a,e]

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

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

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

[d] Center for Precision Psychiatry, Division of Mental Health and Addiction, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

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

* Corresponding author: l.c.b.norbom@psykologi.uio.no

Funding: This work was supported by the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and Innovation program (802998), the Research Council of Norway (#288083, #300767, #323951), and the South-Eastern Norway Regional Health Authority (#2021070, #2023012, #500189).

**Abstract**

Children differ in brain cortical morphometry and microstructure, which together form the structural foundation for cognition. Cortical structure is highly heritable, but whether heritability varies across socioeconomic status (SES) is unknown. In this preregistered study, we estimated single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP)-based heritability of cortical thickness, surface area, sulcal depth, and grey-/white-matter contrast (GWC) among 9,080 US 10-year-olds. We then tested whether genetic and environmental influences were moderated by parental SES, defined as a composite of income, education, and neighbourhood deprivation. Cortical thickness and surface area showed high heritability, while sulcal depth and GWC exhibited moderate heritability. However, among children from lower-SES backgrounds, cortical differences were less genetically influenced and more influenced by unique environmental factors, at times exceeding genetic contributions. These findings suggest that in contexts of socioeconomic disadvantage, children's brain structure reflect lived experience more strongly than previously recognized.

## Introduction

Nearly all human characteristics arise from a combination of genetic and environmental influences. Heritability quantifies the proportion of variation in a trait that is attributable to genetic differences, with estimates based on single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) typically being lower than those derived from family studies (Yang et al., 2017). The cerebral cortex, the brain's outer folded layer, shows individual differences in morphological features such as thickness, surface area, and folding patterns, as well as in microstructural properties reflected in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)-based signal intensity. These structural variations are closely linked to developmental stage (Bethlehem et al., 2022; Norbom et al., 2021) and relate to cognitive functions (Girault et al., 2020; Grydeland et al., 2013; Norbom et al., 2020; Oschwald et al., 2019) and mental health (Boedhoe et al., 2020; Norbom et al., 2019).

Neuroimaging studies document that brain structure is highly heritable, with family-based estimates in the range of 60-80%, with age-, metric-, and region-specific variation (Fernandez-Cabello et al., 2022; Pizzagalli et al., 2020; Strike et al., 2019). However, research has largely overlooked the notion that genetic influences may vary across socioeconomic contexts (De Zeeuw et al., 2019; Marees et al., 2021; Rowe et al., 1999; Scarr-Salapatek, 1971). While socioeconomic status (SES) is related to cortical structure itself (Farah, 2017; Norbom et al., 2022, 2024; Rakesh & Whittle, 2021), it is unknown to which degree its genetic influences also depend on SES. Genetic moderation by SES has mainly been explored in cognitive research.

Twin studies estimate cognitive abilities to be 50-70% heritable, depending on age and the specific ability studied (Bergen et al., 2007; Briley & Tucker-Drob, 2013; Haworth et al., 2010; Smith et al., 2023). Several studies have found that the heritability of cognition is positively moderated by SES. This pattern, known as the "Scarr-Rowe hypothesis", was first

reported in the US in the 1970s (Scarr-Salapatek, 1971) and later replicated in Sweden (Fischbein, 1980) and again in the US (Rowe et al., 1999), though recent findings are mixed (Figlio et al., 2017; Gottschling et al., 2019; Tucker-Drob & Bates, 2016). A commonly proposed mechanism for this relation is that that children from low SES backgrounds have fewer opportunities to develop their predispositions, limiting the expression of their genetic potential. In contrast, genetic influences on cognitive traits may be maximized in high SES-settings, where resources are more readily available (Harden et al., 2007; Tucker-Drob et al., 2011). Alternative theoretical frameworks include the "Pareto hypothesis" which posits that the genetic potential of cognitive abilities is most fully expressed in middle-class environments and restricted in both low and high SES groups due to limiting-, and buffering protective factors, respectively (Lin, 2020). The "Saunders hypothesis" focuses solely on the protective role of high SES, suggesting that genetic potential is less fully expressed within this stratum (Lin, 2020).

Despite extensive research on how the heritability of cognitive abilities varies by socioeconomic standing, no study has examined whether SES similarly moderates the heritability of cortical structure. Addressing this gap could reveal whether children's brains are shaped differently by their inherited predispositions and lived experience depending on socioeconomic context.

In this preregistered study, we tested whether genetic and environmental influences on cortical structure in childhood are moderated by parental SES. We analysed cross-sectional data from over 9,000 children and their parents from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study. Genetic effects were assessed via SNP genotypes, cortical structure via MRI based global and lobar cortical thickness, surface area, sulcal depth, and grey/white-matter contrast (GWC), and SES via a composite of parental income, education, and neighbourhood

deprivation. Additionally, we examined the genetic and environmental effects on cognitive abilities within the same sample.

## Results

### *Genetic influence on cortical structure and moderation by parental SES*

Cortical thickness

Baseline linear mixed effects modelling without genetic or environmental interaction terms revealed a SNP-based heritability for mean cortical thickness of $h^2 = 0.82$ after controlling for age, sex, and genetic principal components (PC) related to population stratification.

Likelihood ratio tests comparing the baseline main effects-model and the interaction model between the SES index and additive genetic, shared environment, and unique environmental factors yielded a non-significant interaction after multiple comparisons correction ($x^2 = 8.27$, Df = 3, $p = 0.04$, corrected $p = 0.051$), thus providing no indication that the heritability of global cortical thickness differs across SES levels. Baseline lobar analyses revealed that the heritability of cortical thickness varied between 0.69-0.80, depending on region (Figure 1 and Supplementary Information (SI) Table 1). Further, likelihood ratio tests indicated that the genetic and environmental factors contributing to the heritability of parietal ($x^2 = 12.56$, Df = 3, $p = 0.006$, corrected $p = 0.015$) and occipital thickness ($x^2 = 9.47$, Df = 3, $p = 0.024$, corrected $p = 0.04$) varied across SES levels (Table 1). Specifically, the heritability of parietal and occipital thickness was higher for children in high SES settings, due to increased additive genetic effects and reduced unique environmental influences, while shared environmental effects remain consistently negligible across SES levels (Figure 2).

Heritability estimates for all imaging metrics derived from a twin-based method yielded similar results, and are presented in the SI Results.




Figure 1. Lobar heritability estimates for cortical thickness, surface area, sulcal depth and grey/white-matter contrast. This figure presents lobar heritability estimates for cortical thickness, surface area, and grey/white-matter contrast, mapped onto the Desikan-Killiany atlas. The left and right hemispheres are identical within each metric due to averaging across hemispheres.

| **Imaging metric and lobe** | **ChiSq** | **Df** | **P** | **P corrected** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Thickness cingulate | 0.11 | 3 | 0.991 | 0.991 |
| Thickness frontal | 4.05 | 3 | 0.256 | 0.295 |
| Thickness occipital | 9.47 | 3 | **0.024*** | **0.040*** |
| Thickness parietal | 12.56 | 3 | **0.006*** | **0.015*** |
| Thickness temporal | 6.61 | 3 | 0.086 | 0.114 |
| Area cingulate | 6.48 | 3 | 0.091 | 0.114 |
| Area frontal | 9.71 | 3 | **0.021*** | **0.039*** |
| Area occipital | 8.73 | 3 | **0.033*** | **0.050*** |
| Area parietal | 11.54 | 3 | **0.009*** | **0.019*** |
| Area temporal | 12.91 | 3 | **0.005*** | **0.015*** |
| GWC cingulate | 16.22 | 3 | **0.001*** | **0.007*** |
| GWC frontal | 13.00 | 3 | **0.005*** | **0.015*** |
| GWC occipital | 3.55 | 3 | 0.315 | 0.337 |
| GWC parietal | 12.30 | 3 | **0.006*** | **0.015*** |
| GWC temporal | 16.95 | 3 | **0.001*** | **0.007*** |

Table 1. Interaction tests for relevant imaging metrics. The table presents interaction test results for various imaging metrics across brain lobes. It includes Chi-square (ChiSq) values, degrees of freedom (Df), uncorrected (P), and corrected p-values (P corrected). Significant interactions ($p \leq 0.05$) are marked in bold. Based on global findings, lobar sulcal depth was not tested.




Figure 2. Genetic and environmental variance of parietal (left) and occipital (right) thickness across SES. The image displays splines representing heritability (dark brown), along with its components: additive genetics (green), shared environment (dark orange) and unique environment (yellow) for cortical thickness across the standardized SES construct. The density distribution of SES is shown as a shaded area along the x-axis, around 0. The dotted grey line shows the total phenotypic variance (A + C + E).

Surface area

SNP-based heritability for total surface area was $h^2 = 0.82$ after controlling for age, sex, and population stratification. Likelihood ratio tests yielded a non-significant interaction between the SES index and genetic and environmental factors after correction ($x^2$=8.34, df=3, p=0.04, corrected p = 0.051), thus providing no indication that the heritability of global surface area differs across SES levels. Lobar analyses revealed that heritability varied between 0.69-0.90 (Figure 1 and SI Table 1). Moreover, genetic and environmental contributions to 4 out of 5 lobes, namely frontal, parietal, temporal and occipital surface area, varied across SES (Table 1). Specifically, the heritability of surface area was higher for children from high-SES settings due to increased additive genetic effects, while environmental influences generally remained

negligible-, or were lower in high SES settings. This was except unique environmental influences, which were slightly higher in high-SES settings for occipital surface area (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Genetic and environmental variance of frontal (upper left), parietal (upper right), temporal (lower left) and occipital (lower right) surface area across SES. The image displays splines representing heritability ($h^2$; brown), along with its components: additive genetics (A; green), shared environment (C; dark orange) and unique environment (E; yellow) for cortical surface area across the standardized SES construct. The dotted grey line shows the total phenotypic variance (A + C + E).

Sulcal depth

Mean sulcal depth showed a heritability of $h^2 = 0.57$ after controlling for relevant covariates. There was no significant interaction between the SES-index and the genetic and environmental factors ($x^2 = 1.08$, df = 3, p = 0.781, corrected p = 0.781), thus providing no indication that the heritability of global sulcal depth differs across SES levels. Lobar heritability varied between 0.34 and 0.61 (Figure 1 and SI Table 1). Due to the low chi-square value and non-significance before correction, we did not proceed with lobar assessments of sulcal depth.

GWC

SNP-based heritability for GWC was $h^2 = 0.57$ after controlling for age, sex, and population stratification. Likelihood ratio tests revealed an interaction between the SES index and genetic and environmental factors ($x^2 = 13.59$, df = 3, p = 0.004, corrected p = 0.010). The results indicate that the heritability of global GWC was higher in children from high-SES backgrounds due to increased additive genetic effects and a marked reduction in unique environmental influences, along with a slight decrease in shared environmental effects. In contrast, for children from low-SES backgrounds, unique environmental influences exceed genetic contributions, suggesting that these experiences play a greater role in shaping GWC under such circumstances (Figure 3). Lobar analyses showed that the heritability of GWC varied between 0.48 and 0.59 (Figure 1 and SI Table 1). Genetic and environmental factors varied across SES levels for four out of five lobes, namely the cingulate, frontal, parietal, and occipital lobes (Table 1), with patterns generally resembling the global pattern (Figure 4), except for a somewhat varying contribution from shared environmental influences.




Figure 3. Genetic and environmental variance of mean grey-white matter contrast (GWC) across SES. The image displays splines representing heritability (brown), along with its components: additive genetics (green), shared environment (dark orange) and unique environment (yellow) for mean GWC across the standardized SES construct. The dotted grey line shows the total phenotypic variance (A + C + E).




Figure 4. Genetic and environmental variance of frontal (upper left), parietal (upper right), temporal (lower left) and cingulate (lower right) GWC across SES. The image displays splines representing heritability (brown), along with its components: additive genetics (green), shared environment (dark orange) and unique environment (yellow) for GWC across the standardized SES construct. The dotted grey line shows the total phenotypic variance (A + C + E).

*Genetic and environmental influence on general cognitive ability and moderation by parental SES*

Baseline linear mixed effects modelling without genetic or environmental interaction terms revealed a SNP-based heritability for general cognitive ability of $h^2 = 0.57$ after controlling for age, sex, and population stratification. Likelihood ratio tests comparing the baseline main effects-model and the interaction model between the SES index and additive genetic, shared environment, and unique environmental factors yielded a significant interaction ($x^2 = 29.60$, Df = 3, p and corrected $p \leq 0.001$), indicating that these factors which constitute the heritability of general cognition vary across SES levels. More specifically, the heritability of general cognition was higher for children from high-SES settings, due to increased additive genetic effects and a reduction in unique and to a lesser extent shared environmental influences. In contrast, for children from lower SES, genetic and environmental impact appeared similar, with unique environmental influences exceeding genetic contributions (Figure 5).




Figure 5. Genetic and environmental variance of general cognitive ability across SES. The image displays splines representing heritability (brown), along with its components: additive genetics (green), shared environment (dark orange) and unique environment (yellow) for general cognitive ability across the standardized SES construct. The dotted grey line shows the total phenotypic variance (A + C + E).

## Discussion

In a sample of over 9000 10-year-old children from the US, we found that differences in cortical thickness and surface area were primarily influenced by genetic variation, while cortical folding

and intensity showed moderate heritability. Across cortical metrics, the frontal lobe was the most heritable region. These estimates align with previous research (Eyler et al., 2012; Jansen et al., 2015; Panizzon et al., 2012; Zhao et al., 2019), yet our study shows that they do not fully generalize to children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, where regional cortical structure appears to be more influenced by unique environmental factors, at times exceeding genetic influence. This parallels findings for cognitive abilities, including our own, and suggests that the balance between genetic and environmental contributions to child brain structure also shifts with socioeconomic context.

We find that cortical thickness and surface area are about 80% heritable in childhood, in line with general heritability estimates for T1-weighted cortical structure across the lifespan (Jansen et al., 2015). Our estimates show some discrepancies with those reported in a previous study using twin-based methods on the same sample (n=1544) (Maes et al., 2023). The study reported global thickness and surface area estimates of 66% and 95%, respectively, but with lower and more varied ROI based estimates. Discrepancies between the studies include their adjustment for self-reported ethnicity and three twin sites, whereas we included SES and genetic PCs in our models and harmonized cortical data across scanners. Leveraging a Canadian dataset of 57 monozygotic and 35 dizygotic 8-year-old twins, Yoon et al. (2010) reported vertex-wise heritability estimates of cortical thickness ranging from 0 to a maximum of 78% (left) and 67% (right) (Yoon et al., 2010). Assessing the twins surface area in native imaging space resulted in interclass correlations that indicated left to right heritability asymmetries of approximately 62% and 46% respectively (Yoon et al., 2012). However, these studies had a more limited sample size.

We found that sulcal depth and GWC were both moderately heritable, with estimates approaching 60%. While no prior study has specifically assessed either metric in childhood, our results are generally in line with previous studies of related metrics or in young adulthood. Maes and colleagues (2023) reported average convexity heritability below 40% across most ROIs. In young adulthood, Pizzagalli et al. (2020) estimated heritability to be 40% for mean sulcal depth in two separate Australian and American samples (Pizzagalli et al., 2020) and Schmitt et al. (2021) reported heritability estimates of 49% for average convexity and 61% for mean curvature in the same American sample. A study of Vietnamese twins in midlife reported ROI based heritability for GWC ranging from 0-66% (Panizzon et al., 2012), and a US-based twin study found approximately 50% heritability for a related intensity metric, the T1-weighted/T2-weighted (T1w/T2w)-ratio (Schmitt et al., 2020).

The heritability of cortical morphometry and microstructure is lower in children from lower- compared to higher SES families. This pattern was evident for occipital and parietal thickness, as well as for most of lobar surface area and GWC, but not for cortical folding. While genetic differences accounted for most of cortical variation among children from high-SES backgrounds, in low-SES settings, unique environmental factors appeared to play a larger role, corresponding to-, or even exceeding the influence of genetics. Shared environment or specifically, being part of the same family played a minimal role in shaping cortical structure in our study. The moderating effects of SES on the heritability, or on the genetic and environmental components, of cortical structure have not been previously tested. However, Chiang et al. (2011) used 705 Australian twins and their siblings to assess whether the heritability and additive genetic influences on white matter fractional anisotropy were moderated by occupational status. While they found no moderating effect on the heritability estimate, occupational status interacted

with the additive genetic component in isolated white matter voxels. Our results suggest that, much like previous (albeit inconsistent) findings for cognitive abilities (Gottschling et al., 2019; Rowe et al., 1999; Tucker-Drob et al., 2011; Tucker-Drob & Bates, 2016), and in line with our own cognitive findings, the genetic and environmental contributions to regional cortical morphometry and microstructure, key structural correlates of cognition, also vary with SES.

Our study cannot determine why unique environmental conditions associated with socioeconomic disadvantage play a greater role in explaining differences in child cortical structure. While our finding of positive SES moderation aligns with the Scarr-Rowe hypothesis, the underlying mechanism proposed by Scarr-Rowe may not. In our data, overall phenotypic variance in most cortical and general cognitive metrics was larger in lower-SES strata, suggesting that children from high-SES backgrounds are more similar to one another. Surface area, however, showed the opposite pattern. Still, if this were to generally reflect greater environmental homogeneity, it might align more closely with the "Saunders hypothesis" (Lin, 2020) than with the individualized opportunities posited for high-SES contexts in the Scarr-Rowe framework (Harden et al., 2007; Tucker-Drob et al., 2011). Based on the overall pattern observed in our data, although speculative, it is also conceivable that in high SES environments, neurobiological processes, which are under strong genetic control (Jan & Jan, 2003; S. Liu et al., 2019) and assumed to influence MRI based cortical structure, such as dendritic arborization, axon caliber, and cortical myelin (Norbom et al., 2021), cause differences in cortical structure. In contrast, in children from low SES families, certain unique environmental events or exposures (adverse or other) are more frequent and have broad non-specific effects on the same neurobiological processes, thus becoming the primary driver of cortical differences in these children. This is somewhat similar to the "social push" hypothesis which posits that

environmental as opposed to genetic factors become more central in explaining outcomes when conditions are extreme or adverse (Raine, 2002).

There are several limitations to our study. First, although we aimed to create a broad SES construct, we were unable to reliably include status related to the key SES subfactor occupation. Moreover the index does not capture subjective or cultural aspects of SES (W. M. Liu et al., 2004; Yosso, 2005). Second, our study can only capture associations and cannot infer causation. Third, our analyses are based on SNP data within families and therefore do not account for rare genetic variants, which, in some cases, have profound impact on both brain structure and function. Fourth, our ACE model cannot capture non-additive genetic effects such as dominance or epistasis. Finally, unique environmental influences are not specifically modelled, and as such, we cannot probe which experiences or exposures underlie the non-shared environmental variance.

Children differ in their cortical brain architecture. Our findings show that genetic and environmental contributions to regional cortical thickness, most of surface area, and both global and regional microstructure vary between socioeconomically advantaged and disadvantaged children. Among socioeconomically advantaged children, inherited predispositions appear to play a large role in shaping brain structure, whereas in contexts of socioeconomic disadvantage, structural brain variation may more strongly reflect a child's lived experience. Our study underscores the importance of considering context when interpreting brain heritability estimates.

## Methods and Materials

### *Participants*

Data was acquired from the ABCD Study using the annual release 5.1 (https://data-dict.abcdstudy.org/?) and 3.0 for SNP-based information. The ABCD study consists of nearly 12,000 US children, approximately 9-10 years old at the time of study inclusion, as well as their parents, with planned follow-ups for 10 years. The protocol contains comprehensive assessments of demographic information, genetics, behavior and brain structure and function (Feldstein Ewing et al., 2018). Recruitment was generally conducted through the school system and was informed by sex, ethnicity, SES, and urbanicity. Parental informed consent as well as child assent was obtained for all participants. The Institutional Review Board at the University of California, San Diego approved all aspects of the ABCD Study (Auchter et al., 2018) and the current study was conducted in line with the Helsinki Declaration and approved by the Regional Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics (REK 2019/943). Exclusion criteria and further details are presented in SI Methods.

The current study focused on baseline assessments from 11,868 participants. 1934 individuals were excluded due to missing data on either initial demographic, socioeconomic, neighborhood, cognitive, genetic ethnicity, family ID, scanner, imaging quality, or cortical macro- or microstructure-based variables of interest (SI Figure 1). 213 individuals were excluded due to failing imaging-based quality control (QC) (described below) and 641 children were excluded due to missing or poor-quality SNP-based relatedness data. The final sample thus consisted of 9080 children (4266=females) aged 8.9-11.1 years (mean = 9.9 SD= 0.63). Two individuals who were assigned intersex-male at birth were recoded as male to enhance statistical robustness while ensuring the inclusion of all relevant individuals to our study. SI Figure 2 shows the spread of SES and cognitive abilities for excluded individuals.

*Measurements of socioeconomic status and neighbourhood deprivation*

Socioeconomic information was reported by a parent or guardian on behalf of themselves and a partner if relevant. Parental and partner education was assessed by indicating the highest grade level or degree received, on a 22-point scale. We recoded this scale to assimilate years of education (SI Table 2) and parental education was then defined as the highest educational score of either the reporting parent or their partner if applicable.

Parental and partner income was assessed by indicating their earnings before taxes and other deductions over the past 12 months on a 10-point scale. Total combined income was measured using the same scale, reflecting all sources of family income over the past 12 months. We recoded these income brackets to the median point, pragmatically setting the maximum of the top bracket to $350,000 (SI Table 2) based on online reports indicating that the threshold for the top 1% of U.S households in 2018 was $434,454.80 (https://dqydj.com/2018-average-median-top-household-income-percentiles/). Parental income was defined as the highest value reported from parent, partner, or combined income. To account for diminishing marginal utility, we applied a natural logarithm transformation to the income data.

Neighborhood deprivation was assessed using a composite score from the Area Deprivation Index (ADI) in the "Residential History Derived Scores" data file. The ADI is the scaled and weighted sum of 17 US census variables, including measures of poverty, education, housing, and employment, with a higher score indicating greater deprivation (Kind et al., 2014).

In line with our pre-registration, we did not include assessments of occupation in this study. The rationale, detailed in the SI Information, is that the ABCD Occupation Survey does not rank occupations by status but instead provides status-neutral categories.

To create a single overarching SES index, we reduced z-scored parental education, parental income, and neighborhood deprivation by principal component analysis (PCA) in R

using the “prcomp” package. The first component, which explained 65% of the total variance, was extracted as the overarching “SES-index” with contributions from income (38.5%), education (36.1%), and neighborhood deprivation (25.4%). Higher values reflect higher income and education, and lower neighborhood deprivation (SI Figure 3). See SI Figure 4 for the distribution of SES and neighborhood-related variables in the final sample.

*Genotype Data Processing and Relatedness Estimation*

Genotype data was based on Data Release 3.0 and derived from saliva and blood samples (Uban et al., 2018). Genotyping was conducted using the Affymetrix NIDA SmokeScreen Array (Baurley et al., 2016), containing 733,293 SNPs, with samples processed at Rutgers University Cell and DNA Repository (RUCDR). Initial DNA-based QC was performed by RUCDR, followed by further QC by the ABCD Data Analysis and Informatics Resource Center (DAIRC) using the Ricopili pipeline (Lam et al., 2020). Pre-imputation steps followed TOPMed documentation and included identifying rare and common variants with PLINK v1.9, ensuring format consistency, converting to VCF format, and uploading to the TOPMed Imputation Server (Fan et al., 2023). Data was then imputed, with mixed ancestry references to improve accuracy for diverse populations and phased with Eagle v2.4 to determine allele arrangement on each chromosome.

Genetic relatedness among participants was estimated from the imputed genotype data (Fan et al., 2023). The matrix of all pairwise genetic relatedness coefficients is referred to as the GRM, with each cell representing genetic similarity between pairs and self-relatedness along the diagonal. In samples of unrelated individuals, this matrix can be used to estimate the additive genetic contribution of all tagged and imputed SNPs (Yang et al., 2017). When applied to

samples of related individuals, Smith and colleagues (2023) suggested that all relatedness coefficients in the GRM could be set to zero between non-family members, such that the additive genetic effect is only correlated among members of the same family. The method was suggested to perform well when applied to cognitive phenotypes in the ABCD study, and was implemented in the current application.

For validation, we additionally calculated heritability based on a twin based method as detailed in SI Methods. This analysis was not pre-registered.

*MRI acquisition, quality control, preprocessing, and scanner harmonization*

Imaging data was acquired on 29 separate 3T scanners from Siemens Prisma, General Electric (GE) 750 and Philips. The T1w image was an inversion prepared RF-spoiled gradient echo scan, with prospective motion correction when available, and a 1 mm isotropic voxel resolution. Detailed descriptions of acquisition parameters, and child-friendly MRI practices are presented elsewhere (Casey et al., 2018).

Raw QC of the T1w sequences were performed by the ABCD Data Analysis and Informatics Core. They used a standardized pipeline of automated and manual procedures that yielded a binary code for images recommended for inclusion (Hagler et al., 2019).

We relied on FreeSurfer version 6.0 runs provided by the ABCD consortium to perform volumetric segmentations and cortical surface reconstructions. This process includes defining the “white” and “pial” surface, which is the grey/white matter boundary and the grey/cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) boundary, respectively (Dale et al., 1999; Fischl et al., 1999). Cortical thickness is then computed as the shortest vertex-wise distance between the white and pial surface, while vertex-wise surface area is calculated by summing the triangle areas converging at each

particular vertex on the white surface. Vertex-wise-sulcal depth is calculated as the mm signed distance a vertex moves during an inflation operation from the white- to the inflated surface. Values are median-standardized and scaled based on variance, so that a positive value indicates outward motion more than the median of all vertices indicating a deeper sulcus, whereas a negative value indicates inward motion and shallower sulci. GWC is calculated using intensity sampling from "rawavg.mgz", where white matter is sampled 1 mm below-, and grey matter is sampled 30% above the white surface. The vertex-wise percentage is then computed as:

$$100 \times \frac{white - grey}{\frac{white + grey}{2}}$$

In this way lower GWC reflects more similar grey and white matter, a blurring that is documented across youth development (Norbom et al., 2019). We used the global surface metrics from the tabulated files provided by the ABCD consortium, which are derived by averaging the values across all vertices, except for surface area where values are summed into a total.

To examine the spatial variability of interactions between the SES index and $h^2$, we also performed analyses at lobal granularity (frontal, parietal, temporal, occipital, and cingulate), reducing the Desikan atlas across hemispheres following FreeSurfer recommendations (Klein & Tourville, 2012). The fusiform gyrus, which spans both the occipital and temporal lobes, was assigned to the temporal lobe due to its stronger association with higher-order visual functions. The insula, which does not map cleanly to any conventional lobe and was represented by single values per hemisphere, was not included in lobar analyses. Surface area was summed, while the remaining metrics were averaged using a weighted-mean approach based on surface area.

In addition to raw image QC, we excluded individuals whose original surface showed extreme topological defects (i.e., holes, bumps, or handles), defined as exceeding 4 standard deviations from the mean on the “defect topology” variable for the left and right hemispheres.

To adjust for systematic and unwanted scanner related variance, imaging metrics were subsequently imported to R and the package neuroCombat (Fortin et al., 2018) was employed to harmonize data across each of the 29 scanners. We included relevant covariates to our model, namely age, sex, parental education, parental income, neighborhood deprivation, general cognitive ability, family ID, and 32 genetic PCs, to preserve such variance during the harmonization procedure. Box plots of global MRI measures pre- and post-neuroCombat adjustments are presented in SI Figure 5-8.

*Measurement of general cognitive ability*

Cognitive abilities were assessed using the neurocognitive battery “the NIH toolbox” (Bleck et al., 2013; Gershon et al., 2013; Hodes et al., 2013), administered on an iPad while monitored by a research assistant. The battery comprises seven tasks, covering episodic memory, executive function, attention, working memory, processing speed, and language (Luciana et al., 2018; Thompson et al., 2019). As a measure of general cognitive ability, we used the uncorrected total composite score of cognition. Figure 6 shows correlations between age, the SES-index, general cognitive ability, and global imaging metrics.




Figure 6. Correlations between relevant variables. The figure shows a correlation matrix between age, the SES-index, general cognitive abilities, and global metrics after scanner harmonization for the final sample.

*Statistical analyses*

This study was pre-registered at (https://osf.io/azucp). For each imaging metric and the general cognitive ability score, we fit a mixed effects "baseline model" using the svcm package in R (Eilertsen, 2021). These models, for individual $i$ in family $j$, include all main effects but no interaction terms and were specified as:

.

$$y_{ij} = \boldsymbol{w}'_{ij}\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \beta s_j + a_{ij} + c_j + e_{ij}.$$

In this linear model ($y$) represented the cortical or cognitive metric, $\gamma$ was the fixed effects of the covariates (e.g. age, sex and 32 genetic PCs derived by Fan et al., (2023) related to minimizing population stratification), and $\beta$ was the fixed effect of the SES index (s). The term $a$ was a person-varying random additive genetic effect, distributed across individuals according to the GRM with variance $\sigma_a^2$. The term $c$ was a family-varying random effect, independent across families with variance $\sigma_c^2$. The term $e$ was a person-varying random environmental/residual effect independent across individuals with variance $\sigma_e^2$. Under this model, the genetic and environmental components of variance do not depend on the SES index. Heritability ($h^2$) was calculated as the proportion of total variance, conditional on the fixed effects, explained by genetics:

$$h^2 \frac{\sigma_a^2}{\sigma_a^2 + \sigma_c^2 + \sigma_e^2}.$$

In a secondary set of "interaction models", we expanded the baseline model to include interaction terms between the SES index and random effects:

$$y_{ij} = \boldsymbol{w}_{ij}'\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \beta s_j + a_{1ij} + c_{1j} + e_{1ij} + s_j a_{2ij} + s_j c_{2j} + s_j e_{2ij}.$$

The three new terms $s_j a_{2ij} + s_j c_{2j} + s_j e_{2ij}$ were random slopes of $s_j$ regarding the genetic and environmental background factors, which had the consequence of inducing heteroscedastic variance. The random slope terms had similar distributions across individuals as in the baseline model, but with variances $\sigma_{a2}^2$, $\sigma_{c2}^2$, and $\sigma_{e2}^2$. Importantly, the genetic and environmental components of variance are now quadratic functions of SES. For the additive genetic variance, the function was:

$$\sigma_a^2(s) = \sigma_{a1}^2 + 2\sigma_{a1}\sigma_{a2}s + \sigma_{a2}^2 s^2.$$

The shared and unique environmental variance had similar functions with respect to the SES-index. This specification of the models is similar to what Purcell (2002) referred to as

"quantitative interactions". Consequently, the heritability cannot be evaluated without reference to the SES-index:

$$h^2(s) = \frac{\sigma_a^2(s)}{\sigma_a^2(s) + \sigma_c^2(s) + \sigma_e^2(s)}.$$

The baseline models were nested in the interaction models, and we obtained joint tests for interaction terms with likelihood ratio tests.

Adjustments for multiple comparisons were performed using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure for false discovery rate (FDR), separately for global and lobar analyses. Statistical significance was defined as FDR-adjusted $p \leq 0.05$.

Acknowledgements: Data was obtained from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study (https://abcdstudy.org), which 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 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.

Declaration of AI Assistance: The manuscript was written by the corresponding author in collaboration with the co-authors. ChatGPT 4.0 was used to refine the English language and improve readability. The corresponding author takes full responsibility for all content within the manuscript.

## References


Auchter, A. M., Hernandez Mejia, M., Heyser, C. J., Shilling, P. D., Jernigan, T. L., Brown, S. A., Tapert, S. F., & Dowling, G. J. (2018). A description of the ABCD organizational structure and communication framework. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*, 8–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.04.003

Baurley, J. W., Edlund, C. K., Pardamean, C. I., Conti, D. V., & Bergen, A. W. (2016). Smokescreen: A targeted genotyping array for addiction research. *BMC Genomics*, *17*(1), 145. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-016-2495-7

Bergen, S. E., Gardner, C. O., & Kendler, K. S. (2007). Age-Related Changes in Heritability of Behavioral Phenotypes Over Adolescence and Young Adulthood: A Meta-Analysis. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, *10*(3), 423–433. https://doi.org/10.1375/twin.10.3.423

Bethlehem, R. A. I., Seidlitz, J., White, S. R., Vogel, J. W., Anderson, K. M., Adamson, C., Adler, S., Alexopoulos, G. S., Anagnostou, E., Areces-Gonzalez, A., Astle, D. E., Auyeung, B., Ayub, M., Bae, J., Ball, G., Baron-Cohen, S., Beare, R., Bedford, S. A., Benegal, V., … Alexander-Bloch, A. F. (2022). Brain charts for the human lifespan. *Nature*, *604*(7906), 525–533. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04554-y

Bleck, T. P., Nowinski, C. J., Gershon, R., & Koroshetz, W. J. (2013). What is the NIH Toolbox, and what will it mean to neurology? *Neurology*, *80*(10), 874–875. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872ea0

Boedhoe, P. S. W., Van Rooij, D., Hoogman, M., Twisk, J. W. R., Schmaal, L., Abe, Y., Alonso, P., Ameis, S. H., Anikin, A., Anticevic, A., Arango, C., Arnold, P. D., Asherson, P., Assogna, F., Auzias, G., Banaschewski, T., Baranov, A., Batistuzzo, M. C., Baumeister, S., … Van Den Heuvel, O. A. (2020). Subcortical Brain Volume, Regional Cortical

Thickness, and Cortical Surface Area Across Disorders: Findings From the ENIGMA ADHD, ASD, and OCD Working Groups. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *177*(9), 834–843. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.19030331

Briley, D. A., & Tucker-Drob, E. M. (2013). Explaining the Increasing Heritability of Cognitive Ability Across Development: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Twin and Adoption Studies. *Psychological Science*, *24*(9), 1704–1713. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613478618

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

Chiang, M.-C., McMahon, K. L., De Zubicaray, G. I., Martin, N. G., Hickie, I., Toga, A. W., Wright, M. J., & Thompson, P. M. (2011). Genetics of white matter development: A DTI study of 705 twins and their siblings aged 12 to 29. *NeuroImage*, *54*(3), 2308–2317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.10.015

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

De Zeeuw, E. L., Kan, K.-J., Van Beijsterveldt, C. E. M., Mbarek, H., Hottenga, J.-J., Davies, G. E., Neale, M. C., Dolan, C. V., & Boomsma, D. I. (2019). The moderating role of SES on genetic differences in educational achievement in the Netherlands. *Npj Science of Learning*, *4*(1), 13. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-019-0052-2

Eilertsen, E. moen. (2021). *svcm—Fit structured variance component models with sparse relationship matrices* (Version 0.4.0) [Computer software].

Eyler, L. T., Chen, C.-H., Panizzon, M. S., Fennema-Notestine, C., Neale, M. C., Jak, A., Jernigan, T. L., Fischl, B., Franz, C. E., Lyons, M. J., Grant, M., Prom-Wormley, E., Seidman, L. J., Tsuang, M. T., Fiecas, M. J. A., Dale, A. M., & Kremen, W. S. (2012). A Comparison of Heritability Maps of Cortical Surface Area and Thickness and the Influence of Adjustment for Whole Brain Measures: A Magnetic Resonance Imaging Twin Study. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, *15*(3), 304–314. https://doi.org/10.1017/thg.2012.3

Fan, C. C., Loughnan, R., Wilson, S., Hewitt, J. K., ABCD Genetic Working Group, Agrawal, A., Dowling, G., Garavan, H., LeBlanc, K., Neale, M., Friedman, N., Madden, P., Little, R., Brown, S. A., Jernigan, T., & Thompson, W. K. (2023). Genotype Data and Derived Genetic Instruments of Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study® for Better Understanding of Human Brain Development. *Behavior Genetics*, *53*(3), 159–168. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-023-10143-0

Farah, M. J. (2017). The Neuroscience of Socioeconomic Status: Correlates, Causes, and Consequences. *Neuron*, *96*(1), 56–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.08.034

Feldstein Ewing, S. W., Bjork, J. M., & Luciana, M. (2018). Implications of the ABCD study for developmental neuroscience. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*, 161–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.05.003

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

Figlio, D. N., Freese, J., Karbownik, K., & Roth, J. (2017). Socioeconomic status and genetic influences on cognitive development. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *114*(51), 13441–13446. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708491114

Fischbein, S. (1980). IQ and social class. *Intelligence*, *4*(1), 51–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896(80)90006-9

Fischl, B., Sereno, M. I., & Dale, A. M. (1999). Cortical Surface-Based Analysis. *NeuroImage*, *9*(2), 195–207. 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

Gershon, R. C., Wagster, M. V., Hendrie, H. C., Fox, N. A., Cook, K. F., & Nowinski, C. J. (2013). NIH Toolbox for Assessment of Neurological and Behavioral Function. *Neurology*, *80*(11_supplement_3). https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872e5f

Girault, J. B., Cornea, E., Goldman, B. D., Jha, S. C., Murphy, V. A., Li, G., Wang, L., Shen, D., Knickmeyer, R. C., Styner, M., & Gilmore, J. H. (2020). Cortical Structure and Cognition in Infants and Toddlers. *Cerebral Cortex*, *30*(2), 786–800. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhz126

Gottschling, J., Hahn, E., Beam, C. R., Spinath, F. M., Carroll, S., & Turkheimer, E. (2019). Socioeconomic status amplifies genetic effects in middle childhood in a large German twin sample. *Intelligence*, *72*, 20–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2018.11.006

Grydeland, H., Walhovd, K. B., Tamnes, C. K., Westlye, L. T., & Fjell, A. M. (2013). Intracortical Myelin Links with Performance Variability across the Human Lifespan: Results from T1- and T2-Weighted MRI Myelin Mapping and Diffusion Tensor Imaging. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *33*(47), 18618–18630. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2811-13.2013

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

Harden, K. P., Turkheimer, E., & Loehlin, J. C. (2007). Genotype by Environment Interaction in Adolescents' Cognitive Aptitude. *Behavior Genetics*, *37*(2), 273–283. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-006-9113-4

Haworth, C. M. A., Wright, M. J., Luciano, M., Martin, N. G., De Geus, E. J. C., Van Beijsterveldt, C. E. M., Bartels, M., Posthuma, D., Boomsma, D. I., Davis, O. S. P., Kovas, Y., Corley, R. P., DeFries, J. C., Hewitt, J. K., Olson, R. K., Rhea, S.-A., Wadsworth, S. J., Iacono, W. G., McGue, M., … Plomin, R. (2010). The heritability of general cognitive ability increases linearly from childhood to young adulthood. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *15*(11), 1112–1120. https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2009.55

Hodes, R. J., Insel, T. R., Landis, S. C., & On behalf of the NIH Blueprint for Neuroscience Research. (2013). The NIH Toolbox: Setting a standard for biomedical research. *Neurology*, *80*(11_supplement_3). https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872e90

Jan, Y.-N., & Jan, L. Y. (2003). The Control of Dendrite Development. *Neuron*, *40*(2), 229–242. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(03)00631-7

Jansen, A. G., Mous, S. E., White, T., Posthuma, D., & Polderman, T. J. C. (2015). What Twin Studies Tell Us About the Heritability of Brain Development, Morphology, and Function: A Review. *Neuropsychology Review*, *25*(1), 27–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-015-9278-9

Kind, A. J. H., Jencks, S., Brock, J., Yu, M., Bartels, C., Ehlenbach, W., Greenberg, C., & Smith, M. (2014). Neighborhood Socioeconomic Disadvantage and 30-Day Rehospitalization: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *161*(11), 765. https://doi.org/10.7326/M13-2946

Klein, A., & Tourville, J. (2012). 101 Labeled Brain Images and a Consistent Human Cortical Labeling Protocol. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2012.00171

Lam, M., Awasthi, S., Watson, H. J., Goldstein, J., Panagiotaropoulou, G., Trubetskoy, V., Karlsson, R., Frei, O., Fan, C.-C., De Witte, W., Mota, N. R., Mullins, N., Brügger, K., Lee, S. H., Wray, N. R., Skarabis, N., Huang, H., Neale, B., Daly, M. J., … Ripke, S. (2020). RICOPILI: Rapid Imputation for COnsortias PIpeLIne. *Bioinformatics*, *36*(3), 930–933. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btz633

Lin, M.-J. (2020). The social and genetic inheritance of educational attainment: Genes, parental education, and educational expansion. *Social Science Research*, *86*, 102387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2019.102387

Liu, S., Li, A., Zhu, M., Li, J., & Liu, B. (2019). Genetic influences on cortical myelination in the human brain. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*, *18*(4), e12537. https://doi.org/10.1111/gbb.12537

Liu, W. M., Ali, S. R., Soleck, G., Hopps, J., dunston, K., & Pickett, T. (2004). Using Social Class in Counseling Psychology Research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *51*(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.51.1.3

Luciana, M., Bjork, J. M., Nagel, B. J., Barch, D. M., Gonzalez, R., Nixon, S. J., & Banich, M. T. (2018). Adolescent neurocognitive development and impacts of substance use: Overview of the adolescent brain cognitive development (ABCD) baseline neurocognition battery. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*, 67–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.02.006

Maes, H. H. M., Lapato, D. M., Schmitt, J. E., Luciana, M., Banich, M. T., Bjork, J. M., Hewitt, J. K., Madden, P. A., Heath, A. C., Barch, D. M., Thompson, W. K., Iacono, W. G., & Neale, M. C. (2023). Genetic and Environmental Variation in Continuous Phenotypes in the ABCD Study®. *Behavior Genetics*, *53*(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-022-10123-w

Marees, A. T., Smit, D. J. A., Abdellaoui, A., Nivard, M. G., Van Den Brink, W., Denys, D., Galama, T. J., Verweij, K. J. H., & Derks, E. M. (2021). Genetic correlates of socio-economic status influence the pattern of shared heritability across mental health traits. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *5*(8), 1065–1073. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01053-4

Norbom, L. B., Doan, N. T., Alnæs, D., Kaufmann, T., Moberget, T., Rokicki, J., Andreassen, O. A., Westlye, L. T., & Tamnes, C. K. (2019). Probing Brain Developmental Patterns of Myelination and Associations With Psychopathology in Youths Using Gray/White Matter Contrast. *Biological Psychiatry*, *85*(5), 389–398. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.09.027

Norbom, L. B., Ferschmann, L., Parker, N., Agartz, I., Andreassen, O. A., Paus, T., Westlye, L. T., & Tamnes, C. K. (2021). New insights into the dynamic development of the cerebral cortex in childhood and adolescence: Integrating macro- and microstructural MRI findings. *Progress in Neurobiology*, *204*, 102109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2021.102109

Norbom, L. B., Hanson, J., van der Meer, D., Ferschmann, L., Røysamb, E., von Soest, T., Andreassen, O. A., Agartz, I., Westlye, L. T., & Tamnes, C. K. (2022). Parental socioeconomic status is linked to cortical microstructure and language abilities in children and adolescents. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *56*, 101132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2022.101132

Norbom, L. B., Rokicki, J., Alnæs, D., Kaufmann, T., Doan, N. T., Andreassen, O. A., Westlye, L. T., & Tamnes, C. K. (2020). Maturation of cortical microstructure and cognitive development in childhood and adolescence: A T1w/T2w ratio MRI study. *Human Brain Mapping*, *41*(16), 4676–4690. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.25149

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*, e12220. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcv2.12220

Oschwald, J., Guye, S., Liem, F., Rast, P., Willis, S., Röcke, C., Jäncke, L., Martin, M., & Mérillat, S. (2019). Brain structure and cognitive ability in healthy aging: A review on longitudinal correlated change. *Reviews in the Neurosciences*, *31*(1), 1–57. https://doi.org/10.1515/revneuro-2018-0096

Panizzon, M. S., Fennema-Notestine, C., Kubarych, T. S., Chen, C.-H., Eyler, L. T., Fischl, B., Franz, C. E., Grant, M. D., Hamza, S., Jak, A., Jernigan, T. L., Lyons, M. J., Neale, M. C., Prom-Wormley, E. C., Seidman, L., Tsuang, M. T., Wu, H., Xian, H., Dale, A. M., & Kremen, W. S. (2012). Genetic and environmental influences of white and gray matter signal contrast: A new phenotype for imaging genetics? *NeuroImage*, *60*(3), 1686–1695. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.01.122

Pizzagalli, F., Auzias, G., Yang, Q., Mathias, S. R., Faskowitz, J., Boyd, J. D., Amini, A., Rivière, D., McMahon, K. L., De Zubicaray, G. I., Martin, N. G., Mangin, J.-F., Glahn, D. C., Blangero, J., Wright, M. J., Thompson, P. M., Kochunov, P., & Jahanshad, N. (2020). The reliability and heritability of cortical folds and their genetic correlations across hemispheres. *Communications Biology*, *3*(1), 510. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-020-01163-1

Purcell, S. (2002). Variance Components Models for Gene–Environment Interaction in Twin Analysis. *Twin Research*, *5*(6), 554–571. https://doi.org/10.1375/136905202762342026

Raine, A. (2002). Biosocial Studies of Antisocial and Violent Behavior in Children and Adults: A Review. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *30*(4), 311–326. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015754122318

Rakesh, D., & Whittle, S. (2021). Socioeconomic status and the developing brain – A systematic review of neuroimaging findings in youth. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *130*, 379–407. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.08.027

Rowe, D. C., Jacobson, K. C., & Van Den Oord, E. J. C. G. (1999). Genetic and Environmental Influences on Vocabulary IQ: Parental Education Level as Moderator. *Child Development*, *70*(5), 1151–1162. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00084

Scarr-Salapatek, S. (1971). Race, Social Class, and IQ: Population differences in heritability of IQ scores were found for racial and social class groups. *Science*, *174*(4016), 1285–1295. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.174.4016.1285

Schmitt, J. E., Raznahan, A., Liu, S., & Neale, M. C. (2020). The genetics of cortical myelination in young adults and its relationships to cerebral surface area, cortical thickness, and intelligence: A magnetic resonance imaging study of twins and families. *NeuroImage*, *206*, 116319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116319

Schmitt, J. E., Raznahan, A., Liu, S., & Neale, M. C. (2021). The Heritability of Cortical Folding: Evidence from the Human Connectome Project. *Cerebral Cortex*, *31*(1), 702–715. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhaa254

Smith, D. M., Loughnan, R., Friedman, N. P., Parekh, P., Frei, O., Thompson, W. K., Andreassen, O. A., Neale, M., Jernigan, T. L., & Dale, A. M. (2023). Heritability Estimation of Cognitive Phenotypes in the ABCD Study® Using Mixed Models. *Behavior Genetics*, *53*(3), 169–188. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-023-10141-2

Strike, L. T., Hansell, N. K., Couvy-Duchesne, B., Thompson, P. M., de Zubicaray, G. I., McMahon, K. L., & Wright, M. J. (2019). Genetic Complexity of Cortical Structure:

Differences in Genetic and Environmental Factors Influencing Cortical Surface Area and Thickness. *Cerebral Cortex*, *29*(3), 952–962. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhy002

Thompson, W. K., Barch, D. M., Bjork, J. M., Gonzalez, R., Nagel, B. J., Nixon, S. J., & Luciana, M. (2019). The structure of cognition in 9 and 10 year-old children and associations with problem behaviors: Findings from the ABCD study's baseline neurocognitive battery. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *36*, 100606. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.12.004

Tucker-Drob, E. M., & Bates, T. C. (2016). Large Cross-National Differences in Gene × Socioeconomic Status Interaction on Intelligence. *Psychological Science*, *27*(2), 138–149. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615612727

Tucker-Drob, E. M., Rhemtulla, M., Harden, K. P., Turkheimer, E., & Fask, D. (2011). Emergence of a Gene × Socioeconomic Status Interaction on Infant Mental Ability Between 10 Months and 2 Years. *Psychological Science*, *22*(1), 125–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610392926

Uban, K. A., Horton, M. K., Jacobus, J., Heyser, C., Thompson, W. K., Tapert, S. F., Madden, P. A. F., & Sowell, E. R. (2018). Biospecimens and the ABCD study: Rationale, methods of collection, measurement and early data. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*, 97–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.03.005

Yang, J., Zeng, J., Goddard, M. E., Wray, N. R., & Visscher, P. M. (2017). Concepts, estimation and interpretation of SNP-based heritability. *Nature Genetics*, *49*(9), 1304–1310. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3941

Yoon, U., Fahim, C., Perusse, D., & Evans, A. C. (2010). Lateralized genetic and environmental influences on human brain morphology of 8-year-old twins. *NeuroImage*, *53*(3), 1117–1125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.01.007

Yosso, T. (2005). Whose cultural has capital. *A Critical Race Theory Discussion Of*.

Zhao, B., Ibrahim, J. G., Li, Y., Li, T., Wang, Y., Shan, Y., Zhu, Z., Zhou, F., Zhang, J., Huang, C., Liao, H., Yang, L., Thompson, P. M., & Zhu, H. (2019). Heritability of Regional Brain Volumes in Large-Scale Neuroimaging and Genetic Studies. *Cerebral Cortex*, *29*(7), 2904–2914. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhy157