Title: Associations Between Negative Social Ties and Accelerated Biological Aging, Inflammation, and Multiple Morbidities[†]

Authors: Byungkyu Lee[1], Gabriele Ciciurkaite[2], Siyun Peng[3], Colter Mitchell[4], Brea L. Perry[3]

Affiliations:
[1] Department of Sociology, New York University
[2] Department of Sociology, Utah State University
[3] Department of Sociology, Indiana University – Bloomington
[4] Survey Research Center, University of Michigan – Ann Arbor

Abstract:
Negative social ties, or "difficult ties," are pervasive yet understudied components of social networks that may accelerate biological aging and morbidity. Using ego-centric network data and DNA methylation-based biological aging clocks from a state representative probability sample in Indiana, we examine how negative social ties are associated with accelerated biological aging and a broad range of adverse physical and mental health outcomes. First, we find that difficult social ties are surprisingly common: on average, one in four network members is described as difficult, and nearly 60% of individuals report having at least one difficult tie. Regression analyses show that having more negative ties is associated with accelerated biological aging, with the most pronounced associations observed among individuals whose networks comprise more than 50% difficult ties. Finally, having negative ties is also associated with multiple adverse health outcomes beyond epigenetic aging, including poorer self-rated health, higher levels of depression and anxiety, elevated inflammation, greater multimorbidity, and unfavorable anthropometric indicators such as increased waist-to-hip ratio and BMI. These findings together highlight the critical role of negative social ties in biological aging as chronic stressors and the need for interventions that reduce the impact of negative social stressors within close social networks to promote healthier aging trajectories.

[†] Research reported in this manuscript was supported by the National Institute on Aging of the National Institutes of Health under award number R01AG076032 (PI Brea Perry). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. Additional funding for this research was provided by the Indiana University Office of the Vice President for Research through the Precision Health Grand Challenge (PI Bernice Pescosolido). We thank Bernice Pescosolido, Dalton Conley, Adam Roth, Yoosik Youm, members of the Biosociology lab at Princeton, and members of the EMUS lab at Indiana University for comments on drafts of this paper. Please direct your correspondence to Byungkyu Lee (bklee@nyu.edu) or Brea Perry (blperry@iu.edu).

Introduction

Aging is a universal biological process involving the gradual accumulation of unrepaired molecular damage, leading to progressive declines in physiological functions and increased vulnerability to disease[1,2]. Despite its universality, individuals vary substantially in their rates of biological aging—distinct from chronological aging—due to genetic predispositions, as well as environmental and social factors[3,4]. Advancements in epigenetic biomarkers, particularly DNA methylation (DNAm)-based epigenetic clocks, have now made it possible to quantify and study biological aging. Early epigenetic clocks primarily measure DNAm patterns correlated with chronological age; therefore, they are less suitable for health research, whereas newer, second- and third-generation clocks, such as DunedinPACE and GrimAge, specifically reflect aging phenotypes, health risks, and mortality outcomes[5,6]. Recent research demonstrates that accelerated biological aging, as indicated by these advanced DNAm clocks, robustly predicts critical health outcomes, including chronic conditions and mortality risk [7]. With these critical tools, a crucial next step is to explore the factors that may accelerate or slow biological aging by linking molecular mechanisms with the broader social forces that shape the aging process.

Chronic stress is a well-established driver of biological aging, influencing epigenetic modifications that regulate gene expression and inflammation[8]. While often conceptualized as sources of support that promote health and well-being[9–12], social relationships may also function as chronic stressors, contributing to increased allostatic load through repeated stress activation[13,14]. This dual nature of social ties—both protective and harmful—raises important questions about their role in biological aging and the pathogenesis of common morbidities. However, existing research relies on methods that capture only the positive dimensions of social relationships (e.g., social support), often overlooking negative or strained ties. As a result, there is comparatively little empirical insight into how the dark side of networks contributes to biological aging.

A growing body of research suggests that negative ties—relationships characterized by hostility, strain, or excessive burden, making one's life difficult— may be more prevalent than previously assumed and may have lasting health consequences[15–17]. These "difficult ties" may accelerate biological aging by mimicking the harmful effects of more traditional chronic stressors, such as financial strain or workplace stress[18,19], contributing to increased inflammation, compromised immune function, and elevated risk for cardiovascular and other diseases[20]. For example, several studies have demonstrated that conflict and hostility in the context of marital relationships are associated with accelerated epigenetic aging[21–23]. Still, it is unclear whether such stressful relationships outside of marriage have similar biological effects, or whether individuals can buffer these effects through supportive ties[10,24].

These gaps are due in large part to methodological limitations such as limited data on biological indicators of aging and social networks. To address these gaps, our study draws on a unique age-heterogeneous, state-representative probability sample in Indiana (i.e., the Person-to-Person study) that includes biomarkers and extensive measures of both positive and negative interactions within personal networks using an in-depth ego-centric network module. To assess biological aging, we measure newly developed epigenetic clocks (age-accelerated GrimAge2 and DunedinPACE) derived from high-quality saliva samples. We examine the prevalence of negative ties and their associations with accelerated biological aging using these newer clocks. We assess how the associations are robust against potential confounders, including smoking status, health insurance, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, beyond socio-demographic

controls and technical controls. We also investigate their associations with a range of health indicators beyond epigenetic aging measures.

Results

Table S1 in the SI provides descriptive statistics for demographic characteristics and the key variables in our analytic sample (N = 2,223). Participants range widely in chronological age, from 18 to 104 years (mean = 50.54, SD = 18.63), allowing us to explore epigenetic aging across a broad age span. We employ two complementary epigenetic aging measures: age-accelerated GrimAge2 (GrimAge2), which captures cumulative biological aging relative to chronological age, and DunedinPACE (PACE), which captures the rate of biological aging. Figure 1 illustrates that both GrimAge2 and PACE exhibit substantial variability across all chronological ages. On average, older adults tend to display faster aging rates (PACE), but we also see individuals in younger age groups who show high epigenetic age acceleration (GrimAge2), indicating that some are aging faster biologically relative to what would be expected given their chronological age in the study population.

Figure 1. Distribution of Age-Accelerated GrimAge2 and DunedinePACE across chronological age groups.



Note. This figure presents the distribution of Age-Accelerated GrimAge2 (left panel) and DunedinPACE (right panel) across different chronological age groups. Each box plot displays the median (black line), interquartile range (dark gray box), and overall data range (whiskers). The red vertical lines indicate the reference points: 0 for Age-Accelerated GrimAge2 (indicating no deviation from expected aging) and 1.0 for DunedinPACE (representing the population average pace of aging).

We define “difficult ties” as network members whom respondents reported as “occasionally” or “often” hassling them, causing problems, or making life difficult, rather than selecting “never” or “rarely.” Figure 2, Panel A (also see Table S2) presents the distribution of

network size and the prevalence of "difficult ties" within these networks. The average network size was 5.07 (SD = 2.46), with a maximum size of 25. Social isolation was rare, with only 1.3% of respondents reporting no network members, while 8.6% listed more than 10 names. On average, respondents identified 24.3% of their network members as difficult ties. Notably, the proportion of difficult ties remained consistent across different network sizes. These findings suggest that a significant proportion of individuals interact with at least one difficult alter, demonstrating that negative ties are not rare in close social ties. Figure 2, Panel B (also see Table S3) reports the distribution of difficult ties. The mean size of the negative tie network was 1.25 (SD = 1.51). Among 2,685 respondents, 50.8% reported having at least one difficult tie in their network, and 5% indicated having more than five difficult ties (Figure 3, Panel C).

Figure 2. The distribution of overall and negative network sizes.



Note. Panel A shows the distribution of overall network size (capped at 10). Panel B illustrates the proportion of difficult ties within each network size. Panel C presents the distribution of the number of difficult ties, again with network size capped at 10.

Next, we examine how the presence of difficult ties in social networks is associated with accelerated biological aging (GrimAge2) and the rate of aging (PACE). To do so, we estimated a series of OLS regression models (Models 1–6 in Table 1, also see Table S4 for the full regression coefficients) using various indicators of difficult ties as predictors, while controlling for demographic confounders (i.e., age, gender, education, and related technical background variables). Models 1 and 4 focus on the count of difficult ties in networks. Individuals reporting a greater number of difficult ties experience significantly higher levels of biological aging than those reporting none. Specifically, each additional difficult tie is associated with a 0.00465 increase in PACE and a 0.212 increase in GrimAge2 (both $p < 0.05$). We next consider the relative presence of difficult ties, given that one difficult tie in a small network may be more consequential than one difficult tie in a large network. Models 2 and 5 show that each percent increase in the proportion of difficult ties is linked to elevated aging scores, reflecting a stronger role of stressful ties when they comprise a larger share of the social circle. Lastly, Models 3 and 6 examine how an increasing percentage of difficult ties is associated with epigenetic aging. We find that once difficult ties constitute at least half of an individual's network, GrimAge2 and PACE values both increase substantially. These findings imply that not only is the presence of difficult ties detrimental to healthy aging, but the concentration of these problematic ties within a network can amplify the association. Table S5 shows three alternative

measures of negative ties, which all show that results are robust against alternative measurement strategies.

Table 1. Associations between Negative Social Ties and Epigenetic Aging Clocks

Outcome	PACE			AgeAccelGrim2		
Model	Model1	Model2	Model3	Model4	Model5	Model6
Number of Negative Ties	0.00465*			0.212**		
	(0.00192)			(0.0563)		
Number of Non-negative Ties	-0.00293*			-0.133**		
	(0.00120)			(0.0362)		
% Negative Ties		0.0360**			1.787**	
		(0.0114)			(0.344)	
% Negative Ties (Ref = 0%)						
% Negative Ties < 25%			0.0164+			0.511+
			(0.00986)			(0.306)
% Negative Ties < 50%			0.0108			0.504*
			(0.00810)			(0.251)
% Negative Ties < 100%			0.0291**			1.202**
			(0.00869)			(0.257)
% Negative Ties = 100%			0.0201			1.734**
			(0.0149)			(0.520)
Observations	2227	2227	2227	2227	2227	2227
Controls						
Individual controls	V	V	V	V	V	V
Network size dummies		V	V		V	V

Note. Coefficients represent the estimated effects of negative social ties on biological aging outcomes, with standard errors in parentheses. Models 1 and 4 estimate the effects of the count of negative ties, while Models 2 and 5 examine the proportion of negative ties as a continuous variable. Models 3 and 6 introduce categorical thresholds for negative tie proportions, with 0% negative ties as the reference group. Individual controls include age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, and marital status. Network size dummies account for differences in social network size, ensuring that the relative impact of negative ties is not confounded by absolute network size. Statistical significance is denoted as follows: + p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01 (two-tailed tests).

Finally, we assess whether the negative associations of difficult ties are unique to biological aging or extend to broader health outcomes by examining their association with various health outcomes, even after controlling for demographic characteristics and network size. Demonstrating broader health impacts of difficult ties strengthens the validity of our principal findings on biological aging and is suggestive of wide-ranging pathogenic implications of molecular aging processes. Table 2 presents the results (also see Tables S6 and S7 for the full regression coefficients), showing that the percentage of difficult ties in one's network is significantly associated with worse health across all domains. Specifically, individuals with a

higher proportion of difficult ties report worse overall health (0.524, $p < 0.01$), poorer mental health (0.635, $p < 0.01$), and lower self-rated physical health (0.479, $p < 0.01$). Negative ties also correspond to pronounced psychological distress, reflected in higher anxiety severity scores (12.27, $p < 0.01$) and depression severity scores (14.67, $p < 0.01$). These results underscore the pervasive impact of strained social interactions, highlighting their detrimental consequences for mental and physical well-being. Further underscoring the breadth of these associations, Table 2 (Models 6 to 9) also demonstrates that having a larger share of difficult ties is associated with higher levels of certain physiological risk factors and disease indicators. Specifically, the percentage of difficult ties is linked to epigenetic inflammation score (0.357, $p < 0.01$), a greater likelihood of multimorbidity (0.345, $p < 0.01$), a higher waist-to-hip ratio (0.0154, $p < 0.05$), and increased BMI (2.419, $p < 0.01$). It is important to note that the proportion of difficult ties does not significantly affect height, which serves as a useful control because height is a stable biological trait unlikely to be influenced by social relationships in adulthood; thus, the absence of a significant association for height strengthens confidence that the observed associations with other health outcomes reflect genuine associations rather than methodological artifacts. Taken together, these results underscore the broad and multifaceted impact of relational stressors on health trajectories.

Table 2. Associations between Negative Social Ties and Other Health Outcomes.

Outcome	General Health	Mental Health	Physical Health	Anxiety Severity	Depression Severity
	Model1	Model2	Model3	Model4	Model5
% Negative Ties	0.524** (0.0773)	0.635** (0.0806)	0.479** (0.0758)	12.27** (1.400)	14.67** (1.490)
Observations	2226	2226	2226	2174	2174
Individual controls	V	V	V	V	V
Network size FE	V	V	V	V	V
Outcome	Epigenetic inflammation score	Multi-morbidity	Waist to Hip Ratio	BMI	Height
	Model6	Model7	Model8	Model9	Model10
% Negative Ties	0.357** (0.0113)	0.345** (0.113)	0.0154* (0.00761)	2.419** (0.793)	-0.678 (0.760)
Observations	2227	2050	1823	1873	1887
Individual controls	V	V	V	V	V
Network size FE	V	V	V	V	V

Note. Models 1–5 assess self-reported general health, mental health, physical health, anxiety severity, and depression severity, while Models 6–10 analyze objective biomarkers and anthropometric indicators, including log-transformed C-reactive protein (CRP), multimorbidity, waist-to-hip ratio, body mass index (BMI), and height. Coefficients represent the estimated effects of negative social ties on each outcome, with standard errors in parentheses. Higher values indicate worse health across all measures except height, which serves as a biologically stable control. Observations vary by model based on available data for each outcome. Statistical significance is denoted as follows: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$ (two-tailed tests).*

To assess the robustness of our findings, we conducted sensitivity analyses by incorporating key covariates that could confound the observed relationship between negative social ties and biological aging. Table 3 presents the average marginal effects of % difficult ties on PACE (Models 1–4) and GrimAge2 (Models 5–8), progressively adding controls for the

timing of data collection (Models 2 and 5), smoking status and health insurance (Models 3 and 6), and county fixed effects (Models 4 and 8). In the PACE models, the percentage of difficult ties remained significantly associated with faster biological aging after adjusting for insurance status and the COVID-19 pandemic (0.0369, $p < 0.01$). This association attenuated but remained marginally significant after controlling for smoking (0.0218, $p < 0.1$) and persisted after incorporating county fixed effects (0.0283, $p < 0.1$). Similar attenuation patterns were observed in the GrimAge2 models, where the initial association size (1.787, $p < 0.01$) was reduced to 0.772 ($p < 0.05$) after accounting for smoking. These results suggest that while health behaviors partially mediate the link between social stress and biological aging, the persistent associations underscore that stressful social environments exert an independent, long-term physiological toll on aging trajectories.

Table 3. Sensitivity Analysis of The Impact of Negative Social Ties on Epigenetic Aging Clocks

Outcome	PACE			
Model	Model1	Model2	Model3	Model4
% Hasslers	0.0360**	0.0369**	0.0217+	0.0283+
	(0.0114)	(0.0114)	(0.0112)	(0.0155)
Observations	2227	2221	2223	2218
Controls				
Individual controls	V	V	V	V
Network size dummies	V	V	V	V
Covid-19 period		V		V
Health Insurance		V		V
Smoking Status			V	V
County FE				V
Outcome	GrimAge2			
Model	Model4	Model6	Model7	Model8
% Hasslers	1.787**	1.768**	0.772*	0.868*
	(0.344)	(0.348)	(0.300)	(0.421)
Observations	2227	2221	2223	2218
Controls				
Individual controls	V	V	V	V
Network size dummies	V	V	V	V
Covid-19 period		V		V
Health Insurance		V		V
Smoking Status			V	V
County FE				V

Note. Models 1–4 predict PACE, while Models 5–8 predict AgeAccelGrim2. Coefficients represent the estimated associations between % negative ties and biological aging outcomes, with standard errors in parentheses. Individual controls include age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, and marital status. Network size dummies adjust for variations in social network size to isolate the proportional effect of negative ties. Additional robustness adjustments include controls for the COVID-19 exposure period, health insurance, and smoking status (a known epigenetic confounder), and county fixed effects. Statistical significance is denoted as follows: *p < .05, **p < .01 (two-tailed tests).*

Discussion

Negative social ties—those that cause conflict, hassles, or stress—are a prevalent yet underappreciated dimension of social networks that can significantly accelerate biological aging.

Although substantial research has focused on how supportive ties protect against age-related decline[12,25–27], our findings underscore that the presence and proportion of negative ties also hold critical implications for biological aging trajectories. By integrating comprehensive ego-centric network data with advanced DNAm-based measures of biological age, this study provides new evidence that negative social relationships function as potent, chronic stressors capable of shaping epigenetic and physiological risk profiles across adulthood.

Prior work has documented that adverse social experiences ranging from loneliness to marital conflict can elevate allostatic load, increase inflammation, and shorten telomeres[14,28–30]. Recent research using data on older adults from the Health and Retirement Study shows that both loneliness and social isolation, including the absence of friendships and marital relationships, are associated with epigenetic clocks measuring mortality risk and accelerated aging across multiple organ systems[25,27,31,32]. However, few population-based studies have isolated the specific impacts of *negative ties* within close social relationships on biologically measured aging outcomes. In this respect, our data fills an important gap: they show that these detrimental relationships are not rare anomalies but rather common aspects of everyday social life, often comprising a sizable fraction of one's closest connections. Further, we find, net of demographic covariates and health behaviors like smoking, respondents with more difficult ties exhibited significantly greater epigenetic age acceleration. By linking negative tie measures to two state-of-the-art epigenetic clocks, we demonstrate robust associations with both cumulative and rate-based biological aging.

Crucially, the detrimental influence of negative ties extends beyond epigenetic aging alone. When analyzing additional indicators—self-reported health, psychiatric symptoms, epigenetic inflammation score, waist-to-hip ratio, and BMI—those reporting higher percentages of difficult ties showed systematically worse health profiles across the board. Such convergence across molecular, anthropometric, clinical, and subjective outcomes strongly supports the idea that negative social relationships exact a broad physiological toll[17,24]. These findings reinforce the concept of *allostatic load*, the cumulative "wear and tear" emerging from repeated physiological attempts to adapt to stress[14,33]. Although positive social integration can reduce allostatic load, the present study demonstrates the inverse: frequent exposure to difficult ties may chronically activate stress-sensitive systems, fueling systemic inflammation, epigenetic dysregulation, and metabolic strain. These findings extend the literature by highlighting that "difficult" relationships are directly implicated in the same downstream physiological processes previously ascribed to major psychosocial and environmental stressors.

Negative social interactions, such as ongoing conflict or difficult relationships, could contribute to faster biological aging by putting chronic strain on the body's hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis. When people experience frequent interpersonal tension, their bodies respond by activating stress-related systems, which trigger the release of hormones like cortisol and adrenaline[34]. While these hormones help the body respond to immediate challenges, prolonged activation can take a toll on mental health, increasing feelings of anxiety and depression[35]. At the same time, chronic social stress also fuels inflammation in the body. When stress is persistent, it activates molecular pathways that increase the production of inflammatory proteins, and over time, this repeated immune activation leads to higher levels of epigenetic inflammation scores. Our findings on the significant associations between the proportion of difficult ties and both mental health and inflammation markers provide indirect evidence to support these mechanisms.

Several limitations are worth noting. First, because our study uses cross-sectional data, we cannot definitively establish the causal pathway—longitudinal or quasi-experimental

evidence is needed to clarify how negative ties develop and drive biological aging processes over time. Second, self-reported measures of difficult ties may be vulnerable to recall biases; however, the strong correlations with objective biomarkers indicate that participants' subjective accounts likely capture authentic physiological effects. Finally, not all difficult ties may exert the same level of harm, and their associations likely vary depending on the nature, frequency, and intensity of the conflict. Future research should disentangle *which* types of negative ties are most detrimental to biological aging and health outcomes.

Taken together, our findings indicate that strained social relationships—often hiding in plain sight within close networks—function as powerful chronic stressors, accelerating age-related biological processes through multiple, interlinked pathways. By systematically mapping these relationships onto advanced epigenetic measures and additional health markers, this study highlights that the "dark side" of social connections can wear down physiological resilience and hasten aging and the development of morbidities. Future endeavors to mitigate relationship strain, alongside bolstering positive support, could represent a crucial avenue to promote healthier aging and reduce the burden of age-related disease. Rather than focusing solely on loneliness or isolation, these results underscore the need to recognize and address the multifaceted nature of social adversity in shaping our biological and aging trajectories.

Data and Methods

This study utilizes data from the Person-to-Person Health Interview Study (P2P), a statewide omnibus health survey conducted in Indiana. The P2P provides representative estimates for Indiana's adult population (aged 18 years and older) on various health, social, and behavioral measures. Employing a stratified probability sampling design similar to the General Social Survey, the study drew participants from household addresses in both rural and urban counties across Indiana. Sampling was executed by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, with intentional oversampling in two economically disadvantaged rural counties. Trained interviewers administered structured surveys using standardized protocols and collected anthropometric measurements. At the end of each interview, participants were invited to provide saliva samples for epigenetic analysis. DNA extraction and quality assessment occurred within six weeks of collection at the Indiana University Genetics Biobank using the Chemagic 360 magnetic bead-based high-throughput extraction system. Data collection spanned from October 2018 to July 2021, with 2,685 individuals participating (overall response rate of approximately 30%). Of these, 91% (N = 2,435) consented to saliva collection. After DNA extraction, quality control, and epigenetic profiling, biomarker data were successfully obtained from 2,229 respondents. An additional 11 respondents were excluded due to missing data on key control variables, predictors, or outcomes. This resulted in a final analytic sample size of N = 2,218 participants. The Institutional Review Board at Indiana University approved all study procedures. Informed consent was obtained from each participant, and the confidentiality of data was rigorously maintained throughout the study.

Egocentric Network Module

A central aspect of the P2P survey is its ego-centric network module, which captures respondents' ("egos") significant social connections ("alters"). Participants were asked to complete a personal social network protocol following standard methods of egocentric network research[36]. Initially, respondents were asked via "name generators" to list individuals with whom they have interacted over the past six months. Here, the number of individual respondents could

name was unrestricted, avoiding potential right censoring common in similar ego-centric network surveys. The survey employed five name generators from the PhenX Social Network Battery [37] to elicit different types of relationships: confidantes (people with whom respondents discussed personal problems), health discussants (individuals respondents discussed their health with or could rely on for help regarding physical or emotional issues), health regulators (those frequently discussing and influencing respondents' mental and physical health behaviors), regular companions (people respondents regularly spent free or leisure time with), and hasslers (individuals causing respondents stress or difficulty). Following the elicitation of names, respondents completed "name interpreter" questions that detailed each alter's characteristics and relationship attributes.

To identify negative ties, we ask each ego to assess each alter's potential for interpersonal stress or conflict in the following question: "How often has (alter) hassled you, caused problems, or made life difficult?" Here, we define "difficult ties" as alters whom respondents identified as "occasionally" or "often" causing problems or difficulties, rather than "rarely" or "never." Our primary measures in this study are the count and proportion of difficult ties within each respondent's network. We present results assuming zero difficult ties when network size is zero, though the findings remain virtually unchanged if we drop these cases, as very few individuals (N = 35, 1.3%) report a network size of zero. To assess potential non-linear threshold effects, we categorized this measure into five groups: 0%, 0–24.9%, 25–49.9%, 50–99.9%, and 100%. Additionally, we conducted robustness checks using alternative measures, including the total count of difficult ties and the mean frequency of difficult interactions.

Saliva Collection and Epigenetic Data Processing

DNA methylation (DNAm) was assessed from saliva samples using the Infinium Methylation EPIC BeadChip. To ensure unbiased results, samples were randomized across plates based on demographic variables (age, sex, and race/ethnicity), and 40 pairs of blinded duplicate samples were included. Data preprocessing and quality control were conducted using the *minfi* package in **R**, with probes and samples failing the detection P-value threshold excluded, along with samples demonstrating sex mismatches. This study focuses on two advanced DNAm clocks—age-accelerated GrimAge2 and DunedinPACE—both of which demonstrate superior predictive validity for morbidity and mortality compared to earlier-generation epigenetic clocks. GrimAge2 and DunedinPACE offer complementary insights into biological aging by capturing both cumulative biological age (GrimAge2) and the current rate of physiological aging (PACE), providing a robust, multidimensional evaluation of aging processes and associated longevity risks. Age-accelerated GrimAge2 quantifies biological aging relative to chronological age by measuring deviations from the expected GrimAge2 estimate.

GrimAge2 was developed using a two-stage procedure: first, plasma proteins and smoking pack-years were regressed on chronological age, sex, and CpG methylation levels to generate DNAm-derived biomarkers. These biomarkers were then used to predict time-to-death, adjusting for age, sex, and DNAm-smoking-pack-years[6]. We use the age-adjusted version (i.e., age regressed out) of GrimAge2, which represents the residual difference between observed and predicted GrimAge2, with higher values indicating accelerated biological aging beyond what is expected for a given chronological age. Elevated GrimAge2 scores are associated with increased vulnerability to mortality and age-related diseases, making it a robust predictor of long-term health risks and physiological decline. In contrast, DunedinPACE quantifies the ongoing rate of biological aging rather than cumulative age acceleration. The creation of this measure also

involved multiple phases[5]. First, researchers tracked longitudinal changes in 19 biomarkers reflecting multiple organ systems, assessed at ages 26, 32, 38, and 45. They then used linear mixed-effects models to estimate the rate of change for each biomarker, which were combined to calculate individual Pace of Aging scores. These scores were scaled so that a value of 1.0 represents one biological year per chronological year (e.g., a score of 2.3 indicates aging at 2.3 biological years per chronological year). Finally, researchers applied elastic net regression to create an algorithm that predicts the 20-year Pace of Aging using a subset of DNAm markers measured at age 45. Thus, unlike GrimAge2, PACE provides a dynamic measure of aging speed, directly capturing the rate of cellular and physiological deterioration. The mean GrimAge2 in our sample is 0.01 (SD = 6.73), indicating that participants, on average, closely match the GrimAge2 reference population for cumulative epigenetic aging, though considerable variation exists at the individual level (range: -16.35 to 24.54 years). By contrast, the mean PACE is 1.33 (SD = 0.20), significantly above the benchmark rate of 1.0 established in the original Dunedin Study cohort, suggesting that individuals in our sample are aging approximately 33% faster than the reference.

Other Health Outcomes

Self-rated general health was measured by asking "Would you say that, overall, your health is…" with response options: 1)Poor, 2) Fair, 3) Good, 4) Very Good, 5) Excellent. *Self-rated physical health* was measured by asking "Would you say that, in general, your mental health is…" with response options: 1)Poor, 2) Fair, 3) Good, 4) Very Good, 5) Excellent. *Self-rated mental health* was measured by asking "Would you say that, in general, your physical health is…" with response options: 1)Poor, 2) Fair, 3) Good, 4) Very Good, 5) Excellent. *Depression and anxiety severity* (range = 0 – 100) were measured using the Computerized Adaptive Test Mental Health (CAT-MH) [38,39], an efficient computerized adaptive test based on multidimensional item response theory. The CAT-MH contains validated measures for diagnostic screening and continuous measurement of targeted mental health disorders and is superior to brief assessments used in other studies.

Multimorbidity (range = 0 - 9) was measured by summing the total number of affirmative responses to a set of question asking whether respondents had been diagnosed by a physician with the following conditions: arthritis, asthma, cancer, emphysema, stroke, myocardial infarction, coronary heart disease, kidney disease, obesity, and diabetes. *Epigenetic inflammation score* is a measure derived from a large-scale epigenome-wide association study (EWAS) of circulating C-reactive protein (CRP), a widely used biomarker of systemic inflammation, which identified and replicated DNAm signatures at 58 CpG sites across two large and ethnically diverse cohorts (N > 12,000). These methylation markers were robustly associated with CRP levels and showed enrichment in genes linked to immune response and cardiometabolic risk, independent of known genetic predictors. By leveraging these validated methylation sites, we construct a composite inflammation score that reflects chronic inflammatory processes at the molecular level[40].

For anthropometric measurement, trained interviewers measured participants' weight and height three times using a standardized protocol to ensure accuracy and reliability. Waist and hip circumferences were also measured three times using a flexible measuring tape at the narrowest part of the waist and the widest part of the hips, respectively. The final weight, height, waist, and hip values used in analyses were the averages of the three measurements. The *waist-to-hip ratio* was calculated as the average waist circumference divided by the average hip circumference. *Body Mass Index* (BMI) was computed as weight (kg) divided by height squared (m^2). These

anthropometric indicators were used to assess overall body composition and central adiposity in subsequent analyses.

Controls

Consistent with standard practice for models regressing epigenetic clocks on predictors, we adjust for two technical covariates: batch effects and cell types[41,42]. We control for the following socio-demographic characteristics across all models: age, gender at birth (men/women), race and ethnicity (non-Hispanic White / non-Hispanic Black / Other race), educational attainment (less than high school education or high school diploma or equivalent / some college or technical school/bachelor's degree or higher), and marital status (never married/married or living with a partner / divorced or widowed or separated). In the sensitivity analysis, we account for additional potential post-treatment confounders that might influence both social network characteristics and epigenetic aging to rigorously assess the robustness of our findings. First, the COVID-19 pandemic occurred while the P2P study was in the field and data collection was suspended for one year during the height of the pandemic. The COVID-19 pandemic might have induced differences in social network patterns[43] and/or affected epigenetic aging[44]. As such, we adjust for a variable indicating whether the data was collected before or after the pandemic. Second, we adjust for health insurance status, which captures disparities in access to medical care and preventive services, as it may shape both biological aging and the structure of social relationships. Third, we adjust for smoking status (never smoker / ever smoker / current smoker / daily smoker) to determine whether the association between social network characteristics and epigenetic clocks is behavioral rather than biological. Fourth, we add county fixed effects to control for unobserved, time-invariant contextual factors—such as environmental exposures, healthcare infrastructure, and community norms—that may jointly influence interpersonal dynamics and aging processes.

Analytic Strategy

Our analytic approach focuses on evaluating how negative social ties ("difficult ties") within individuals' social networks relate to accelerated biological aging, as measured by two DNAm-based epigenetic clocks: age-accelerated GrimAge2 and the PACE. The primary independent variables are the count and proportion (%) of difficult ties reported by each respondent. These dual measures allow us to differentiate between the absolute burden of negative relationships and their relative frequency within the respondent's overall social network. We employ OLS regression models to estimate associations between negative social ties and our biological aging outcomes. Our initial models include basic socio-demographic covariates—age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, and marital status—to adjust for fundamental demographic confounding. For models using the proportion of difficult ties as the main predictor, we also introduce dummy variables indicating network size categories. This adjustment accounts for the possibility that respondents with larger networks may report a higher absolute count of difficult ties but a lower relative proportion, clarifying the independent contribution of network negativity above and beyond network size itself.

To further assess the robustness and validity of our results, we conduct a series of sensitivity analyses. In doing so, we sequentially introduce additional controls that could confound the observed relationship between negative social ties and biological aging. Further, we explore alternative specifications of difficult ties to assess potential nonlinearities or threshold effects. Specifically, we estimate additional models using a categorical measure of

network negativity, dividing respondents into five groups: 0%, 0–24.9%, 25–49.9%, 50–99.9%, and 100%. These analyses examine whether biological aging accelerates disproportionately when difficult ties surpass a critical threshold within an individual's close relationships. Finally, we expand our analyses to other health outcomes, including self-rated health, mental health symptoms (anxiety and depression severity scores), inflammation (C-reactive protein), and anthropometric indicators (waist-to-hip ratio, BMI). This comprehensive assessment evaluates whether negative social relationships exert broad-spectrum health impacts beyond biological aging itself, reflecting chronic stress-induced multisystem physiological dysregulation.

We interpret and report results as average marginal effects (AMEs) to facilitate intuitive understanding and direct comparison across models. To ensure the generalizability and representativeness of our findings to the adult population of Indiana, all analyses incorporate survey weights provided by NORC. These weights correct for differential nonresponse rates and oversampling of specific demographic subgroups. Analyses are performed using Stata and **R** statistical software, and all analytic codes required to reproduce our results will be publicly shared upon publication.

References

1. Kirkwood, T. B. L. Evolution of ageing. *Nature* **270**, 301–304 (1977).
2. López-Otín, C., Blasco, M. A., Partridge, L., Serrano, M. & Kroemer, G. The Hallmarks of Aging. *Cell* **153**, 1194–1217 (2013).
3. Christensen, K. & Vaupel, J. W. Determinants of longevity: genetic, environmental and medical factors. *J. Intern. Med.* **240**, 333–341 (1996).
4. Finch, C. E. *Longevity, Senescence, and the Genome*. (University of Chicago Press, 1994).
5. Belsky, D. W. *et al.* DunedinPACE, a DNA methylation biomarker of the pace of aging. *eLife* **11**, e73420 (2022).
6. Lu, A. T. *et al.* DNA methylation GrimAge strongly predicts lifespan and healthspan. *Aging* **11**, 303 (2019).
7. Faul, J. D. *et al.* Epigenetic-based age acceleration in a representative sample of older Americans: Associations with aging-related morbidity and mortality. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **120**, e2215840120 (2023).
8. Miller, G. E., Chen, E. & Parker, K. J. Psychological stress in childhood and susceptibility to the chronic diseases of aging: Moving toward a model of behavioral and biological mechanisms. *Psychol. Bull.* **137**, 959–997 (2011).
9. Smith, K. P. & Christakis, N. A. Social Networks and Health. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* **34**, 405–429 (2008).
10. Cohen, S. & Wills, T. A. Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychol. Bull.* **98**, 310–357 (1985).
11. Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B. & Layton, J. B. Social Relationships and Mortality Risk: A Meta-analytic Review. *PLoS Med* **7**, e1000316 (2010).
12. House, J. S., Landis, K. R. & Umberson, D. Social Relationships and Health. *Science* **241**, 540–545 (1988).
13. Due, P., Holstein, B., Lund, R., Modvig, J. & Avlund, K. Social relations: network, support and relational strain. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **48**, 661–673 (1999).
14. McEwen, B. S. & Stellar, E. Stress and the Individual: Mechanisms Leading to Disease.

Arch. Intern. Med. **153**, 2093–2101 (1993).
15. Offer, S. & Fischer, C. S. Difficult People: Who Is Perceived to Be Demanding in Personal Networks and Why Are They There? *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **83**, 111–142 (2018).
16. Small, M. L., Brant, K. & Fekete, M. The Avoidance of Strong Ties. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **89**, 615–649 (2024).
17. Rook, K. S. The negative side of social interaction: impact on psychological well-being. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **46**, 1097–1108 (1984).
18. Rook, K. S., Luong, G., Sorkin, D. H., Newsom, J. T. & Krause, N. Ambivalent versus problematic social ties: Implications for psychological health, functional health, and interpersonal coping. *Psychol. Aging* **27**, 912–923 (2012).
19. Uchino, B. N. *et al.* Social relationships and health: Is feeling positive, negative, or both (ambivalent) about your social ties related to telomeres? *Health Psychol.* **31**, 789–796 (2012).
20. Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. & Newton, T. L. Marriage and health: his and hers. *Psychol. Bull.* **127**, 472–503 (2001).
21. Wang, W., Dearman, A., Bao, Y. & Kumari, M. Partnership status and positive DNA methylation age acceleration across the adult lifespan in the UK. *SSM - Popul. Health* **24**, 101551 (2023).
22. Kim, J. K., Arpawong, T. E., Klopack, E. T. & Crimmins, E. M. Parental Divorce in Childhood and the Accelerated Epigenetic Aging for Earlier and Later Cohorts: Role of Mediators of Chronic Depressive Symptoms, Education, Smoking, Obesity, and Own Marital Disruption. *J. Popul. Ageing* **17**, 297–313 (2024).
23. Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Wilson, S. J. & Madison, A. Marriage and Gut (Microbiome) Feelings: Tracing Novel Dyadic Pathways to Accelerated Aging. *Psychosom. Med.* **81**, 704–710 (2019).
24. Lincoln, K. D. Social Support, Negative Social Interactions, and Psychological Well-Being. *Soc. Serv. Rev.* **74**, 231–252 (2000).
25. Hillmann, A. R., Dhingra, R. & Reed, R. G. Positive Social Factors Prospectively Predict Younger Epigenetic Age: Findings from the Health and Retirement Study. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **148**, 105988 (2023).
26. House, J. S., Umberson, D. & Landis, K. R. Structures and Processes of Social Support. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* **14**, 293–318 (1988).
27. Rentscher, K. E. *et al.* Social Relationships and Epigenetic Aging in Older Adulthood: Results from the Health and Retirement Study. *Brain. Behav. Immun.* **114**, 349–359 (2023).
28. Epel, E. S. *et al.* Accelerated telomere shortening in response to life stress. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **101**, 17312–17315 (2004).
29. Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Gouin, J.-P. & Hantsoo, L. Close relationships, inflammation, and health. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **35**, 33–38 (2010).
30. Seeman, T., Epel, E., Gruenewald, T., Karlamangla, A. & McEwen, B. S. Socio-economic differentials in peripheral biology: Cumulative allostatic load. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **1186**, 223–239 (2010).
31. Freilich, C. D., Markon, K. E., Mann, F. D., Cole, S. W. & Krueger, R. F. Associations Between Loneliness, Epigenetic Aging, and Multimorbidity Through Older Adulthood. *J. Gerontol. B. Psychol. Sci. Soc. Sci.* **79**, gbae169 (2024).
32. Lynch, M., Em Arpawong, T. & Beam, C. R. Associations Between Longitudinal Loneliness, DNA Methylation Age Acceleration, and Cognitive Functioning. *J. Gerontol.*

Ser. B **78**, 2045–2059 (2023).
33. McEwen, B. S. From Molecules to Mind. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **935**, 42–49 (2001).
34. McEwen, B. S. Protective and Damaging Effects of Stress Mediators. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **338**, 171–179 (1998).
35. Lupien, S. J., McEwen, B. S., Gunnar, M. R. & Heim, C. Effects of stress throughout the lifespan on the brain, behaviour and cognition. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **10**, 434–445 (2009).
36. Perry, B. L., Pescosolido, B. A. & Borgatti, S. P. *Egocentric Network Analysis: Foundations, Methods, and Models*. (Cambridge University Press, New York, 2018).
37. Hamilton, C. M. *et al.* The PhenX Toolkit: get the most from your measures. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **174**, 253–260 (2011).
38. Gibbons, R. D. & deGruy, F. V. Without Wasting a Word: Extreme Improvements in Efficiency and Accuracy Using Computerized Adaptive Testing for Mental Health Disorders (CAT-MH). *Curr. Psychiatry Rep.* **21**, 67 (2019).
39. Graham, A. K. *et al.* Validation of the Computerized Adaptive Test for Mental Health in Primary Care. *Ann. Fam. Med.* **17**, 23–30 (2019).
40. Ligthart, S. *et al.* DNA methylation signatures of chronic low-grade inflammation are associated with complex diseases. *Genome Biol.* **17**, 255 (2016).
41. Houseman, E. A. *et al.* DNA methylation arrays as surrogate measures of cell mixture distribution. *BMC Bioinformatics* **13**, 86 (2012).
42. Leek, J. T. *et al.* Tackling the widespread and critical impact of batch effects in high-throughput data. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **11**, 733–739 (2010).
43. Lee, B., Lee, K. & Hartmann, B. Transformation of social relationships in COVID-19 America: Remote communication may amplify political echo chambers. *Sci. Adv.* **9**, eadi1540 (2023).
44. Cao, X. *et al.* Accelerated biological aging in COVID-19 patients. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 2135 (2022).

Supporting Information for Associations Between Negative Social Ties and Accelerated Biological Aging, Inflammation, and Multiple Morbidities

Table S1. The descriptive statistics of individual characteristics in the analytic sample

	Mean	SD	Min	Max	N (=2218)
Individual characteristics					
Age	46.46	18.1	18	104	
Gender: Male	0.48	0.5	0	1	
Gender: Female	0.52	0.5	0	1	
Race: White	0.811	0.39	0	1	
Race: Black	0.103	0.3	0	1	
Race: Hispanic	0.086	0.28	0	1	
Education: HS or less than HS	0.302	0.46	0	1	
Education: Some college	0.387	0.49	0	1	
Education: College or higher	0.311	0.46	0	1	
Marital Status: Never-married	0.224	0.42	0	1	
Marital Status: Married or cohabiting	0.578	0.49	0	1	
Marital Status: Widowed/Separated/Divorced	0.198	0.4	0	1	
Smoking: Never smoker	0.539	0.5	0	1	
Smoking: Ever smoker	0.227	0.42	0	1	
Smoking: Current smoker	0.062	0.24	0	1	
Smoking: Daily smoker	0.172	0.38	0	1	
Interview during COVID-19	0.917	0.28	0	1	
ACES (count)	0.401	0.49	0	1	
Independent variables					
Network Size : All	5.281	2.95	0	25	
Network Size: Negative ties	1.327	1.61	0	13	
% Negative Ties	0.251	0.28	0	1	
Mean Hassle Frequency	0.85	0.66	0	3	
Outcome variables					
AgeAccelGrim2	-0.466	6.15	-16.4	24.54	2218
PACE	1.313	0.2	0.818	1.899	2218
Self-reported General Health	2.701	0.99	1	5	2217
Self-reported Physical Health	2.564	1.06	1	5	2217
Self-reported Mental Health	2.841	1.04	1	5	2217
Anxiety Severity	19.24	18.4	0	100	2165
Depression Severity	29.68	19.1	0	100	2165
Epigenetic inflammation score	-0.036	0.29	-0.64	1.044	2218
Multi-morbidity index	1.09	1.32	0	9	2218
Waist to Hip Ratio	0.91	0.1	0.402	1.295	1815
BMI	30.54	8.26	7.9	100.3	1866
Obese	0.481	0.5	0	1	1866
Height	169.3	11.3	105	199.5	1880

Note. Survey weights were applied to adjust the descriptive statistics.

Table S2. The distribution of network size and the proportion of negative ties.

Network Size	**Freq**	**Percent**	**% Negative ties**
0	35	1.3	
1	97	3.6	25.8
2	232	8.6	23.8
3	415	15.5	22.6
4	461	17.2	24.9
5	404	15	23.6
6	343	12.8	25.4
7	247	9.2	24.9
8	139	5.2	25.3
9	80	3	24.9
10+	232	8.6	24.1
Total	2685	100	
mean	5.07		24.3
sd	2.46		27.6

Table S3. The distribution of the size of negative ties.

N alters	**Freq**	**%**
0	1149	42.8
1	645	24
2	402	15
3	229	8.5
4	131	4.9
5	66	2.5
6+	63	2.3
Total	2685	100
mean	1.25	
sd	1.51	

Table S4. OLS regression models predicting two epigenetic aging clocks.

Outcome	PACE			GrimAge2		
	Model1	Model2	Model3	Model4	Model5	Model6
Batch Number (ref = 8615)						
8732	-0.0105	-0.0109	-0.0109	0.224	0.207	0.210
	(0.00973)	(0.00982)	(0.00984)	(0.315)	(0.316)	(0.316)
9054	-0.0247**	-0.0235*	-0.0229*	0.0687	0.0988	0.119
	(0.00922)	(0.00931)	(0.00935)	(0.284)	(0.284)	(0.284)
9109	-0.00827	-0.00858	-0.00871	0.0627	0.0425	0.0355
	(0.00928)	(0.00929)	(0.00928)	(0.293)	(0.295)	(0.294)
9213	-0.0381**	-0.0394**	-0.0391**	-0.0162	-0.0321	-0.0216
	(0.0105)	(0.0106)	(0.0107)	(0.328)	(0.335)	(0.335)
% Leukocyte cells	-0.594**	-0.597**	-0.597**	-20.27**	-20.30**	-20.29**
	(0.0163)	(0.0161)	(0.0161)	(0.456)	(0.455)	(0.454)
Age	0.0000932	0.0000579	0.0000667	-0.0589**	-0.0594**	-0.0593**
	(0.000205)	(0.000204)	(0.000203)	(0.00681)	(0.00691)	(0.00687)
Race (ref = White)						
Black	0.0756**	0.0758**	0.0768**	2.356**	2.323**	2.328**
	(0.0126)	(0.0128)	(0.0129)	(0.415)	(0.414)	(0.416)
Other	0.0356**	0.0356**	0.0354**	0.471	0.464	0.457
	(0.0111)	(0.0112)	(0.0112)	(0.349)	(0.351)	(0.353)
FEMALE	0.0344**	0.0358**	0.0354**	-0.746**	-0.693**	-0.698**
	(0.00666)	(0.00667)	(0.00669)	(0.227)	(0.228)	(0.229)
Education (ref = HS or less than HS)						
Some college	-0.0185*	-0.0176*	-0.0179*	-0.649**	-0.622*	-0.626*
	(0.00743)	(0.00750)	(0.00751)	(0.242)	(0.244)	(0.244)
College or higher	-0.0650**	-0.0651**	-0.0649**	-2.507**	-2.479**	-2.473**
	(0.00779)	(0.00782)	(0.00782)	(0.245)	(0.249)	(0.249)
Martial Status (ref = Never-married)						
Married or living with a partner	0.0115	0.0126	0.0128	0.460	0.492+	0.498+
	(0.00880)	(0.00875)	(0.00878)	(0.297)	(0.296)	(0.297)
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	0.0322**	0.0335**	0.0337**	1.869**	1.895**	1.905**
	(0.0101)	(0.0100)	(0.00998)	(0.370)	(0.367)	(0.367)
Number of negative ties	0.00465*			0.212**		
	(0.00192)			(0.0563)		
Number of non-negative ties	-0.00293*			-0.133**		
	(0.00120)			(0.0362)		
% Negative Ties		0.0360**			1.787**	
		(0.0114)			(0.344)	
% Negative Ties (ref = 0%)						
.01-			0.0164+			0.511+

			(0.00986)			(0.306)
.25-			0.0108			0.504*
			(0.00810)			(0.251)
.5-			0.0291**			1.202**
			(0.00869)			(0.257)
1-			0.0201			1.734**
			(0.0149)			(0.520)
Constant	1.862**	1.877**	1.875**	21.66**	21.68**	21.66**
	(0.0199)	(0.0373)	(0.0372)	(0.616)	(1.229)	(1.227)
Observations	2227	2227	2227	2227	2227	2227

Note. Models 2, 3, 5, and 6 control for network size dummies. Standard errors are in parentheses (+ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$).

Table S5. Results from the alternative specification of negative ties.

	PACE		AgeAccelGrim2	
	Model1	Model2	Model3	Model4
Presence of any negative ties	0.0186**		0.848**	
	(0.00642)		(0.189)	
Mean Frequency of Negative Interactions		0.0172**		0.755**
		(0.00483)		(0.144)
Observations	2227	2227	2227	2227
Controls				
Individual controls	V	V	V	V
Network size dummies	V	V	V	V

Note. Coefficients represent the estimated effects of negative social ties on biological aging outcomes, with standard errors in parentheses. Individual controls include age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, and marital status. Network size dummies account for differences in social network size, ensuring that the relative impact of negative ties is not confounded by absolute network size. Statistical significance is denoted as follows: + $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed tests).

Table S6. OLS regression models predicting self-reported health outcomes.

Outcome	General Health	Mental Helth	Physical Health	Anxiety Severity	Depression Severity
Models	Model1	Model2	Model3	Model4	Model5
% Negative Ties	0.523**	0.635**	0.479**	12.27**	14.68**
	(0.0773)	(0.0806)	(0.0758)	(1.399)	(1.489)
Batch Number (ref = 8615)					
8732	0.0579	0.0373	0.0247	-0.499	0.898
	(0.0649)	(0.0699)	(0.0676)	(1.226)	(1.299)
9054	0.0163	0.0415	0.0246	0.0304	1.327
	(0.0642)	(0.0709)	(0.0640)	(1.215)	(1.315)
9109	0.123+	0.115	0.160*	-0.145	0.942
	(0.0664)	(0.0717)	(0.0673)	(1.196)	(1.268)
9213	0.0601	0.0752	0.0218	1.792	2.223+
	(0.0718)	(0.0755)	(0.0706)	(1.307)	(1.345)
% Leukocyte cells	-0.561**	-0.348**	-0.522**	-8.930**	-9.256**
	(0.108)	(0.105)	(0.106)	(1.878)	(1.945)
Age	-0.00243+	-0.00966**	-0.000664	-0.261**	-0.219**
	(0.00135)	(0.00130)	(0.00143)	(0.0229)	(0.0231)
Race (ref = White)					
Black	0.0913	-0.0359	0.0387	-1.916	-3.400*
	(0.0813)	(0.0782)	(0.0877)	(1.467)	(1.449)
Other	0.0491	-0.103	0.0618	0.0714	-1.247
	(0.0848)	(0.0881)	(0.0885)	(1.650)	(1.590)
FEMALE	0.0573	0.180**	0.113*	3.219**	3.058**
	(0.0440)	(0.0445)	(0.0473)	(0.776)	(0.815)
Education (ref = HS or less than HS)					
Some college	-0.222**	-0.207**	-0.218**	-1.437	-1.314
	(0.0524)	(0.0529)	(0.0559)	(1.023)	(1.020)
College or higher	-0.490**	-0.400**	-0.507**	-4.011**	-4.450**
	(0.0552)	(0.0539)	(0.0551)	(0.997)	(1.062)
Martial Status (ref = Never-married)					
Married or living with a partner	-0.0665	-0.132*	-0.0928	-2.329*	-2.906**
	(0.0590)	(0.0636)	(0.0619)	(1.154)	(1.123)
Widowed/Divorced/Separated	0.115+	0.0679	0.0663	1.103	1.694
	(0.0693)	(0.0751)	(0.0732)	(1.389)	(1.398)
Constant	3.668**	3.606**	3.634**	40.34**	45.96**
	(0.259)	(0.256)	(0.256)	(5.768)	(6.043)
Observations	2226	2226	2226	2174	2174

Note. All models control for network size dummies. Standard errors are in parentheses (+ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$).

Table S7. OLS regression models predicting objective health outcomes.

Outcome	Epigenetic inflammation score	Multi morbidity	Waist to Hip Ratio	BMI	Height
Models	Model6	Model7	Model8	Model9	Model10
% Negative Ties	0.0357**	0.345**	0.0155*	2.417**	-0.674
	(0.0128)	(0.113)	(0.00761)	(0.793)	(0.759)
Batch Number (ref = 8615)					
8732	-0.0230*	-0.00227	0.00494	-0.739	-0.0100
	(0.0107)	(0.0963)	(0.00690)	(0.682)	(0.687)
9054	-0.0444**	-0.00703	0.000357	-0.476	0.471
	(0.0102)	(0.0912)	(0.00660)	(0.638)	(0.656)
9109	-0.0258*	0.0718	0.00524	0.104	0.539
	(0.0102)	(0.0894)	(0.00667)	(0.620)	(0.637)
9213	-0.0410**	-0.00812	0.00190	-1.111	0.851
	(0.0119)	(0.101)	(0.00692)	(0.722)	(0.676)
% Leukocyte cells	-1.207**	-0.717**	-0.00976	1.312	-1.413
	(0.0196)	(0.161)	(0.0101)	(0.943)	(1.010)
Age	0.000737**	0.0270**	0.000917**	-0.000193	-0.109**
	(0.000226)	(0.00198)	(0.000147)	(0.0144)	(0.0119)
Race (ref = White)					
Black	0.0184	-0.00375	0.00658	1.169	-0.667
	(0.0130)	(0.113)	(0.00684)	(0.877)	(0.695)
Other	0.00591	0.107	0.00190	0.895	-1.888**
	(0.0126)	(0.117)	(0.00712)	(0.845)	(0.627)
FEMALE	0.0382**	0.0354	-0.0847**	0.749+	-13.81**
	(0.00726)	(0.0626)	(0.00435)	(0.429)	(0.393)
Education (ref = HS or less than HS)					
Some college	-0.0121	-0.104	-0.00436	0.305	0.645
	(0.00813)	(0.0755)	(0.00505)	(0.501)	(0.438)
College or higher	-0.0586**	-0.269**	-0.0151**	-1.601**	1.837**
	(0.00861)	(0.0803)	(0.00553)	(0.502)	(0.502)
Martial Status (ref = Never-married)					
Married or living with a partner	0.00936	0.0344	0.0121*	0.676	0.669
	(0.00995)	(0.0693)	(0.00602)	(0.626)	(0.615)

Widowed/Divorced/Separated	0.0467**	0.164+	0.0169*	0.747	0.412
	(0.0111)	(0.0901)	(0.00666)	(0.753)	(0.694)
Constant	1.055**	0.236	0.926**	30.64**	176.3**
	(0.0370)	(0.386)	(0.0282)	(2.797)	(3.579)
Observations	2227	2050	1823	1873	1887

Note. All models control for network size dummies. Standard errors are in parentheses (+ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$).