The impact of parental adverse childhood experiences on children's healthcare utilisation: a systematic review

Mark F.M. Ketelaars[1,2], Merel Sprenger[1], Anouk J.M. Bos[2], Anne M. de Grauw[2], Michiel Burger[2], Mirjam van Veen[2], Jessica C. Kiefte-de Jong[1]

[1] Health Campus The Hague/Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Leiden University Medical Center, Turfmarkt 99, 2511 DP, The Hague, The Netherlands
[2] Juliana Children's Hospital (Haga Teaching hospital), Els Borst-Eilersplein 275, 2545 AA, The Hague, the Netherlands.

Abstract

Background Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) are potentially traumatic events occurring before the age of 18 and are linked to a range of health, cognitive, and socioeconomic challenges – effects that can extend into the next generation. While the association between ACEs and disease risk has been extensively studied, the impact of parental ACEs on children's healthcare utilisation is not yet systematically evaluated. The aim of this study was to systematically gather the available evidence on the influence of parental ACEs on the use of healthcare services used by their children.

Methods Original studies on parental ACEs and other types of childhood adversity and preventive, primary, or secondary healthcare utilisation before December 2024 were sought in PubMed, Embase and PsycINFO. Title and abstract screening was conducted using ASReview. To assess quality across multiple domains (study design, participant selection, outcome selection and measurement, and statistical analysis), we applied a combination of three existing frameworks.

Results In total, 8494 papers were found, of which 16 included. While the results from these publications were mixed, a modest positive effect of parental ACEs on healthcare utilisation was found. Especially in secondary care utilisation, the majority of the evidence pointed towards a positive association. No associations were found for primary care utilisation.

Conclusions The findings do not provide strong evidence that children of parents with ACEs use more healthcare services, but this group seems to use more specialised care that may increase future healthcare burden.

Keywords Adverse childhood experiences, intergenerational transmission, delivery of healthcare.

What is already known on this topic:

- *Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) can have adverse effects on both mental and physical health. The last decade, more has become known about their intergenerational effects and developmental and health effects have been observed in children of parents exposed to ACEs. Also, previous reviews have demonstrated the effects of ACEs on healthcare utilisation in adults. However, evidence for the effects of parental ACEs on healthcare utilisation of their children has not been systematically reviewed.*

What this study adds

- *No association was found between parental ACEs and primary care utilisation, and mixed results were found for preventive care. However, a general trend suggests that parental ACEs increase secondary healthcare utilisation in children.*

How this study might affect research, practice or policy

- *Higher secondary care utilisation in children of parents with ACEs implicates an increased burden of disease and added stress on healthcare systems. Addressing ACE-related healthcare challenges requires an integrated care approach that incorporates recognition and prevention of ACEs. In practice, this calls for early identification and coordinated family support. Future research should explore which care strategies best meet the needs of these families and how to effectively target upstream risk.*

Introduction

Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) are potentially traumatic events that take place during childhood (0-17 years). Examples of these ACEs are child abuse or witnessing domestic violence, household substance abuse, neglect, psychological problems and divorcing parents.[1] A history of ACEs has been linked to a wide variety of problems, including chronic and mental illnesses, social cognitive impairments, and economic disadvantage.[2–5] An accumulating body of literature provides growing evidence that ACEs can be transmitted across generations, with parents who have a history of ACEs potentially passing health effects on to their children.[5] Several mechanisms are thought to play a role in this transmission, including impaired parenting resulting from the social-emotional effects of ACEs, epigenetic changes induced by early-life stress, and physiological changes associated with increased allostatic load, further increasing the risk of subsequent illnesses.[6,7]

The intergenerational transmission of ACEs is an important contributor to the overall burden of adversity on parents, children, healthcare, and society. Parental mental health conditions related to ACEs exacerbate long-term negative health outcomes and may increase healthcare use. Moreover, certain healthcare interventions themselves can become traumatic events.[8] Additionally, Shah et al. describe that ACEs may lead to suboptimal coping abilities in parents that affect their capabilities to care for their child after hospitalisation.[9] This interplay of adversity, caregiving strain, and systemic factors further increases the burden on healthcare and society, amplifying the direct effects of ACEs.

According to Hughes et al., ACEs are associated with major health issues and financial costs across European countries.[3] However, the actual impact of parental ACEs on healthcare utilisation has never been systematically evaluated. Thus, more extensive research on the impact of parental ACEs and their healthcare consequences is needed for population health management purposes.[10] Hence, this review aims to systematically examine the association between parental ACEs and children's healthcare utilisation. Understanding this relationship can make way for reducing ACE-related complications in future generations and benefit both communities and patients.

Methods

DATA SOURCES AND SEARCH STRATEGY

This review followed a preregistered protocol (PROSPERO ID: 422942, accesible online via https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/view/CRD42023422942) and PRISMA guidelines.[11] We searched PubMed, Embase, and PsycINFO for literature on parental ACEs and healthcare utilisation published before December 2024, using terms related to ACEs, early life stress, and healthcare use (see online supplement 1). Only English and Dutch-language reports were included. Case reports, qualitative studies, and reviews were excluded. Grey literature was hand-searched via the DANS Data Station Life Sciences and British Library EThOS.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Peer-reviewed studies assessing the association between parental ACEs and healthcare utilisation were eligible for inclusion. Studies had to meet two criteria: (1) the exposure involved parental, maternal, or paternal ACEs; and (2) the outcome described healthcare use or access by children. A broad definition of ACEs was used, allowing inclusion of studies using standardised tools (e.g. ACE Index, CTQ), individual events (e.g. physical violence, parental substance use), or less common adversities (e.g. migration). Healthcare utilisation included a wide range of services, such as GP visits, specialist care, well-child visits, dental care, treatment, and medication.

STUDY SELECTION

All initially identified records were imported into Active Learning for Systematic Reviews (ASReview) for abstract screening. ASReview combines machine learning with active learning to predict inclusion likelihood.[12] Based on prior evaluation studies, we selected the Naïve Bayes classifier with TF-IDF for feature extraction, and applied certainty-based sampling to prioritise relevant records. Screening was halted after 25% of records were reviewed, optimising efficiency while minimising irrelevant results.[13]

Subsequently, remaining records were imported into Mendeley for full-text screening using a standardised form (MS Forms) to assess eligibility and extract key information. Five reviewers (MK, JK,

MS, AZ, AB) independently labelled studies as “included” or “excluded” with reasons; discrepancies were resolved through discussion. All inclusions were verified by the first author. Screening of reference lists from selected studies and prior reviews yielded one additional paper, resulting in 16 included studies. No separate list of excluded studies was compiled. Figure 1 shows the PRISMA flowchart.[11]



Figure 1. PRISMA flow chart.

DATA EXTRACTION

Data extraction was carried out by MK in accordance with the review protocol, on which a screening form and data extraction form were based (online supplementary materials 3). Extracted data included article information, population characteristics (age, ethnicity and type of population), study design, ACE assessment, types of healthcare utilisation, and effect estimates.

ASSESSMENT OF RISK OF BIAS

Study quality was assessed using a tool based on three established frameworks (online supplementary materials 2).[14–16] The checklist included five domains: study design, participant selection, outcome selection and measurement, and statistical analysis. Each domain was scored 0–2 points, except statistical analysis, which allowed up to 3 points for more rigorous confounder adjustment. Total scores ranged from 0 to 11 and were grouped into four categories: poor (0–3), fair (4–6), good (7–8), and excellent (9–11). This approach provided a transparent and systematic method for comparing methodological quality across studies.

DATA SYNTHESIS AND ANALYSIS

For the 16 included papers, results were reported using harvest plots to visualise effects by study. Studies were ranked by quality score, and exposures and outcomes were categorised to summarise the heterogeneous findings. We created two groups for the exposures based on the ACE assessment, dividing the studies in original ACE index (ACE-10) as defined by Felitti et al., or other assessments of parental adversity.[17] Outcomes were grouped by levels of healthcare: preventive, primary and secondary care. Since the healthcare levels are related in a hierarchical and integrated manner, this approach enables assessments of the mutual influence of utilisation in each of the levels.

Results

Included studies were conducted between 2008 and 2024. The majority, 14 out of 16, were conducted in the United States. The total sample size across all studies was 106,775, with a median of 451 (range: 61–

93,391). While only a small portion of studies reported parental age at time of the study, there was a wide range (15–50+ years), and mean maternal age was 34.4 years. The included publications studied children across all age groups (0–17 years), with a mean child age of 6.9 years. Among all studies, the most studied population identified as Black. Most studies were cross-sectional observational designs. The mean study quality was 5.6 (SD 1.8), with a range of 3 to 9. The majority were rated as fair (61.9%), with only one (4.76%) rated as excellent. The findings are summarised in figure 2. Studied exposures and outcomes were highly heterogeneous. An overview of all exposures and outcomes is available in the data extraction form (online supplementary material 3).



Figure 2. Evidence for effects of parental ACEs on healthcare utilisation. A Harvest plot matrix covering three levels of care (columns) and exposures, categorised as original ACE index or any other ACE measure (rows). Each association is represented by a mark in each row for which that study had reported relevant results. The height of the bar and the number in the bar indicate the quality of the study. Some papers reported more than one association. *The studied outcome in this research was treatment completion. Hence, a decline in treatment completion should be regarded in the same way as increased healthcare utilisation, as both indicate a higher burden on the healthcare system. †The publications studied the same population, but two years apart.

PREVENTIVE CARE

Mixed evidence was found in the studies in which the association between parental ACEs and healthcare utilisation were analysed. It is important to note that the decrease concerns well-child visits; Eismann et al. found that maternal, but not paternal, ACEs were associated with an increased probability of missing well-child visits (IRR 1.60; 95% CI, 1.04-2.47; P = .010).[18] In the same study of fair quality (score 6),

they did not find an effect of parental ACEs on delayed or missed immunisations (as recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics).

Contrastingly, Day et al. reported that parental ACE exposure was associated with an increased odds ratio (OR 1.18; 95% CI, 1.00–1.39, p = 0.049) of paediatric influenza vaccinations.[19] It is notable, however, that this study was among the lowest quality of all included studies, with a score of 3, categorising it as poor. In general, the mean quality (4.75) of the studies in this domain was the second lowest of all domains.

There were no studies included in which exposures other than the original ACE index were studied in combination with preventive care services.

PRIMARY CARE

Across primary care outcomes, none of the studies found an association with parental ACEs or other ACE measures. These studies were of fair quality. Parental adversity did not seem to influence children's use of primary care services, such as sick visits or having a usual source of healthcare. However, with three studies of fair quality and one of poor quality, the mean quality of studies in this domain (4.25) was lowest of all.

SECONDARY CARE

Studies examining the association between parental ACEs and secondary care services showed a trend towards increased healthcare utilisation. While two studies of high quality reported no association, three publications reported increased healthcare utilisation. In their study of fair quality (6), Weigert demonstrated that parental ACEs were associated with a slightly higher number of paediatric emergency department visits (IRR 1.013; 95% CI, 1.001–1.024, P = not reported).[20] Another increase in secondary healthcare utilisation was found by Shah et al. In this high-quality study (8), children of parents with 4 or more ACEs had higher odds (OR 1.69; 95% CI, 1.11-2.60, P = 0.02) of unanticipated reutilisation after an index hospitalisation (e.g. return to the emergency room, urgent care, or unplanned readmission within 30 days of hospital discharge), compared with children of parents with no ACEs.[21]

In the secondary care domain with other ACE measures as the exposure, increased healthcare utilisation was observed in four studies, three of which were high quality studies. This provides strong evidence for an increase in healthcare utilisation. While Day et al. found no association between the original ACE index and paediatric antibiotic use, they did show that caregiver childhood sexual abuse was associated with earlier infection-related clinical encounter (e.g., primary care, UC, ED, admission) in children (HR 1.27; 95% CI, 1.05-1.53, P = not reported) and caregiver exposure to physical abuse was associated with more antibiotics use in children (OR 1.90; 95% CI, 1.20-1.30, P = not reported).[19,22] The final increase in this domain was described by Santavirta et al., who reported that maternal childhood evacuation in World War II increased chances of psychiatric hospitalisation in children (HR 2.04; 95% CI, 1.04–4.01, P = not reported).[23]

Notably, the only observed decrease in healthcare utilisation was reported in a study by Simons et al., where the studied outcome was treatment completion.[24] While there were two studies of fair quality that found no associations, the general trend in associations of parental ACEs and other ACE measures with secondary care is positive.

Discussion

In this review, we examined the associations of parental ACEs and other ACE measures among three healthcare levels. Whilst our findings do not provide strong evidence that in general children of parents with ACEs use more healthcare services, they suggest a positive trend for specific forms of healthcare utilisation. For preventive care, two studies found no association, while two others found contradictory results. A decrease in attendance at well-child visits may delay the identification of developmental or medical concerns in children of parents with ACEs, potentially increasing the risk of late detection.[18] In contrast, an observed increase in vaccination uptake—such as for influenza—may indicate greater protection against specific infectious diseases. The authors of the latter study noted that their results

contradicted existing literature, as they expected parents with high ACEs to be more concerned about vaccination.[19] These findings should be carefully interpreted, also given the poor quality of the study.

Parental ACEs and other ACE measures were not associated with utilisation of primary care services, but for secondary care, a general positive trend was found. In the ACE domain, three of four studies investigating hospital presentation or admission reported an increase in the outcome. Notably, the study by Sosnowski et al., which found no association, differed fundamentally in its methodological approach to ACE measurement compared to Ciciolla et al., despite examining a similar outcome.[25,26]

In the domain of other ACE measures, four positive associations with increased secondary healthcare utilisation were observed, reflecting a similar trend. The only reported decrease in healthcare utilisation in secondary care came from a study with a fair quality (5). In this study, Simons et al. reported lower treatment completion in mothers and children when mothers were exposed to emotional neglect in their childhood.[24] Lower treatment completion could increase children's disease burden, further supporting the trend from three high-quality studies that showed parental ACEs lead to increased secondary healthcare utilisation.

To our knowledge, no other reviews have been published examining the association between parental ACEs and children’s healthcare utilisation. However, the trend towards increased secondary care utilisation is in line with existing literature, as Bhattarai reported increased all-cause hospitalisation in adults exposed to ≥1 ACE.[27] In our review, 85% of studies examining hospital presentation or admission in children similarly reported an increase in utilisation. Together, these findings suggest that parental ACEs may, over time, contribute to increased morbidity in children, with health problems potentially going unrecognised until symptoms escalate—resulting in greater reliance on acute rather than planned care.

The observed trend in secondary care, especially hospitalisation, could be explained by children of parents with ACEs being at higher disease risk yet not seeking preventive or primary care more

frequently, possibly due to multiple factors. First, parents with ACEs may not be aware of their own or children's increased health risks, as the intergenerational effects – potentially mediated by mechanisms such as allostatic load – are often gradual and biologically embedded.[28] This complexity also challenges healthcare providers, who may struggle to accurately identify parents with a history of adversity. Secondly, ACEs are associated with lower socioeconomic position, which negatively affects access to healthcare.[29] Third, experiencing adversity can lead to changes in behaviour, including increased risky health behaviour, avoidance of healthcare services and altered coping mechanisms to stress in parents – all of which may contribute to reduced healthcare seeking for their own children.[30–32] Because of the latter, parents may feel less able or are less organised to come to visits as scheduled, which could be supported by the decrease found in treatment completion and increase in missed well-child visits in this review.[18,24,33]

Another explanation is a possible mismatch between the levels of care. Improved coordination between preventive, primary, and specialist services could help prevent unnecessary escalation of care – particularly in individuals with a history of ACEs, who may already be navigating multiple services. For these individuals, the complexity of the healthcare system may be especially challenging, contributing to disengagement or delayed care. Moreover, early identification of parental ACEs may help children at an elevated risk of healthcare burden later in life. Integrating mental health support in family care can help mitigate the downstream effects of parental adversity on children's healthcare utilisation. Psychosocial needs underlying lower treatment completion and a reduced utilisation of preventive care services could be addressed by intervening at family level. This focus allows for targeting root causes of healthcare utilisation and improving long-term outcomes, while also prompting reflection on whether conventional service use metrics fully capture the needs of families affected by ACEs.

It is also possible that healthcare utilisation alone does not fully capture the support needs of these families. Barriers such as limited system trust, financial constraints, or use of alternative care may

contribute to underutilisation of formal services, despite elevated health risks in children of parents with ACEs

The findings in this research should be interpreted in light of some methodological considerations. First, although the quality of the included studies was generally fair to good, the applied analytics in these studies was highly heterogeneous, which precluded meta-analysis. Moreover, a major methodological challenge in this research field is the lack of consensus on the operationalisation of ACEs. In this review, among the 10 studies with an ACE index, 4 treated ACEs as numerical, 6 as categorical variables and 4 different categorisations were used. Not only does the lack of uniformity in approaches make it difficult to compare results between studies, it may also skew results.

In this review, effect sizes differed notably depending on how ACEs were operationalised, as categorical approaches can yield larger ORs than numerical approaches.[25,26] Treating ACEs categorically may capture threshold or non-linear effects more effectively than a continuous approach. Lê-Scherban et al. provided some relevant methodological basis for this observed difference.[5] In their main analysis using a continuous parental ACE score, they found no association with child dental care or children having a usual source of care. However, in a sensitivity analysis using categorical ACE groups, they reported markedly higher odds of poor overall health among children of highly exposed parents. Although their outcome domain differs, the finding illustrates how categorising ACEs may reveal stronger dose-response relationships than continuous measures might. This calls for more consensus on ACE operationalisation in future research.

Secondly, while a comprehensive search strategy was applied, the possibility of language or publication bias cannot be fully excluded. Only peer-reviewed studies in English were included (Dutch reports were sought but not found). This may have led to an underrepresentation of evidence published in other formats or languages. Moreover, controlling for publication bias in observational studies can be difficult because registration of the protocol is not standard. Furthermore, the generalisability of the evidence is limited—particularly in a European context—as 14 of the 16 included studies were conducted in the

United States. Of the remaining two, only one was carried out in Europe (Finland), while the other originated from Nepal. Hence, the results might not reflect the associations present in European countries, where healthcare is generally more accessible. Finally, in many of the included studies, specific ethnic groups were overrepresented. This warrants further research in other countries and general populations.

While there is ample research on the association between ACEs and disease outcomes, evidence on how parental ACEs affect healthcare utilisation in children remains limited. Nonetheless, a trend towards increased secondary care utilisation was observed. This review highlights the need for further research to clarify these secondary consequences and to inform policy development. Investing in early identification and integrated, proactive care approaches may help reduce the intergenerational burden of ACEs on health systems and society.

Ethics statements

PATIENT CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Not applicable.

ETHICS APPROVAL

Not applicable.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

Funding

No funding was received for the conduct of this review.

Acknowledgements

We thank Anne Zijp for her contribution to the screening process.

References

1. Gilgoff R, Singh L, Koita K, Gentile B, Marques SS. Adverse Childhood Experiences, Outcomes, and Interventions. Vol. 67, Pediatric Clinics of North America. W.B. Saunders; 2020. p. 259–73.

2. McDonnell CG, Valentino K. Intergenerational Effects of Childhood Trauma: Evaluating Pathways Among Maternal ACEs, Perinatal Depressive Symptoms, and Infant Outcomes. Child Maltreat. 2016 Nov 1;21(4):317–26.

3. Hughes K, Bellis MA, Hardcastle KA, Sethi D, Butchart A, Mikton C, et al. The effect of multiple adverse childhood experiences on health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Public Health [Internet]. 2017;2(8):e356–66. Available from: www.thelancet.com/

4. Morris G, Berk M, Maes M, Carvalho AF, Puri BK. Socioeconomic Deprivation, Adverse Childhood Experiences and Medical Disorders in Adulthood: Mechanisms and Associations. Vol. 56, Molecular Neurobiology. Humana Press Inc.; 2019. p. 5866–90.

5. Lê Scherban F, Xi W, Boyle-Steed KH, Pachter LM. Intergenerational associations of parent adverse childhood experiences and child health outcomes. Pediatrics [Internet]. 2018;141(6). Available from: http://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article-pdf/141/6/e20174274/1065668/peds_20174274.pdf

6. Danese A, McEwen BS. Adverse childhood experiences, allostasis, allostatic load, and age-related disease. Vol. 106, Physiology and Behavior. 2012. p. 29–39.

7. Bhattacharya S, Fontaine A, Maccallum PE, Drover J, Blundell J. Stress across generations: DNA methylation as a potential mechanism underlying intergenerational effects of stress in both post-traumatic stress disorder and pre-clinical predator stress rodent models. Vol. 13, Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience. Frontiers Media S.A.; 2019.

8. Heyne CS, Kazmierczak M, Souday R, Horesh D, Lambregtse-van den Berg M, Weigl T, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of birth-related posttraumatic stress among parents: A comparative systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Psychol Rev [Internet]. 2022;94(February):102157. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2022.102157

9. Shah AN, Beck AF, Sucharew HJ, Litman S, Pfefferman C, Haney J, et al. Parental adverse childhood experiences and resilience on coping after discharge. Pediatrics [Internet]. 2018;141(4):e20172127. Available from: http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/pediatrics/141/4/e20172127.full.pdf?download=true

10. Granatir T, Lord JT. Lessons from the USA Population health management in a US health plan. J Manag Marketing Healthc [Internet]. 2007 Aug [cited 2025 Apr 10];1(1):102–9. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1179/mmh.2007.1.1.102

11. Page M, McKenzie J, Bossuyt P, Boutron I, Hoffmann T, Mulrow C. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;

12. van de Schoot R, de Bruin J, Schram R, Zahedi P, de Boer J, Weijdema F, et al. An open source machine learning framework for efficient and transparent systematic reviews. Nat Mach Intell [Internet]. 2021;3(2):125–33. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s42256-020-00287-7

13. Ferdinands G. AI-Assisted Systematic Reviewing: Selecting Studies to Compare Bayesian Versus Frequentist SEM for Small Sample Sizes. Multivariate Behav Res. 2020;56(1):153–4.

14. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. JAMA [Internet]. 2000 Apr 19 [cited 2025 Apr 10];283(15):2008–12. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10789670/

15. Wong WCW, Cheung CSK, Hart GJ. Development of a quality assessment tool for systematic reviews of observational studies (QATSO) of HIV prevalence in men having sex with men and associated risk behaviours. Emerg Themes Epidemiol [Internet]. 2008 [cited 2025 Apr 10];5. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19014686/

16. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. J Clin Epidemiol [Internet]. 2008 Apr [cited 2025 Apr 10];61(4):344–9. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18313558/

17. Felitti VJ, Anda RF, Nordenberg D, Williamson DF, Spitz AM, Edwards V, et al. Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The adverse childhood experiences (ACE) study. Am J Prev Med [Internet]. 1998 May;14(4):245–58. Available from: www.elsevier.

18. Eismann EA, Folger AT, Stephenson NB, Brownrigg ME, Shapiro RA, Macaluso M, et al. Parental Adverse Childhood Experiences and Pediatric Healthcare Use by 2 Years of Age. Journal of Pediatrics [Internet]. 2019;211:146–51. Available from: http://www.elsevier.com/inca/publications/store/6/2/3/3/1/1/index.htt

19. Day ME, Sucharew H, Burkhardt MC, Reyner A, Giles D, Beck AF, et al. High Caregiver Adverse Childhood Experiences Are Associated With Pediatric Influenza and COVID-19 Vaccination Uptake. J Pediatric Infect Dis Soc [Internet]. 2023 Dec 1 [cited 2025 Apr 10];12(12):595–601. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37846858/

20. Weigert RM, McMichael BS, Vandervelden HA, Lee DB, Cutler GJ, Troy MF, et al. Parental Childhood Adversity and Pediatric Emergency Department Utilization: A Pilot Study. Pediatr Emerg Care [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1 [cited 2025 Apr 10];38(12):665–71. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36375010/

21. Shah AN, Auger KA, Sucharew HJ, Mangeot C, Childress K, Haney J, et al. Effect of Parental Adverse Childhood Experiences and Resilience on a Child's Healthcare Reutilization. J Hosp Med [Internet]. 2020;15(11):645–51. Available from: https://shmpublications.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/15535606

22. Day ME, Duan Q, Burkhardt MC, Klein M, Schlaudecker EP, Beck AF. Caregiver Adverse Childhood Experiences and Pediatric Infection-Related Outcomes. J Pediatric Infect Dis Soc [Internet]. 2024 Oct 1 [cited 2025 Apr 10];13(10):523–32. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39297516/

23. Santavirta T, Santavirta N, Gilman SE. Association of the World War II finnish evacuation of children with psychiatric hospitalization in the next generation. JAMA Psychiatry. 2018 Jan 1;75(1):21–7.

24. Simons L. Characteristics of drug-abusing women with children in residential treatment: A preliminary evaluation of program retention and treatment completion. J Ethn Subst Abuse. 2008 Jun 12;7(2):165–87.

25. Sosnowski DW, Ellison-Barnes A, Kaufman J, Hoyo C, Murphy SK, Hernandez RG, et al. Financial stress as a mediator of the association between maternal childhood adversity and infant birth weight, gestational age, and NICU admission. BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2023 Dec 1 [cited 2025 Jan 21];23(1):1–7. Available from: https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-023-15495-0

26. Ciciolla L, Shreffler KM, Tiemeyer S. Maternal Childhood Adversity as a Risk for Perinatal Complications and NICU Hospitalization. J Pediatr Psychol [Internet]. 2021 Aug 1 [cited 2025 Apr 10];46(7):801–13. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34304270/

27. Bhattarai A, Dimitropoulos G, Bulloch AGM, Tough SC, Patten SB. Childhood adversities and rate of adulthood all-cause hospitalization in the general population: A

retrospective cohort study. PLoS One [Internet]. 2023 Jun 1 [cited 2025 Apr 10];18(6). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37307280/

28. Finlay S, Roth C, Zimsen T, Bridson TL, Sarnyai Z, McDermott B. Adverse childhood experiences and allostatic load: A systematic review. Vol. 136, Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews. Elsevier Ltd; 2022.

29. Alcalá HE, Valdez-Dadia A, Von Ehrenstein OS. Adverse childhood experiences and access and utilization of health care. J Public Health (Oxf) [Internet]. 2017 Dec 1 [cited 2025 Apr 10];40(4):684. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6306082/

30. Shonkoff JP, Garner AS, Siegel BS, Dobbins MI, Earls MF, McGuinn L, et al. The Lifelong Effects of Early Childhood Adversity and Toxic Stress. Pediatrics [Internet]. 2012 Jan 1 [cited 2025 Apr 10];129(1):e232–46. Available from: /pediatrics/article/129/1/e232/31628/The-Lifelong-Effects-of-Early-Childhood-Adversity

31. Maurya C, Maurya P. Adverse childhood experiences and health risk behaviours among adolescents and young adults: evidence from India. BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2023 Dec 1 [cited 2025 Apr 10];23(1):1–12. Available from: https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-023-15416-1

32. Duffy KA, McLaughlin KA, Green PA. Early life adversity and health-risk behaviors: proposed psychological and neural mechanisms. Ann N Y Acad Sci [Internet]. 2018 Sep 1 [cited 2025 Apr 10];1428(1):151. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6158062/

33. Koball AM, Rasmussen C, Olson-Dorff D, Klevan J, Ramirez L, Domoff SE. The relationship between adverse childhood experiences, healthcare utilization, cost of care and medical comorbidities. Child Abuse Negl. 2019 Apr 1;90:120–6.


Identification of studies via databases and registers
Identification of studies via other methods
Identification
Records identified from:
n = 8494
Initial search (n = 7489)
PubMed n = 1927
PsycINFO n = 437
Embase n = 5125
Search update (n = 1005)
PubMed n = 283
PsycINFO n = 65
Embase n = 661
Records removed before screening:
Duplicate records removed (n = 1024)
Initial search (n = 922)
Search update (n = 102)
Records identified from:
Citation searching (n = 1)
Grey literature (n = 0)
Screening
Records screened and sought for retrieval (n = 7461)
Records not retrieved (n = 14)
Records excluded (n = 7162, human: 1568, ASReview: 5594)
Reports sought for retrieval (n = 1)
Reports assessed for eligibility (n = 285)
Reports excluded: (n = 270)
Qualitative research or review (n = 24)
Exposure ≠ ACEs/trauma (n = 81)
Outcome ≠ health care utilisation (n = 120)
Population ≠ children of parents/adult caregivers with ACEs (n = 85)
Reports assessed for eligibility (n = 1)
Included
Studies included in review (n = 18)


Preventive care
Effect on utilisation
Primary care
Effect on utilisation
Secondary care
Effect on utilisation
Study quality
Decrease
No effect
Increase
Excellent
Good
Fair
Poor
Original ACE Index
Other ACE mea-sures
6
4
6
3
3
4
4
6
8
9
5
6
8
5*
5†5†
4
8
8
8
6