Title: **The timing of childhood adversity associates with epigenetic patterns across childhood and adolescence: results from a prospective, longitudinal study**

Authors: Alexandre A. Lussier, PhD*[1,2,3]; Yiwen Zhu, MSc[1,4]; Brooke J. Smith, MSc[1]; Janine Cerutti, BSc[1]; Jonah Fisher, BSc[5]; Phillip Melton, PhD[6]; Natasha M. Wood, B.Psych[7]; Sarah Cohen-Woods, PhD[7,8,9]; Professor Rae-Chi Huang, PhD[10]; Colter Mitchell, PhD[5]; Lisa Schneper, PhD[11], Professor Daniel A. Notterman, MD[11]; Andrew J. Simpkin, PhD[12]; Andrew D.A.C. Smith, PhD[13]; Matthew J. Suderman, PhD[14]; Esther Walton, PhD[15]; Professor Caroline L. Relton, PhD[14]; Professor Kerry J. Ressler MD, PhD[2,16]; Erin C. Dunn, ScD**[1,2,3,17]

Affiliations:

[1] Psychiatric and Neurodevelopmental Genetics Unit, Centre for Genomic Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, 02114, USA.

[2] Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, 02115, USA.

[3] Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research, The Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT, Cambridge, MA, 02142, USA.

[4] Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, 02114, USA

[5] Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Abor, MI, 48104, USA.

[6] School of Population and Global Health, University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA, Australia; Menzies Research Institute, University of Tasmania, Hobart, TAS, Australia.

[7] College of Education, Psychology, and Social Work, Flinders University, Adelaide, SA, Australia.

[8] Flinders Institute for Mental Health and Wellbeing, Flinders University, Adelaide, SA, Australia.

[9] Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, SA, Australia.

[10] Nutrition Health Innovation Research Institute, Edith Cowan University, Perth, WA, Australia.

[11] Department of Molecular Biology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, 08540, USA.

[12] School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, University of Galway, H91 H3CY, Ireland.

[13] Mathematics and Statistics Research Group, University of the West of England, Bristol, BS16 1QY, UK.

[14] MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1UD, UK.

[15] Department of Psychology, University of Bath, Bath, BA2 7AY, UK.

[16] McLean Hospital, Belmont, MA, 02478, USA.

[17] Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 02138, USA.

Corresponding authors contact information:

*Alexandre A. Lussier: alussier[at]mgh.harvard.edu; 617-642-0193

**Erin C. Dunn: edunn2[at]mgh.harvard.edu; 617-726-9387

Address: 185 Cambridge Street, Room 6.260
Boston, MA 02114

1

RESEARCH IN CONTEXT

Evidence before this study

We searched PubMed from inception to July 29, 2022 for articles on childhood adversity and DNA methylation measured during childhood and adolescence in human populations. Search terms included "DNA methylation OR epigenetics", "trauma OR adversity OR abuse", "child OR childhood", "adolescent OR adolescence". Our search did not identify any previous studies that investigated time-varying associations between childhood adversity on adolescent DNA methylation or trajectories of DNA methylation across development.

Added value of this study

To our knowledge, this is the first human study to incorporate time-dependent measures of childhood adversity in the study of longitudinal epigenetic patterns. Our findings are the first to demonstrate the dynamic developmental associations between adversity on the human epigenome. These analyses extend prior work that revealed sensitive periods for the association of childhood adversity with epigenetic alterations at age 7 in ALSPAC, further highlighting that exposure to adversity between the ages of 3-5 may be more closely linked to biological processes and future health than exposure during other time periods.

Implications of all the available evidence

Our study suggests epigenetic mechanisms may serve as a biological link between childhood adversity and long-term health. If replicated, these findings could explain why there are both immediate and latent manifestations of disease among people with histories of childhood adversity. Our findings also support the need for further studies investigating the role of DNA methylation trajectories in predicting child and adolescent health, including risk for immune dysfunction, metabolic disorder, and mental health problems.

ABSTRACT

Background: Childhood adversity is a potent determinant of health across development. Altered DNA methylation (DNAm) signatures have been identified in children exposed to adversity and may be more common among children exposed during sensitive periods in development. However, it remains unclear if adversity has persistent epigenetic associations across childhood and adolescence. We examined the relationship between time-varying adversity and genome-wide DNAm, measured three times from birth to adolescence using prospective data from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children.

Methods: We investigated the relationship between the timing of exposure to seven adversity types (measured 5-8 times between ages 0-11) and blood DNAm at age 15 using a structured life course modeling approach. We also assessed the persistence of adversity-DNAm associations we previously identified from age 7 blood DNAm into adolescence and the influence of adversity on DNAm trajectories from ages 0-15. We attempted to replicate our age 15 associations using data from the Raine Study and Future of Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWS).

Findings: Adversity associated with differences in age 15 DNAm at 41 loci ($R^2 \geq 0.035$). Most loci (20/41; 49%) were associated with adversities occurring between ages 3-5. Most associations were identified for exposures to one-adult households (20/41; 49%), financial hardship (9/41; 22%), or physical/sexual abuse (4/41; 10%). Differences in age 15 DNAm were not present in age 7 DNAm; DNAm differences previously identified at age 7 resolved by age 15. We identified six distinct DNAm trajectories from these patterns of stability and persistence. We replicated the direction of associations for 90% (18/20 loci) of one-adult household loci using adolescent blood DNAm from the Raine Study and 64% of loci (18/28 loci) using saliva

46   DNAm from the FFCWS. The direction of effects for 11 one-adult household loci were

47   replicated in both cohorts.

48   **Interpretation:** These findings highlight the time-varying impact of childhood adversity on

49   DNAm profiles across development, providing a potential biological mechanism linking

50   adversity to adverse health outcomes in children and adolescents.

INTRODUCTION

Children exposed to adversity, such as abuse or maltreatment, family disruption or dysfunction, or poverty, frequently have poorer physical and mental health outcomes later in development and across the life course(1). Epigenetic processes, including DNA methylation (DNAm), are increasingly recognized as potential underlying mechanisms for these associations, as DNAm is responsive to experiences(2) and may mediate the link between environmental exposures and health outcomes(3). Indeed, hundreds of studies in humans, including population-based studies, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses have shown links between childhood adversity, DNAm, and adverse health outcomes across the life course (reviewed in (4)). However, prior studies investigating the epigenome of children exposed to adversity have not yet explored two key dimensions of the adversity-DNAm relationship: 1) the timing of adversity, and 2) the timing of DNAm measurement and its stability over time. These dimensions are critical to understand the biological risk posed by childhood adversity, identify children at risk for poor health, and improve intervention targets for health promotion and disease prevention in children and adolescents.

First, it remains unclear how the *timing* of childhood adversity might shape DNAm. Both human and animal studies suggest there may be *sensitive periods* for epigenetic programming when physiological and neurobiological systems are primed for external influences, allowing experiences to impart more enduring effects(5, 6). Notably, we have previously identified a potential sensitive period for the effects of adversity on childhood DNAm between the ages of 3-5 (7, 8). However, no prior studies have investigated sensitive periods for epigenetic patterns in adolescence.

75   Second, little is known about how DNAm profiles of children exposed to adversity vary

76   across development and how DNAm variation *across time* may shape health. In a recent article,

77   Oh and Petronis(9) argued that the dynamic nature of epigenetic mechanisms is best examined

78   through longitudinal studies that model chrono-epigenetic patterns, meaning the dynamics of

79   epigenetic processes across time, rather than at single timepoints. Although previous studies have

80   shown the epigenome is dynamic across development(10-17), no study has determined how

81   childhood adversity might influence DNAm trajectories.

82   To address these gaps, we examined the longitudinal relationship between early-life

83   adversity and genome-wide DNAm across childhood and adolescence, using data collected over

84   two decades from a subsample of youth in the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children

85   (ALSPAC) cohort. We examined the associations between exposure to seven types of childhood

86   adversity, assessed repeatedly between birth and age 11, and DNAm at age 15. Given the unique

87   availability of three waves of DNAm in ALSPAC (measured from cord blood, and blood at ages

88   7 and 15), we also examined DNAm trajectories from birth to adolescence.

89   Our aims were to: 1) determine whether childhood adversity has time-dependent

90   associations with adolescent DNAm; 2) characterize the developmental trajectories of DNAm

91   linked to adversity; and 3) evaluate the persistence of associations between childhood adversity

92   and DNAm at age 7 that we previously identified in ALSPAC(8) (see **Figure S1** for analytic

93   flow-chart). This study is the first to investigate the time-varying influences of childhood

94   adversity on adolescent DNAm and DNAm trajectories from childhood to adolescence.

95

96   **METHODS**

97   **Study design and participants**

98   ALSPAC is a large population-based birth cohort from Avon, UK of 14,451 children

99   followed from before birth through early adulthood[18, 19]. Blood-based DNAm profiles were

100   generated for a subsample of ALSPAC mother-child pairs as part of the Accessible Resource for

101   Integrated Epigenomic Studies (ARIES), which includes cord blood at birth (n=905), whole

102   blood at age 7 (n=970), and peripheral blood leukocytes at age 15 (n=966)[20] (**Appendix p.3**).

103   We examined seven types of childhood adversity previously associated with DNAm: 1)

104   caregiver physical or emotional abuse; 2) sexual or physical abuse (by anyone); 3) maternal

105   psychopathology; 4) one-adult households; 5) family instability; 6) financial hardship; and 7)

106   neighborhood disadvantage. These adversities were reported by mothers via mailed

107   questionnaires, collected 5-8 times between birth and age 11 (**Figure 1**; **Table S1**).

108   DNAm was measured from blood at 485,577 CpG sites using the Infinium

109   HumanMethylation450 BeadChip microarray (Illumina, San Diego, CA). Laboratory procedures,

110   preprocessing, and quality control steps were described previously[20-21]. We removed non-

111   variable CpGs (<5% DNAm difference between children in the 10th and 90th percentile),

112   resulting in 302,581 CpGs for analyses (**Appendix p.3**). DNAm was analyzed as beta values,

113   which represent the percent of methylation at each site.

114   Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law

115   Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees. Consent for biological samples has been

116   collected in accordance with the Human Tissue Act (2004). Informed consent was obtained from

117   participants following the recommendations of the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee.

118   Secondary analyses of these data were approved with oversight by the Mass General Brigham

119   Institutional Review Boards (Protocol 2017P001110).

120

Statistical analysis

121 **Statistical analysis**

122   We examined time-dependent associations for each adversity among children with

123 DNAm data and no missing data among covariates or the adversity timepoints shown in Figure 1

124 (N=609-665). To adjust for known potential confounders(7), we controlled for age of blood

125 collection, sex, race/ethnicity, maternal age at birth, maternal education at birth, birthweight,

126 number of previous pregnancies, maternal smoking during pregnancy, and cell type proportions (

127 **Appendix p.3** and **Figure S2**).

128   Our primary analyses focused on identifying time-dependent associations between each

129 type of childhood adversity and DNAm measured in adolescence (age 15). We used the

130 structured life course modeling approach (SLCMA), a two-stage method that simultaneously

131 compares *a priori* life course hypotheses explaining exposure-outcome relationships(22-24).

132 SLCMA first uses variable selection to identify the life course hypothesis explaining the greatest

133 proportion of outcome variation. Effect estimates, confidence intervals, and p-values are then

134 calculated for the selected life course hypothesis using post-selective inference. SLCMA detects

135 time-varying associations with more statistical power and less bias than traditional epigenome-

136 wide association studies of ever/never-exposed or cross-sectional paradigms (7, 8, 25).

137   We generated variables corresponding to six separate life course hypotheses, including

138 four sensitive periods hypotheses encoding exposure to each childhood adversity during: 1) *very*

139 *early childhood* (ages 0-2), 2) *early childhood* (ages 3-5), 3) *middle childhood* (ages 6-7), 4) *late*

140 *childhood* (ages 8-11); and two additive hypotheses: 5) *accumulation of exposures* (total

141 exposures of the specific adversity across childhood; **Table S2**), and 6) *recency of exposures*

142 (total exposures of the specific adversity weighted by age) to determine whether more recent

143 exposures had a stronger impact than distal exposures. We tested associations using selective

144   inference and accounted for multiple-testing using the false-discovery rate (FDR). SLCMA,

145   Quantile-quantile plots (**Figure S3**), genomic inflation estimates, and functional analyses of top

146   loci are in **Appendix p.4**.

147   As sensitivity analyses. we completed internal validation analyses of the SLCMA results

148   using ordinary nonparametric bootstrapping, and investigated the impact of potential

149   confounders or alternate mediators of the association between childhood adversity and DNAm at

150   age 15, including exposures to other types of childhood adversity in the same or different

151   sensitive periods (**Appendix p.5-7, 10-12**).

152

153   We sought to replicate primary associations between childhood adversity and DNAm

154   levels in adolescence using data from The Raine Study(26, 27) and the Future of Families and

155   Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWS)(28). In the Raine Study, we analyzed the loci linked to one-

156   adult households using blood DNAm measured at age 17 (N=382-529). In the FFCWS, we

157   analyzed the loci linked to caregiver abuse, financial hardship, maternal psychopathology, and

158   one-adult households using saliva DNAm measured at age 15 (N=662-1,859). The timing of

159   adversity exposures was matched with the one identified in ALSPAC (see **Appendix p.7-10**).

160

161   Finally, the three waves of longitudinal DNAm data available in ALSPAC also allowed

162   us to investigate three subsequent analyses of DNAm trajectories across development (**Appendix**

163   **p.12-13**). First, we assessed whether DNAm differences identified at age 15 emerged earlier in

164   development, using linear regression to test whether exposure to the same type and timing of

165   childhood adversity was associated with DNAm at the same top loci at birth or age 7. Second,

166   we investigated DNAm patterns in our top loci beyond the age 15 time point, studying

167 longitudinal change and stability of DNAm across age 0, 7, and 15 among children from three

168 distinct exposure groups: 1) children who had adversity exposure *during* the sensitive period

169 identified from the SLCMA (labeled as exposed-SP); 2) children who had adversity exposure

170 *outside* the sensitive period identified from the SLCMA (exposed-other); and 3) children who

171 were never exposed to adversity.

172   Third, we previously identified associations between time-varying exposures to

173 childhood adversity and DNAm levels at age 7 for 46 loci across the epigenome(8). To

174 determine whether these DNAm alterations persisted to adolescence, we performed linear

175 regressions between the same type and timing of childhood adversity and DNAm levels

176 measured at age 15 for these 46 loci.

177 **Role of the funding sources**

178   The funding sources played no role in the writing of the manuscript or decision to submit

179 for publication. The authors were not paid to write this article by a pharmaceutical company or

180 other agency.

181

182 **RESULTS**

183   Demographic characteristics did not differ between the ARIES sample and children

184 exposed to any adversity between ages 0-11 (**Table S3**). The prevalence of exposure to a given

185 adversity between ages 0-11 ranged from 15.1% (sexual/physical abuse, 100 of 663 children) to

186 34.8% (maternal psychopathology, 222 of 639 children) (**Figure S4; Table S4**). The tetrachoric

187 correlation of exposure within adversity across development ranged from 0.36 (family

188 instability) to 0.786 (one-adult households). Different types of adversity were weakly correlated

189 (r_{avg}=-0.04-0.16).

190

Across all types of adversity, 41 loci showed significant associations between exposure to adversity and DNAm levels at age 15 ($\geq$3.5% of DNAm variance explained by adversity; largest p-value=5.94x10^{-6}; **Table 1; Table S5**). Of these, 22 loci were significant after multiple-test correction (FDR<0.05). As prior studies show that p-values are poor metrics of statistical inference on their own(29, 30), particularly in the context of time-varying associations(8), we focused downstream analyses on CpGs meeting the R^2 threshold.

Sensitive periods were the most often selected life course hypothesis by the SLCMA, with 35 loci showing associations with childhood adversity that occurred during *very early childhood* (20%; 18/41), *early childhood* (56%; 23/41), or *late childhood* (10%; 4/41) (**Figure 2**). Only 3 loci (7%) showed associations with the accumulation or recency of adversity. Most of these associations were for exposure to one-adult households (20 loci), followed by financial hardship (9 loci), sexual or physical abuse by anyone (4 loci), caregiver physical or emotional abuse (3 loci), neighborhood disadvantage (3 loci), family instability (1 locus), and maternal psychopathology (1 locus).

Childhood adversity was mainly associated with a decrease in DNAm (35/41 loci). On average, childhood adversity exposure was linked to a 3.5% absolute difference in DNAm (range 0.9-10.4%). For loci associated with accumulated time living in one-adult households, each additional exposure timepoint associated with a 1% difference in DNAm (range 0.3-1.4%). For loci associated with the recency of financial hardship, one additional exposure was linked to a -1.3% to 2.3% change in DNAm per year of age at exposure.

Top loci showed higher representation in low CpG density regions, such as enhancers (p=0.008) and Open Seas (p=0.018) (**Figure S5**). Most loci (28/41) had weak, positive brain-blood

213 correlations in individuals without exposure to adversity (28/41 positive; r_{avg}=0.10; 10 with

214 p<0.05; **Table S6**; **Figure S6**)(31), suggesting adversity-associated differences in blood DNAm

215 could be reflected in the central nervous system. No biological processes were significantly

216 enriched in top loci using the DAVID or *missMethyl* gene ontology tools(32, 33)(**Figures S7-**

217 **S8**). Seven genes linked to sexual/physical abuse (*TAF1*), family instability (*PKD2*), financial

218 hardship (*FBXL16, XKR6*), or one-adult households (*DSP*, *CUX2*, *STK38L*) showed evidence of

219 strong functional constraint through analyses of probability of intolerance to loss-of-function

220 mutations(34)(**Table S5; Figure S9**). Finally, several loci were previously associated with

221 gestational age (7 loci), sex (6 loci), smoking (1 locus), inflammatory bowel disease (1 locus),

222 and rheumatoid arthritis (4 loci). Together, these findings suggest different types of childhood

223 adversity may act through diverse biological processes (**Appendix p.4-5**).

224   Internal validation of top associations yielded nearly identical results to the initial

225 analyses (largest difference in effect estimates=2.03%) (**Figure S10; Table S7**). Our results

226 remained stable when correcting for exposure to other adversities during the sensitive period or

227 across childhood, suggesting they were not influenced by co-occurring adversity (**Appendix p.6-**

228 **7; Figure S11-13**). Together, these results point to the robustness and specificity of associations

229 between time-varying childhood adversity and DNAm at age 15.

230   We attempted to replicate these associations in two independent datasets, the Raine Study

231 and FFCWS (**Figure S14**). Using data from the Raine Study (blood DNAm), we tested

232 associations for the 20 CpGs associated with one-adult households (**Table S8**). Of these, 18

233 CpGs (90%) showed the same direction of effects in the Raine Study, which was more likely

234 than random chance (p=2x10^{-4}; **Figure S15**). Three CpGs were nominally significant (p<0.05) in

235 the Raine Study; none of the effect estimate confidence intervals contained zero and all had the

236   same direction as ALSPAC. Effect estimates in the Raine Study were smaller compared to

237   ALSPAC. These differences were mitigated when correcting for winner's curse effects (**Figure**

238   **S15**).

239   Using data from FFCWS (saliva DNAm), we attempted to replicate associations for 28

240   loci associated with four childhood adversities. Of these, 64% of CpGs (18/28) showed the same

241   direction of effects in the FFCWS (p=0.092), with 73% of one-adult household loci (11/15)

242   showing concordant directions (p=0.059; Figure S16; Table S9). Importantly, all 11 of these one-

243   adult household loci showed the same direction of effects in the Raine Study. While the

244   magnitudes of effects were smaller in FFCWS, one CpG associated with the accumulation of

245   one-adult household exposures (cg00807464; *CUX2*) showed nearly identical effect estimates

246   between cohorts. These results point to the partial replication of associations from ALSPAC in

247   independent cohorts, particularly for exposures to one-adult households.

248

249   For the 41 loci identified in age 15 DNAm, none showed associations between adversity

250   and DNAm at birth (**Table S10**) or age 7 (**Table S11**). Notably, the age 7 estimates were *smaller*

251   than the age 15 associations, with consistent directions-of-effect in about half of loci (20/41)

252   (**Figure 3A**). Agnostic of adversity exposure, correlations in DNAm levels across ages were low

253   at the individual-level (r_{avg}=0.11; **Figure S17**). The emergence of these associations was not

254   explained by early-life confounders (<10% change in effect estimates for parental socio-

255   economic position, maternal BMI, or gestational age) or biological mediators during adolescence

256   (<5% of the association mediated through age at pubertal onset, adolescent BMI, CRP levels, or

257   smoking), suggesting some adolescent differences may emerge later in development and become

258   stronger with time (**Appendix p.10-12**); **Figures S2, S18-24**).

259

260   Moving beyond adolescent DNAm, 34 of the 41 loci had significant adversity exposure

261   group-by-age interactions (FDR<0.05), suggestive of more complex patterns of change and

262   stability across development. From these loci, we identified five additional types of longitudinal

263   DNAm trajectories (**Figure 4**), which showed distinct DNAm patterns across ages and adversity

264   exposure groups (**Figures S25-28; Table S12**), but not between the FDR and R^2 subsets of CpGs

265   (**Figure S29**).

266

267   Finally, of the 46 CpG sites previously showing time-varying associations between

268   adversity and DNAm at age 7 (8), only one showed an association at age 15 (p<0.05; **Table**

269   **S13**), which did not pass multiple-test correction. Again, approximately half of loci showed

270   consistent direction-of-effect between age 7 and 15 (24/46) (**Figure 3B**). These findings suggest

271   some childhood epigenetic responses to adversity may not persist into adolescence.

272

273   **DISCUSSION**

274   This study's main finding is that associations between childhood adversity and DNAm

275   vary across the life course, manifesting at different developmental stages through distinct

276   patterns of persistence and latency. To our knowledge, this is the first study to incorporate time-

277   dependent measures of childhood adversity when assessing longitudinal epigenetic patterns.

278   Our findings point to early childhood – the period between ages 3 to 5 – as a possible

279   sensitive period for the biological embedding of childhood adversity that manifests in

280   adolescence. These findings are consistent with prior human and animal studies showing that

281   exposures earlier in life may have greater influence on epigenetic patterns measured in

14

282 childhood(7, 8) or adolescence(35). As early childhood is a time of rapid cognitive, social,

283 emotional, and regulatory development(36), epigenetic processes may be more malleable(12),

284 resulting in increased sensitivity to life experiences that shape DNAm levels and trajectories

285 across development. These findings suggest early childhood may be a period for focused

286 interventions to limit or prevent the long-term sequelae of childhood adversity.

287   Of the seven types of adversity examined, exposure to single parent households had the

288 greatest number of associations to DNAm in adolescence. By contrast, previous research on

289 DNAm from the same children at age 7 identified no associations with one-adult households(8),

290 suggesting these associations are adolescent-specific. Prior studies have shown the effects of

291 single parent households begin to emerge around puberty, manifesting through shifts in puberty

292 timing (37), poorer self-esteem(38), and higher depressive symptoms(39) and externalizing

293 behaviors(39). Of note, we did not detect any mediation of the associations of one-adult

294 households and DNAm through pubertal onset age, nor were any loci previously linked to

295 pubertal onset or sex hormone levels, or confounded by socioeconomic factors (**Figure S19**). We

296 also replicated the direction of associations for 11 loci associated with one-adult households in

297 two independents cohort. These results are particularly salient given the differences in the

298 sociodemographic contexts and in the DNAm tissue assessed between studies. Beyond broad

299 tissue differences, saliva is more heterogenous across individuals than blood (40), which further

300 increased the stringency of the replicated effects and highlights the potential relevance of these

301 top loci. Overall, these findings suggest a latency to the effects of one-adult households on

302 biological processes and health outcomes, which may not become apparent until the rapid

303 developmental changes occurring during puberty.

304   Curiously, we observed fewer associations for other adversities, such as maternal

305   psychopathology and experiences of sexual, physical, or emotional abuse. These adversities may

306   have subtler influences on the adolescent epigenome, requiring larger sample sizes or meta-

307   analyses to uncover. None of our top loci overlapped between different types of childhood

308   adversity, nor were they present among top loci from a twin study of adolescents exposed to

309   severe victimization (N=118)(11). As discussed in ongoing debates surrounding the "lumping or

310   splitting" of childhood adversities in clinical research(41), different dimensions of adversity

311   could result in distinct epigenetic signatures, a hypothesis supported by the finding that adjusting

312   for other types of adversity only modestly influenced associations. Of note, we found that

313   exposures to deprivation-type adversities during early childhood may have more influence on

314   adolescent DNAm than threat-type adversities (42)(**Figure S30**).

315   Arguably the most novel finding from our study concerned the patterns of stability and

316   change in the relationship between adversity and DNAm. Most DNAm trajectories showed

317   primarily *latent* associations with adversity, meaning they did not emerge until age 15 in youth

318   exposed to adversity. These findings align with previous longitudinal studies of genome-wide

319   DNAm from ALSPAC and Project Viva, which showed that early-life stressors, such as prenatal

320   maternal smoking(13) and socio-economic disadvantage during childhood(10, 14), can have both

321   immediate and latent associations with DNAm during childhood and adolescence. Subtle

322   desynchronization of DNAm levels may appear earlier in development, while evading immediate

323   detection until later in life. These "sleeper" patterns may explain why complex diseases unfold

324   over years of development, rather than immediately after exposures or risk factors(9). We also

325   note that most of our top loci showed little individual-level stability over time, suggesting these

326   latent effects may be located within regions of the epigenome that change across development.

327 Future research is needed to determine whether latent associations between childhood adversity

328 and the epigenome persist into adulthood and whether they are more likely to influence physical

329 and mental health than alterations arising earlier in development.

330 Similarly, the DNAm differences we previously observed at age 7 did not persist into

331 adolescence(8). Studies on early-life stressors(10, 14), birthweight and gestational age(16), and

332 maternal weight before and during pregnancy(15) parallel these findings, showing that DNAm

333 differences linked to early-life environments rarely persist across time. Whether these patterns

334 resolve naturally or due to active intervention is unknown and should be investigated to

335 determine whether interventions can be beneficial in reversing epigenetic effects of early-life

336 stressors. Nevertheless, even short-term alterations that eventually fade over time could alter the

337 developmental trajectories of downstream cellular pathways to influence future health .

338 Several differentially methylated genes we identified were implicated in processes that

339 could influence downstream disease. For instance, *CUX2* is transcription factor involved in

340 dendrite and synapse formation(43), alterations to which could influence neurodevelopment and

341 vulnerability to mental disorders. Several top genes, including *DUSP10*, *DSP*, and *VEGFA*, are

342 also linked to cardiac function, and may partially reflect mechanisms linking childhood adversity

343 to heart disease(44). We note, however, that findings from epigenome and genome-wide

344 association studies have different interpretations and have not yet converged on common

345 mechanisms underlying human health and disease. As DNAm alterations may not reflect

346 concomitant changes in gene function or expression, experimental studies are needed to identify

347 the true functional and health consequences of these epigenetic differences and determine

348 whether short- and/or long-term DNAm changes could link childhood adversity to adverse health

349 outcomes across the lifespan.

350   If replicated, our results may reveal how the biological embedding of early-life exposures

351   through DNAm contribute to disease risk across development, which could have important

352   clinical implications for early risk prediction, disease prognosis, and therapeutic guides for

353   individuals and populations exposed to adversity. Several recent studies have shown that DNAm

354   can predict risk and progression of diseases such as cancer(45) and depression(46). It may be that

355   certain adversity-associated DNAm trajectories predict concomitant trajectories of disease risk.

356   If true, repeated measures of DNAm could serve as a biological indicator or early warning-sign

357   of initiated disease processes, helping identify people at greater risk for future disease. Moreover,

358   these adversity-associated DNAm trajectories may also act as biological measures of treatment

359   response, for example to salutary interventions or protective factors designed to buffer against

360   the effects of adversity. Recent research shows that DNAm differences among adults with post-

361   traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (compared to those without PTSD) resolved following

362   psychotherapy treatment; such DNAm changes corresponded to a reduction in PTSD symptom

363   severity(47). Thus, repeated measures of DNAm could be used as a marker of therapeutic

364   efficacy, tracking possible disease progress and/or resolution.

365   Our study had limitations. First, DNAm data were generated from slightly different tissue

366   types at each wave. Although we corrected for cell type composition using established methods,

367   differences in the stability of DNAm differences between waves may have been partially driven

368   by tissue-based differences and variability. Second, we could not replicate all findings, partially

369   due to the lack of available data from the Raine Study and FFCWS. Further, differences in

370   associations between cohorts could reflect differences in the socio-economic environment or the

371   specific timing and tissue of DNAm measurements, among other factors. Future studies should

372   confirm these longitudinal epigenetic responses to childhood adversity and triangulate the socio-

373   biological factors that modulate adversity-induced epigenetic differences and health outcomes.

374   Third, we cannot rule out the possibility that unmeasured confounding or technical factors

375   influenced our findings. However, our results were robust in internal validation analyses and

376   when controlling for 11 potential confounders and investigating four potential mediators.

377   Similarly, we could not assess the impact of time-varying confounding, which could have

378   influenced our results(48). Fourth, our analytic subsample was mainly composed of children

379   from European descent. This lack of diversity limited the generalizability of our findings,

380   emphasizing the importance of replicating this work in more diverse cohorts. Finally, the

381   differences in DNAm observed in youth exposed to adversity may not reflect concomitant

382   phenotypic alterations, as epigenetic alterations in peripheral tissues may only partially reflect

383   the causal mechanisms that drive health and disease. Thus, studies that combine both model

384   systems and human populations are necessary to fully delineate the relationships among

385   adversity, DNAm, and health.

386

387   In sum, this study highlights developmental variability in the relationship between

388   adversity and DNAm trajectories and its potential role in adversity-related health outcomes

389   across childhood and adolescence. Future studies should continue to investigate longitudinal

390   measures of DNAm to identify the potential role of latent and persistent epigenetic alterations in

391   driving the short- and long-term health outcomes that result from childhood adversity.

392   Ultimately, this research will help guide intervention strategies and identify individual at higher

393   risk for physical and mental disorders arising from exposure to childhood adversity.

440   Finally, we would also like to thank Dr. Garrett Fitzmaurice for his guidance on the

441   characterization of DNAm trajectories across development. We also thank Elizabeth Leblanc for

442   her assistance with the prediction of age at pubertal onset using superimposition by translation

443   and rotation (SITAR).

444

445   **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

446   AAL designed the study, performed all primary analyses in ALSPAC, led the replication

447   analyses, interpreted the results, and wrote the manuscript. YZ, BJS, JC, AJS, ADACS, MJS,

448   EW, CLR, and KJR assisted in the design and interpretation of the study and provided critical

449   input in writing the manuscript. PM, NMW, SCW, and RCH performed the Raine Study analyses

450   and provided critical input on the manuscript. JF, CM, LS, and DN performed the FFCWS

451   analyses and provided critical input on the manuscript. ECD obtained grant support for this

452   work, designed the study, interpreted the results, and helped write the manuscript. AAL and YZ

453   directly accessed and verified the ALSPAC data reported in the manuscript. PM and NMW

454   directly accessed and verified the Raine Study data reported in the manuscript. JF and CM

455   directly accessed and verified the FFCWS data reported in the manuscript. AAL reviewed and

456   compiled the scripts and results for the Raine Study and FFCWS analyses. AAL and ECD made

457   the final decision to submit the manuscript.

458

459   **COMPETING INTEREST**

460   The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

461

462

DATA SHARING

464   ALSPAC data are available by request from the ALSPAC Executive Committee for

465   researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data

466   (bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/access/). Data from the Raine Study are available with the

467   permission of the Raine Study. Restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were

468   used under license for this study. The FFCWS data analyzed in the current study are available

469   with permission from the Future of Families and Childhood Wellbeing Study repository

470   (fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/documentation)

REFERENCES

1. Grummitt LR, Kreski NT, Kim SG, Platt J, Keyes KM, McLaughlin KA. Association of Childhood Adversity With Morbidity and Mortality in US Adults: A Systematic Review. JAMA pediatrics. 2021.

2. Aristizabal MJ, Anreiter I, Halldorsdottir T, Odgers CL, McDade TW, Goldenberg A, et al. Biological embedding of experience: A primer on epigenetics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020;117(38):23261.

3. Fujii R, Sato S, Tsuboi Y, Cardenas A, Suzuki K. DNA methylation as a mediator of associations between the environment and chronic diseases: A scoping review on application of mediation analysis. Epigenetics. 2021;ahead-of-print:1-27.

4. Parade SH, Huffhines L, Daniels TE, Stroud LR, Nugent NR, Tyrka AR. A systematic review of childhood maltreatment and DNA methylation: candidate gene and epigenome-wide approaches. Translational Psychiatry. 2021;11(1):134.

5. Knudsen E. Sensitive periods in the development of the brain and behavior. J Cogn Neurosci. 2004;16:1412-25.

6. Shonkoff JP, Boyce WT, McEwen BS. Neuroscience, molecular biology, and the childhood roots of health disparities. JAMA. 2009;301(21):2252-9.

7. Dunn EC, Soare TW, Zhu Y, Simpkin AJ, Suderman MJ, Klengel T, et al. Sensitive periods for the effect of childhood adversity on DNA methylation: results from a prospective, longitudinal study. Biological Psychiatry. 2019;85(10):838-49.

8. Lussier AA, Zhu Y, Smith BJ, Simpkin AJ, Smith ADAC, Suderman MJ, et al. Updates to data versions and analytic methods influence the reproducibility of results from epigenome-wide association studies. Epigenetics. 2022.

9. Oh ES, Petronis A. Origins of human disease: the chrono-epigenetic perspective. Nat Rev Genet. 2021.

10. Laubach ZM, Perng W, Cardenas A, Rifas-Shiman SL, Oken E, DeMeo D, et al. Socioeconomic status and DNA methylation from birth through mid-childhood: a prospective study in Project Viva. Epigenomics. 2019;11(12):1413-27.

11. Kandaswamy R, Hannon E, Arseneault L, Mansell G, Sugden K, Williams B, et al. DNA methylation signatures of adolescent victimization: analysis of a longitudinal monozygotic twin sample. Epigenetics. 2020:1-18.

12. Mulder RH, Neumann A, Cecil CAM, Walton E, Houtepen LC, Simpkin AJ, et al. Epigenome-wide change and variation in DNA methylation in childhood: trajectories from birth to late adolescence. Hum Mol Genet. 2021;30(1):119-34.

13. Richmond RC, Simpkin AJ, Woodward G, Gaunt TR, Lyttleton O, McArdle WL, et al. Prenatal exposure to maternal smoking and offspring DNA methylation across the lifecourse: findings from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). Hum Mol Genet. 2015;24(8):2201-17.

14. Alfano R, Guida F, Galobardes B, Chadeau-Hyam M, Delpierre C, Ghantous A, et al. Socioeconomic position during pregnancy and DNA methylation signatures at three stages across early life: epigenome-wide association studies in the ALSPAC birth cohort. Int J Epidemiol. 2019;48(1):30-44.

15. Sharp GC, Lawlor DA, Richmond RC, Fraser A, Simpkin A, Suderman M, et al. Maternal pre-pregnancy BMI and gestational weight gain, offspring DNA methylation and later offspring adiposity: findings from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. Int J Epidemiol. 2015;44(4):1288-304.

16. Simpkin AJ, Hemani G, Suderman M, Gaunt TR, Lyttleton O, McArdle WL, et al. Prenatal and early life influences on epigenetic age in children: a study of mother–offspring pairs from two cohort studies. Human Molecular Genetics. 2016;25(1):191-201.

520 17. Martins J, Czamara D, Sauer S, Rex-Haffner M, Dittrich K, Dorr P, et al. Childhood adversity
521   correlates with stable changes in DNA methylation trajectories in children and converges with
522   epigenetic signatures of prenatal stress. Neurobiol Stress. 2021;15:100336.
523 18. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, Boyd A, Golding J, Davey Smith G, et al. Cohort
524   Profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. Int J
525   Epidemiol. 2013;42(1):97-110.
526 19. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, et al. Cohort Profile: the
527   'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children.
528   Int J Epidemiol. 2013;42(1):111-27.
529 20. Relton CL, Gaunt T, McArdle W, Ho K, Duggirala A, Shihab H, et al. Data Resource Profile:
530   Accessible Resource for Integrated Epigenomic Studies (ARIES). Int J Epidemiol.
531   2015;44(4):1181-90.
532 21. Min JL, Hemani G, Davey Smith G, Relton C, Suderman M. Meffil: efficient normalization and
533   analysis of very large DNA methylation datasets. Bioinformatics (Oxford, England).
534   2018;34(23):3983-9.
535 22. Mishra G, Nitsch D, Black S, De Stavola B, Kuh D, Hardy R. A structured approach to modelling
536   the effects of binary exposure variables over the life course. Int J Epidemiol. 2009.
537 23. Smith ADAC, Heron J, Mishra G, Gilthorpe MS, Ben-Shlomo Y, Tilling K. Model Selection of the
538   Effect of Binary Exposures over the Life Course. Epidemiology. 2015.
539 24. Smith ADAC, Hardy R, Heron J, Joinson CJ, Lawlor DA, Macdonald-Wallis C, et al. A structured
540   approach to hypotheses involving continuous exposures over the life course. Int J Epidemiol. 2016.
541 25. Zhu Y, Simpkin AJ, Suderman MJ, Lussier AA, Walton E, Dunn EC, et al. A Structured Approach
542   to Evaluating Life Course Hypotheses: Moving Beyond Analyses of Exposed Versus Unexposed in
543   the Omics Context. Am J Epidemiol. 2020.
544 26. Newnham JP, Evans SF, Michael CA, Stanley FJ, Landau LI. Effects of frequent ultrasound during
545   pregnancy: a randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 1993;342(8876):887-91.
546 27. McKnight CM, Newnham JP, Stanley FJ, Mountain JA, Landau LI, Beilin LJ, et al. Birth of a
547   cohort--the first 20 years of the Raine study. Med J Aust. 2012;197(11):608-10.
548 28. Reichman NE, Teitler JO, Garfinkel I, McLanahan SS. Fragile families: sample and design.
549   Children and Youth Services Review. 2001;23(4/5):303-26.
550 29. Amrhein V, Greenland S. Remove, rather than redefine, statistical significance. Nature Human
551   Behaviour. 2018;2(1):4-.
552 30. McShane BB, Gal D, Gelman A, Robert C, Tackett JL. Abandon Statistical Significance. The
553   American Statistician. 2019;73(sup1):235-45.
554 31. Hannon E, Lunnon K, Schalkwyk L, Mill J. Interindividual methylomic variation across blood,
555   cortex, and cerebellum: implications for epigenetic studies of neurological and neuropsychiatric
556   phenotypes. Epigenetics. 2015;10(11):1024-32.
557 32. Huang da W, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. Systematic and integrative analysis of large gene lists
558   using DAVID bioinformatics resources. Nat Protoc. 2009;4(1):44-57.
559 33. Phipson B, Maksimovic J, Oshlack A. missMethyl: an R package for analyzing data from
560   Illumina's HumanMethylation450 platform. Bioinformatics. 2016;32(2):286-8.
561 34. Lek M, Karczewski KJ, Minikel EV, Samocha KE, Banks E, Fennell T, et al. Analysis of protein-
562   coding genetic variation in 60,706 humans. Nature. 2016;536(7616):285-91.
563 35. Essex MJ, Boyce WT, Hertzman C, Lam LL, Armstrong JM, Neumann SM, et al. Epigenetic
564   vestiges of early developmental adversity: childhood stress exposure and DNA methylation in
565   adolescence. Child Development. 2013;84(1):58-75.
566 36. Shonkoff JP, Phillips DA. From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood
567   development. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 2000.
568 37. Aghaee S, Deardorff J, Greenspan LC, Quesenberry CP, Kushi LH, Kubo A. Early life household
569   intactness and timing of pubertal onset in girls: a prospective cohort study. BMC Pediatrics.
570   2020;20(1):464.

571 38. Alami A, Khosravan S, Sadegh Moghadam L, Pakravan F, Hosseni F. Adolescents' self-esteem in
572   single and two-parent families. Int J Community Based Nurs Midwifery. 2014;2(2):69-76.
573 39. Daryanani I, Hamilton JL, Abramson LY, Alloy LB. Single Mother Parenting and Adolescent
574   Psychopathology. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology. 2016;44(7):1411-23.
575 40. Middleton LYM, Dou J, Fisher J, Heiss JA, Nguyen VK, Just AC, et al. Saliva cell type DNA
576   methylation reference panel for epidemiological studies in children. Epigenetics. 2022;17(2):161-
577   77.
578 41. Smith KE, Pollak SD. Rethinking Concepts and Categories for Understanding the
579   Neurodevelopmental Effects of Childhood Adversity. Perspectives on psychological science : a
580   journal of the Association for Psychological Science. 2021;16(1):67-93.
581 42. McLaughlin KA, Sheridan MA, Lambert HK. Childhood adversity and neural development:
582   deprivation and threat as distinct dimensions of early experience. Neurosci Biobehav Rev.
583   2014;47:578-91.
584 43. Cubelos B, Sebastián-Serrano A, Beccari L, Calcagnotto ME, Cisneros E, Kim S, et al. Cux1 and
585   Cux2 regulate dendritic branching, spine morphology, and synapses of the upper layer neurons of
586   the cortex. Neuron. 2010;66(4):523-35.
587 44. Jakubowski KP, Cundiff JM, Matthews KA. Cumulative childhood adversity and adult
588   cardiometabolic disease: A meta-analysis. Health Psychol. 2018;37(8):701-15.
589 45. Deng Y, Wan H, Tian J, Cheng X, Rao M, Li J, et al. CpG-methylation-based risk score predicts
590   progression in colorectal cancer. Epigenomics. 2020;12(7):605-15.
591 46. Barbu MC, Shen X, Walker RM, Howard DM, Evans KL, Whalley HC, et al. Epigenetic prediction
592   of major depressive disorder. Mol Psychiatry. 2021;26(9):5112-23.
593 47. Vinkers CH, Geuze E, van Rooij SJH, Kennis M, Schür RR, Nispeling DM, et al. Successful
594   treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder reverses DNA methylation marks. Mol Psychiatry.
595   2021;26(4):1264-71.
596 48. Mansournia MA, Etminan M, Danaei G, Kaufman JS, Collins G. Handling time varying
597   confounding in observational research. BMJ. 2017;359:j4587.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Top associations between time-dependent exposure to adversity and DNA methylation at age 15.

Adversity	Timing	Age (years)	CpG	DNAm unexp[1]	DNAm SP[2]	Δ DNAm[3]	Effect estimate[4]	SE*	95% CI*	R2[5]	P-value	FDR-adjusted p-value	Nearest gene	Trajectory class
Caregiver physical or emotional abuse	Early childhood	5	cg14855874	0.091	0.121	0.030	0.030	0.005	0.019; 0.041	0.041	3.32E-07	1.01E-01	BANK1	Emergent
			cg15454534	0.885	0.868	-0.017	-0.017	0.003	-0.023; -0.01	0.039	6.76E-07	1.02E-01	OR2T1	Latent
			cg06215562	0.847	0.826	-0.021	-0.021	0.004	-0.029; -0.013	0.035	2.37E-06	1.81E-01		Latent
Sexual or physical abuse by anyone)	Early childhood	3.5	cg26970800	0.902	0.847	-0.055	-0.055	0.010	-0.074; -0.036	0.044	8.51E-08	2.08E-02	CBLIF	Emergent
			cg15723468	0.822	0.779	-0.043	-0.045	0.009	-0.062; -0.028	0.041	1.89E-07	2.08E-02	GALNT2	Latent
			cg17928317	0.681	0.785	0.104	0.076	0.015	0.045; 0.106	0.041	2.06E-07	2.08E-02	MAGEC3	Primed
	Late childhood	8	cg27558057	0.257	0.289	0.032	0.107	0.024	0.059; 0.155	0.036	1.53E-06	1.16E-01	TAF1	Stable
Family instability	Very early childhood	2.5	cg02735620	0.877	0.857	-0.021	-0.019	0.004	-0.027; -0.012	0.036	2.07E-06	4.63E-01	PKD2	Emergent
Financial hardship	Very early childhood	0.66	cg14455319	0.289	0.339	0.050	0.052	0.011	0.032; 0.074	0.036	3.87E-06	2.00E-01	ANKK1	Time-stable
			cg13204236	0.861	0.824	-0.037	-0.037	0.007	-0.051; -0.023	0.036	5.94E-06	2.00E-01	STPG4	Latent
	Early childhood	5	cg15037420	0.780	0.746	-0.035	-0.034	0.007	-0.049; -0.021	0.036	3.04E-06	2.00E-01	BSPH1	Latent
			cg06410970	0.860	0.825	-0.035	-0.033	0.006	-0.046; -0.022	0.036	5.56E-06	2.00E-01	ANXA11	Overcompensation
	Late childhood	11	cg02011706	0.861	0.799	-0.062	-0.064	0.013	-0.089; -0.039	0.036	5.35E-06	2.00E-01	LMF1	Emergent
			cg04659536	0.901	0.873	-0.029	-0.028	0.006	-0.039; -0.017	0.035	5.52E-06	2.00E-01	SDK1	Latent
	Recency		cg17670999	0.817	0.807	-0.010	-0.002	0.000	-0.003; -0.001	0.041	8.76E-07	2.00E-01	ARHGAP39	Stable
			cg25459301	0.769	0.756	-0.013	-0.003	0.001	-0.004; -0.002	0.036	4.24E-06	2.00E-01	XKR6	Overcompensation
			cg06812747	0.837	0.825	-0.012	-0.003	0.001	-0.004; -0.002	0.035	4.98E-06	2.00E-01	FBXL16	Stable
Maternal psychopathology	Very early childhood	2.75	cg16813552	0.898	0.883	-0.015	-0.015	0.003	-0.021; -0.01	0.045	7.11E-08	2.15E-02	OGA	Stable
Neighborhood disadvantage	Very early childhood	2.75	cg04288299	0.914	0.905	-0.009	-0.021	0.004	-0.029; -0.013	0.039	4.52E-07	7.00E-02	NELFA	Overcompensation
			cg25019631	0.201	0.223	0.023	0.044	0.009	0.028; 0.061	0.038	6.16E-07	7.00E-02	CASP9	Overcompensation
			cg04224851	0.907	0.894	-0.013	-0.014	0.003	-0.02; -0.009	0.038	6.94E-07	7.00E-02	ZFP36L2	Overcompensation
One adult in the household	Very early childhood	1.75	cg05491478	0.908	0.880	-0.028	-0.027	0.006	-0.039; -0.016	0.038	7.33E-07	2.81E-02	LRRFIP1	Overcompensation
	Early childhood	3.9	cg16907527	0.853	0.824	-0.030	-0.032	0.005	-0.041; -0.022	0.060	4.17E-10	1.26E-04	VEGFA	Flat emergent
			cg08818094	0.847	0.798	-0.048	-0.050	0.008	-0.067; -0.034	0.051	8.79E-09	1.33E-03	TBC1D19	Latent

		CpG	DNAm unexp.[1]	DNAm exp. SP[2]	ΔDNAm[3]	Estimate[4]	R^2[5]	CI*	SE	p-value	FDR	Gene	Profile
		cg01060989	0.824	0.794	-0.031	-0.031	0.005	-0.042; -0.021	0.047	6.73E-08	6.78E-03	DUSP10	Latent
		cg15814750	0.723	0.684	-0.039	-0.040	0.009	-0.058; -0.025	0.039	6.57E-07	2.81E-02	WDR72	Latent
		cg15783822	0.868	0.848	-0.021	-0.021	0.004	-0.031; -0.014	0.039	8.08E-07	2.81E-02	PRR4	Latent
		cg15864691	0.907	0.889	-0.018	-0.018	0.004	-0.025; -0.011	0.038	8.36E-07	2.81E-02	HOXA10	Overcompensation
		cg02584161	0.661	0.603	-0.057	-0.058	0.011	-0.081; -0.038	0.038	1.28E-06	3.42E-02		Latent
		cg02810291	0.840	0.818	-0.022	-0.023	0.005	-0.033; -0.014	0.037	1.35E-06	3.42E-02	AKAP13	Overcompensation
		cg04036644	0.882	0.855	-0.027	-0.026	0.005	-0.037; -0.016	0.037	1.36E-06	3.42E-02	LOC286083	Latent
		cg11811897	0.758	0.711	-0.047	-0.047	0.010	-0.067; -0.03	0.037	1.68E-06	3.64E-02	PKD1L1	Latent
		cg15817130	0.794	0.759	-0.036	-0.038	0.007	-0.051; -0.025	0.037	1.83E-06	3.69E-02	MYO10	Latent
		cg06711254	0.686	0.631	-0.055	-0.056	0.012	-0.08; -0.036	0.036	2.15E-06	3.98E-02	FSIP2	Flat emergent
		cg19096460	0.845	0.821	-0.024	-0.024	0.005	-0.035; -0.015	0.035	2.89E-06	4.85E-02	HERC3	Latent
		cg18980650	0.800	0.760	-0.040	-0.036	0.007	-0.05; -0.024	0.035	3.31E-06	5.08E-02	NOX1	Emergent
		cg27504269	0.771	0.733	-0.038	-0.040	0.008	-0.056; -0.026	0.036	3.52E-06	5.08E-02	SLCO1A2	Latent
Late childhood	10	cg12096528	0.890	0.874	-0.016	-0.016	0.003	-0.023; -0.01	0.036	2.24E-06	3.98E-02	SLC25A41	Overcompensation
Accumulation		cg00807464	0.052	0.057	0.006	0.003	0.001	0.002; 0.004	0.040	7.56E-07	2.81E-02	CUX2	Stable
		cg10420609	0.559	0.522	-0.037	-0.014	0.003	-0.02; -0.009	0.039	7.71E-07	2.81E-02	DSP	Latent
		cg14579651	0.634	0.605	-0.028	-0.012	0.002	-0.018; -0.008	0.037	1.68E-06	3.64E-02	STK38L	Stable

[1]DNAm unexp. = mean DNA methylation levels in children with no exposure to adversity from ages 0 to 11.

[2]DNAm exp. SP = mean DNA methylation levels in children with exposure to adversity that occurred during the selected sensitive period (SP). Accumulation hypotheses show the mean DNA methylation levels in children with at least one exposure to adversity.

[3]ΔDNAm= difference in mean DNA methylation levels between children exposed to adversity during the selected sensitive period and individuals unexposed to adversity (i.e., DNAm exp. SP – DNAm unexp.)

[4]Effect estimates were calculated using linear regression of exposure to adversity from the theoretical model and DNA methylation, correcting for the covariates described in the methods. Standard error and confidence intervals are shown for these estimates.

[5]R^2 is the proportion of variation in DNAm at this CpG that is explained by differences in this adversity at this timing, after removing the associations with covariates.

*CI = Confidence Interval; SE = standard error; Very early childhood = 0-3 years, Early childhood = 3-5 years; Late childhood = 8-11 years.

Figure 1. Summary of exposures and outcomes examined in the present study. Seven types of childhood adversity were assessed 5-8 times between the ages of 0 and 11. The effective sample size (N) was based on the availability of complete data for all covariates, all available timepoints of childhood adversity, and DNAm at age 15 (N=609-665). Each filled cell represents the time point when the adversity was measured, along with the prevalence of children exposed to adversity. Colors represent the four sensitive periods used to define time-dependent exposure to adversity: *very early childhood* (age 0-3), *early childhood* (age 3-5), *middle childhood* (age 5-7), and *late childhood* (age 7-11). The additional life course models tested were accumulation and recency, which reflect the total number of exposures across development and exposure to adversity weighted by time, respectively. Genome-wide DNA methylation (DNAm) data were collected at ages 0, 7, and 15.

Figure 2. Life course theoretical models selected by the SLCMA for top loci at age 15. The life course theoretical models were split by sensitive periods (i.e., exposure to adversity during specific childhood periods) or additive models (i.e., accumulation or recency of exposures). Colors represent the different types of adversity. The distribution of theoretical models for top loci was significantly different than random chance, with exposure to adversity during sensitive periods more frequently predicting DNA methylation levels as compared to the additive models. **A)** 22 loci were identified at a false-discovery rate (FDR) <0.05. Most loci were associated with exposure to one-adult households during early childhood. **B)** 41 loci were identified at an $R^2 \geq 0.035$ cutoff and $p < 1 \times 10^{-5}$ threshold, which again mainly showed associations with adversity occurring during early childhood.

Figure 3. Persistence and stability of associations between childhood adversity and DNA methylation across development. A) The estimates of associations between childhood adversity and DNAm at age 7 or age 15 generally showed variable directions-of-effect for the significant loci identified from the SLCMA at age 15 (20 concordant and 21 non-concordant directionality). Estimates for age 7 DNAm data were also smaller than those at age 15, suggesting that these loci showed latent responses to adversity. **B)** The estimates of associations between childhood adversity and DNAm at age 7 or age 15 generally showed variable directions-of-effect for the significant loci identified in a previous study of age 7 DNAm (24 concordant and 22 non-concordant directionality). Estimates for age 15 DNAm data were also smaller than those at age 7, suggesting that these loci showed early responses to adversity that resolved by adolescence.

Figure 4. **DNA methylation trajectories across development.** Distinguishing features included DNAm differences emerging earlier versus later in development, differences between children exposed during a sensitive period (exposed-SP) or at other developmental stages (exposed-other), and differences linked to age at DNAm measurement. **A)** Emergent trajectory (5 loci): differences in exposed-SP appeared in childhood but did not fully emerge until age 15. **B)** Flat emergent trajectory (2 loci): differences in exposed-SP were modest throughout childhood and fully emerged by age 15. **C)** Latent trajectory (17 loci) differences for exposed-SP emerged at age 15, with no differences observed from exposure at other times. Some CpGs in this cluster showed graded differences between childhood exposed in sensitive periods versus other times. **D)** Overcompensation trajectory (9 loci): cross-over of DNAm differences in exposed-SP were present from age 7 to age 15, along with differences in DNAm level between ages. **E)** Primed trajectory (1 loci): differences in the exposed groups were apparent from birth but were magnified in exposed-SP at age 15. **F)** Stable trajectory (7 loci): differences in exposed-SP were present at age 7 and remained stable until age 15.