

PRENATAL EXPOSURE TO EARLY LIFE ADVERSITY AND NEONATAL BRAIN VOLUMES AT BIRTH

Regina L. Triplett, MD, MS^{1*}, Rachel E. Lean, PhD², Amisha Parikh, BS³, J. Philip Miller, AB⁴,
Dimitrios Alexopoulos, MS¹, Sydney Kaplan, BS¹, Dominique Meyer, BS¹, Chris Adamson,
PhD^{5,6}, Tara A. Smyser, MSE², Cynthia E. Rogers, MD^{2,7}, Deanna M. Barch, PhD^{2,8,9}, Barbara
Warner, MD⁷, Joan L. Luby, MD², and Christopher D. Smyser, MD, MSCI^{1,7,9}

¹ Department of Neurology, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA

² Department of Psychiatry, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA

³ School of Medicine, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA

⁴ Department of Biostatistics, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO

⁵ Developmental Imaging, Murdoch Children's Institute, Melbourne, Australia

⁶ Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

⁷ Department of Pediatrics, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO

⁸ Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Washington University in St. Louis, St.
Louis, MO

⁹ Department of Radiology, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO

***Corresponding author:** Regina L. Triplett, MD, MS

Washington University in Saint Louis School of Medicine, Department of Neurology, 660 South
Euclid Ave Campus Box 8111 Saint Louis, MO 63110 rtriplett@wustl.edu

Manuscript type: Original Investigation, observational

KEY POINTS

Question: Does prenatal exposure to maternal social disadvantage and psychosocial distress alter global and relative brain volumes at birth?

Findings: In this longitudinal, observational study of 280 mother-infant dyads, prenatal exposure to greater maternal social disadvantage, but not psychosocial distress, was associated with reduced white matter, cortical gray matter, and subcortical gray matter volumes and cortical folding at birth after accounting for maternal health and diet. There were no differential effects in the hippocampus or amygdala.

Meaning: Prenatal exposure to social disadvantage is associated with global reductions in brain volumes and folding in the first weeks of life.

ABSTRACT

Importance: Exposure to early life adversity alters the structural development of key brain regions underlying neurodevelopmental impairments. The extent that prenatal exposure to life adversity alters structure at birth remains poorly understood.

Objective: To determine if prenatal exposure to maternal social advantage and psychosocial distress alters global and regional brain volumes and cortical folding in the first weeks of life.

Design: A prospective, longitudinal study of sociodemographically-diverse mothers recruited in the first trimester of pregnancy and their infants who underwent brain magnetic resonance imaging scan in the first weeks of life.

Setting: Mothers were recruited from local obstetric clinics from 2017-2020.

Participants: Of 399 mother-infant dyads prospectively recruited into the parent study, 280 healthy, term-born infants (47% female, mean postmenstrual age at scan 42 weeks) were eligible for inclusion.

Exposures: Maternal social advantage and psychosocial distress in pregnancy.

Main Measures and Outcomes: Two measures of latent constructs were created using Confirmatory Factor Analyses spanning Maternal Social Advantage (Income to Needs ratio, Area Deprivation Index, Healthy Eating Index, education level, insurance status) and Psychosocial Stress (Perceived Stress Scale, Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale, Everyday Discrimination Scale, Stress and Adversity Inventory). Neonatal cortical and subcortical gray matter, white matter, cerebellar, hippocampus, and amygdala volumes were generated using semi-automated age-specific segmentation pipelines.

Results: After covariate adjustment and multiple comparisons correction, greater social disadvantage (i.e., lower Advantage values) was associated with reduced cortical gray matter ($p=.03$), subcortical gray matter ($p=.008$), and white matter ($p=.004$) volumes and cortical folding ($p=.001$). Psychosocial Stress was not related to neonatal brain metrics. While social disadvantage was associated with smaller absolute volumes of the bilateral hippocampi and

amygdalae, after correcting for total brain volume, there were no regional effects.

Conclusions and Relevance: Prenatal exposure to social disadvantage is associated with global reductions in brain volumes and cortical folding at birth. No regional specificity for the hippocampus or amygdala was detected. Results highlight that the deleterious effects of poverty begin *in utero* and are evident in the first weeks of life. These findings emphasize that preventative interventions to support fetal brain development should address socioeconomic hardships for expectant parents.

PRENATAL EXPOSURE TO EARLY LIFE ADVERSITY AND NEONATAL BRAIN VOLUMES AT BIRTH

Introduction

Socioeconomic inequality is growing in the United States¹ and places low-income, pregnant women at disproportionately greater risk of poor health outcomes² and psychiatric disorders.^{3,4} Furthermore, low income is associated with higher levels of perceived stress during pregnancy.⁵ Thus, infants born to mothers experiencing social disadvantage are often exposed to multiple, overlapping socioenvironmental stressors.⁶ Early life adversity (ELA), including exposure to poverty, parental psychopathology, and stress, increases risk for adverse neurodevelopmental, socioemotional, and health outcomes from childhood and beyond.^{7,8,9,10}

Human and animal studies suggest that altered brain development may be a key mechanism by which exposure to poverty and related psychosocial stressors increases the risk of poor outcomes.^{8,11,12,13} For example, poverty in early childhood is associated with reduced cortical gray and white matter, hippocampal, and amygdalae volumes at school-age.^{14,15,16,17,18,19} In turn, altered hippocampal volumes mediate the association of early adversity to behavioral problems in childhood.²⁰ Despite clear and compelling negative impacts of social disadvantage on infant and child neurodevelopment,^{7,8,9,10} much less is known about its prenatal effects.

The prenatal period is a vulnerable stage of brain growth and development.^{21,22} The majority of neurogenesis and neuronal migration begins *in utero* with ongoing synaptogenesis, pruning, and myelination in the second and third trimesters.²³ A small but growing literature demonstrates the deleterious and lasting consequences of prenatal exposure to maternal socioeconomic disadvantage and psychological stress on childhood outcomes, including cognitive delay, executive dysfunction, and higher rates of Conduct Disorder and Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder.^{24,25,26} However, few studies have explored the effect of prenatal ELA on brain outcomes at birth. The extant literature has largely conducted two parallel lines of

research with most studies concentrating on maternal psychosocial stress, whereas few have examined prenatal exposure to social disadvantage.²⁷ Further, the effects of related factors such as maternal health, diet, and substance use, have rarely been incorporated.

To date, studies investigating the effects of maternal mental health in pregnancy on neonatal brain volumes have focused on the hippocampus. Maternal depression and stress during pregnancy are associated with reduced hippocampal volumes and increased cortical folding.²⁸ Other studies have shown that prenatal exposure to maternal depression and anxiety is associated with increased hippocampal volumes at birth and slower hippocampal growth.^{29,30} These findings highlight that subcortical structures may be particularly vulnerable to prenatal exposure to maternal mental health problems during a critical developmental window.

Far less is known regarding the role of social disadvantage during pregnancy on infant brain volumes at birth. One study found that lower socioeconomic status (indexed by income-to-needs ratio and education) was associated with smaller cortical and subcortical gray matter volumes at age one month,³¹ whereas Knickmeyer et al. found that maternal education but not income was positively associated with total white and gray matter volumes at birth.³²

Knickmeyer et al. also found that independent of maternal education, maternal smoking in pregnancy and positive maternal psychiatric history explained variability in neonatal brain volumes.³² With the exception of this investigation, prior prenatal ELA studies have not considered the influence of maternal health, diet, and substance use, which may also impact brain structural growth and development among socially disadvantaged infants.^{27,32,33,34,35,36}

In this study, we investigated the extent to which measures assessing latent constructs of maternal social advantage (including the contribution of diet) and psychosocial stress related to neonatal brain volumes and folding at birth. We included maternal health and substance use (tobacco and marijuana) as covariates. We analyzed global measures of cortical and subcortical

gray matter, white matter, and cerebellar volume along with two structures of interest, the amygdala and hippocampus. We hypothesized that varying forms of prenatal ELA (i.e., reduced maternal social advantage and higher psychosocial stress) would each be associated with lower neonatal brain volumes, including regionally-specific susceptibility in the hippocampus and amygdala, and reduced cortical folding. Disentangling the independent roles of social disadvantage and maternal psychosocial distress *in utero* is vital to design targeted and effective preventative interventions that support fetal neurodevelopment.^{11,21}

Methods

Study Design and Population

In this longitudinal, observational, multi-wave, multi-method NIMH-funded collaborative study, a cohort of pregnant women who participated in a large-scale study of preterm birth within the March of Dimes Prematurity Research Center at Washington University in St. Louis were recruited from 2017-2020. Women from the parent study were invited to participate in this investigation (see Luby, et al. for cohort details)³⁷ with the following exclusion criteria: multiple gestations, diagnosed infections known to cause congenital disease (e.g., toxoplasmosis), and/or alcohol or drug use (excluding tobacco and marijuana). Participating mothers completed assessments during each trimester of pregnancy and at delivery. Medical data were collected from participant questionnaires and chart review. Neonatal brain MRI scans were performed in the first weeks of life. Exclusion criteria for the current analyses included premature birth (<37 weeks gestational age), Neonatal Intensive Care Unit admission >7 days, birthweight <2000g, or evidence of brain injury on MRI.

The study was approved by the Washington University Human Research Protection Office. Informed consent was obtained for each participant and subsequent parental informed consent was obtained for each infant prior to participation.

Measures

Demographics, Social Advantage, and Psychosocial Stress. Maternal age, health insurance status (public, private, uninsured), highest educational level, address, and household composition were obtained from all participants each trimester during pregnancy. Participants also reported their self-identified racial/ethnic background.

As described in Luby et al., confirmatory factor analysis was used to derive two composite measures of Maternal Social Advantage and Maternal Psychological Stress.³⁷ The following datapoints were used to estimate Social Advantage: household Income to Needs Ratio (I/R)³⁸ in each trimester, national Area Deprivation Index (ADI) percentiles,³⁹ Healthy Eating Index (HEI),⁴⁰ highest level of educational attainment, and health insurance status. Race was highly correlated with Social Advantage, offering no additional improvement to the model after other variables (including racial discrimination) were accounted for and, thus, it was not included in the latent Advantage composite. To estimate Psychosocial Stress, four measures were used: Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) in each trimester,⁴¹ Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) in each trimester,⁴² Stress and Adversity Inventory (STRAIN, lifetime count and severity) at time of neonatal scan ($n=190$) or at follow-up at one or two years ($n=80$),⁴³ and Everyday Discrimination Scale (EDS) at time of neonatal scan.⁴⁴

Maternal Medical Co-Morbidities. A Maternal Medical Risk (MMR) score was calculated for each participant using questionnaire data and chart review.⁴⁵ This validated index⁴⁶ is a sum of weighted maternal co-morbidities including advanced age, cardiac disease, and pre-eclampsia with higher scores predicting increased risk of severe maternal morbidity (acute end-organ injury) or mortality. Maternal pre-pregnancy BMI is not included in the index and was therefore independently evaluated as a co-variate of interest.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) Scanning. All MRI scans occurred within the first weeks

of life without sedation during natural sleep. MRI data were collected using a Siemens Prisma 3T scanner and a 64-channel Siemens head coil. T1- and T2-weighted and spin echo fieldmap data were acquired with the following sequence parameters, T1: repetition time (TR)=2400ms, echo time (TE)=2.22ms, voxel size=0.8x0.8x0.8 mm³; T2: TR=3200/4500ms, TE=563ms, tissue T2=160ms, voxel size=0.8x0.8x0.8 mm³, and spin echo: TR=8000ms, TE=66ms, voxel size=2x2x2 mm³; 2 mm isotropic, multiband factor (MB)=1. Infants (n=11) without high-quality (i.e., low motion) structural data as determined by an experienced rater (DA) were excluded.

MRI Preprocessing and Brain Volumetric Measures. T1 and T2 images were corrected for gradient nonlinearity and readout distortions using FSL tools⁴⁷ then denoised using ANTs.⁴⁸ The Melbourne Children's Regional Infant Brain atlas Surface (M-CRIB-S) segmentation and surface extraction toolkit was used to generate segmentations and surface-based cortical parcellations from preprocessed T2 images.^{49,50} The M-CRIB-S toolkit included N4 bias field correction and brain extraction, as well as automatic segmentation into white and gray matter, cerebellum, brainstem, and subcortical gray matter subdivisions corresponding to FreeSurfer-like labeling. Curvature-based spherical registration and mapping, alignment, and averaging were performed allowing for spatial normalization within the cohort and to the M-CRIB atlas. All segmentations and surfaces were inspected and manually corrected for accuracy by two experienced raters (DA and DM).

Brain volumes of interest included total cortical and subcortical gray matter, white matter, and cerebellum, in addition to right and left hippocampi and amygdalae. Total volumes for all structures were analyzed, as were standardized regional volumes for the hippocampi and amygdalae generated by dividing by total brain volume (TBV). Cortical folding was measured using the total surface area of the cortex for both hemispheres.

Statistical Analysis. Analyses were performed using SPSS version 27 (IBM Corporation, New York). Potential co-variates were explored using Pearson's correlation and t-tests. Co-variates that demonstrated significant associations with brain volumes of interest included maternal tobacco use, infant sex, birthweight, and postmenstrual age (PMA) at MRI scan (Table S2). These variables and the factor scores for Social Advantage and Psychosocial Stress were included as independent variables in hierarchical regression analyses, each with regional brain volumes/cortical folding as the dependent variable. For each volume of interest, the first step accounted for maternal tobacco use, infant sex, birthweight, and PMA at MRI scan. The Social Advantage and Psychosocial Stress factors were added simultaneously in the second step of the model to determine the unique, independent proportion of variance explained in brain volume and folding outcomes over and above covariate factors. Regression models were checked for linearity, homoscedasticity, absence of multicollinearity, and the residuals approximated a normal distribution. Results for primary outcomes (total volumes, relative hippocampal and amygdalae volumes, and cortical folding) were corrected for multiple comparisons using a Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate procedure.⁵¹

Results

The study recruited $n=395$ women during pregnancy ($n=268$ eligible subjects declined participation) and their $n=399$ singleton offspring ($n=4$ mothers had 2 singleton births during the recruitment period). After applying exclusion and data quality criteria, 280 mother-infant dyads were included in current analysis (see Figure S1 for exclusion reasons).

Infant Clinical Characteristics

Infants were born at 39 weeks gestation on average (range 37–41) with 53% males (Table 1). At the time of MRI scan, infants were at an average of 42 weeks PMA (range 38–45). Male infants had larger birthweights than females ($p=.03$, Table S1). There were no additional sex differences for scan PMA, Social Advantage, and Psychosocial Stress (Table S1).

Prenatal Life Adversity

Table 1 provides a summary of the prenatal life adversity characteristics of the sample, including the latent constructs of maternal Social Advantage and Psychological Stress. Higher Social Advantage was associated with lower maternal Psychological Stress ($r=-0.42$, $p<.001$).

MRI Volumes

Brain Volumes. Table 2 provides a summary of the second, final step of the hierarchical regression results, with full results in Table S3. In Step 1, the following co-variables were related to smaller cortical and subcortical gray matter, white matter, and cerebellar volumes: female sex, lower birthweight, and younger PMA at scan (Table S3). Tobacco use related to reduced subcortical gray and white matter (Table S3). In Step 2, greater social disadvantage (i.e., lower Social Advantage values) related to reduced volumes across all tissue types and accounted for an additional 1.6-7% of the variance (Table 2, Figure 1) except for the cerebellum which did not survive correction for multiple comparisons (Table S3). The contribution of Psychosocial Stress was not significant (Table 2). A similar pattern of results was found for TBV (Table S4).

Hippocampus and Amygdala. In Step 1, the following co-variables were related to smaller right and left hippocampi and amygdalae volumes: female sex, lower birthweight, and younger PMA at scan (Table S3). Tobacco use related to reduced amygdala volumes bilaterally (Table S3). In Step 2, greater social disadvantage was related to reduced volumes for subcortical regions of interest and accounted for an additional 2.0-3.1% of the variance (Table 2, Figure 2). The contribution of Psychosocial Stress was not significant (Table 2). After standardizing hippocampal and amygdalae volumes using TBV, there were no significant relationships with any co-variables or ELA constructs (Table S3).

Cortical Folding. In Step 1, the following covariates related to diminished cortical folding: female sex, smaller birthweight, and younger PMA at scan (Table S3). In Step 2, higher social

disadvantage related to reduced cortical folding and accounted for an additional 4.1% of the variance (Table 2, Figure 3). Tobacco use and Psychosocial Stress were not significant predictors.

Discussion

This is one of the largest investigations of the fetal origins of health and disease beginning in the first trimester of gestation with focus on disentangling the effects of prenatal exposure to poverty and maternal psychosocial stressors on brain morphometry at birth. Study findings suggest that in this cohort of healthy, term-born neonates, prenatal exposure to social disadvantage had a global adverse effect across all brain tissue types, including reduced cortical and subcortical gray and white matter, as well as decreased cortical folding in the first weeks of life. After accounting for global differences in brain volume, regionally-specific effects on the hippocampus and amygdala were limited. Potentially because this cohort was enriched for psychosocial adversity, exposure to higher levels of cumulative social disadvantage *in utero* appeared to play a greater role in brain structural development than maternal psychosocial distress.

We provide evidence for the global, adverse impact of prenatal exposure to socioeconomic disadvantage on brain structural growth and development at birth. Current findings are consistent with two cross-sectional studies showing that lower family I/R was related to reduced total cortical and subcortical gray matter in infants at five weeks³¹ and five months of age.¹⁵ Our findings are also consistent with work demonstrating regional reductions in cortical folding among older children from low socioeconomic backgrounds.¹⁶ Importantly, we show that the effects of poverty on brain volumes begin *in utero* and are evident on structural MRI in the first weeks of life. Among the different tissue types examined, social disadvantage was most strongly associated with reduced white matter volume, explaining 7% of the variance. This finding highlights the timing of prenatal exposure to poverty and the relative vulnerability of white matter, as myelination occurs rapidly beginning *in utero* at 28-29 weeks of gestation.^{52,53} During

fetal development, oligodendrocyte progenitor cells and subplate neurons are selectively vulnerable to oxidative stress, and the deleterious impact of exposures may have cascading effects on pruning and/or crossing fibers and subsequent white matter volume at birth.^{23,54}

Although social disadvantage *in utero* was associated with global reductions in brain volume and cortical folding at birth, the amygdala and hippocampus were not preferentially affected. Prenatal exposure to social disadvantage was related to reduced amygdala and hippocampus volume, but the association did not persist after adjustment for individual differences in total brain volume, which were also related to social disadvantage (Table S4). Previous work has shown the structural development of subcortical brain regions may be disproportionately susceptible to early exposure to poverty.^{15,31} Differences in study findings may be attributed to the fact that prior work has relied on single measures of adversity, assessed brain development at later timepoints, and/or included samples of higher socioeconomic status.^{15,28,31,55} Thus, we interpret the current study finding as evidence of a more widespread neuropathological disruption to global brain growth and development in the setting of exposure to significant, multifactorial socioeconomic disadvantage *in utero*.

This study addresses the independent contributions of maternal social disadvantage and psychosocial distress during pregnancy on offspring brain morphometry at birth.⁵⁶ Consistent with other findings,⁵⁷ social disadvantage was modestly associated with psychological distress during pregnancy. However, prenatal exposure to social disadvantage was more strongly associated with brain volumes and cortical folding than maternal psychosocial stress, which was not significant. Current results could reflect the fact that participants were oversampled for mothers experiencing socioeconomic disadvantage. We also assessed multiple aspects of social adversity, which when examined together, are likely more impactful.^{58,59} Although the precise mechanism remains unclear, post-natal ELA studies posit that chronic deprivation of resources overstimulates the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis and the immune

system, leading to impaired brain-behavior outcomes.^{13,60} Fetal sensitivity to glucocorticoids during development is a leading hypothesis to explain the deleterious regional effects of prenatal ELA on the hippocampi, amygdalae, and prefrontal cortex.^{35,61,62,63,64} Alternatively, mothers experiencing multiple social hardships demonstrate altered cortisol production and systemic inflammation and often live in areas with higher levels of environmental pollutants, which together may differentially affect the maternal and developing fetal HPA axes^{9,13,65,66} Furthermore, maternal immune activation may contribute to globally impaired brain development *in utero* via mechanisms including increased synaptic pruning, altered neurotransmitter profiles, impaired placental delivery of neurotrophic factors, and placental epigenetic programming.^{67,68} Future directions to elucidate causal mechanisms of neurodevelopmental and socioemotional impairments include examining maternal inflammatory cytokines and cortisol,^{55,61} as well as linking prenatal ELA and brain morphometry findings to childhood outcomes.^{69,70}

Unique strengths of the current study include a prospective, longitudinal design from the first trimester of pregnancy, a cohort enriched for social disadvantage, and a comprehensive multidimensional assessment of maternal social disadvantage and related psychosocial stressors. However, our findings should be interpreted in light of study limitations. First, we assessed maternal depression with the EPDS, and although this questionnaire is a validated measure of perinatal depression, the lack of a semi-structured interview may have led to underreporting of maternal depression. Second, this study did not assess other environmental exposures such as lead and air pollution, which may be linked with both poverty and aberrant brain development in offspring. Third, as described in Luby et al.,³⁷ we did not investigate the role of race in this analysis due to the co-linearity between race and social disadvantage. This sample reflects the clear link between racial disparities and social disadvantage in the United States and provides justification for including a measure of racial discrimination.

In this study, we examined the independent roles of maternal social advantage and

psychosocial distress during pregnancy. Key findings highlighted the adverse, global consequences of maternal social disadvantage on neonatal brain volumetric and folding measures, while the effects of maternal psychosocial distress in the setting of disadvantage were less prominent. Most importantly, these results highlight that the deleterious effects of poverty begin *in utero* and are evident in the first weeks of life. These findings may inform future randomized-controlled trials of poverty reduction and family-based interventions to address the psychosocial and material needs of expectant parents and prevent adverse neonatal brain outcomes at birth.⁷¹

REFERENCES

1. Dickman SL, Himmelstein DU, Woolhandler S. Inequality and the health-care system in the USA. *The Lancet*. 2017;389(10077):1431-1441. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30398-7
2. Daw JR, Hatfield LA, Swartz K, Sommers BD. Women In The United States Experience High Rates Of Coverage 'Churn' In Months Before And After Childbirth. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2017;36(4):598-606. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2016.1241
3. Rich-Edwards JW. Sociodemographic predictors of antenatal and postpartum depressive symptoms among women in a medical group practice. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2006;60(3):221-227. doi:10.1136/jech.2005.039370
4. Cena L, Mirabella F, Palumbo G, Gigantesco A, Trainini A, Stefana A. Prevalence of maternal antenatal and postnatal depression and their association with sociodemographic and socioeconomic factors: A multicentre study in Italy. *J Affect Disord*. 2021;279:217-221. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.09.136
5. Herbell K, Zauszniewski JA, Williams E. Stress and Depressive Symptoms Among Demographically Diverse American Pregnant Women. *Issues Ment Health Nurs*. 2020;41(1):73-82. doi:10.1080/01612840.2019.1662145
6. Biggeri M, Cuesta JA. An Integrated Framework for Child Poverty and Well-Being Measurement: Reconciling Theories. *Child Indic Res*. 2021;14(2):821-846. doi:10.1007/s12187-020-09774-0
7. Barrero-Castillero A, Morton SU, Nelson CA, Smith VC. Psychosocial Stress and Adversity: Effects from the Perinatal Period to Adulthood. *NeoReviews*. 2019;20(12):e686-e696. doi:10.1542/neo.20-12-e686
8. Noble KG, Giebler MA. The neuroscience of socioeconomic inequality. *Curr Opin Behav Sci*. 2020;36:23-28. doi:10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.05.007
9. Miller GE, Chen E, Parker KJ. Psychological stress in childhood and susceptibility to the chronic diseases of aging: Moving toward a model of behavioral and biological mechanisms. *Psychol Bull*. 2011;137(6):959-997. doi:10.1037/a0024768
10. Evans GW. The Environment of Childhood Poverty. *Am Psychol*. 2004;59(2):77-92. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.77
11. Merz EC, Wiltshire CA, Noble KG. Socioeconomic Inequality and the Developing Brain: Spotlight on Language and Executive Function. *Child Dev Perspect*. 2019;13(1):15-20. doi:10.1111/cdep.12305
12. Perry RE, Finegood ED, Braren SH, et al. Developing a neurobehavioral animal model of poverty: Drawing cross-species connections between environments of scarcity-adversity, parenting quality, and infant outcome. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2019;31(02):399-418. doi:10.1017/S095457941800007X

13. Hantsoo L, Kornfield S, Anguera MC, Epperson CN. Inflammation: A Proposed Intermediary Between Maternal Stress and Offspring Neuropsychiatric Risk. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2019;85(2):97-106. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.08.018
14. Luby J, Belden A, Botteron K, et al. The Effects of Poverty on Childhood Brain Development: The Mediating Effect of Caregiving and Stressful Life Events. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2013;167(12):1135. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.3139
15. Hanson JL, Hair N, Shen DG, et al. Family Poverty Affects the Rate of Human Infant Brain Growth. Baud O, ed. *PLoS ONE*. 2013;8(12):e80954. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0080954
16. Jednoróg K, Altarelli I, Monzalvo K, et al. The Influence of Socioeconomic Status on Children's Brain Structure. Frasch MG, ed. *PLoS ONE*. 2012;7(8):e42486. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0042486
17. Noble KG, Houston SM, Brito NH, et al. Family income, parental education and brain structure in children and adolescents. *Nat Neurosci*. 2015;18(5):773-778. doi:10.1038/nn.3983
18. Taylor RL, Cooper SR, Jackson JJ, Barch DM. Assessment of Neighborhood Poverty, Cognitive Function, and Prefrontal and Hippocampal Volumes in Children. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(11):e2023774. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.23774
19. Hair NL, Hanson JL, Wolfe BL, Pollak SD. Association of Child Poverty, Brain Development, and Academic Achievement. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2015;169(9):822. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.1475
20. Hanson JL, Nacewicz BM, Sutterer MJ, et al. Behavioral Problems After Early Life Stress: Contributions of the Hippocampus and Amygdala. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2015;77(4):314-323. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.04.020
21. Luby JL, Baram TZ, Rogers CE, Barch DM. Neurodevelopmental Optimization after Early-Life Adversity: Cross-Species Studies to Elucidate Sensitive Periods and Brain Mechanisms to Inform Early Intervention. *Trends Neurosci*. 2020;43(10):744-751. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2020.08.001
22. Buss C, Entringer S, Wadhwa PD. Fetal Programming of Brain Development: Intrauterine Stress and Susceptibility to Psychopathology. *Sci Signal*. 2012;5(245):pt7-pt7. doi:10.1126/scisignal.2003406
23. Tau GZ, Peterson BS. Normal Development of Brain Circuits. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2010;35(1):147-168. doi:10.1038/npp.2009.115
24. Larson CP. Poverty during pregnancy: Its effects on child health outcomes. *Paediatr Child Health*. 2007;12(8):673-677. doi:10.1093/pch/12.8.673
25. Glover V. Maternal depression, anxiety and stress during pregnancy and child outcome; what needs to be done. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol*. 2014;28(1):25-35. doi:10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2013.08.017

26. O'Donnell KJ, Meaney MJ. Fetal Origins of Mental Health: The Developmental Origins of Health and Disease Hypothesis. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2017;174(4):319-328. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.16020138
27. Pulli EP, Kumpulainen V, Kasurinen JH, et al. Prenatal exposures and infant brain: Review of magnetic resonance imaging studies and a population description analysis. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2019;40(6):1987-2000. doi:10.1002/hbm.24480
28. Wu Y, Lu YC, Jacobs M, et al. Association of Prenatal Maternal Psychological Distress With Fetal Brain Growth, Metabolism, and Cortical Maturation. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(1):e1919940. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.19940
29. Wang C, Shen M, Guillaume B, et al. FKBP5 Moderates the Association between Antenatal Maternal Depressive Symptoms and Neonatal Brain Morphology. *Neuropsychopharmacol Off Publ Am Coll Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2018;43(3):564-570. doi:10.1038/npp.2017.232
30. Qiu A, Rifkin-Graboi A, Chen H, et al. Maternal anxiety and infants' hippocampal development: timing matters. *Transl Psychiatry*. 2013;3(9):e306-e306. doi:10.1038/tp.2013.79
31. Betancourt LM, Avants B, Farah MJ, et al. Effect of socioeconomic status (SES) disparity on neural development in female African-American infants at age 1 month. *Dev Sci*. 2016;19(6):947-956. doi:10.1111/desc.12344
32. Knickmeyer RC, Xia K, Lu Z, et al. Impact of Demographic and Obstetric Factors on Infant Brain Volumes: A Population Neuroscience Study. *Cereb Cortex*. Published online October 26, 2016:cercor/bhw331v1. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhw331
33. Monk C, Georgieff MK, Osterholm EA. Research Review: Maternal prenatal distress and poor nutrition - mutually influencing risk factors affecting infant neurocognitive development: Maternal prenatal distress and poor nutrition. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2013;54(2):115-130. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12000
34. Marques AH, Børke-Monsen AL, Teixeira AL, Silverman MN. Maternal stress, nutrition and physical activity: Impact on immune function, CNS development and psychopathology. *Brain Res*. 2015;1617:28-46. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2014.10.051
35. Lindsay KL, Buss C, Wadhwa PD, Entringer S. The Interplay Between Nutrition and Stress in Pregnancy: Implications for Fetal Programming of Brain Development. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2019;85(2):135-149. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.06.021
36. Margolis AE, Pagliaccio D, Ramphal B, et al. Prenatal environmental tobacco smoke exposure alters children's cognitive control circuitry: A preliminary study. *Environ Int*. 2021;155:106516. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2021.106516
37. Luby JL, Barch DM, Warner B, et al. *Modeling Prenatal Adversity/Advantage: Effects on Birth Weight*. *Pediatrics*; 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.12.16.21267938
38. Brooks-Gunn J, Klebanov PK, Liaw F ruey. The learning, physical, and emotional environment of the home in the context of poverty: The infant health and development program. *Child Youth Serv Rev*. 1995;17(1-2):251-276. doi:10.1016/0190-7409(95)00011-Z

39. Kind AJH, Buckingham WR. Making Neighborhood-Disadvantage Metrics Accessible — The Neighborhood Atlas. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(26):2456-2458. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1802313
40. Krebs-Smith SM, Pannucci TE, Subar AF, et al. Update of the Healthy Eating Index: HEI-2015. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2018;118(9):1591-1602. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2018.05.021
41. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. *J Health Soc Behav*. 1983;24(4):385-396.
42. Cox JL, Holden JM, Sagovsky R. Detection of Postnatal Depression: Development of the 10-item Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale. *Br J Psychiatry*. 1987;150(6):782-786. doi:10.1192/bjp.150.6.782
43. Slavich GM, Shields GS. Assessing Lifetime Stress Exposure Using the Stress and Adversity Inventory for Adults (Adult STRAIN): An Overview and Initial Validation. *Psychosom Med*. 2018;80(1):17-27. doi:10.1097/PSY.0000000000000534
44. Williams DR, Yan Yu, Jackson JS, Anderson NB. Racial Differences in Physical and Mental Health: Socio-economic Status, Stress and Discrimination. *J Health Psychol*. 1997;2(3):335-351. doi:10.1177/135910539700200305
45. Bateman BT, Mhyre JM, Hernandez-Diaz S, et al. Development of a Comorbidity Index for Use in Obstetric Patients: *Obstet Gynecol*. 2013;122(5):957-965. doi:10.1097/AOG.0b013e3182a603bb
46. Metcalfe A, Lix L, Johnson J, et al. Validation of an obstetric comorbidity index in an external population. *BJOG Int J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2015;122(13):1748-1755. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.13254
47. Jenkinson M, Beckmann CF, Behrens TEJ, Woolrich MW, Smith SM. FSL. *NeuroImage*. 2012;62(2):782-790. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.09.015
48. Manjón JV, Coupé P, Martí-Bonmatí L, Collins DL, Robles M. Adaptive non-local means denoising of MR images with spatially varying noise levels: Spatially Adaptive Nonlocal Denoising. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2010;31(1):192-203. doi:10.1002/jmri.22003
49. Alexander B, Murray AL, Loh WY, et al. A new neonatal cortical and subcortical brain atlas: the Melbourne Children's Regional Infant Brain (M-CRIB) atlas. *NeuroImage*. 2017;147:841-851. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.09.068
50. Adamson CL, Alexander B, Ball G, et al. *Parcellation of the Cortex Using Surface-Based Melbourne Children's Regional Infant Brain Atlases (M-CRIB-S)*. Neuroscience; 2019. doi:10.1101/544304
51. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *J R Stat Soc Ser B Methodol*. 1995;57(1):289-300.
52. Hüppi PS, Warfield S, Kikinis R, et al. Quantitative magnetic resonance imaging of brain development in premature and mature newborns: Brain MRI in Newborns. *Ann Neurol*. 1998;43(2):224-235. doi:10.1002/ana.410430213

53. Gao W, Lin W, Chen Y, et al. Temporal and Spatial Development of Axonal Maturation and Myelination of White Matter in the Developing Brain. *Am J Neuroradiol*. 2009;30(2):290-296. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A1363
54. Volpe JJ. Brain injury in premature infants: a complex amalgam of destructive and developmental disturbances. *Lancet Neurol*. 2009;8(1):110-124. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(08)70294-1
55. Graham AM, Rasmussen JM, Rudolph MD, et al. Maternal Systemic Interleukin-6 During Pregnancy Is Associated With Newborn Amygdala Phenotypes and Subsequent Behavior at 2 Years of Age. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2018;83(2):109-119. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.05.027
56. Silveira PP, Pokhvisneva I, Parent C, et al. Cumulative prenatal exposure to adversity reveals associations with a broad range of neurodevelopmental outcomes that are moderated by a novel, biologically informed polygenetic score based on the serotonin transporter solute carrier family C6, member 4 (*SLC6A4*) gene expression. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2017;29(5):1601-1617. doi:10.1017/S0954579417001262
57. Verbeek T, Bockting CLH, Beijers C, Meijer JL, van Pampus MG, Burger H. Low socioeconomic status increases effects of negative life events on antenatal anxiety and depression. *Women Birth*. 2019;32(1):e138-e143. doi:10.1016/j.wombi.2018.05.005
58. Manley BJ, Roberts RS, Doyle LW, et al. Social Variables Predict Gains in Cognitive Scores across the Preschool Years in Children with Birth Weights 500 to 1250 Grams. *J Pediatr*. 2015;166(4):870-876.e2. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2014.12.016
59. Jensen SKG, Berens AE, Nelson CA. Effects of poverty on interacting biological systems underlying child development. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2017;1(3):225-239. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(17)30024-X
60. Perry RE, Braren SH, Opendak M, et al. Elevated infant cortisol is necessary but not sufficient for transmission of environmental risk to infant social development: Cross-species evidence of mother–infant physiological social transmission. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2020;32(5):1696-1714. doi:10.1017/S0954579420001455
61. Buss C, Davis EP, Shahbaba B, Pruessner JC, Head K, Sandman CA. Maternal cortisol over the course of pregnancy and subsequent child amygdala and hippocampus volumes and affective problems. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2012;109(20):E1312-E1319. doi:10.1073/pnas.1201295109
62. McEwen BS, Nasca C, Gray JD. Stress Effects on Neuronal Structure: Hippocampus, Amygdala, and Prefrontal Cortex. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2016;41(1):3-23. doi:10.1038/npp.2015.171
63. Muhammad A, Carroll C, Kolb B. Stress during development alters dendritic morphology in the nucleus accumbens and prefrontal cortex. *Neuroscience*. 2012;216:103-109. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2012.04.041
64. Lucassen PJ, Naninck EFG, van Goudoever JB, Fitzsimons C, Joels M, Korosi A. Perinatal programming of adult hippocampal structure and function; emerging roles of stress, nutrition and epigenetics. *Trends Neurosci*. 2013;36(11):621-631. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2013.08.002

65. Barrington WE, Stafford M, Hamer M, Beresford SAA, Koepsell T, Steptoe A. Neighborhood socioeconomic deprivation, perceived neighborhood factors, and cortisol responses to induced stress among healthy adults. *Health Place*. 2014;27:120-126. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2014.02.001
66. Marques AH, O'Connor TG, Roth C, Susser E, Bjørke-Monsen AL. The influence of maternal prenatal and early childhood nutrition and maternal prenatal stress on offspring immune system development and neurodevelopmental disorders. *Front Neurosci*. 2013;7. doi:10.3389/fnins.2013.00120
67. Beijers R, Buitelaar JK, de Weerth C. Mechanisms underlying the effects of prenatal psychosocial stress on child outcomes: beyond the HPA axis. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2014;23(10):943-956. doi:10.1007/s00787-014-0566-3
68. Knuesel I, Chicha L, Britschgi M, et al. Maternal immune activation and abnormal brain development across CNS disorders. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2014;10(11):643-660. doi:10.1038/nrneurol.2014.187
69. Vargas T, Damme KSF, Mittal VA. Neighborhood deprivation, prefrontal morphology and neurocognition in late childhood to early adolescence. *NeuroImage*. 2020;220:117086. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117086
70. Overfeld J, Entringer S, Rasmussen JM, et al. Neonatal hippocampal volume moderates the effects of early postnatal enrichment on cognitive development. *Dev Cogn Neurosci*. 2020;45:100820. doi:10.1016/j.dcn.2020.100820
71. Blair C, Raver CC. Poverty, Stress, and Brain Development: New Directions for Prevention and Intervention. *Acad Pediatr*. 2016;16(3):S30-S36. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2016.01.010

FIGURES




Figure 1. Plots demonstrating correlation between total brain volume and Maternal Social Advantage factor for A) cortical gray matter, B) white matter, C) subcortical gray matter, and D) cerebellum. Correlation and p values included for line of best fit included. Automated volumetric segmentation for each tissue type overlaid on T2-weighted image for representative infant also included.





Figure 2. Plots demonstrating correlation between regional brain volume and Maternal Social Advantage factor for left and right A) hippocampus and B) amygdala. Correlation and p values included for line of best fit included. Automated volumetric segmentation for each structure overlaid on T2-weighted image for representative infant also included. Note similar results across hemispheres.

**High Cortical
Surface Area**



**Low Cortical
Surface Area**





Figure 3. Plot demonstrating correlation between global cortical surface area (i.e., folding) and Maternal Social Advantage factor. Cortical surfaces for representative infants with high vs low cortical folding included for reference.

Table 1. Social Background and Infant Clinical Characteristics of the Sample ($n=280$)

Maternal Age (years), mean (SD) [range]	29.1 (5.3) [18.7-41.8]
Maternal Race	
Black/African American, n (%)	170 (60.7)
White, n (%)	100 (35.7)
Other, n (%)	10 (3.6)
Maternal Medical Risk Score, mean (SD) [range]	1.0 (1.30) [0-8]
Maternal Tobacco Use	
Heavy Use (6 or more cigarettes/day), n (%)	16 (5.7)
Some Use (less than 6 cigarettes/day), n (%)	20 (7.1)
None, n (%)	244 (87.1)
Maternal Marijuana Use	
Daily Use, n (%)	21 (7.5)
Some Use (less than daily), n (%)	15 (5.4)
None, n (%)	244 (87.1)
Insurance	
Medicaid/Medicare, n (%)	105 (37.6)
Individual/Group Health Insurance, n (%)	144 (51.4)
Uninsured, n (%)	31 (11.0)
Married Mothers, n (%)	99 (35.4)
Maternal Education (n = 272)	
Did not complete high school, n (%)	28 (10.3)
Finished high school/GED, n (%)	68 (25.0)
Some college/vocational school, n (%)	83 (30.5)
College degree (4 years), n (%)	34 (12.5)
Graduate degree, n (%)	59 (21.7)
Income to Needs Ratio, mean (SD) [range]	2.8 (2.9) [0.4-12.0]
Log₁₀ Income to Needs Ratio, mean (SD)	0.3 (0.4)
Area Deprivation Index, mean (SD) [range]	68.2 (24.9) [1-100]
Healthy Eating Index (n = 223), mean (SD) [range]	58.8 (10.0) [33.0-80.7]
Social Advantage, mean (SD) [range]	.05 (1.0) [-1.5-2.2]
Perceived Stress Survey (PSS), mean (SD) [range]	
1 st Trimester (n = 276)	13.1 (7.2) [0-35]
2 nd Trimester (n = 215)	12.9 (7.5) [0-36]
3 rd Trimester (n = 234)	12.5 (7.3) [0-37]
Edinburgh Postpartum Depression Scale, mean (SD) [range]	
1 st Trimester (n = 278)	4.8 (4.5) [0-25]
2 nd Trimester (n = 235)	4.4 (4.4) [0-20]
3 rd Trimester (n = 239)	4.1 (4.7) [0-25]
STRAIN (n = 263)	
Stressful event count, mean (SD) [range]	7.3 (5.9) [0-30]
Weighted severity, mean (SD) [range]	20.9 (18.6) [0-99]
Everyday Discrimination Scale (n = 261), mean (SD) [range]	1.5 (.9) [1-6]
Psychological Stress, mean (SD) [range]	-.11 (.88) [-1.7-3.7]
Infant gestational age (weeks), mean (SD) [range]	38.6 (1.0) [37-41]
Postmenstrual age at MRI (weeks), mean (SD) [range]	41.7 (1.3) [38-45]
Infant sex (male), n (%)	149 (53.2)
Infant Birthweight (g), mean (SD) [range]	3257.7 (487.7) [2200-4627]

Table 2. Summary of Final Step in Hierarchical Regression Models Linking Maternal Social Advantage and Psychosocial Stress with Structural MRI Measures at Birth ($n=280$)

	β	p	q^a
Total Cortical Gray Matter, $R^2 = .559, p < .001$			
Sex	-.235	<.001	.004
Birthweight	.247	<.001	.004
PMA at scan	.522	<.001	.004
Tobacco Use	-.034	.427	1.0
Social Advantage	.129	.008	.032
Psychosocial Distress	-.023	.597	1.0
Total Subcortical Gray Matter, $R^2 = .560, p < .001$			
Sex	-.244	<.001	.004
Birthweight	.202	<.001	.004
PMA at scan	.541	<.001	.004
Tobacco Use	-.068	.112	.448
Social Advantage	.152	.002	.008
Psychosocial Distress	-.046	.303	1.00
Total White Matter, $R^2 = .367, p < .001$			
Sex	-.290	<.001	.004
Birthweight	.188	<.001	.004
Tobacco Use	-.056	.272	1.00
PMA at scan	.187	<.001	.004
Social Advantage	.284	<.001	.004
Psychosocial Distress	-.024	.651	1.00
Total Left Hippocampus, $R^2 = .218, p < .001$			
Sex	.162	.003	.012
Birthweight	.115	.048	.192
PMA at scan	.293	<.001	.004
Tobacco Use	-.026	.643	1.00
Social Advantage	.170	.009	.036
Psychosocial Distress	.016	.784	1.00
Total Right Hippocampus, $R^2 = .219, p < .001$			
Sex	-.142	.010	.040
Birthweight	.151	.010	.040
PMA at scan	.262	<.001	.004
Tobacco Use	-.058	.312	1.00
Social Advantage	.170	.009	.036
Psychosocial Distress	.012	.837	1.00
Total Left Amygdala, $R^2 = .411, p < .001$			
Sex	-.297	<.001	.004
Birthweight	.130	.010	.040
PMA at scan	.370	<.001	.004
Tobacco Use	-.095	.054	.216
Social Advantage	.198	<.001	.004
Psychosocial Distress	.007	.893	1.00
Total Right Amygdala, $R^2 = .416, p < .001$			
Sex	-.282	<.001	.004
Birthweight	.175	.001	.004
PMA at scan	.374	<.001	.004

Tobacco Use	-.052	.292	1.00
Social Advantage	.195	.001	.004
Psychosocial Distress	.005	.928	1.00
Total Cortical Surface Area, $R^2 = .539$, $p < .001$			
Sex	-.253	<.001	.001
Birthweight	.202	<.001	.001
PMA at scan	.490	<.001	.001
Tobacco Use	.043	.329	.392
Social Advantage	.219	<.001	.001
Psychosocial Distress	-.020	.695	.695

Note. Results for all steps of hierarchical regression models are shown in full in Supplementary Material, Table S3.

^a Q-values represent p-values after correction for multiple comparisons using Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate procedure.