

## **Is socioeconomic status associated with risk of childhood type 1 diabetes? A comprehensive review**

Paz Lopez-Doriga Ruiz, MD<sup>1,2,3</sup>; Lars C. Stene, PhD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Chronic Diseases, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway

<sup>2</sup> Department of Endocrinology, Morbid Obesity and Preventive Medicine, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Health and Society, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

**Corresponding Author:** Lars C. Stene, Department of Chronic Diseases, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway, P. O. Box 222 Skøyen, NO-0213 Oslo, Norway. E-mail: [lars.christian.stene@fhi.no](mailto:lars.christian.stene@fhi.no)

Word count: Abstract: 200; Main text: 2404

Figures: 2, Tables: 3

References: 64

Supporting Information: Text (1260 words), 1 Table, and 44 references

**Conflicts of interest:** All authors declare no competing interests.

## **Novelty statement**

### **“What is already known?”**

- Socioeconomic status has been associated with a variety of exposures, but the influence on type 1 diabetes risk is unclear.

### **“What this study has found?”**

- Our searches identified eight high-quality and several lower quality studies, mostly using socioeconomic status as a confounder. There was no consistent association between socioeconomic status and risk of childhood type 1 diabetes. No conclusions could be drawn for specific parental occupations.

### **“What are the implications of the study?”**

- While there is a need for more high-quality studies, the existing literature does not suggest a major and consistent role of socioeconomic status in the risk of type 1 diabetes.

## **Acknowledgments**

We thank the following colleagues for commenting on an earlier draft of this manuscript: Siri E. Håberg, NIPH; Inger J. Bakken, Directorate of Health, Norway; Torild Skrivarhaug, Oslo University Hospital; Geir Joner, Oslo University Hospital.

**Funding.** This research was funded in part by a grant from the South-Eastern Norway Regional Health Authority and by the Norwegian Institute of Public Health.

**Author Contributions.** LCS conceived the idea of the work. LCS and PLD were involved in the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of the work and drafted the work.

## **Aims**

Studies of social inequality in risk of type 1 diabetes seems inconsistent. The present review aimed to comprehensively review relevant literature and describe what has been reported on socioeconomic status or parental occupation and risk of type 1 diabetes in children.

## **Methods**

We searched for publications between January 1, 1970, and November 30, 2021. We focused on the most recent and/or informative publication in case of multiple publications from the same data source and referred to these as primary studies.

## **Results**

Our search identified 69 publications with relevant data. We identified eight primary cohort studies with individual-level data, which we considered the highest quality of evidence. Furthermore, we identified 13 primary case-control studies and 14 semi-ecological studies with area-level socioeconomic status variables which provide weaker quality of evidence. Four of eight primary cohort studies contained data on maternal education, showing non-linear associations with type 1 diabetes that were not consistent across studies. There were no consistent patterns on the association of parental occupation and childhood-onset type 1 diabetes.

## **Conclusions**

There is a need for more high-quality studies, but the existing literature does not suggest a major and consistent role of socioeconomic status in the risk of type 1 diabetes.

**Key words** socioeconomic status, incidence, type 1 diabetes, parental education, parental occupation, environmental factors, public health

**Abbreviations** CI, confidence interval

## Introduction

The incidence of childhood-onset type 1 diabetes varies widely between countries and tend to be more common in wealthier countries (1). The incidence has doubled during two to three decades in many countries (2). Environmental factors, probably operating in early life, are therefore likely involved in the aetiology (3).

Lower parental socioeconomic status has been consistently associated with a variety of lifestyles and exposures hypothesized to be linked to the risk of childhood-onset type 1 diabetes such as maternal and child obesity, smoking in pregnancy, lack of breastfeeding, child infections (4-6). Studies describing risk of type 1 diabetes according to socioeconomic status can therefore shed light on the aetiology of type 1 diabetes (Figure 1).

Socioeconomic status variables may have different meanings and interpretations in different locations and at different times. For health outcomes in children, it is the parental socioeconomic status that is relevant. Education, occupation, and income has traditionally been the most frequently used measures in epidemiology (7-9). Occupation has traditionally been used in some countries to categorise families in groups of social status. Specific parental occupations may serve as indicators of exposures, including prenatal exposures, that may provide clues to the aetiology of type 1 diabetes. For instance, studies in asthma and allergy have suggested that farm living is associated with lower risk of these outcomes (10). Teachers or health workers are typically frequently exposed to infections (11, 12). Industrial workers may be exposed to toxic chemicals (13).

The literature linking socioeconomic status or parental occupation and risk of type 1 diabetes is scattered and is rarely mentioned in reviews of risk factors for the disease. A 1982 review suggested higher risk of type 1 diabetes in children from families with high socioeconomic status (14). In contrast, a 2010 review of type 1 diabetes epidemiology emphasized that there were inconsistent methods and results across studies (15), and a 2014 review of socioeconomic status and autoimmune disease briefly covered type 1 diabetes (16). An updated review of this topic is lacking.

We therefore aimed to comprehensively review relevant literature on the relationship between socioeconomic status or parental occupation and the risk of childhood onset type 1 diabetes.

## Methods

### *Search strategy and inclusion criteria*

We carried out a comprehensive literature review of socioeconomic status and the potential association with incidence of childhood-onset type 1 diabetes. We searched PubMed for publications between January 1, 1970, and November 30, 2021 (search terms in Supporting Information). We focused on the most recent and/or informative publication in case of multiple publications from the same data source and referred to these as primary studies. We excluded all studies of socioeconomic consequences of type 1 diabetes. Including prevalent cases of type 1 diabetes was considered a methodological weakness, especially if socioeconomic status variables were only available after diagnosis, because having a child with type 1 diabetes may influence parental socioeconomic status.

We imported the identified articles to the software Covidence© and the duplicates were characterized and excluded. We also included articles from our personal reference lists from a previous review (17) and references from review-articles from 2010 and 2014 (15, 16). In addition, we assessed studies included in previous systematic reviews on risk factors of type 1 diabetes (18, 19). We included studies with data on socioeconomic variables and incident type 1 diabetes during childhood (age <18 years) and focused on the most recent and/or informative publication in case of multiple publications from the same data source. The reference lists from publications with a main aim of investigating socioeconomic status in relation to risk of type 1 diabetes were screened for additional publications. Studies with a minimum of 100 cases of incident type 1 diabetes were included. Both authors screened the articles, and we resolved any disagreement through discussion.



### *Study designs and quality of evidence*

Study designs were categorized based on whether individual level childhood socioeconomic status or area-based socioeconomic status was available, and on whether the study design was cohort, case-control, ecological, or other. Cohort studies with detailed individual level information on were considered the highest-level evidence, particularly if based on complete population-based registries. Case-control studies nested within registries, without need for active participation in an interview or returning a questionnaire, were considered equal level evidence to that for a cohort design. Traditional case-control studies have a number of potential limitations, and even more so for ecological studies (see discussion section). Ecological study designs were considered the lowest quality of evidence. A study was labelled ecological if socioeconomic status was only available at level of area of residence (even if type 1 diabetes were available at the individual level, see Supporting Information for details).

## Results

After screening 240 titles/abstracts from the PubMed search and excluding the majority due to lack of relevant data, 35 publications with relevant data were assessed in detail. We added 34 additional publications from other sources to a total of 69 publications with relevant data (Figure 2).

Eight primary publications used cohort design (including one large scale registry-based case-control study considered of equivalent quality as cohort) with individual level data on socioeconomic status (Table 1). Thirteen primary case-control studies are presented in Table 2. All case-control studies had individual level socioeconomic status data (two had area-based socioeconomic status in addition). Fourteen primary ecological studies are presented in Table 3.

The majority of studies had not accounted for ethnicity or country background, which may lead to confounding. The majority of the cohort and case-control studies included socioeconomic status as an adjustment variable, not as a primary study variable. A summary of the numbers of publications with different strengths and weaknesses are presented in the Supporting Information results section. A meta-analysis was not possible due to heterogeneity of the socioeconomic indicators, but major studies were tabulated and characterized in terms of main characteristics and direction of association (20).

### *Maternal or paternal education in relation to risk of type 1 diabetes*

Four of eight primary cohort studies contained data on maternal education in relation to risk of type 1 diabetes, showing non-linear associations with highest risk of

childhood-onset type 1 diabetes in the mid (or highest) of three categories of maternal education in one, and a U-shaped association in one study (Table 1).

Of 14 primary case-control studies, nine contained data on maternal education, two on paternal education and one on parental education (highest of maternal or paternal education). Of the nine studies with maternal education, six reported inverse association, and the remaining showed no clear association. Of two studies with paternal education, one showed a positive and the other no significant association with type 1 diabetes (Table 2).

#### *Occupation-derived socioeconomic status and risk of childhood type 1 diabetes*

One primary cohort study reported maternal social class based on occupation and found no significant association. Parental unemployment tended to be associated with higher risk of type 1 diabetes in a study from Southern Australia, but not in a study from Denmark (Table 1).

Of 14 primary case-control studies, six reported social class according to maternal occupation, and six according to paternal occupation, and there was no clear association with childhood-onset type 1 diabetes in these (Table 2).

#### *Parental income and risk of childhood type 1 diabetes*

None of the primary cohort studies reported associations for parental income (main Table 2). Parental employment status (both parents working, only father, only mother or neither), use of public versus private hospital were reported by Begum et al. in South Australia, showing a slightly but significantly higher risk associated with higher

socioeconomic status. In a Danish study, family poverty (5.5% of cohort), parental long-term unemployment (25% of cohort) was not significantly associated with childhood-onset type 1 diabetes (21).

Two of the 14 primary case-control studies contained data on parental or family income, both from the USA, and results showed associations in the opposite direction (Table 2).

#### *Other socioeconomic status indicators and risk of type 1 diabetes: Crowding*

Bruno 2013 analysed household crowding (persons per area of the residence) in the city of Turin, Italy, and found no significant association in the 4–14-year-olds (Table 1). Bruno found higher crowding index to be associated with a borderline significantly higher risk of type 1 diabetes in the 0–3-year-olds (22).

#### *Area-based socioeconomic status in relation to type 1 diabetes incidence*

Details regarding methodological aspects and composite indices used in area-based studies are described in Supporting Information results section. Five of 14 primary studies analysing area-based socioeconomic status in relation to type 1 diabetes incidence found a positive relation, while one found a clear inverse relation (Patterson 1991) and the remaining found no clearly significant associations or suggestive non-linear associations (Table 3).

#### *Occupation-derived socioeconomic status and risk of childhood type 1 diabetes*

One primary cohort study reported maternal social class based on occupation and found no significant association. Parental unemployment tended to be associated

with higher risk of type 1 diabetes in a study from Southern Australia, but not in a study from Denmark (Table 1).

Of 14 primary case-control studies, six reported social class according to maternal occupation, and six according to paternal occupation, and there was no clear association with childhood-onset type 1 diabetes in these (Table 2).

#### *Specific maternal or paternal occupation in relation to type 1 diabetes*

We found no study investigating risk of childhood-onset type 1 diabetes across several types of maternal or paternal occupations. However, we found three studies of some relevance for parental farming, showing no clear association with risk of childhood type 1 diabetes (see Supporting Information results section for details).

We found only publication investigating parental occupational exposure, a case-control study from which it was difficult to draw firm conclusions (see Supporting Information results section for details).

## Discussion

There were remarkably few high-quality studies relating socioeconomic status or parental occupation to childhood type 1 diabetes. Many studies reported non-linear associations, but there was little or no consistency across studies, even among the highest quality studies.

### *Methodological weaknesses in published studies*

Several methodological weaknesses were apparent in the majority of studies assessed. Registry-based case-control studies typically do not require consent or active participation, or at least consent and/or participation in data collection is done before the disease outcome and hence similarly for cases and controls. On the other hand, traditional case-control studies require active participation and usually involves collection of data at or after diagnosis of cases with type 1 diabetes. Participation is always lower than 100%, biased towards participants with higher socioeconomic status and differentially so in cases and controls because of typically lower participation among controls than cases (23, 24). Severe selection and/or recall bias is therefore often present in case-control studies of socioeconomic status and type 1 diabetes. Many studies with a main aim of relating socioeconomic status to type 1 diabetes had used area-based socioeconomic status. Ecological studies are vulnerable to distinct biases that cannot be mitigated by adjustment for confounding (25). The larger and more heterogeneous the geographical area on which an individual's socioeconomic status is attributed, the larger the potential for very strong biases that may even reverse the direction of associations or causal effects existing at the individual level.

The general lack of adjustment for ethnicity and immigration status in most studies also represent an important problem when attempting to interpret the literature (2).

We excluded studies with prevalent type 1 diabetes, as type 1 diabetes in a child may influence parental socioeconomic status (26).

### *The wider context of social inequality in child health*

Many health aspects are well known to be associated with low socioeconomic status, including child mortality (27), and our review does not in any way negate this this.

However, we should also not take for granted that all aspects of health are caused by or predicted by low socioeconomic status. Social inequality in child health represents separate methodological challenges, and it is important to differentiate between studies of objective health outcomes that are not likely to be influenced by parents' reports or behaviour that may influence the likelihood of their child receiving a diagnosis which may create bias in studies of child health. A previous review of childhood cancer risk documented methodological weaknesses and inconsistencies in the literature similar to what we have documented here for type 1 diabetes (28). It is possible that aspects of socioeconomic status have context dependent effects. A recent study of city dwellers in high-income European countries reported higher circulating levels of several toxicants in children and their mothers with higher socioeconomic status, perhaps contrary to expectation (29).

Childhood type 1 diabetes is a well-defined disease for which underdiagnosis is not a likely problem, at least in middle- and high-income settings. It is well documented that low socioeconomic status is associated with poorer glycaemic control and comorbidities in patients with type 1 diabetes (30, 31). However, the latter is an

entirely different research question that what we have addressed in the current review.

### *Practical implications for future studies*

Given the relatively weak and inconsistent associations between socioeconomic status and risk of type 1 diabetes documented here and the many layers of methodological problems discussed above, additional ecological studies are not likely to advance the field. Future studies should aim for prospective designs, possibly registry-based studies with complete population coverage. Furthermore, large sample size is important for sufficient power to detect the likely weak to moderate strength of associations, or conclusively rule out associations. We further recommend to avoid categorizing indicators of socioeconomic status too coarsely, and to allow for potential non-linear associations in the analysis. Finally, use clearly defined individual level socioeconomic status indicators (area-based indicators could be used together with individual level indicators in multilevel analyses).

### *Strengths and imitations of the review*

We have comprehensively reviewed a large literature that was scattered and sometimes difficult to identify because socioeconomic status was not necessarily part of the main aim of the study. Most studies were from middle- or high-income countries. We limited our review to childhood-onset type 1 diabetes to make interpretation of parental socioeconomic status most relevant. Type 1 diabetes may occur at any age, and socioeconomic status may have different effects in young adults. While a few studies have also included young adults (e.g. Bruno (22)), the



person's own indicator of socioeconomic status may become increasingly relevant with increasing age.

### *Conclusion*

We conclude that there is a need for more high-quality studies and that the existing literature does not suggest a major and consistent role of socioeconomic status as a risk factor for type 1 diabetes.

## References

1. Gomez-Lopera N, Pineda-Trujillo N, Diaz-Valencia PA. Correlating the global increase in type 1 diabetes incidence across age groups with national economic prosperity: A systematic review. *World J Diabetes*. 2019;10(12):560-80.
2. Tuomilehto J, Ogle GD, Lund-Blix NA, Stene LC. Update on worldwide trends in occurrence of childhood type 1 diabetes in 2020. *Pediatr Endocrinol Rev*. 2020;17(Suppl 1):198-209.
3. Rewers M, Ludvigsson J. Environmental risk factors for type 1 diabetes. *Lancet*. 2016;387(10035):2340-8.
4. Dowd JB, Zajacova A, Aiello A. Early origins of health disparities: burden of infection, health, and socioeconomic status in U.S. children. *Soc Sci Med*. 2009;68(4):699-707.
5. Lund-Blix NA, Dydensborg Sander S, Størdal K, Nybo Andersen AM, Rønningen KS, Joner G, et al. Infant feeding and risk of type 1 diabetes in two large Scandinavian birth cohorts. *Diabetes Care*. 2017;40(7):920-7.
6. Biehl A, Hovengen R, Grøholt EK, Hjelmesaeth J, Strand BH, Meyer HE. Adiposity among children in Norway by urbanity and maternal education: a nationally representative study. *BMC Public Health*. 2013;13:842.
7. Liberatos P, Link BG, Kelsey JL. The measurement of social class in epidemiology. *Epidemiol Rev*. 1988;10:87-121.
8. Krieger N, Williams DR, Moss NE. Measuring social class in US public health research: concepts, methodologies, and guidelines. *Annual review of public health*. 1997;18:341-78.
9. Galobardes B, Shaw M, Lawlor DA, Lynch JW, Davey Smith G. Indicators of socioeconomic position (part 1). *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2006;60(1):7-12.
10. von Mutius E. The "hygiene hypothesis" and the lessons learnt from farm studies. *Front Immunol*. 2021;12:635522.
11. Ponsonby AL, Pezic A, Cameron FJ, Rodda C, Kemp AS, Carlin JB, et al. Higher parental occupational social contact is associated with a reduced risk of incident pediatric type 1 diabetes: Mediation through molecular enteroviral indices. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(4):e0193992.
12. Allen DW, Kim KW, Rawlinson WD, Craig ME. Maternal virus infections in pregnancy and type 1 diabetes in their offspring: Systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Rev Med Virol*. 2018;28(3):e1974.
13. Savitz DA, Chen JH. Parental occupation and childhood cancer: review of epidemiologic studies. *Environ Health Perspect*. 1990;88:325-37.
14. Anonymous. Diabetes mellitus and socioeconomic factors (Editorial). *Lancet*. 1982;2(8297):530-1.
15. Borchers AT, Uibo R, Gershwin ME. The geoepidemiology of type 1 diabetes. *Autoimmun Rev*. 2010;9(5):A355-A65.
16. Calixto OJ, Anaya JM. Socioeconomic status. The relationship with health and autoimmune diseases. *Autoimmun Rev*. 2014;13(6):641-54.
17. Stene LC, Tuomilehto J, Rewers M. Global epidemiology of type 1 diabetes. In: Ekoé J-M, Rewers M, Williams R, Zimmet P, editors. *The epidemiology of diabetes mellitus*. 2 ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell; 2008. p. 355-83.
18. Cardwell CR, Stene LC, Ludvigsson J, Rosenbauer J, Cinek O, Svensson J, et al. Breast-feeding and childhood-onset type 1 diabetes: a pooled analysis of individual participant data from 43 observational studies. *Diabetes Care*. 2012;35(11):2215-25.
19. Cardwell CR, Stene LC, Joner G, Bulsara MK, Cinek O, Rosenbauer J, et al. Birth order and childhood type 1 diabetes risk: a pooled analysis of 31 observational studies. *International journal of epidemiology*. 2011;40(2):363-74.
20. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Altman DG. *Systematic reviews in health care: meta-analysis in context*. London: BMJ Publishing Group; 2001 2001.
21. Bengtsson J, Byberg S, Carstensen B, De Stavola BL, Svensson J, Jørgensen ME, et al. Accumulation of childhood adversities and type 1 diabetes risk: a register-based cohort study of all

- children born in Denmark between 1980 and 2015. *International journal of epidemiology*. 2020;49(5):1604-13.
22. Bruno G, Spadea T, Picariello R, Gruden G, Barutta F, Cerutti F, et al. Early life socioeconomic indicators and risk of type 1 diabetes in children and young adults. *J Pediatr*. 2013;162(3):600-5 e1.
  23. Norris JM, Johnson RK, Stene LC. Type 1 diabetes-early life origins and changing epidemiology. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2020;8(3):226-38.
  24. Stene LC, Joner G, the Norwegian Childhood Diabetes Study Group. Use of cod liver oil during the first year of life is associated with lower risk of childhood-onset type 1 diabetes: a large, population based, case-control study. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2003;78:1128-34.
  25. Morton LM, Cahill J, Hartge P. Reporting participation in epidemiologic studies: a survey of practice. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2006;163(3):197-203.
  26. Morgenstern H, Wakefield J. Ecological studies and analysis. In: Lash TL, VanderWeele TJ, Haneuse S, Rothman KJ, editors. *Modern epidemiology*. 4 ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer; 2021.
  27. Dehn-Hindenberg A, Sassmann H, Berndt V, Biester T, Heidtmann B, Jorch N, et al. Long-term occupational consequences for families of children with type 1 diabetes: the mothers take the burden. *Diabetes Care*. 2021.
  28. Gissler M, Rahkonen O, Mortensen L, Arntzen A, Cnattingius S, Nybo Andersen AM, et al. Sex differences in child and adolescent mortality by parental education in the Nordic countries. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2012;66(1):57-63.
  29. Poole C, Greenland S, Luetters C, Kelsey JL, Mezei G. Socioeconomic status and childhood leukaemia: a review. *International journal of epidemiology*. 2006;35(2):370-84.
  30. Montazeri P, Thomsen C, Casas M, de Bont J, Haug LS, Maitre L, et al. Socioeconomic position and exposure to multiple environmental chemical contaminants in six European mother-child cohorts. *Int J Hyg Environ Health*. 2019;222(5):864-72.
  31. Hill-Briggs F, Adler NE, Berkowitz SA, Chin MH, Gary-Webb TL, Navas-Acien A, et al. Social determinants of health and diabetes: a scientific review. *Diabetes Care*. 2020.
  32. Lindner LME, Rathmann W, Rosenbauer J. Inequalities in glycaemic control, hypoglycaemia and diabetic ketoacidosis according to socio-economic status and area-level deprivation in Type 1 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review. *Diabetic medicine : a journal of the British Diabetic Association*. 2018;35(1):12-32.
  33. Begum M, Chittleborough C, Pilkington R, Mittinty M, Lynch J, Penno M, et al. Incidence of type 1 diabetes by socio-demographic characteristics among South Australian children: Whole-of-population study. *J Paediatr Child Health*. 2020;56(12):1952-8.
  34. Syrjälä E, Nevalainen J, Peltonen J, Takkinen HM, Hakola L, Åkerlund M, et al. A joint modeling approach for childhood meat, fish and egg consumption and the risk of advanced islet autoimmunity. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9(1):7760.
  35. Clausen TD, Bergholt T, Bouaziz O, Arpi M, Eriksson F, Rasmussen S, et al. Broad-spectrum antibiotic treatment and subsequent childhood type 1 diabetes: a nationwide Danish cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(8):e0161654.
  36. Khashan AS, Kenny LC, Lundholm C, Kearney PM, Gong T, McNamee R, et al. Gestational age and birth weight and the risk of childhood type 1 diabetes: a population-based cohort and sibling design study. *Diabetes Care*. 2015;38(12):2308-15.
  37. D'Angeli MA, Merzon E, Valbuena LF, Tirschwell D, Paris CA, Mueller BA. Environmental factors associated with childhood-onset type 1 diabetes mellitus: an exploration of the hygiene and overload hypotheses. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2010;164(8):732-8.
  38. Levins R, Roberts SE, Goldacre MJ. Perinatal factors associated with subsequent diabetes mellitus in the child: record linkage study. *Diabetic medicine : a journal of the British Diabetic Association*. 2007;24(6):664-70.
  39. Liese AD, Puett RC, Lamichhane AP, Nichols MD, Dabelea D, Lawson AB, et al. Neighborhood level risk factors for type 1 diabetes in youth: the SEARCH case-control study. *Int J Health Geogr*. 2012;11:1.

40. Karavanaki K, Tsoka E, Karayianni C, Petrou V, Pippidou E, Brisimitzi M, et al. Prevalence of allergic symptoms among children with diabetes mellitus type 1 of different socioeconomic status. *Pediatr Diabetes*. 2008;9(4 Pt 2):407-16.
41. Svensson J, Carstensen B, Mortensen HB, Borch-Johnsen K, Diabetes DSGoC. Early childhood risk factors associated with type 1 diabetes—is gender important? *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2005;20(5):429-34.
42. Sipetic S, Vlajinac H, Kocev N, Saji S. The Belgrade childhood diabetes study: prenatal and social associations for type 1 diabetes. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 2004;18(1):33-9.
43. Sipetic SB, Vlajinac HD, Kocev NI, Marinkovic JM, Radmanovic SZ, Bjekic MD. The Belgrade childhood diabetes study: a multivariate analysis of risk determinants for diabetes. *Eur J Public Health*. 2005;15(2):117-22.
44. Wadsworth EJ, Shield JP, Hunt LP, Baum JD. A case-control study of environmental factors associated with diabetes in the under 5s. *Diabetic medicine : a journal of the British Diabetic Association*. 1997;14(5):390-6.
45. McKinney PA, Parslow R, Gurney K, Law G, Bodansky HJ, Williams DR. Antenatal risk factors for childhood diabetes mellitus; a case-control study of medical record data in Yorkshire, UK. *Diabetologia*. 1997;40(8):933-9.
46. Verge CF, Howard NJ, Irwig L, Simpson JM, Mackerras D, Silink M. Environmental factors in childhood IDDM. A population-based, case-control study. *Diabetes Care*. 1994;17(12):1381-9.
47. Soltesz G, Jeges S, Dahlquist G, Hungarian Childhood Diabetes Epidemiology Study Group. Non-genetic risk determinants for type 1 (insulin-dependent) diabetes mellitus in childhood. *Acta Paediatr*. 1994;83(7):730-5.
48. Patterson CC, Carson DJ, Hadden DR, Waugh NR, Cole SK. A case-control investigation of perinatal risk factors for childhood IDDM in Northern Ireland and Scotland. *Diabetes Care*. 1994;17(5):376-81.
49. Lawler-Heavner J, Cruickshanks KJ, Hay WW, Gay EC, Hamman RF. Birth size and risk of insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus (IDDM). *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 1994;24(3):153-9.
50. Virtanen SM, Räsänen L, Aro A, Lindström J, Sippola H, Lounamaa R, et al. Infant feeding in Finnish children >7 yr of age with newly diagnosed IDDM. *Diabetes Care*. 1991;14:415-7.
51. Blom L, Dahlquist G, Nystrom L, Sandstrom A, Wall S. The Swedish childhood diabetes study - social and perinatal determinants for diabetes in childhood. *Diabetologia*. 1989;32(1):7-13.
52. Castillo-Reinado K, Maier W, Holle R, Stahl-Pehe A, Baechele C, Kuss O, et al. Associations of area deprivation and urban/rural traits with the incidence of type 1 diabetes: analysis at the municipality level in North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany. *Diabetic medicine : a journal of the British Diabetic Association*. 2020;37(12):2089-97.
53. Lu CL, Shen HN, Chen HF, Li CY. Epidemiology of childhood Type 1 diabetes in Taiwan, 2003 to 2008. *Diabetic medicine : a journal of the British Diabetic Association*. 2014;31(6):666-73.
54. Ball SJ, Haynes A, Jacoby P, Pereira G, Miller LJ, Bower C, et al. Spatial and temporal variation in type 1 diabetes incidence in Western Australia from 1991 to 2010: increased risk at higher latitudes and over time. *Health Place*. 2014;28:194-204.
55. Puett RC, Lamichhane AP, M DN, Lawson AB, D AS, Liu L, et al. Neighborhood context and incidence of type 1 diabetes: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth study. *Health Place*. 2012;18(4):911-6.
56. Harron KL, McKinney PA, Feltbower RG, Bodansky HJ, Norman PD, Campbell FM, et al. Incidence rate trends in childhood type 1 diabetes in Yorkshire, UK 1978-2007: effects of deprivation and age at diagnosis in the South Asian and non-South Asian populations. *Diabetic medicine : a journal of the British Diabetic Association*. 2011;28(12):1508-13.
57. Robertson L, Harrild K. Maternal and neonatal risk factors for childhood type 1 diabetes: a matched case-control study. *BMC Public Health*. 2010;10(1):281.
58. Gopinath S, Örtqvist E, Norgren S, Green A, Sanjeevi CB. Variations in incidence of type 1 diabetes in different municipalities of stockholm. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2008;1150:200-7.
59. Cardwell CR, Carson DJ, Patterson CC. Higher incidence of childhood-onset type 1 diabetes mellitus in remote areas: a UK regional small-area analysis. *Diabetologia*. 2006;49(9):2074-7.

60. Lipton RB, Drum M, Li S, Choi H. Social environment and year of birth influence type 1 diabetes risk for African-American and Latino children. *Diabetes Care*. 1999;22(1):78-85.
61. Patterson CC, Waugh NR. Childhood diabetes and material deprivation. *BMJ*. 1991;303(6801):523.
62. Crow YJ, Alberti KG, Parkin JM. Insulin dependent diabetes in childhood and material deprivation in northern England, 1977-86. *BMJ*. 1991;303(6795):158-60.
63. Siemiatycki J, Colle E, Campbell S, Dewar R, Aubert D, Belmonte MM. Incidence of IDDM in Montreal by ethnic group and by social class and comparisons with ethnic groups living elsewhere. *Diabetes*. 1988;37(8):1096-102.
64. LaPorte RE, Orchard TJ, Kuller LH, Wagener DK, Drash AL, Schneider BB, et al. The Pittsburgh Insulin Dependent Diabetes Mellitus Registry: the relationship of insulin dependent diabetes mellitus incidence to social class. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1981;114(3):379-84.

**Table 1.** Literature review: Primary cohort studies of individual level socioeconomic status and incidence of type 1 diabetes\*

First author, year published (reference)	Period T1D diagnosed	No. w/T1D (age)†	Place	SES variables‡	Direction of association§	Results¶	Comments
Begum 2020 (32)	2002-2014	333 (<11 y)	South Australia	Parental employment status, public/private hospital (+ area-based)	+	Both parents employed vs none: uRR=1.3 (unclear statistical significance)	Only unadjusted associations shown
Bengtsson 2020 (21)	1980-2015	8335 (<35 y)	Denmark	Family poverty (5.5% of cohort), parental long-term unemployment (25% of cohort)	No clear association	RRs 0.94-1.05, not significant	SES part of “adversities” before age 18, as time-varying
Syrjälä 2019 (33)	1996-2018	188	Finland (Oulu and Tampere)	Maternal education	Non-linear	uRR for highest to lowest mat educ., 1.00, 0.63 (upper vocational), 0.55 (vocational)	Cohort with genetically susceptible children
Clausen 2016 (34)	1997-2012	1503	Denmark	Mat. and pat. educ. at child's birth (incl vocational/occupation)	Non-linear	Highest risk in mid of 3 categories for mat.educ (uRR=1.13, 95%CI 0.99-1.29), no assoc. with paternal education	Ordering of levels not obvious
Khashan 2015 (35)	1973-2009	13944	Sweden	Maternal education	Non-linear	Highest risk in mid cat vs low: uRR=1.1; high vs low: uRR=0.9 (both significant)	uRR calculated from Table 1
Bruno 2013 (22)	1984-2007	274	Italy (city of Turin)	Parental education, crowding	+ (non-linear)	Age 4-14y: high vs low par. educ.: RR=1.67 (mid vs low: uRR=0.99). Low vs. high h.hold crowding: RR= 0.83 (95%CI: 0.56-1.22) (educ. and crowding mutually adjusted)	Other ages studied but no significant parental educ. x age interaction
D'Angeli 2010 (36)	1992-2005	899 (<19 y)	US (Washington State)	Maternal education	+ (non-linear)	Mat. educ. high (>=13y) vs low (<12y): aRR= 1.9 (p<0.05). Mid (12y) vs low: aRR=1.8.	Assoc. adj. for maternal age and marital status. Mat educ. only for births after 1992
Ievins 2007 (37)	1963-1999	348	UK (Oxfordshire, West Berkshire)	Maternal social class	No clear association	High (I and II) vs. low (IV and V): uRR=1.2, not significant	20% missing data

u/aRR: Unadjusted (u) or adjusted (a) relative risk (or odds ratio, incidence rate ratio or hazard ratio) comparing higher versus lower socioeconomic status. H.hold: Household.

\* One register-based, large scale nested case-control study was considered of equal quality as cohort design (D'Angeli 2010). Bruno 2013 was the only publication where investigation of socioeconomic status (SES) as a risk factor for type 1 diabetes (T1D) was the main aim, while socioeconomic status was only a covariate in Syrjälä 2019, Khashan 2015, and Ievins 2007. The following had accounted for ethnicity by adjustment or restriction: Bengtsson 2020, D'Angeli 2020 and possibly Begum 2020.

† Age (years) at diagnosis of type 1 diabetes (T1D) less than 15 years unless otherwise specified. Cases with available data on socioeconomic status are reported.

‡ Socioeconomic (SES) variables. Parental educ (education) or occupation refers to highest level within the pair of maternal or paternal education, as opposed to separate data for mat. (maternal) or pat. (paternal) educ.

§ Comparing higher versus lower socioeconomic status (SES). +: increased socioeconomic status was associated with higher risk of type 1 diabetes. -: Increased socioeconomic status was associated with lower risk of type 1 diabetes. For socioeconomic status variables such as deprivation and unemployment mean low socioeconomic status. Socioeconomic status based on occupation typically used in the UK are often labelled with roman number I for high social class and III, IV or V refers to lower socioeconomic status.

|| The three levels of maternal and paternal education in Clausen 2016 were labelled "Elementary school/high school", "Short education/skilled worker", and "Medium/long education". It is not obvious whether skilled worker refers to education or actual occupation, and the ordering of these categories is not entirely obvious.

**Table 2. Characteristics of 13 primary case-control studies of socioeconomic status and T1D\***

First author, year published (reference)	Period T1D diagnosed	No. w/T1D (age)†	Place	SES variables‡	Direction of association§	Results	Comments
Liese 2012 (38)	2003-2006	507 (10-22y)	US (2 centres)	Parental educ. and income, area characteristics	+	Parental high vs low educ: uRR=2.1; high vs low income uRR=4.9	Response in eligible controls: ca 20%
Karavanaki 2008 (39)	1999-2000	107 (<16y)	Greece (Athens)	Mat. and pat. educ. and occup	-	Mat. university vs elem. uRR=0.1; Pat. univ vs elem uRR=0.51, n.s.) Occup socioeconomic status not consistent (n.s.)	Also reported socioeconomic status but not defined. Small study
Svensson 2005 (40)	1996-1999	490	Denmark	Maternal white collar worker or not	-	Mat. white collar worker (high socioeconomic status) vs not (low): aRR=0.82 (95%CI: 0.64-1.05)	Response: 81% in cases and ca 48% om controls
Sipetic 2004 (41)	1994-1997	105 (<16y)	Serbia (Belgrade)	Mat. and pat. educ. and occupation	+ (non-linear)	Mat. educ high vs. low: uRR=1.1 (n.s.) Pat. educ. high vs. low uRR=1.6 (sign.). Highest T1D risk in mid cat.	Controls hospitalised. Small study. Pat educ. sign. after adjustment in Sipetic 2005 (42)
Stene 2003 (23)	1997-2000	545	Norway	Mat. educ.	(-)	Mat.educ highest vs lowest: aRR=0.60 (CI: 0.32-1.10)	Response: cases 73%, controls 56%.
Wadsworth 1997 (43)	1992	218 (<5y)	UK and Ireland	Mat. and pat. soc. class	No clear assoc.	Mat. class high vs low: uRR=0.89 (n.s.); pat class: uRR=0.80 (n.s.)	Only <5-year-old children
McKinney 1997 (44)	1993-1994	196	UK (Yorkshire)	Mat. educ. and occup. soc. status	No clear assoc.	Mat educ vs none: high: RR=0.84, basic: RR=0.79 (n.s.). No assoc with mat occup	
Verge 1994 (45)	1990-1991	235	Australia (New South Wales)	Mat. educ.	-	Mat. educ high vs none: uRR ca 0.6, p(trend)=0.06	Response 92% in cases, 55% in controls
Soltész 1994 (46)	1990	130	Hungary	Mat. educ.	-	Mat educ university vs not: uOR=0.59 (p=0.07)	Friends as controls matched for socioeconomic status to some extent
Patterson 1994 (47)	1975-1988	529	N. Ireland and Scotland	Pat. occup. (soc. class)	Inconsistent	High pat. occup. soc. class->higher T1D in N. Ireland, but n.s. lower T1D in Scotland.	
Lawler-Heavner 1994 (48)	1978-1988	221	US (Colorado)	Mat. educ., fam. income	-	Mat >high school vs high school or less: uRR=0.63 (p=0.03). fam.income high vs low: uRR=0.49 (p[trend]<0.001)	Results seems inconsistent with overlapping data in Mayer 1988 (Table S10).



Virtanen 1991 (49)	1988-1989	103 (<7y)	Finland	Mat. educ.	–	>13 y of educ vs ≤13y: uRR=0.51, p=0.04	Response 95% in cases, 54% in controls. Small study.
Blom 1989 (50)	1985-1986	339	Sweden	Mat. and pat. educ. and occup.	–	Mat university vs elementary: uRR = 0.66 (p<0.05) (pat educ. similar but n.s.). Pat self- employed vs manual: uRR ca 0.7-0.8	Response 86% in cases, 67% in controls

u/aRR: Unadjusted (u) or adjusted (a) relative risk (or odds ratio, incidence rate ratio or hazard ratio) comparing higher versus lower socioeconomic status (SES). Often calculated from characteristics tables in publications. socioeconomic status: Socioeconomic status.

\* Case-control studies where controls (and typically also cases) were invited to participate for data collection via questionnaire (ten studies) or interview (two studies: McKinney 1997 and Liese 2012). Patterson 1994 used information from health records. All studies typically have less than complete participation, and lower participation among controls than among cases was quite common.

† Age (years) at diagnosis of type 1 diabetes (T1D) less than 15 years unless otherwise specified. Cases with available data on socioeconomic status are reported.

‡ Socioeconomic (SES) variables. Parental educ (education) or occupation refers to highest level within the pair of maternal or paternal education, as opposed to separate data for mat. (maternal) or pat. (paternal) educ.

§ +: increased socioeconomic status was associated with higher risk of type 1 diabetes. –: Increased socioeconomic status was associated with lower risk of type 1 diabetes. Lower level of deprivation and unemployment means higher socioeconomic status. Socioeconomic status based on occupation typically used in the UK are often labelled with roman number I for high social class and III, IV or V refers to lower socioeconomic status.

**Table 3. Characteristics of 14 primary ecological studies of socioeconomic status and T1D\***

First author, year published (reference)	Period T1D diagnosed	No. w/T1D (age)†	Place	SES variables (area level) *	Direction of association‡	Results
Castillo-Reinado 2020 (51)	2007-2014	6143 (<20 y)	Germany (North Rhine-Westphalia)	Municipality avg. employment, educ., income, composite index	+	Highest vs lowest 5th municipal prop. employed: uRR ca 1.1
Lu 2014 (52)	2003-2008	1306	Taiwan	Area composite index	No clear assoc.	No clear association
Ball 2014 (53)	1991-2010	1576	Western Australia	Area composite index	(+)	Highest vs lowest RR<1.1 (n.s).
Puett 2012 (54)	2002-2003	1502 (<19 y)	US (4 centres)	Neighbourhood avg. h.hold income, educ., poverty	+	Average household income high vs low: RR=1.3
Harron 2011 (55)	1990-2007	2662	UK (Yorkshire)	Small area composite index (Townsend)	Inconsistent	RR per score unit: 0.99 (0.98-1.01) in non-S. Asians, but IRR=1.22 (1.02-1.46) for S. Asians (p[interaction]=0.051)
Robertson 2010 (56)	1972-2005	361	Scotland (Aberdeen)	Small area composite index (Carstairs, for mother)	No association	aOR per unit score: 1.0, p=0.5
Holmqvist 2008 (57)	1977-2001	1871 (<16 y)	Sweden (5 South Eastern counties)	Small area avg. income, educ + composite index	+/non-linear	Highest avg. educ vs lowest 3rd: IRR=1.30; highest 3rd socioeconomic status index (low deprivation) vs lowest: IRR=1.23
Gopinath 2008 (57)	1990-2003	733 (<18 y)	Sweden (Stockholm County)	Municipality avg. income, proportion taxpayers	+/non-linear	Lowest avg income around 20 and three upper quartiles had T1D incidence around 25/100 000
Cardwell 2006 (58)	1989-2003	1433	Northern Ireland	Small area income deprivation index	+	Highest avg socioeconomic status vs lowest: RR=1.06 (trend significant)
Lipton 1999 (59)	1985-1990	400 (<17 y)	US (Chicago)	Neighbourhood composite index	Inconsistent	Neighbourhood avg. educ pos assoc with T1D overall and in Afr Am but not Latinos (higher avg. no. of rooms/person ->incr T1D overall and in African Americans but not in Latinos)
Patterson 1991 (60)	1977-1983	2135 (<19 y)	Scotland	Small area composite index (Carstairs)	+	Least deprived 6th vs most depr 6th: uRR=1.5
Crow 1991 (61)	1977-1986	919 (<16 y)	UK (Northern England)	Area Townsend composite deprivation score at diagnosis	-	Least deprived. 6th vs most deprived 6th: uRR ca 0.4
Siemiatycki 1988 (62)	1971-1985	919	Canada (Montreal)	Small residential area based (average fam inc.) at diagnosis	+	T1D incidence 11-12 per 100,000 pyr in income group 5 and 6, and approximately 9 per 100,000 pyr in 3 lowest quintiles

LaPorte 1981 (63)	1965-1976	939 (<20 y)	US (Allegheny County)	Area avg. fam. Income	No clear assoc.	No clear association
----------------------	-----------	-------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	----------------------


u/aRR: Unadjusted (u) or adjusted (a) relative risk (or odds ratio, incidence rate ratio or hazard ratio) comparing higher versus lower socioeconomic status.

\* Ecological design here refers to semi-ecological designs where type 1 diabetes (T1D) (and possibly covariates) are available at the individual level, but socio-economic status (SES) variables are only available as an average at the place of residence at the time of diagnosis of type 1 diabetes (T1D), not at the individual level. Many countries have their own composite indexes, such as Australia, whereas several related indexes such as Townsend and Carstairs deprivation scores are typically used in the UK. Avg: average. H.hold: household.

† Age (years) at diagnosis of type 1 diabetes (T1D) less than 15 years unless otherwise specified. (Some studies also included additional cases of T1D at older ages). Cases with available data on socioeconomic status are reported.

‡ ±: increased socioeconomic status (SES) was associated with higher risk of type 1 diabetes. -: Increased socioeconomic status was associated with lower risk of type 1 diabetes. Lower level of deprivation and unemployment means higher socioeconomic status.

**Figure 1. Illustration of the research question. Potential role of socioeconomic status as a risk factor of type 1 diabetes.**



**Figure 2. Flow chart of literature review**

