1. Title page

Title: Socially stratified DNA-methylation profiles are associated with disparities in child and adolescent mental health

Authors: Raffington[1,2], L., PhD, Tanksley[1,2], P., PhD, Vinnik[1], L., MSc, Sabhlok [1], A., MA, Patterson[3], M.W., PhD, Mallard, T.[1], PhD, Malanchini[4], M., PhD, Ayorech[5], Z., PhD, Tucker-Drob[1,2], E.M., PhD, & Harden[1,2], K.P., PhD

Affiliations:

[1]Department of Psychology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA.

[2]Population Research Center, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA

[3]Department of Psychiatry, University of Colorado, Denver – Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO, USA

[4]Department of Biological and Experimental Psychology, Queen Mary University of London, UK.

[5]PROMENTA Research Center, Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Norway

Corresponding Authors: Laurel Raffington, University of Texas at Austin, 108 E. Dean Keeton Stop A8000, Austin, Texas 78712-1043. E-mail: laurel.raffington@austin.utexas.edu

Kathryn P. Harden, University of Texas at Austin, 108 E. Dean Keeton Stop A8000, Austin, Texas 78712-1043. E-mail: harden@utexas.edu

These authors contributed equally: Elliot M. Tucker-Drob, Kathryn P. Harden

Manuscript word count (not including title, abstract, acknowledgment, references, tables, and figure legends, max 3000): 2995

Key Points

1. **Question**: We examined whether salivary DNA-methylation profiles are socially stratified and associated with child mental health.
2. **Findings**: In this preregistered, cross-sectional observational study of 1,183 children and adolescents, socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic disparities in mental health were associated with salivary DNA-methylation profiles of inflammation and the pace of biological aging.
3. **Meaning**: DNA-methylation biomarkers hold promise as tools to quantify the biological impact of socioeconomic inequality and being racially minoritized in a manner that is tied to social disparities in mental health.

2. Abstract

Importance: Economic and racial inequality is linked to disparities in children's mental health. Biomarkers that reflect these social disparities are lacking.

Objective: We examined the hypothesis that salivary DNA-methylation patterns of higher inflammation and faster pace of biological aging are economically, racially and ethnically stratified and are associated with child mental health.

Design: The Texas Twin Project is an on-going, observational, longitudinal study that began in May 2012. Analyses were preregistered on May 7, 2021, and completed on August 23, 2021.

Setting: The population-based study identified and recruited participants from public school rosters in the greater Austin area.

Participants: Participants in the analytic data set included all participants that agreed to contribute DNA samples and whose samples were assayed by January 2021.

Exposures: Family- and neighborhood-level socioeconomic inequality, racial and ethnic identities (White, Latinx, Black, Asian).

Main Measure(s): Environmental exposures were analyzed in relation to salivary DNA-methylation profiles of higher inflammation (DNAm-CRP) and faster pace of biological aging (DunedinPoAm). Child internalizing problems, attention problems, aggression, rule-breaking, ADHD, oppositional defiant disorder, and conduct disorder were measured using parent-reports and self-reports on abbreviated versions of the Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist and Conners 3. The hypotheses being tested were formulated after data collection of the present data freeze and were pre-registered prior to analyses being conducted.

Results: In a sample of *N*=1,183 8-to-19-year-olds (609 female, age M=13.38y), children's salivary DNA-methylation profiles and psychiatric symptoms differed by socioeconomic

conditions, race and ethnicity. Children with more parent-reported internalizing symptoms had higher DNAm-CRP (*r*=0.15, 95% CI=0.05 to 0.25, P=0.004) and DunedinPoAm (*r*=0.15, CI=0.05 to 0.25, P=0.002), and children with more parent-reported aggression problems had higher DNAm-CRP (*r*=0.17, CI=0.04 to 0.31, P=0.013). DNAm-CRP partially mediated advantage of higher family socioeconomic status (16% of total effect) and White racial identity (12% of total effect) on reduced internalizing symptoms. DunedinPoAm also partially mediated advantage of White racial identity on internalizing (19% of total effect).

Conclusions and Relevance: Socioeconomic and racial inequality are visible in children's epigenetic profiles of inflammation and the rate of biological aging in a manner that is tied to social disparities in mental health.

Keywords: DNA-methylation; epigenetics; mental health; children; socioeconomic status; racism

3. Text

Children who experience environmental adversities, including financial scarcity and the discrimination, prejudice, and oppression associated with racial and ethnic marginalization, are at increased risk of experiencing symptoms of psychiatric disorders. Their mental health burden includes both problems with internalizing such as anxiety and depression, as well as behaviors characteristic of externalizing disorders like aggression and hyperactivity[1–3]. In contrast, White racial identity may confer protective effects on children's mental health, as White children experience the generational legacy of state-sanctioned social power, resources, and favoritism lived by White people, *i.e.* White privilege[4,5]. We capitalize these terms to highlight that racial and ethnic identities are social constructions that are not based on "innate" biosocial boundaries, but may have biosocial effects through people's lived experiences[6] (**see Box 1**).

Biomarkers that reflect these social disparities are lacking in child populations. Here we test whether DNA-methylation alterations are sensitive to socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic disparities in mental health. Biomarkers developed and validated in adults that associate social disparities with children's mental health would be a novel tool to (1) improve forecasting of psychiatric illness from childhood to later life, (2) study the early-life social determinants of lifelong mental health, and (3) assess the efficacy of interventions and policies through a new surrogate outcome relevant for later life.

In the current study, we leverage results from *discovery* epigenome-wide studies of adults to create DNA-methylation composite scores that can be used for *prediction* of mental health outcomes and sensitivity to environmental inequality in our independent pediatric sample. Following a preregistered analysis plan (https://osf.io/t3vnp/), two salivary DNA-methylation composite scores and one genetic composite score were selected because their blood-derived

composites have been associated with psychiatric symptoms or they have been found to be sensitive to social inequality. First, we examined DNA-methylation profiles of a peripheral proxy for systemic low-grade inflammation (*i.e.*, C-reactive protein, CRP; DNAm-CRP[7]), which in blood samples have previously been found to be associated with internalizing and externalizing symptoms in children[8]. While inflammation is an essential component of immunosurveillance and host defense, a chronic low-grade inflammatory state is a pathological feature of a wide range of chronic health conditions that is also known to affect brain and psychological development[9,10]. Second, we examined genetic profiles of inflammation (*i.e.*, polygenic scores of CRP, PGS-CRP[11]), because there are genetic correlations of CRP with mood disorders in adults, such as PTSD[12] and depressive symptoms[13] that may include causal effects of CRP on depression[14,15]. Third, we previously reported that socioeconomic disadvantage and Latinx compared to White identity is associated with the pace of multi-system biological aging, as indicated by DunedinPoAm[16], in an earlier sub-sample of salivary DNA-methylation data from the Texas Twin Project (N=600)[17]. In the current analysis, we examine data from 1,183 children and adolescents from the Texas Twin Project aged 8-to-19-years.

Box 1. Racial and Ethnic Identity, Racism, and Genetic Ancestry.

Racial and ethnic identity, social and institutional racism, and genetic ancestry are not the same thing[18,19]. Racial and ethnic groups as they are defined in the U.S. were pseudoscientific inventions used as a political tool benefitting White people to justify the enslavement of Africans and genocide of indigenous Americans[4,5]. Social and institutional racism includes the generational legacy of state-sanctioned social power, resources, representation, and favoritism lived by White people, *i.e.* White privilege, which comes at the cost of marginalized racial and ethnic groups[4,5]. Racial and ethnic identity is context-specific both in terms of how people self-identify[20] and how they are categorized by others[21].

Racial and ethnic disparities in child mental health arise through various factors tied to classism and racism, including inequitable access to high-quality childcare, educational resources, healthcare, nutrition, and differences in exposure to toxicants, family stress, and neighborhood threat, among other factors[22,23]. Importantly, racial and ethnic identity itself is not a form of adversity or risk factor for mental health, whereas the institutional racial discrimination and chronic nature of interpersonal discrimination associated with racial and ethnic marginalization is[24,25].

In contrast, genetic ancestry describes patterns of gene frequencies that people have inherited from their genetic ancestors, and people's genetic ancestry does not change across social contexts[18,26]. The lack of biological "reality" underlying race does not mean that race is unimportant: Racial and ethnic identity remains relevant as it pertains to people's lived experiences, culture, community, social challenges, and opportunity. Thus, these social constructs are not based on "innate" biosocial boundaries, but may have biosocial effects through people's lived experiences[6].

Because we are integrating genetic, epigenetic, and social levels of analysis, we employ both labels based on biogeographical ancestry (like "predominantly recent European ancestries") as relevant to our genomic measure and socially based labels (like "White") that are more appropriate for population health disparities research[27].

Method

Sample

The Texas Twin Project is an ongoing longitudinal study[28]. Participants in the current study were 1213 children and adolescents that had at least one DNA-methylation sample. 195 participants contributed two DNA-methylation samples (time between repeated samples: *M*=22 months, *SD*=6.5, range 3 to 38 months) and 16 samples were assayed in duplicate for reliability analyses (total methylation sample *n*=1424). After exclusions based on DNA-methylation quality control criteria, data from 1,183 (609 female) children, including 426 monozygotic and 757 dizygotic twins from 611 unique families, aged 8 to 19 years (age M=13.38y, *SD*=2.99y) was analyzed. Participants self-identified as White only (*n*=752), Latinx only (*n*=147), Latinx and White (*n*=97), Black and potentially another race/ethnicity (Black+, *n*=120), Asian and potentially another race/ethnicity (but not Latinx or Black; Asian+, *n*=90), and Indigenous American, Pacific Islander or other (but not Latinx, Black, or Asian; *n*=7). The University of Texas Institutional Review board granted ethical approval.

Measures

DNA-methylation

Saliva samples were collected during a laboratory visit using Oragene kits (DNA Genotek, Canada). The Infinium MethylationEPIC BeadChip kit (Illumina, Inc., USA) was used to assess methylation levels at 850,000 methylation sites. **Supplemental Methods** contain information on preprocessing, **Table 1** a description of DNA-methylation profiles calculation, and **Table 2** descriptive statistics.

Genetics

Genetic data was used to calculate a polygenic score for CRP (PGS-CRP; description in **Table 1**). The PGS-CRP is an approximate indicator of an individual's genetic liability for developing high levels of CRP[26]. All PGS-CRP analyses were restricted to individuals solely of European ancestries in order to reduce the risk of spurious findings due to population stratification[26]. **Supplemental Methods** contain information on genotyping.

Mental health

Multiple dimensions of child and adolescent mental health were measured using self-reports and parent-reports on abbreviated versions of the Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist[29,30], and the *DSM-IV* symptom count scales of the Conners 3[31]. **Table 1** contains a description of mental health composite measure calculation and **Table S1** a full list of items included in each measure.

Socioeconomic context

We measured children's socioeconomic disadvantage at the family and neighborhood levels of analysis (**Table 1**).

Developmental covariates and tobacco exposure

Body mass index[32] (BMI), pubertal status[33,34], and tobacco exposure[35] have been associated with early life disadvantage as well as differential DNA-methylation patterns[36–38]. We therefore consider these factors in our analysis as covariates (**Table 1**).

Statistical analyses

Fourteen mental health outcomes were examined in each model, including 7 self-reported and 7 parent-reported aggregate measures of (1) internalizing, (2) attention problems, (3) aggression, (4) rule-breaking, (5) ADHD, (6) oppositional defiant disorder (ODD), and (7) conduct disorder (CD).

We performed multilevel, multivariate regression models fit with FIML in *Mplus* 8.2 software[39]. All models included a random intercept, representing the family-level intercept of the dependent variable, to correct for non-independence of twins. To account for nesting of repeated measures within individuals, a sandwich correction was applied to the standard errors in all analyses. All models included age, gender, and an age by gender interaction as covariates.
We used the Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate method (FDR)[40] to account for multiple testing. We report standardized effect size estimates and nominal *P*-values as significant, when the FDR-corrected *P*-values were below alpha<0.05.

Results

Mental health is socially stratified in children

We observed socioeconomic disparities in parent- and child-reported psychiatric burden. After correcting for seven comparisons, family-level disadvantage was associated with more

parent-reported internalizing, attention problems, aggression, rule-breaking, ADHD, and ODD symptoms, but not CD symptoms (effect sizes *r*=0.11 to 0.26; **Figure 1** and **Supplemental Table S2)**. Family-level disadvantage was also associated with higher children's self-reported attention problems, aggression, and rule-breaking (effect sizes *r*=0.16 to 0.24; **Figure 1** and **Supplemental Table S3)**.

Neighbourhood-level disadvantage was associated with higher parent-reported internalizing (*r*=0.13, CI=0.04 to 0.22, *P*=0.003) and attention problems (*r*=0.12, CI=0.03 to 0.20, *P*=0.008). Neighborhood opportunity was associated with lower parent-reported internalizing, attention problems, aggression, and ODD (effect sizes *r*=-0.12 to -0.19; **Figure 1** and **Table S2)**. Neighbourhood-level disadvantage and less neighbourhood opportunity were both also associated with higher child-reported aggression, rule-breaking, and ODD (effect sizes *r*=0.13 to 0.16 and *r*=-0.13 to -0.16, respectively; **Figure 1** and **Table S3)**.

We also observed racial/ethnic disparities in parent- and child-reported mental health. Children identifying as Latinx-only or Black+ had higher parent-reported internalizing and attention problems than White-only identifying children (effect sizes *b*=0.09 to 0.23; **Figure 1** and **Table S2)**. Black+ identifying children also showed more parent-reported symptoms of ADHD. Asian+ identifying children had lower parent-reported ADHD, ODD, and CD than White-only children (effect sizes *b*=-0.06 to -0.11). Child-reported mental health was largely unrelated to their race/ethnicity except that Black+ identifying children self-reported higher rates of aggression than White-only children (*b*=0.15, CI=0.06 to 0.23, *P*=0.001).

We then examined the degree to which socioeconomic inequality statistically accounted for racial/ethnic disparities in mental health. Children reporting Black+ and Latinx-only identities lived in substantially more socioeconomically disadvantaged families and

neighborhoods compared to children reporting White-only identity (effect sizes *b*=0.25 to 0.43; **Table S4**). Family-level disadvantage accounted for differences between Latinx-only and White-only children's parent-reported internalizing, but not attention problems (**Table S2)**. Family-level disadvantage accounted for differences between Black+ and White-only children's parent-reported ADHD and child-reported aggression, but not differences in parent-reported internalizing or attention problems (**Table S2 and S3)**. After accounting for family-level disadvantage, Latinx-only children self-reported lower rates of CD than White-only children.

Linear regression analysis (not preregistered) indicated that White identity compared to racial/ethnic categories associated with marginalization was associated with less parent-reported internalizing (*r*=-0.16, 95% CI=-0.23 to -0.08, *P*<0.001) and fewer attention problems (*r*=-0.19, CI=-0.27 to -0.11, P<0.001), but not less aggression (*r*=-0.09, CI=-0.19 to 0.01, *P*=0.079), rule-breaking (*r*=-0.05, CI=-0.13 to 0.02, *P*=0.139), ADHD (*r*=-0.01, CI=-0.09 to 0.07, *P*=0.796), ODD (*r*=0.03, CI=-0.05 to 0.11, *P*=0.471), or CD (*r*=0.00, CI=-0.13 to 0.13, *P*=0.990). Though attenuated, White identity remained a statistically significant predictor of parent-reported internalizing (*r*=-0.09, CI=-0.16 to -0.02, *P*=0.012) and attention problems (*r*=-0.15, CI=-0.38 to -0.19, *P*<0.001) after accounting for family-level disadvantage (racial/ethnic identity and family-level disadvantage: *r*=-0.29, CI=-0.38 to -0.19, *P*<0.001). White identity also remained a significant predictor of parent-reported internalizing (*r*=-0.09, CI=-0.16 to -0.01, *P*=0.020) and attention problems (*r*=-0.15, CI=-0.23 to -0.06, *P*=0.001), after accounting for both family- and neighborhood-level socioeconomic disadvantage together (*r*=-0.34, CI=-0.42 to -0.26, *P*<0.001).



Figure 1. **Associations between measures of socioeconomic inequality, racial and ethnic identity with parent- and self-reported mental health in children and adolescents.** Depicted are standardized effect size estimates and 95% confidence intervals. See Supplemental Table S2 and S3 for coefficients.

Salivary DNA-methylation profiles are socially stratified in children

Analyses of 15 technical replicates (one sample did not pass quality control) suggested moderate-to-good reliability of DNA-methylation profiles residualized for technical artifacts and cell composition (ICC for DNAm-CRP=0.73, DunedinPoAm=0.84; see **Table 1** for descriptive

statistics). Biometric models using the twin family structure, where the sum of additive genetic factors (*A*) and environmental factors shared by twins living in the same home (*C*) represents a lower bound estimate of reliability (because it does not include measurement error), also suggested good reliability of DNA-methylation profiles (*A*+*C* variation for DNAm-CRP= 60.7%, DunedinPoAm= 54.2%, accounting for age and gender).

Higher DNAm-CRP was correlated with higher DunedinPoAm (r =0.89, CI=0.81 to 0.96, P<0.001, accounting for age and gender). This is not surprising, as CRP levels were one of the 18 biomarkers that the pace of aging algorithm was trained on, and 7 CpG sites overlapped across measures[16].

Older children had higher DNAm-CRP (r =0.35, CI=0.26 to 0.44, P<0.001) and DunedinPoAm profiles (r =0.13, CI=0.02 to 0.23, P=0.018). Boys had lower DNAm-CRP (b=-0.26, CI=-0.34 to -0.18, P<0.001) and DunedinPoAm (b=-0.18, CI=-0.27 to -0.10, P<0.001) profiles (b=0.06, CI= -0.02 to 0.14, P=0.143) as compared to girls. All models included age, gender, and an age by gender interaction as covariates.

We observed salivary DNA-methylation profiles that differed by socioeconomic and racial/ethnic inequality. As reported in Raffington et al.[41], children from socioeconomically disadvantaged families, socioeconomically disadvantaged neighborhoods, neighborhoods with less neighborhood opportunity, and Latinx-only or Black+ identity relative to White-only identity exhibited DNA-methylation profiles associated with higher chronic inflammation and a faster pace of biological aging (effect sizes r=0.08 to 0.28; **Table S5**). The analyses of Raffington et al.[41] were preregistered at the same time as the preregistration of the present study. See **Table S6** for effect size estimates between socioeconomic inequality and DNA-methylation profiles reported separately for each racial/ethnic group (not preregistered).

Salivary DNA-methylation profiles are associated with child and adolescent mental health

We assessed whether salivary DNA-methylation profiles were associated with child mental health. Higher DNAm-CRP was associated with higher parent-reported internalizing (r=0.15, CI=0.05 to 0.25, P=0.004) and aggression (r=0.17, CI=0.04 to 0.31, P=0.013; **Figure 2** and **Table S7**). Faster DunedinPoAm was also associated with higher parent-reported internalizing (r=0.15, CI=0.05 to 0.25, P=0.002).

Since both profiles were associated with parent-reported internalizing, we performed commonality analyses to examine the proportion of overlapping and unique variation explained. DNAm-CRP and DunedinPoAm explained largely unique variation in parent-reported internalizing (DNAm-CRP alone: 2.5%, DunedinPoAm alone: 2.2%, combined: 4.5%).

DNA-methylation profiles were not associated with children's self-reported mental health (**Table S8**). See **Table S9 and S10** for effect size estimates between DNA-methylation profiles and mental health reported separately for each racial/ethnic group (not preregistered).



Figure 2. Associations between A) DNAm-CRP, B) PGS-CRP, and C) DunedinPoAm with parent-reported mental health in children and adolescents. DNA-methylation profiles and mental health values are in standard deviation units. Higher DNAm-CRP values indicate a methylation profile associated with higher chronic inflammation. Higher PGS-CRP values indicate a genetic profile associated with higher chronic inflammation. Higher DunedinPoAm values indicate a methylation profile associated with faster biological aging. See **Supplemental Table S7** for standardized regression coefficients.

DNA-methylation partially accounts for associations of family-level disadvantage and racial and ethnic marginalization with mental health

We observed that DNAm-CRP and DunedinPoAm partially accounted for associations of family-level disadvantage and racial/ethnic disparities in mental health. DNAm-CRP, but not DunedinPoAm, partially mediated family-level disadvantage on internalizing (indirect effect 16% of total effect), but not on aggression. Both DNAm-CRP and DunedinPoAm partially mediated the impact of being racially minoritized compared to not on internalizing (indirect DNAm-CRP effect 12% of total effect; indirect DunedinPoAm effect 19% of total effect).

BMI statistically accounts for associations of DNA-methylation with mental health

We next examined the role of BMI, pubertal status, and DNAm-smoke in associations of DNA-methylation with mental health (see **Table S7**). Associations of DNAm-CRP and DunedinPoAm with mental health were largely accounted for by controlling for BMI, but not by controlling for pubertal status. Associations of DNAm-CRP with aggression were largely accounted for by controlling for DNAm-smoke.

Within-family analyses indicate family-level stratification of DNA-methylation

We further assessed the extent to which DNA-methylation associations with mental health are robust to complete genetic and family-level environmental control in a bivariate ACE model that used the twin family structure. We found no evidence to suggest that monozygotic twins who differ from their co-twins in DNA-methylation show corresponding differences in their mental health (see **Table S11**). This is consistent with the hypothesis that DNA-methylation

associations with mental health represents (potentially partially unmeasured) effects of family-level stratification.

Polygenic scores of CRP are associated with mental health

In an analysis restricted to participants solely of European genetic ancestry, PGS-CRP was not correlated with DNAm-CRP (r=0.04, CI=-0.08 to 0.17, P=0.476) or DunedinPoAm (r=-0.04, CI=-0.18 to 0.10, P=0.563).

Higher PGS-CRP was associated with higher parent-reported internalizing (r=0.14, CI 0.04 to 0.23, P=0.004) and attention problems (r=0.16, CI=0.05 to 0.28, P=0.004; **Figure 1** and **Table S7**) and these associations were unaffected by controlling for BMI, pubertal status, DNAm-smoke, and family-level disadvantage. PGS-CRP was not associated with children's self-reported mental health (**Table S8**).

Commonality analyses showed that PGS-CRP explained largely unique variation in parent-reported internalizing (PGS-CRP alone: 2%) relative to both DNAm-CRP (combined: 4.5%) and DunedinPoAm (combined: 4.2%).

In exploratory preregistered analyses of 364 dizygotic twin pairs, PGS-CRP did not account for differences in internalizing (r=0.07, 95% CI=-0.06 to 0.20, P=0.316) or attention problems (r=0.13, 95% CI=-0.02 to 0.27, P=0.094), although we caution that effect size estimates warrant a repeated examination of this question in a larger sample.

Discussion

We analyzed epigenetic data from 1183 children and adolescents participating in the Texas Twin Project to examine whether salivary DNA-methylation patterns are socially stratified

and are associated with mental health. We find that salivary DNA-methylation profiles of inflammation (DNAm-CRP), faster pace of biological aging (DunedinPoAm) and parent-reported child and adolescent mental health, consistently differed by socioeconomic inequality and self-reported racial/ethnic identity. Additionally, these salivary DNA-methylation profiles and genetic profiles of inflammation (PGS-CRP) were associated with children's internalizing, aggression, and attention problems. Moreover, salivary DNA-methylation profiles partially accounted for child mental health disparities related to family-level disadvantage, racial, and ethnic identities.

Our findings linking environmental inequality to epigenetic profiles and mental health were most consistent for internalizing symptoms, which is in line with previous research on peripheral inflammation[42] and a blood-based study on DNA-methylation of inflammation in children[8]. These results add to a growing body of research in animals and humans that links exposure to social adversity, DNA-methylation changes, and gene expression markers associated with inflammation[10,43,44]. Animal research suggests that inflammation affects synaptogenesis, synaptic survival, and myelination, for instance in neural circuitries subserving executive control, and threat and reward processing that are pertinent to emotional and behavioral regulation[45]. Further, inflammation and DNA-methylation alterations are environmentally-sensitive hallmarks of biological aging[46–48]. We found that body mass index largely accounted for associations of DNAm-CRP and DunedinPoAm with mental health, which corresponds to new insights casting obesity as an inflammatory disease of accelerated biological aging[49].

Highlighting the distinctly harmful role of social and institutional racism, we found that even after accounting for the lower rates of socioeconomic disadvantage experienced by White children, White identifying children sustained a lower burden of mental health symptoms. Thus,

socioeconomic inequality captures some but not all of the pathways through which social and institutional racism impacts children's mental health[24]. Moreover, our categorization of children's complex racial and ethnic identities that for instance grouped Black and Black-White identifying children together is likely to dilute and underestimate the bio-psychological effects of racial marginalization as the proximity to White privilege and experiences of marginalization are not the same between these identities.

Further research is needed to contextualize the biological and mental health effects of race-based discrimination, prejudice, and oppression experienced by marginalized youth compared to the favoritism and privilege experienced by Whites[3,6,50]. While our findings are in line with the hypothesis that DNA-methylation alterations are one mechanism for how psychosocial stress is biologically embedded to injure children's psychiatric health, our observational design is, of course, not well-suited to evaluate mechanistic hypotheses. Randomized controlled trials and natural experiments that involve exogenous changes to various aspects of social inequality (*e.g.*, eliminating redlining, child tax credits) are necessary to establish whether children's salivary DNA-methylation profiles change in response to intervention in a way that is tied to mental health.

In contrast to results seen for parent-reported psychiatric symptoms, child-reported mental health was generally not associated with DNA-methylation or PGS-CRP profiles. Previous research in this sample has found that children and parents agree minimally on specific symptoms scales[51]. In addition, both children and parent self-reports can be influenced by their level of insight of their specific psychopathological burden, and the degree to which they have internalised narratives associated with being racially minoritized, *i.e*, internalised racism[52]. We further acknowledge that restricting PGS-CRP analyses to participants solely of European

genetic ancestry is a major study limitation. Future research should explore whether recent approaches to compute ancestry deconvoluted polygenic scores[53] can be applied to PGS-CRP and validated with serum CRP in ancestrally diverse samples.

In conclusion, our findings suggest that salivary DNA-methylation patterns of higher inflammation and faster pace of biological aging are economically and racially stratified and are associated with child mental health. Because saliva can easily be collected in large-scale pediatric epidemiological studies and may indicate emerging health conditions, these DNA-methylation profiles can be employed in research seeking to understand and prevent economic and racial disparities in childhood mental health.

Table 1. Description of study measures.

DNAm-CRP	DNAm-CRP was computed on the basis of an epigenome-wide association study of CRP [7]. Using the summary statistics of the associations between CpG sites and adult CRP, we created one methylation score per person by summing the product of the weight and the individual beta estimate for each individual at each of the 218 CpG sites significantly associated ($P < 1.15 \times 10^{-7}$) with CRP.
DunedinPoAm	DunedinPoAm was developed from DNA-methylation analysis of Pace of Aging in the Dunedin Study birth cohort. Pace of Aging is a composite phenotype derived from analysis of longitudinal change in 18 biomarkers of organ-system integrity measured when Dunedin Study members were all 26, 32, and 38 years of age 17. Elastic-net regression machine learning analysis was used to fit Pace of Aging to Illumina 450k DNA-methylation data generated from blood samples collected when participants were aged 38 years. The elastic net regression produced a 46-CpG algorithm. Increments of DunedinPoAm correspond to "years" of physiological change occurring per 12-months of chronological time. The Dunedin Study mean was 1, *i.e.* the typical pace of aging among 38-year-olds in that birth cohort. Thus, 0.01 increment of DunedinPoAm corresponds to a percentage point increase or decrease in an individual's pace of aging relative to the Dunedin birth cohort at midlife. DunedinPoAm was calculated based on the published algorithm 10 using code available at https://github.com/danbelsky/DunedinPoAm38.
PGS-CRP	PGS-CRP was computed in two steps. First, GWAS summary statistics were adjusted for linkage disequilibrium, or LD (i.e., correlation structures in the genome that capture population stratification). The preregistered analysis plan proposed using SBayesR [54] for LD-adjustment. However, as the GWAS summary statistics used to compute PGS-CRP did not meet the data requirements of SBayesR (e.g., effect allele frequency, per SNP sample size), we elected to use PRScs for LD-adjustment instead. PRScs is a program that uses Bayesian regression to infer posterior SNP effects using continuous shrinkage priors. PRScs has been shown to improve prediction accuracy of PGSs over other widely used PGS approaches [55]. PRScs requires GWAS summary statistics and an external reference panel of the same ancestry as the GWAS. For the summary statistics, we used publicly available data from a GWAS of CRP in 148,164 individuals solely of European ancestry [11]. For the reference panel, we used the 1000 Genomes Project [56] European reference panel (phase 3 v5; provided with the software) that was restricted to HapMap3 SNPs [57]. Second, we used PLINK v2 [58] to apply the LD-adjusted SNP effects from PRScs in the Texas Twins Project sample. The resulting PGS-CRP is described by the following equation: $$PGS = \sum_{i}^{m} x_i \hat{\beta}_i$$ where m is the number of SNPs, $\hat{\beta}$ is the estimated effect of the ith SNP and x, coded as 0, 1 or 2, is the number of effect alleles of the ith SNP. All PGS analyses were restricted to individuals solely of European ancestries in order to reduce the risk of spurious findings due to population stratification. PGS-CRP was residualized for the top five genetic principal components and genotyping batch and then standardized using Z-scores (M=1; SD=0).
Mental Health	Self and parent-reported scales of CBCL and Conners were analyzed separately. Based on prior published work in this sample[51,59,60], CBCL items were averaged into means scores of internalizing (5 self-reported anxiety items, 6 depression items; 9 parent-reported anxiety items, 6 depression items, 4 somatic complaint items), aggression (13 self-reported items; 11 parent-reported items), rule-breaking (12 self-reported items; 5 parent-reported items), and attention problems (7 self-reported items; 6 parent-reported items). All items were rated on a 3-point scale ranging from 0 – *Not true* to 2 – *Very true or often true*." Conners items were coded as summed symptom counts of ADHD (self-reported 10 inattentive items and 11 hyperactive/impulsive items; parent-reported 9 inattentive items and 10 hyperactive/impulsive items; items correspond to 9 symptoms for inattention and 9 symptoms for hyperactivity-impulsivity), oppositional defiant disorder (8 self-reported items; 8 parent-reported; each item corresponds to one symptom), and conduct disorder (9 self-reported items; 12 parent-reported items; each item corresponds to one symptom). All items were rated on a 4-point scale, ranging from 0 – *Not at all* to 3 – *Very often*. Responses of 2 ("often") or 3 ("very often") on each item were classified as a symptom count. See **Table S1** for a full list of items included in each measure.

Family-level socioeconomic disadvantage	The family-level measure was computed from parent reports of household income, parental education, occupation, history of financial problems, food insecurity (based on the US Household Food Security Survey Module [61], father absence, residential instability (changes in home address), and family receipt of public assistance. These were aggregated to form a composite measure of household-level cumulative socioeconomic disadvantage described in [62], and coded such that higher scores reflect greater disadvantage.
Neighborhood-level socioeconomic disadvantage	The neighbourhood-level measure was composed from tract-level US Census data according to the method described in [62]. Briefly, participant addresses were linked to tract-level data from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey averaged over five years (https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs). A composite score of neighbourhood-level socioeconomic disadvantage was computed from tract-level proportions of residents reported as unemployed, living below the federal poverty threshold, having less than 12 years of education, not being employed in a management position, and single mothers. These were aggregated to form a neighbourhood-level socioeconomic disadvantage composite measure described in [62], and coded such that higher scores reflect greater disadvantage.
Neighborhood opportunity	The neighborhood opportunity measure indexed the intergenerational economic mobility of children of low-income parents. It examines average annual household income in 2014-15 of offspring (born between 1978-1983, who are now in their mid-thirties) of low-income parents (defined as mean pre-tax income at the household level across five years (1994, 1995, 1998-2000) at the 25th percentile of the national income distribution, or $27000/year) within each census tract. Household income was obtained from federal tax return records between 1989-2015, the 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census (US Census Bureau, 2000, 2010; https://data2.nhgis.org/main), and 2005-2015 American Community Surveys (https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs). Census tracts reflect where the child resided through the age of 23. This data was compiled by and obtained from the Opportunity Atlas (https://opportunityatlas.org; 53) .
Body mass index (BMI)	We measured BMI from in-laboratory measurements of height and weight transformed to gender- and age-normed z-scores according to the method published by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (https://www.cdc.gov/growthcharts/percentile_data_files.htm).
Pubertal status	Pubertal development was measured using children's self-reports on the Pubertal Development Scale [64]. The scale assesses the extent of development across five sex-specific domains (for both: height, body hair growth, skin changes; for girls: onset of menses, breast development; for boys: growth in body hair, deepening of voice). A total pubertal status score was computed as the average response (1 = "Not yet begun" to 4 = "Has finished changing") across all items. Pubertal development was residualized for age, gender, and an age by gender interaction.
Tobacco exposure	We indexed tobacco exposure using a DNA-methylation smoking (DNAm-smoke) score created by summing the product of the weight and the individual beta estimate for each individual at each CpG site significantly associated with smoking in the discovery EWAS [38]. Excluding self-reported tobacco users (n=53) did not significantly alter results.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics.

Sample	*n*	*M*	*SD*
DNAm-CRP [a]	1365	0.03	0.02
DunedinPoAm [a]	1365	1.02	0.06
PGS-CRP [b]	654	0	1
Parent-reported internalizing	1311	3.05	0.39
Parent-reported attention problems	1311	3.27	0.50
Parent-reported aggression	805	3.02	0.46
Parent-reported rule-breaking	1311	3.14	0.70
Parent-reported ADHD	1266	2.39	3.87
Parent-reported oppositional defiant disorder	1266	0.63	1.39
Parent-reported conduct disorder	1266	0.06	0.32
Child-reported internalizing	1255	0.55	0.40
Child -reported attention problems	1255	0.72	0.43
Child -reported aggression	1255	0.39	0.27
Child -reported rule-breaking	1255	0.25	0.24
Child -reported ADHD	1104	4.45	3.99
Child -reported oppositional defiant disorder	1104	1.06	1.27
Child -reported conduct disorder	1104	0.11	0.46
Family-level socioeconomic disadvantage	993	-0.02	0.96
Neighborhood-level socioeconomic disadvantage	1218	-0.02	1
Neighborhood opportunity	950	0.31	0.62
Body mass index	1364	0.4	1.34
Pubertal development	1325	2.61	0.92
Tobacco use (yes/no)	58/631	–	–
DNAm-smoke	1365	-13.62	1.84

[a] After exclusion of participants based on DNA-methylation preprocessing (n=44), excluding technical replicates (n=15), and including repeated samples (n= 182). Means of raw scores before residualizing for cell composition, array, slide, and batch. Scores were standardized (mean = 0, SD = 1) for analyses.

[b] PGS-CRP only computed for individuals solely of recent European ancestries.

4. References

1. Kinge JM, Øverland S, Flatø M, et al. Parental income and mental disorders in children and adolescents: prospective register-based study. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. Published online May 11, 2021:dyab066. doi:10.1093/ije/dyab066

2. Peverill M, Dirks MA, Narvaja T, Herts KL, Comer JS, McLaughlin KA. Socioeconomic status and child psychopathology in the United States: A meta-analysis of population-based studies. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2021;83:101933. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2020.101933

3. Vaid E, Lansing AH. Discrimination, Prejudice, and Oppression and the Development of Psychopathology. In: Benuto LT, Duckworth MP, Masuda A, O'Donohue W, eds. *Prejudice, Stigma, Privilege, and Oppression: A Behavioral Health Handbook*. Springer International Publishing; 2020:235-248. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-35517-3_14

4. Davis FJ. *Who Is Black? One Nation's Definition*. Pennsylvania State University Press; 2001. doi:10.2307/4612582

5. Kendi IX. *Stamped from the Beginning: The Definitive History of Racist Ideas in America*. Random House; 2017.

6. Goosby BJ, Cheadle JE, Mitchell C. Stress-related biosocial mechanisms of discrimination and African American health inequities. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2018;44(1):319-340. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053403

7. Ligthart S, Marzi C, Aslibekyan S, et al. DNA methylation signatures of chronic low-grade inflammation are associated with complex diseases. *Genome Biology*. 2016;17(1):255. doi:10.1186/s13059-016-1119-5

8. Barker ED, Cecil CAM, Walton E, et al. Inflammation-related epigenetic risk and child and adolescent mental health: A prospective study from pregnancy to middle adolescence. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2018;30(3):1145-1156. doi:10.1017/S0954579418000330

9. Danese A, J Lewis S. Psychoneuroimmunology of Early-Life Stress: The Hidden Wounds of Childhood Trauma? *Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2017;42(1):99-114. doi:10.1038/npp.2016.198

10. Snyder-Mackler N, Burger JR, Gaydosh L, et al. Social determinants of health and survival in humans and other animals. *Science*. 2020;368(6493):eaax9553. doi:10.1126/science.aax9553

11. Ligthart S, Vaez A, Võsa U, et al. Genome Analyses of >200,000 Individuals Identify 58 Loci for Chronic Inflammation and Highlight Pathways that Link Inflammation and Complex Disorders. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*. 2018;103(5):691-706. doi:10.1016/j.ajhg.2018.09.009

12. Muniz Carvalho C, Wendt FR, Maihofer AX, et al. Dissecting the genetic association of C-reactive protein with PTSD, traumatic events, and social support. *Neuropsychopharmacol*. Published online March 16, 2020. doi:10.1038/s41386-020-0655-6

13. Kappelmann N, Arloth J, Georgakis MK, et al. Dissecting the Association Between Inflammation, Metabolic Dysregulation, and Specific Depressive Symptoms: A Genetic Correlation and 2-Sample Mendelian Randomization Study. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2021;78(2):161-170. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.3436

14. Dardani C, Yarmolinsky J, Robinson J, et al. Disentangling causal relationships between inflammatory markers and depression: a bidirectional Mendelian randomization analysis. *bioRxiv*. Published online November 25, 2019:712133. doi:10.1101/712133

15. Milton DC, Ward J, Ward E, et al. The association between C-reactive protein, mood disorder, and cognitive function in UK Biobank. *European Psychiatry*. 2021;64(1). doi:10.1192/j.eurpsy.2021.6

16. Belsky D, Caspi A, Arseneault L, et al. Quantification of the pace of biological aging in humans through a blood test: The DunedinPoAm DNA methylation algorithm. *eLife*. 2020;9. doi:10.1101/2020.02.05.927434

17. Raffington L, Belsky DW, Kothari M, Malanchini M, Tucker-Drob EM, Harden KP. Socioeconomic Disadvantage and the Pace of Biological Aging in Children. *Pediatrics*. Published online May 17, 2021:e2020024406. doi:10.1542/peds.2020-024406

18. Rutherford A. *How to Argue with a Racist: History, Science, Race, and Reality*. Hachette UK; 2020.

19. Yudell M, Roberts D, DeSalle R, Tishkoff S. Taking race out of human genetics. *Science*. 2016;351(6273):564-565. doi:10.1126/science.aac4951

20. Pauker K, Meyers C, Sanchez DT, Gaither SE, Young DM. A review of multiracial malleability: Identity, categorization, and shifting racial attitudes. *Soc Personal Psychol Compass*. 2018;12(6):e12392. doi:10.1111/spc3.12392

21. Abascal M. Contraction as a Response to Group Threat: Demographic Decline and Whites' Classification of People Who Are Ambiguously White. *American Sociological Review*. Published online March 3, 2020:000312242090512. doi:10.1177/0003122420905127

22. Anglin DM, Ereshefsky S, Klaunig MJ, et al. From Womb to Neighborhood: A Racial Analysis of Social Determinants of Psychosis in the United States. *AJP*. Published online May 3, 2021:appi.ajp.2020.2. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20071091

23. Krieger N. Measures of Racism, Sexism, Heterosexism, and Gender Binarism for Health Equity Research: From Structural Injustice to Embodied Harm—An Ecosocial Analysis. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2020;41(1):37-62. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040119-094017

24. Williams DR, Priest N, Anderson NB. Understanding associations among race, socioeconomic status, and health: Patterns and prospects. *Health Psychology*. 2016;35(4):407-411. doi:10.1037/hea0000242

25. Adam EK, Hittner EF, Thomas SE, Villaume SC, Nwafor EE. Racial discrimination and ethnic racial identity in adolescence as modulators of HPA axis activity. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2020;32(5):1669-1684. doi:10.1017/S095457942000111X

26. Raffington L, Mallard T, Harden KP. Polygenic Scores in Developmental Psychology: Invite Genetics In, Leave Biodeterminism Behind. *Annu Rev Dev Psychol*. 2020;2(1):389-411. doi:10.1146/annurev-devpsych-051820-123945

27. Olson S, Berg K, Bonham V, et al. The use of racial, ethnic, and ancestral categories in human genetics research. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*. 2005;77(4):519-532. doi:10.1086/491747

28. Harden KP, Tucker-Drob EM, Tackett JL. The Texas Twin Project. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*. 2013;16(01):385-390. doi:10.1017/thg.2012.97

29. Achenbach T. *Integrative Guide for the 1991 CBCL/4-18, YSR, and TRF Profiles*. Department of Psychiatry, University of Vermont; 1991.

30. Lizotte AJ, Chard-Wierschem DJ, Loeber R, Stern SB. A Shortened Child Behavior Checklist for Delinquency Studies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. 1992;8(2):233-245.

31. Conners CK, Sitarenios G, Parker JDA, Epstein JN. The Revised Conners' Parent Rating Scale (CPRS-R): Factor Structure, Reliability, and Criterion Validity. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 1998;26(4):257-268. doi:10.1023/A:1022602400621

32. Datar A, Chung PJ. Changes in Socioeconomic, Racial/Ethnic, and Sex Disparities in Childhood Obesity at School Entry in the United States. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2015;169(7):696. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.0172

33. Braithwaite D, Moore DH, Lustig RH, et al. Socioeconomic status in relation to early menarche among black and white girls. *Cancer Causes Control*. 2009;20(5):713-720. doi:10.1007/s10552-008-9284-9

34. Sumner JA, Colich NL, Uddin M, Armstrong D, McLaughlin KA. Early experiences of threat, but not deprivation, are associated with accelerated biological aging in children and adolescents. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2019;85(3):268-278. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.09.008

35. US Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS).; 2012.

36. Wahl S, Drong A, Lehne B, et al. Epigenome-wide association study of body mass index, and the adverse outcomes of adiposity. *Nature*. 2017;541(7635):81-86. doi:10.1038/nature20784

37. Almstrup K, Lindhardt Johansen M, Busch AS, et al. Pubertal development in healthy children is mirrored by DNA methylation patterns in peripheral blood. *Scientific Reports*. 2016;6(1):28657. doi:10.1038/srep28657

38. Joehanes R, Just AC, Marioni RE, et al. Epigenetic signatures of cigarette smoking. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Genetics*. 2016;9(5):436-447. doi:10.1161/CIRCGENETICS.116.001506

39. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. *Mplus User's Guide*. Eighth Edi. (Muthén & Muthén, ed.).; 2017.

40. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate : A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. 1995;57(1):289-300.

41. Raffington L, Tanksley P, Sabhlok A, et al. Socially stratified epigenetic profiles are associated with cognitive functioning in children and adolescents. *bioRxiv [Preprint]*. Published online 2021.

42. Danese A, Baldwin JR. Hidden Wounds? Inflammatory Links Between Childhood Trauma and Psychopathology. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2017;68(1):517-544. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044208

43. Cole SW, Shanahan MJ, Gaydosh L, Harris KM. Population-based RNA profiling in Add Health finds social disparities in inflammatory and antiviral gene regulation to emerge by young adulthood. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2020;(17):201821367. doi:10.1073/pnas.1821367117

44. McDade TW, Ryan CP, Jones MJ, et al. Genome-wide analysis of DNA methylation in relation to socioeconomic status during development and early adulthood. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 2019;169(1):3-11. doi:10.1002/ajpa.23800

45. Hostinar CE, Nusslock R, Miller GE. Future Directions in the Study of Early-Life Stress and Physical and Emotional Health: Implications of the Neuroimmune Network Hypothesis. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*. 2018;47(1):142-156. doi:10.1080/15374416.2016.1266647

46. Emeny RT, Carpenter DO, Lawrence DA. Health disparities: Intracellular consequences of social determinants of health. *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology*. 2021;416:115444. doi:10.1016/j.taap.2021.115444

47. Epel ES. The geroscience agenda: Toxic stress, hormetic stress, and the rate of aging. *Ageing Research Reviews*. 2020;63:101167. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2020.101167

48. Peters A, Nawrot TS, Baccarelli AA. Hallmarks of environmental insults. *Cell*. 2021;184(6):1455-1468. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2021.01.043

49. Santos AL, Sinha S. Obesity and aging: Molecular mechanisms and therapeutic approaches. *Ageing Research Reviews*. 2021;67:101268. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2021.101268

50. Card D, Giuliano L. Universal screening increases the representation of low-income and minority students in gifted education. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2016;113(48):13678-13683. doi:10.1073/pnas.1605043113

51. Harden KP, Engelhardt LE, Mann FD, et al. Genetic Associations Between Executive Functions and a General Factor of Psychopathology. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2020;59(6):749-758. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2019.05.006

52. Williams DR. Stress and the Mental Health of Populations of Color: Advancing Our Understanding of Race-related Stressors. *J Health Soc Behav*. 2018;59(4):466-485. doi:10.1177/0022146518814251

53. Marnetto D, Pärna K, Läll K, et al. Ancestry deconvolution and partial polygenic score can improve susceptibility predictions in recently admixed individuals. *Nat Commun*. 2020;11(1):1628. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-15464-w

54. Lloyd-Jones LR, Zeng J, Sidorenko J, et al. Improved polygenic prediction by Bayesian multiple regression on summary statistics. *Nature Communications*. 2019;10(1):5086. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-12653-0

55. Pain O, Glanville KP, Hagenaars SP, et al. Evaluation of polygenic prediction methodology within a reference-standardized framework. Plagnol V, ed. *PLoS Genet*. 2021;17(5):e1009021. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1009021

56. Auton A, Abecasis GR, Altshuler DM, et al. A global reference for human genetic variation. *Nature*. 2015;526(7571):68-74. doi:10.1038/nature15393

57. The International HapMap 3 Consortium. Integrating common and rare genetic variation in diverse human populations. *Nature*. 2010;467(7311):52-58. doi:10.1038/nature09298

58. Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LCAM, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ. Second-generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *GigaScience*. 2015;4(1):7. doi:10.1186/s13742-015-0047-8

59. Harden KP, Patterson MW, Briley DA, et al. Developmental changes in genetic and environmental influences on rule-breaking and aggression: age and pubertal development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2015;56(12):1370-1379. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12419

60. Patterson MW, Mann FD, Grotzinger AD, Tackett JL, Tucker-Drob EM, Harden KP. Genetic and environmental influences on internalizing psychopathology across age and pubertal development. *Developmental Psychology*. 2018;54(10):1928-1939. doi:10.1037/dev0000578

61. Service UD of AER. US Household Food Security Survey Module: three-stage design, with screeners. Published online 2012.

62. Engelhardt LE, Church JA, Harden KP, Tucker-Drob EM. Accounting for the shared environment in cognitive abilities and academic achievement with measured socioecological contexts. *Developmental Science*. 2019;22(1):e12699. doi:10.1111/desc.12699

63. Chetty R, Friedman JN, Hendren N, Jones MR, Porter SR. *The Opportunity Atlas: Mapping the Childhood Roots of Social Mobility*. National Bureau of Economic Research; 2018. doi:10.3386/w25147

64. Petersen AC, Crockett L, Richards M, Boxer A. A self-report measure of pubertal status: Reliability, validity, and initial norms. *Journal of youth and adolescence,*. 1988;17(2):117-133.

65. Aryee MJ, Jaffe AE, Corrada-Bravo H, et al. Minfi: A flexible and comprehensive Bioconductor package for the analysis of Infinium DNA methylation microarrays. *Bioinformatics*. Published online 2014. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btu049

66. Triche TJ, Weisenberger DJ, Van Den Berg D, Laird PW, Siegmund KD. Low-level processing of Illumina Infinium DNA Methylation BeadArrays. *Nucleic Acids Research*. 2013;41(7):e90-e90. doi:10.1093/nar/gkt090

67. Pidsley R, Zotenko E, Peters TJ, et al. Critical evaluation of the Illumina MethylationEPIC BeadChip microarray for whole-genome DNA methylation profiling. *Genome Biology*. 2016;17(1):208. doi:10.1186/s13059-016-1066-1

68. Middleton LYM, Dou J, Fisher J, et al. Saliva cell type DNA methylation reference panel for epidemiological studies in children. *Epigenetics*. Published online February 22, 2021:1-17. doi:10.1080/15592294.2021.1890874

69. Johnson WE, Li C, Rabinovic A. Adjusting batch effects in microarray expression data using empirical Bayes methods. *Biostatistics*. 2007;8(1):118-127. doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxj037

70. Anderson CA, Pettersson FH, Clarke GM, Cardon LR, Morris AP, Zondervan KT. Data quality control in genetic case-control association studies. *Nat Protoc*. 2010;5(9):1564-1573. doi:10.1038/nprot.2010.116

71. Turner S, Armstrong LL, Bradford Y, et al. Quality Control Procedures for Genome-Wide Association Studies. *Current Protocols in Human Genetics*. 2011;68(1):1.19.1-1.19.18. doi:10.1002/0471142905.hg0119s68

72. Roshyara NR, Kirsten H, Horn K, Ahnert P, Scholz M. Impact of pre-imputation SNP-filtering on genotype imputation results. *BMC Genetics*. 2014;15(1):88. doi:10.1186/s12863-014-0088-5

Acknowledgment Section

Funding: We gratefully acknowledge all participants of the Texas Twin Project. This research was supported by National Institutes of Health (NIH) grants R01HD083613 and R01HD092548. LR was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG). MWP was supported by a training grant from NIMH, T32MH015442. ZA is supported by a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Fellowship from the European Union (894675). KPH and EMTD are Faculty Research Associates of the Population Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin, which is supported by a NIH grant P2CHD042849. EMTD is a member of the Center on Aging and Population Sciences (CAPS) at The University of Texas at Austin, which is supported by NIH grant P30AG066614. KPH and EMTD were also supported by Jacobs Foundation Research Fellowships. LR and KPH had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Conflicts of interest: Not applicable.

Ethics approval: The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review board granted ethical approval.

Consent to participate: Informed consent to participate in the study was obtained from all participants and their parent or legal guardian.

Consent for publication: Not applicable.

Availability of data and material: Because of the high potential for deductive identification in this special population from a geographically circumscribed area, and the sensitive nature of information collected, data from the Texas Twin Project are not shared with individuals outside of the research team.

Code availability: Code will be shared by the first author upon request.

Author Contributions: KPH, EMTD, & LR developed the study concept and design. LR, PT, LV, & TM performed the data analysis under the supervision of EMTD and KPH. LR drafted the manuscript. All authors provided critical revisions to the analysis plan and manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript for submission.

Supplemental Methods

DNA-methylation preprocessing. DNA extraction and methylation profiling was conducted by Edinburgh Clinical Research Facility (UK). DNA-methylation preprocessing was primarily conducted with the 'minfi' package in R [65]. Within-array normalization was performed to address array background correction, red/green dye bias, and probe type I/II correction, and it has been noted that at least part of the probe type bias is a combination of the first two factors (. Noob preprocessing as implemented by minfi's "preprocessNoob" [66] is a background correction and dye-bias equalization method that has similar within-array normalization effects on the data as probe type correction methods such as BMIQ (Teschendorff et al., 2013).

In line with our preregistered preprocessing plan, CpG probes with detection $p > 0.01$ and fewer than 3 beads in more than 1% of the samples and probes in cross-reactive regions were excluded [67]. None of these failed probes overlapped with the probes used for DNA-methylation scores. 44 samples were excluded because (1) they showed low intensity probes as indicated by the log of average methylation <9 and their detection *p*-value was > 0.01 in >10% of their probes, (2) their self-reported and methylation-estimated sex mismatch, and/or (3) their self-reported and DNA-estimated sex mismatch. Cell composition of immune and epithelial cell types (*i.e.*, CD4+ T-cell, natural killer cells, neutrophilseosinophils, B cells, monocytes, CD8+ T-cell, and granulocytes) were estimated using a newly developed child saliva reference panel implemented in the R package "BeadSorted.Saliva.EPIC" within "ewastools" [68]. Surrogate variable analysis was used to correct methylation values for batch effects using the "combat" function in the SVA package [69].

Genotyping and imputation. DNA samples were genotyped at the University of Edinburgh using the Illumina Infinium PsychArray, which assays ~590,000 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), insertions-deletions (indels), copy number variants (CNVs), structural variants, and germline variants across the genome. Genetic data was subjected to quality control procedures recommended for chip-based genomic data [70,71]. Briefly, samples were excluded on the basis of poor call rate (< 98%) or inconsistent self-reported and biological sex, while variants were excluded if missingness exceeded 2%. As further variant-level filtering has been shown to have a detrimental effect on imputation quality [72], quality control thresholds for minor allele frequency (MAF) and Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) were applied after phasing and imputation.

Untyped markers were imputed on the Michigan Imputation Server (https://imputationserver.sph.umich.edu). Specifically, genotypes were phased and imputed with Eagle v2.4 and Minimac4 (v1.5.7), respectively, while using the 1000 Genomes Phase 3 v5 reference panel [56]. To ensure that only high-quality typed and imputed markers were used for analysis, variants were excluded if they had a MAF < 1e-3, a HWE p-value < 1e-6, or an imputation quality score < .90. These procedures produced a final set of 4,703,309 genetic markers to be used in analyses.

Supplemental Tables

- Table S1. CBCL and Conners items included in each mental health summary measure.
- Table S2. Associations between socioeconomic inequality and racial/ethnic identity with parent-reported mental health.
- Table S3. Associations between socioeconomic inequality and racial/ethnic identity with self-reported mental health.
- Table S4. Associations between racial/ethnic identity and socioeconomic inequality.
- Table S5. Associations between socioeconomic inequality and racial/ethnic identity with DNA-methylation profiles.
- Table S6. Associations between socioeconomic inequality with DNA-methylation profiles for each racial/ethnic group.
- Table S7. Associations between DNA-methylation and genetic profiles with parent-reported mental health.
- Table S8. Associations between DNA-methylation and genetic profiles with self-reported mental health.
- Table S9. Associations between DNA-methylation with parent-reported mental health for each racial/ethnic group.
- Table S10. Associations between DNA-methylation with self-reported mental health for each racial/ethnic group.
- Table S11. Co-twin-control associations between DNA-methylation and parent-reported mental health.

Table S1. CBCL and Conners items included in each mental health summary measure.

Measure	#	CBCL self-report question	CBCL parent-report question
Attention Problems	1	I fail to finish things that I start.	Acts too young for his/her age.
Attention Problems	2	I have trouble concentrating or paying attention.	Can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long.
Attention Problems	3	I have trouble sitting still.	Can't sit still, restless, or hyperactive.
Attention Problems	4	I feel confused or in a fog.	Daydreams or gets lost in his/her thoughts.
Attention Problems	5	I daydream a lot.	Impulsive or acts without thinking.
Attention Problems	6	I act without stopping to think.	Poor school work.
Attention Problems	7	I am inattentive and easily distracted.	/
Internalizing - depression	1	There is very little that I enjoy.	Deliberately harms self or attempts suicide.
Internalizing - depression	2	I feel lonely.	Secretive, keeps things to self.
Internalizing - depression	3	I cry a lot.	Self-conscious or easily embarrassed.
Internalizing - depression	4	I feel overtired without good reason.	Too shy or timid.
Internalizing - depression	5	I don't have much energy.	Unhappy, sad, or depressed.
Internalizing - depression	6	I am unhappy, sad, or depressed.	Withdrawn, doesn't get involved with others.
Internalizing - anxiety	7	I am nervous or tense.	Cries a lot.
Internalizing - anxiety	8	I am too fearful or anxious.	Fears going to school.
Internalizing - anxiety	9	I feel too guilty.	Fears he/she might think or do something bad.
Internalizing - anxiety	10	I am self-conscious and easily embarrassed.	Feels he/she has to be perfect.
Internalizing - anxiety	11	I worry a lot.	Feels worthless or inferior.
Internalizing - anxiety	12	/	Too fearful or anxious.
Internalizing - anxiety	13	/	Feels too guilty.
Internalizing - anxiety	14	/	Whining.
Internalizing - anxiety	15	/	Worries.
Internalizing - somatic complaints	16	/	Aches or pains (not stomach or headaches).
Internalizing - somatic complaints	17	/	Headaches.
Internalizing - somatic complaints	18	/	Nausea, feels sick.
Internalizing - somatic complaints	19	/	Stomachaches.
Rule-Breaking	1	I disobey my parents.	Disobedient at home.
Rule-Breaking	2	I disobey at school.	Disobedient at school.
Rule-Breaking	3	I don't feel guilty after doing something I shouldn't.	Hangs around with others who get in trouble.
Rule-Breaking	4	I break rules at home, school, or elsewhere.	Lying or cheating.
Rule-Breaking	5	I hang around with kids who get in trouble	Steals outside the home.
Rule-Breaking	6	I lie or cheat.	/
Rule-Breaking	7	I run away from home.	/
Rule-Breaking	8	I set fires.	/
Rule-Breaking	9	I steal at home.	/
Rule-Breaking	10	I steal from places other than home.	/
Rule-Breaking	11	I swear or use dirty language.	/

Rule-Breaking	12	I cut classes or skip school.	/
Aggression	1	I argue a lot.	Cruel to animals.
Aggression	2	I brag.	Cruelty, bullying, or meanness to others.
Aggression	3	I am mean to others.	Demands a lot of attention.
Aggression	4	I destroy my own things.	Destroys things belonging to his/her family or others.
Aggression	5	I destroy things belonging to others.	Gets in many fights.
Aggression	6	I get in many fights.	Screams a lot.
Aggression	7	I physically attack people.	Stubborn, sullen, or irritable.
Aggression	8	I scream a lot.	Sudden changes in mood or feelings.
Aggression	9	I am stubborn.	Temper tantrums or hot temper.
Aggression	10	I talk too much.	Threatens people.
Aggression	11	I tease others a lot.	Unusually loud.
Aggression	12	I have a hot temper.	/
Aggression	13	I threaten to hurt people.	/

Measure	**#**	**Conner self-report question**	**Conner parent-report question**
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	1	I blurt out the first thing that I think of.	Talks too much.
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	2	I interrupt other people.	Blurts out answers before the question has been completed.
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	3	I am restless.	Acts as if he/she is driven by a motor.
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	4	I blurt out the answer before the question is finished.	Has difficulty waiting for his/her turn.
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	5	I run or climb even when I am not supposed to.	Runs or climbs when he/she is not supposed to.
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	6	I have trouble waiting for my turn.	Is noisy and loud when playing or using free time.
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	7	I have too much energy to stay still.	Leaves seat when he/she should stay seated.
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	8	I like to be on the go rather than being in one place.	Fidgets or squirms in seat.
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	9	I get out of my seat when I am not supposed to.	Is restless or overactive.
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	10	I feel like I am driven by a motor.	Interrupts others (butts into conversations or games).
ADHD-hyperactive/impulsive	11	I have trouble playing or doing things quietly.	/
ADHD-inattentive	1	I lose stuff that I need.	Is forgetful in daily activities.
ADHD-inattentive	2	I have trouble finishing things.	Avoids or dislikes things that take a lot of effort and are not fun.
ADHD-inattentive	3	I have trouble keeping myself organized.	Does not seem to listen to what is being said to him/her.
ADHD-inattentive	4	It is hard for me to pay attention to details.	Doesn't pay attention to details, makes careless mistakes.
ADHD-inattentive	5	I forget stuff.	Does not follow through on instructions (even when he/she understands and is trying to cooperate).
ADHD-inattentive	6	I make mistakes by accident.	Fails to complete schoolwork, chores, or tasks (even when he/she understands and is trying to cooperate).
ADHD-inattentive	7	I have trouble keeping my mind on what people are saying to me.	Has trouble organizing tasks or activities.

ADHD-inattentive	8	I don't like doing things that make me think hard.	Has trouble keeping his/her mind on work or play for long.
ADHD-inattentive	9	I have trouble following instructions.	Loses things (like schoolwork, pencils, books, tools, or toys).
ADHD-inattentive	10	I have trouble keeping my mind on what I am doing.	/
Conduct Disorder	1	I steal from other people (by mugging or purse snatching).	Skips class.
Conduct Disorder	2	I tell lies to get out of doing things or to get stuff.	Has forced someone into sexual activity.
Conduct Disorder	3	I start fights with other people.	Bullies, threatens, or scares others.
Conduct Disorder	4	I am mean to animals.	Uses a weapon (like a bat, brick, broken bottle, knife or gun).
Conduct Disorder	5	I steal important things when no one is watching.	Starts fights with others on purpose.
Conduct Disorder	6	I use a weapon (like a bat, brick, broken glass, knife, or gun) to scare or hurt people.	Physically hurts people.
Conduct Disorder	7	I break into houses, buildings, or cars.	Lies to get things or to avoid having to do something.
Conduct Disorder	8	I do things to hurt people.	Runs away from home for at least one night.
Conduct Disorder	9	I go out at night even when I am supposed to be at home.	Has set fires with the intention of causing damage.
Conduct Disorder	10	/	Has broken into someone else's house, building, or car.
Conduct Disorder	11	/	Goes out at night even though it breaks the rules.
Conduct Disorder	12	/	Steals while confronting a person (like mugging, purse snatching).
Oppositional Defiant Disorder	1	I do what my parents or other adults ask me to do.	Loses temper.
Oppositional Defiant Disorder	2	I try to annoy other people.	Blames others for his/her mistakes or misbehavior.
Oppositional Defiant Disorder	3	I argue with adults.	Is angry or resentful.
Oppositional Defiant Disorder	4	I blame others for things I do wrong.	Tries to get even with people.
Oppositional Defiant Disorder	5	I lose my temper.	Annoys other people on purpose.
Oppositional Defiant Disorder	6	I am easily annoyed by others.	Is irritable and easily annoyed by others.
Oppositional Defiant Disorder	7	People make me angry.	Actively refuses to do what adults tell him/her to do.
Oppositional Defiant Disorder	8	When I get mad at someone, I get even with them.	Argues with adults.

Table S2. Associations between socioeconomic inequality and racial/ethnic identity with parent-reported mental health.

	Internalizing			**Attention Problems**			**Aggression**			**Rule-Breaking**			**ADHD**			**ODD**			**CD**	
	No further covariates[a]																			
	b	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.25	0.16, 0.33	**0.000**	0.16	0.07, 0.25	**0.001**	0.26	0.14, 0.39	**0.000**	0.11	0.04, 0.19	**0.004**	0.18	0.08, 0.27	**0.000**	0.14	0.04, 0.24	**0.005**	0.16	-0.02, 0.34	0.088
Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.13	0.04, 0.22	**0.003**	0.12	0.03, 0.20	**0.008**	0.07	-0.04, 0.19	0.219	0.04	-0.04, 0.11	0.364	0.04	-0.04, 0.12	0.286	0.04	-0.05, 0.14	0.365	0.16	-0.03, 0.34	0.097
Neighborhood opportunity	-0.17	-0.25, -0.09	**0.000**	-0.19	-0.28, -0.10	**0.000**	-0.12	-0.22, -0.02	0.016	-0.01	-0.09, 0.07	0.826	-0.09	-0.18, 0.01	0.068	-0.18	-0.31, -0.05	**0.008**	-0.23	-0.42, -0.03	0.022
Latinx	0.09	0.01, 0.17	**0.021**	0.18	0.09, 0.27	**0.000**	0.03	-0.08, 0.12	0.689	0.08	-0.08, 0.23	0.352	-0.05	-0.13, 0.02	0.168	-0.06	-0.13, 0.00	0.060	-0.04	-0.08, 0.00	0.047
Latinx-White	0.06	-0.03, 0.14	0.218	0.05	-0.03, 0.14	0.213	0.13	-0.05, 0.22	0.232	0.02	-0.18, 0.21	0.854	0.05	-0.03, 0.13	0.250	0.03	-0.07, 0.13	0.570	0.07	-0.05, 0.18	0.254
Black+	0.23	0.15, 0.30	**0.000**	0.15	0.06, 0.23	**0.001**	0.16	0.01, 0.24	0.027	0.10	-0.06, 0.26	0.204	0.12	0.03, 0.22	**0.009**	0.07	-0.03, 0.18	0.173	0.06	-0.09, 0.20	0.399
Asian+	0.00	-0.07, 0.07	0.946	0.06	-0.03, 0.14	0.173	0.00	-0.09, 0.09	0.995	0.04	-0.14, 0.22	0.647	-0.08	-0.13, -0.04	**0.001**	-0.11	-0.14, -0.08	**0.000**	-0.06	-0.08, -0.03	**0.001**
	Controlling for family-level disadvantage																				
	b	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.17	0.07, 0.26	**0.000**	0.09	-0.02, 0.19	0.105	0.24	0.11, 0.37	**0.000**	0.13	0.03, 0.22	**0.008**	0.16	0.05, 0.27	**0.004**	0.16	0.05, 0.26	**0.004**	0.14	-0.01, 0.29	0.063
Latinx	0.07	-0.02, 0.16	0.120	0.16	0.06, 0.26	**0.002**	-0.02	-0.15, 0.11	0.774	-0.01	-0.11, 0.10	0.909	-0.09	-0.18, 0.01	0.078	-0.11	-0.20, -0.03	**0.007**	-0.10	-0.17, -0.03	**0.005**
Latinx-White	0.06	-0.04, 0.15	0.239	0.05	-0.04, 0.15	0.283	0.13	-0.03, 0.28	0.109	-0.02	-0.10, 0.07	0.692	0.02	-0.08, 0.12	0.685	0.03	-0.09, 0.14	0.682	0.07	-0.08, 0.22	0.360
Black+	0.16	0.06, 0.25	**0.002**	0.14	0.03, 0.26	**0.017**	0.09	-0.06, 0.23	0.250	-0.01	-0.12, 0.10	0.844	0.06	-0.05, 0.16	0.286	-0.02	-0.13, 0.09	0.732	0.09	-0.12, 0.30	0.410
Asian+	-0.03	-0.11, 0.04	0.433	0.08	-0.02, 0.18	0.133	0.02	-0.1, 0.13	0.773	0.04	-0.06, 0.14	0.421	-0.07	-0.13, -0.01	**0.016**	-0.10	-0.14, -0.06	**0.000**	-0.05	-0.11, 0.00	0.075

Standardized regression coefficients (*b*) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and uncorrected *p*-value calculated by regressing parent-reported mental health on socioeconomic inequality and racial/ethnic identity (with and without controlling for family-level disadvantage). *P*-values, where FDR corrected *p*-values < 0.05, are marked in bold. White-only identity is reference group. [a]All models included covariate adjustment for age, gender, and an age by gender interaction. *Note:* ADHD=attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder; ODD=oppositional defiant disorder; CD= conduct disorder.

Table S3. Associations between socioeconomic inequality and racial/ethnic identity with self-reported mental health.

	Internalizing			**Attention Problems**			**Aggression**			**Rule-Breaking**			**ADHD**			**ODD**			**CD**		
No further covariates[a]																					
	b	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.07	-0.04, 0.17	0.237	0.16	0.06, 0.26	**0.001**	0.24	0.13, 0.36	**0.000**	0.16	0.04, 0.28	**0.010**	0.14	0.02, 0.26	0.024	0.08	-0.03, 0.19	0.142	-0.01	-0.07, 0.06	0.778
Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.08	-0.01, 0.17	0.085	0.07	-0.02, 0.17	0.117	0.13	0.03, 0.22	**0.008**	0.15	0.04, 0.26	**0.009**	0.09	0.00, 0.19	0.046	0.16	0.04, 0.28	**0.009**	0.04	-0.05, 0.13	0.409
Neighborhood opportunity	-0.06	-0.16, 0.05	0.280	-0.08	-0.18, 0.03	0.171	-0.15	-0.27, -0.03	**0.013**	-0.16	-0.29, -0.03	**0.017**	-0.09	-0.21, 0.04	0.165	-0.13	-0.22, -0.04	**0.007**	-0.11	-0.21, -0.01	0.039
Latinx	-0.03	-0.12, 0.07	0.578	-0.01	-0.10, 0.08	0.844	0.01	-0.08, 0.09	0.891	0.05	-0.05, 0.16	0.324	0.04	-0.07, 0.15	0.494	-0.01	-0.11, 0.08	0.766	-0.05	-0.11, 0.00	0.045
Latinx-White	0.10	0.00, 0.19	0.050	0.09	-0.01, 0.19	0.092	-0.03	-0.12, 0.06	0.518	0.03	-0.07, 0.12	0.599	0.01	-0.10, 0.11	0.863	-0.03	-0.11, 0.04	0.417	-0.01	-0.08, 0.06	0.763
Black+	0.00	-0.09, 0.08	0.988	0.07	-0.02, 0.15	0.111	0.15	0.06, 0.23	**0.001**	0.08	-0.01, 0.18	0.087	0.07	-0.02, 0.15	0.125	0.05	-0.04, 0.14	0.240	-0.01	-0.07, 0.05	0.742
Asian+	-0.04	-0.12, 0.03	0.284	-0.06	-0.14, 0.02	0.174	-0.03	-0.12, 0.06	0.499	-0.01	-0.10, 0.09	0.913	-0.08	-0.16, 0.00	0.038	-0.03	-0.11, 0.05	0.435	0.00	-0.06, 0.06	0.983
Controlling for family-level disadvantage																					
	b	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*	*b*	CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.10	-0.02, 0.23	0.106	0.18	0.06, 0.29	**0.003**	0.21	0.08, 0.33	**0.001**	0.02	-0.10, 0.15	0.022	0.11	0.24, -0.03	0.122	0.08	-0.04, 0.21	0.187	0.03	-0.05, 0.10	0.508
Latinx	-0.06	-0.17, 0.05	0.286	-0.06	-0.17, 0.05	0.253	-0.02	-0.12, 0.09	0.762	0.01	-0.11, 0.13	0.740	0.04	0.18, -0.09	0.538	-0.02	-0.12, 0.09	0.791	-0.08	-0.13, -0.03	**0.001**
Latinx-White	0.10	-0.01, 0.21	0.077	0.07	-0.06, 0.19	0.302	-0.11	-0.22, 0.00	0.055	-0.03	-0.15, 0.10	0.895	-0.03	0.10, -0.16	0.684	-0.03	-0.10, 0.04	0.480	0.02	-0.07, 0.11	0.726
Black+	-0.07	-0.19, 0.05	0.264	-0.02	-0.12, 0.08	0.732	0.06	-0.05, 0.16	0.311	-0.06	-0.18, 0.06	0.658	0.02	0.13, -0.10	0.775	-0.03	-0.14, 0.08	0.616	-0.05	-0.12, 0.02	0.172
Asian+	-0.04	-0.13, 0.05	0.387	-0.07	-0.16, 0.02	0.138	-0.08	-0.17, 0.02	0.122	0.16	0.02, 0.29	0.315	-0.10	0.00, -0.18	0.040	-0.06	-0.14, 0.02	0.129	-0.04	-0.08, 0.01	0.096

Standardized regression coefficients (*b*) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and uncorrected *p*-value calculated by regressing parent-reported mental health on socioeconomic inequality and racial/ethnic identity (with and without controlling for family-level disadvantage). *P*-values, where FDR corrected *p*-values < 0.05, are marked in bold. White-only identity is reference group. [a]All models included covariate adjustment for age, gender, and an age by gender interaction. *Note:* ADHD=attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder; ODD=oppositional defiant disorder; CD= conduct disorder.

Table S4. Associations between racial/ethnic identity and socioeconomic inequality.

	Family-level disadvantage			Neighborhood-level disadvantage			Neighborhood opportunity		
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
Latinx	0.25	0.16 – 0.35	<**0.001**	0.43	0.33– 0.52	<**0.001**	-0.29	-0.41– -0.17	<**0.001**
Latinx-White	0.02	-0.09 – 0.12	0.763	0.04	-0.06– 0.15	0.444	0.03	-0.11– 0.16	0.700
Black+	0.43	0.35 – 0.52	<**0.001**	0.33	0.25– 0.41	<**0.001**	-0.28	-0.38– -0.18	<**0.001**
Asian+	-0.10	-0.19– -0.02	**0.017**	-0.06	-0.13– -0.01	**0.037**	0.09	0.01– 0.17	0.040

Standardized regression coefficients (*b*), 95% confidence intervals (CIs), and uncorrected *p*-values calculated by regressing socioeconomic measures on racial/ethnic identity. White-only identity is reference group. *P*-values, where FDR corrected *p*-values < 0.05, are marked in bold.

Table S5. Associations between socioeconomic inequality and racial/ethnic identity with DNA-methylation profiles.

	DNAm-CRP			**DunedinPoAm**		
	No further covariates [a]					
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.22	0.12– 0.31	**<0.001**	0.28	0.18– 0.37	**<0.001**
Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.25	0.17 – 0.33	**<0.001**	0.24	0.15 – 0.34	**<0.001**
Neighborhood opportunity	-0.12	-0.21– -0.03	**0.012**	-0.19	-0.30 – -0.08	**0.001**
Latinx	0.15	0.07– 0.24	**0.001**	0.18	0.10– 0.27	**<0.001**
Latinx-White	0.10	-0.02– 0.22	0.108	0.09	-0.01– 0.19	0.089
Black+	0.08	0.02 – 0.15	**0.012**	0.19	0.11– 0.28	**<0.001**
Asian+	-0.01	-0.09– 0.07	0.776	0.11	-0.01– 0.22	0.058
	Controlling for BMI					
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
BMI	0.33	0.24– 0.42	**<0.001**	0.30	0.21– 0.40	**<0.001**
Family-level disadvantage	0.11	0.01– 0.21	0.024	0.19	0.08 – 0.29	**<0.001**
Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.15	0.07– 0.23	**<0.001**	0.14	0.05 – 0.24	**0.004**
Neighborhood opportunity	-0.05	-0.15– 0.05	0.314	-0.09	-0.20 – 0.01	0.088
Latinx	0.10	0.01– 0.18	0.029	0.13	0.04– 0.22	**0.004**
Latinx-White	0.07	-0.03– 0.17	0.180	0.06	-0.03 – 0.14	0.213
Black+	0.01	-0.07– 0.07	0.975	0.11	0.02 – 0.19	**0.011**
Asian+	0.01	-0.07– 0.09	0.857	0.13	0.02 – 0.24	**0.025**
	Controlling for puberty					
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
Puberty	0.13	0.02– 0.24	**0.020**	0.05	-0.07– 0.18	0.402
Family-level disadvantage	0.21	0.12 – 0.31	**<0.001**	0.28	0.18– 0.39	**<0.001**
Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.25	0.16– 0.34	**<0.001**	0.25	0.11– 0.34	**<0.001**
Neighborhood opportunity	-0.12	-0.22 – -0.01	**0.027**	-0.17	-0.28– -0.06	**0.003**
Latinx	0.15	0.06– 0.24	**0.001**	0.18	0.09– 0.27	**<0.001**
Latinx-White	0.14	0.01 – 0.26	**0.033**	0.11	0.01– 0.21	**0.035**
Black+	0.09	0.03 – 0.16	**0.007**	0.19	0.11– 0.27	**<0.001**
Asian+	-0.01	-0.09 – 0.07	0.801	0.11	-0.01 – 0.22	0.059
	Controlling for DNAm-smoke					
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
DNAm-smoke	0.40	0.28– 0.51	**<0.001**	0.24	0.11 – 0.37	**<0.001**
Family-level disadvantage	0.21	0.11– 0.30	**<0.001**	0.28	0.18– 0.38	**<0.001**

Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.22	0.14– 0.30	**<0.001**	0.23	0.14 – 0.33	**<0.001**
Neighborhood opportunity	-0.11	-0.21– -0.02	**0.022**	-0.17	-0.27– -0.06	**0.003**
Latinx	0.11	0.03 – 0.20	**0.011**	0.16	0.07– 0.25	**0.001**
Latinx-White	0.12	0.01 – 0.23	0.048	0.11	0.01 – 0.20	**0.028**
Black+	0.14	0.07 – 0.20	**<0.001**	0.22	0.14 – 0.31	**<0.001**
Asian+	-0.02	-0.09 – 0.06	0.677	0.11	-0.01 – 0.22	0.067
	Controlling for family-level disadvantage					
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.19	0.07– 0.30	**0.002**	0.24	0.13 – 0.36	**<0.001**
Latinx	0.10	0.01– 0.20	0.036	0.12	0.02 – 0.22	**0.019**
Latinx-White	0.12	0.00 – 0.23	0.050	0.10	0.01 – 0.20	0.047
Black+	0.01	-0.06 – 0.09	0.739	0.09	-0.01 – 0.18	0.057
Asian+	0.01	-0.08 – 0.09	0.914	0.13	0.02 – 0.24	**0.021**

Standardized regression coefficients (*b*), 95% confidence intervals (CIs), and uncorrected p-values calculated by regressing DNA-methylation measures on socioeconomic measures and racial/ethnic identity with and without controlling for normed BMI z-scores, puberty (residualized for age within each gender), and DNA-methylation profiles of smoking (DNAm-smoke), separately. *P*-values, where FDR corrected *p*-values < 0.05, are marked in bold.
[a]All models included covariate adjustment for child's age, gender, and an age by gender interaction. Methylation scores were residualized for technical covariates (array, slide, batch, cell composition).

Table S6. Associations between socioeconomic inequality with DNA-methylation profiles for each racial/ethnic group.

	DNAm-CRP			DunedinPoAm		
			White			
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.11	-0.02– 0.24	0.098	0.23	0.08– 0.37	0.002
Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.23	0.11– 0.35	<0.001	0.21	0.06– 0.37	0.007
Neighborhood opportunity	-0.07	-0.19–0.06	0.312	-0.12	-0.3– 0.06	0.182
			Latinx			
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.33	0.07– 0.59	0.014	0.118	-0.18–0.42	0.439
Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.11	-0.12– 0.33	0.352	0.01	-0.27–0.29	0.925
Neighborhood opportunity	-0.18	-0.43– 0.07	0.160	-0.18	-0.51– 0.15	0.278
			Latinx-White			
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.53	0.13– 0.93	0.010	0.29	-0.07– 0.64	0.118
Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.19	-0.1– 0.47	0.197	0.11	-0.16–0.38	0.436
Neighborhood opportunity	-0.01	-0.20– 0.18	0.945	-0.12	-0.33– 0.08	0.232
			Black +			
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.06	-0.22– 0.34	0.678	0.19	-0.13–0.51	0.252
Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.49	0.22– 0.75	<0.001	0.47	0.14– 0.79	0.005
Neighborhood opportunity	-0.24	-0.44– -0.04	0.018	-0.25	-0.52– 0.02	0.065
			Asian +			
	b	95% CI	*p*	*b*	95% CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.08	-0.18–0.34	0.562	0.07	-0.26– 0.41	0.668
Neighborhood-level disadvantage	0.07	-0.2– 0.33	0.629	-0.10	-0.45–0.25	0.590
Neighborhood opportunity	0.25	-0.36 –0.86	0.428	-0.02	-0.85– 0.8	0.959

Standardized regression coefficients (*b*) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and uncorrected *p*-value calculated by regressing DNA-methylation measures on socioeconomic measures, separately, within each racial/ethnic group. All models included covariate adjustment for age, gender, and an age by gender interaction. Methylation scores were residualized for technical covariates (for methylation: array, slide, batch, cell composition).

Table S7. Associations between DNA-methylation and genetic profiles with parent-reported mental health.

	Internalizing			**Attention Problems**			**Aggression**			**Rule-Breaking**			**ADHD**			**ODD**			**CD**		
No further covariates[a]																					
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	0.15	0.05, 0.25	**0.004**	0.10	-0.01, 0.21	0.083	0.17	0.04, 0.31	**0.013**	0.06	-0.05, 0.16	0.270	0.09	-0.01, 0.19	0.084	0.08	-0.04, 0.19	0.194	0.16	0.02, 0.29	0.026
DunedinPoAm	0.15	0.05, 0.25	**0.002**	0.10	0.00, 0.20	0.058	0.11	-0.02, 0.25	0.094	0.00	-0.07, 0.08	0.948	0.11	0.00, 0.21	0.042	0.05	-0.08, 0.17	0.459	0.05	-0.09, 0.46	0.301
PGS-CRP	0.14	0.04, 0.23	**0.004**	0.16	0.05, 0.28	**0.004**	0.11	-0.03, 0.23	0.115	0.09	0.00, 0.17	0.059	0.02	-0.09, 0.12	0.766	0.05	-0.06, 0.15	0.386	0.01	-0.18, 0.19	0.953
Controlling for BMI																					
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
BMI	0.13	0.04, 0.22	**0.004**	-0.02	-0.12, 0.07	0.669	0.14	0.02, 0.26	0.020	0.05	-0.03, 0.14	0.201	0.09	-0.01, 0.2	0.076	0.03	-0.08, 0.15	0.589	0.09	-0.1, 0.29	0.342
DNAm-CRP	0.08	-0.03, 0.19	0.158	0.10	-0.02, 0.23	0.112	0.10	-0.05, 0.25	0.182	0.03	-0.09, 0.15	0.627	0.04	-0.08, 0.16	0.471	0.06	-0.08, 0.19	0.405	0.11	-0.02, 0.23	0.110
DunedinPoAm	0.10	-0.01, 0.2	0.069	0.10	-0.01, 0.22	0.085	0.05	-0.1, 0.19	0.526	-0.03	-0.13, 0.07	0.583	0.08	-0.04, 0.19	0.179	0.03	-0.1, 0.15	0.668	0.15	-0.1, 0.4	0.240
PGS-CRP	0.12	0.03, 0.22	**0.009**	0.17	0.06, 0.28	**0.003**	0.09	-0.04, 0.22	0.182	0.08	-0.01, 0.17	0.075	0.01	-0.1, 0.11	0.934	0.05	-0.06, 0.15	0.383	0.00	-0.19, 0.18	0.974
Controlling for pubertal status																					
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
Puberty	-0.04	-0.14, 0.06	0.435	-0.14	-0.25, -0.03	**0.013**	-0.01	-0.15, 0.12	0.865	-0.03	-0.13, 0.08	0.598	-0.03	-0.13, 0.07	0.568	-0.04	-0.17, 0.08	0.496	-0.16	-0.43, 0.11	0.245
DNAm-CRP	0.16	0.05, 0.26	**0.004**	0.12	0.01, 0.24	0.034	0.18	0.03, 0.32	0.016	0.06	-0.07, 0.19	0.356	0.10	-0.01, 0.2	0.076	0.08	-0.04, 0.2	0.175	0.19	0.02, 0.35	0.025
DunedinPoAm	0.15	0.05, 0.25	**0.002**	0.11	0.01, 0.21	0.040	0.11	-0.02, 0.25	0.098	0.01	-0.09, 0.1	0.920	0.11	0.01, 0.22	0.041	0.05	-0.07, 0.17	0.439	0.20	-0.09, 0.48	0.180
PGS-CRP	0.14	0.04, 0.23	**0.004**	0.17	0.06, 0.28	**0.003**	0.10	-0.03, 0.23	0.116	0.09	0, 0.18	0.051	0.02	-0.09, 0.12	0.775	0.05	-0.06, 0.15	0.374	0.01	-0.18, 0.19	0.949

Controlling for DNAm-smoke																					
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-smoke	-0.07	-0.2, 0.06	0.301	0.05	-0.09, 0.19	0.500	-0.10	-0.26, 0.06	0.217	-0.03	-0.15, 0.1	0.674	-0.05	-0.18, 0.08	0.454	0.06	-0.07, 0.2	0.354	-0.02	-0.2, 0.17	0.850
DNAm-CRP	0.19	0.06, 0.31	**0.004**	0.08	-0.07, 0.22	0.299	0.11	-0.15, 0.37	0.400	0.08	-0.05, 0.21	0.245	0.12	-0.01, 0.24	0.069	0.05	-0.09, 0.18	0.517	0.16	0.03, 0.3	0.021
DunedinPoAm	0.16	0.06, 0.26	**0.002**	0.08	-0.02, 0.19	0.127	0.13	-0.01, 0.27	0.076	0.00	-0.09, 0.1	0.926	0.12	0.01, 0.23	0.031	0.03	-0.1, 0.15	0.665	0.19	-0.08, 0.45	0.177

PGS-CRP	0.14	0.04, 0.23	**0.004**	0.16	0.05, 0.27	**0.005**	0.11	-0.02, 0.24	0.100	0.09	0, 0.11	0.057	0.02	-0.09, 0.12	0.753	0.04	-0.06, 0.15	0.411	0.01	-0.18, 0.19	0.958
Controlling for Family-Level Disadvantage																					
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.21	0.13, 0.3	**0.000**	0.14	0.04, 0.23	**0.005**	0.21	0.1, 0.32	**0.000**	0.10	0.02, 0.18	0.017	0.15	0.06, 0.25	**0.001**	0.13	0.04, 0.22	**0.007**	0.13	-0.04, 0.29	0.136
DNAm-CRP	0.09	-0.01, 0.19	0.078	0.06	-0.05, 0.17	0.301	0.12	-0.03, 0.26	0.111	0.03	-0.08, 0.14	0.593	0.05	-0.06, 0.15	0.375	0.04	-0.07, 0.15	0.472	0.12	0, 0.25	0.056
DunedinPoAm	0.08	-0.02, 0.18	0.108	0.06	-0.05, 0.16	0.289	0.05	-0.09, 0.18	0.497	-0.03	-0.13, 0.06	0.490	0.06	-0.05, 0.17	0.258	0.01	-0.11, 0.12	0.935	0.15	-0.11, 0.41	0.251
PGS-CRP	0.13	0.04, 0.21	**0.005**	0.16	0.05, 0.27	**0.004**	0.10	-0.03, 0.22	0.135	0.08	0, 0.17	0.062	0.01	-0.09, 0.12	0.813	0.04	-0.06, 0.15	0.406	0.00	-0.18, 0.19	0.962

Standardized regression coefficients (*r*) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and uncorrected *p*-value calculated by regressing parent-reported mental health on DNA-methylation measures and PGS-CRP with and without controlling for normed BMI z-scores, puberty (residualized for age within each gender), DNA-methylation profiles of smoking (DNAm-smoke), and family-level disadvantage separately. *P*-values, where FDR corrected *p*-values < 0.05, are marked in bold. PGS analyses were restricted to participants of European ancestries as indicated by genetic ancestry PCs that are comparable to the GWAS discovery sample. [a]All models included covariate adjustment for age, gender, and an age by gender interaction. Methylation scores and PGS-CRP were residualized for technical covariates (for methylation: array, slide, batch, cell composition; for PGS-CRP: genetic ancestry PCs). *Note:* ADHD=attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder; ODD=oppositional defiant disorder; CD= conduct disorder.

Table S8. Associations between DNA-methylation and genetic profiles with self-reported mental health.

	Internalizing			**Attention Problems**			**Aggression**			**Rule-Breaking**			**ADHD**			**ODD**			**CD**	
No further covariates[a]																				
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	0.00	-0.12, 0.12	0.999	0.05	-0.07, 0.18	0.386	0.10	-0.03, 0.22	0.116	0.16	0.03, 0.29	0.018	0.05	-0.08, 0.19	0.427	0.00	-0.11, 0.12	0.952	0.04	-0.05, 0.13	0.386
DunedinPoAm	-0.11	-0.22, 0.00	0.060	0.00	-0.05, 0.05	0.976	0.03	-0.09, 0.14	0.667	-0.01	-0.13, 0.10	0.848	-0.03	-0.14, 0.07	0.562	0.03	-0.08, 0.15	0.564	0.01	-0.09, 0.11	0.783
PGS-CRP	0.01	-0.10, 0.12	0.885	0.01	-0.10, 0.12	0.833	-0.03	-0.13, 0.07	0.597	0.00	-0.11, 0.11	0.980	-0.04	-0.16, 0.08	0.497	-0.02	-0.13, 0.08	0.690	-0.02	-0.09, 0.06	0.692
Controlling for BMI																				
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
BMI	0.06	-0.04, 0.16	0.244	0.04	-0.06, 0.14	0.443	0.10	0.00, 0.2	0.050	-0.02	-0.12, 0.08	0.670	-0.01	-0.11, 0.09	0.799	0.15	0.05, 0.26	0.005	-0.03	-0.13, 0.08	0.631
DNAm-CRP	-0.02	-0.16, 0.11	0.741	0.04	-0.09, 0.17	0.555	0.06	-0.08, 0.19	0.393	0.18	0.03, 0.32	0.016	0.06	-0.08, 0.21	0.399	-0.05	-0.17, 0.07	0.421	0.05	-0.05, 0.15	0.305
DunedinPoAm	-0.14	-0.27, -0.02	0.025	-0.02	-0.13, 0.1	0.777	-0.02	-0.14, 0.11	0.769	-0.02	-0.15, 0.10	0.731	-0.04	-0.15, 0.08	0.545	-0.01	-0.13, 0.12	0.940	0.02	-0.11, 0.15	0.760
PGS-CRP	0.00	-0.11, 0.11	0.963	0.01	-0.1, 0.12	0.895	-0.03	-0.13, 0.07	0.534	0.00	-0.11, 0.11	0.985	-0.04	-0.14, 0.08	0.494	-0.03	-0.13, 0.08	0.598	-0.02	-0.09, 0.06	0.706
Controlling for Puberty																				
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
Puberty	0.15	0.04, 0.26	**0.008**	0.15	0.04, 0.26	**0.008**	0.15	0.04, 0.26	**0.010**	0.17	0.05, 0.3	**0.008**	0.10	-0.02, 0.22	0.106	0.18	0.07, 0.29	**0.001**	0.08	0, 0.16	0.047
DNAm-CRP	-0.03	-0.15, 0.10	0.686	0.03	-0.1, 0.15	0.651	0.07	-0.05, 0.2	0.242	0.13	0, 0.26	0.049	0.04	-0.1, 0.18	0.566	-0.02	-0.14, 0.1	0.716	0.03	-0.07, 0.12	0.555
DunedinPoAm	-0.12	-0.23, 0.00	0.042	-0.01	-0.11, 0.1	0.910	0.02	-0.1, 0.13	0.776	-0.02	-0.13, 0.09	0.718	-0.03	-0.14, 0.07	0.517	0.03	-0.09, 0.15	0.614	0.01	-0.09, 0.11	0.826
PGS-CRP	0.00	-0.1, 0.11	0.941	0.01	-0.1, 0.11	0.890	-0.03	-0.13, 0.07	0.518	-0.01	-0.11, 0.1	0.919	-0.04	-0.16, 0.07	0.463	-0.03	-0.14, 0.08	0.590	-0.02	-0.09, 0.06	0.636
Controlling for DNAm-smoke																				
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-smoke	-0.08	-0.23, 0.06	0.264	-0.07	-0.21, 0.07	0.334	-0.07	-0.23, 0.08	0.339	-0.05	-0.21, 0.11	0.565	-0.52	-0.25, 0.04	0.153	-0.05	-0.21, 0.1	0.515	-0.07	-0.17, 0.07	0.335
DNAm-CRP	0.04	-0.12, 0.2	0.623	0.09	-0.06, 0.25	0.250	0.14	-0.02, 0.29	0.083	0.18	0.02, 0.34	0.032	0.43	-0.06, 0.27	0.196	0.01	-0.14, 0.17	0.857	0.07	-0.04, 0.12	0.235
DunedinPoAm	-0.10	-0.22, 0.02	0.111	0.01	-0.1, 0.13	0.821	0.03	-0.09, 0.16	0.601	-0.02	-0.14, 0.1	0.754	-0.01	-0.13, 0.1	0.825	0.04	-0.08, 0.17	0.511	0.03	-0.09, 0.14	0.653

PGS-CRP	0.01	-0.1, 0.12	0.841	0.01	-0.1, 0.12	0.830	-0.03	-0.13, 0.08	0.616	0.00	-0.11, 0.11	0.994	-0.04	-0.16, 0.08	0.521	-0.02	-0.13, 0.09	0.720	-0.01	-0.09, 0.06	0.730
	Controlling for Family-Level Disadvantage																				
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
Family-level disadvantage	0.07	-0.04, 0.18	0.216	0.16	0.06, 0.26	**0.002**	0.22	0.12, 0.33	**0.000**	0.13	0.02, 0.24	0.026	0.13	0.02, 0.24	0.023	0.11	-0.01, 0.23	0.063	-0.01	-0.07, 0.05	0.665
DNAm-CRP	-0.02	-0.15, 0.11	0.803	0.02	-0.11, 0.14	0.814	0.04	-0.08, 0.17	0.510	0.13	-0.01, 0.26	0.064	0.02	-0.11, 0.16	0.751	-0.02	-0.14, 0.1	0.735	0.04	-0.05, 0.13	0.344
DunedinPoAm	-0.14	-0.26, -0.01	0.031	-0.05	-0.16, 0.07	0.432	-0.04	-0.16, 0.08	0.488	-0.06	-0.18, 0.07	0.385	-0.07	-0.18, 0.04	0.197	0.01	-0.11, 0.13	0.894	0.02	-0.09, 0.12	0.768
PGS-CRP	0.01	-0.11, 0.12	0.914	0.01	-0.1, 0.12	0.885	-0.03	-0.13, 0.07	0.570	0.00	-0.11, 0.11	0.989	-0.04	-0.16, 0.08	0.491	-0.02	-0.12, 0.08	0.709	-0.02	-0.09, 0.06	0.695

Standardized regression coefficients (*r*) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and uncorrected *p*-value calculated by regressing parent-reported mental health on DNA-methylation measures and PGS-CRP with and without controlling for normed BMI z-scores, puberty (residualized for age within each gender), DNA-methylation profiles of smoking (DNAm-smoke), and family-level disadvantage separately. *P*-values, where FDR corrected *p*-values < 0.05, are marked in bold. PGS analyses were restricted to participants of European ancestries as indicated by genetic ancestry PCs that are comparable to the GWAS discovery sample. [a]All models included covariate adjustment for age, gender, and an age by gender interaction. Methylation scores and PGS-CRP were residualized for technical covariates (for methylation: array, slide, batch, cell composition; for PGS-CRP: genetic ancestry PCs). *Note:* ADHD=attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder; ODD=oppositional defiant disorder; CD= conduct disorder.

Table S9. Associations between DNA-methylation with parent-reported mental health for each racial/ethnic group.

	Internalizing			**Attention Problems**			**Aggression**			**Rule-Breaking**			**ADHD**			**ODD**			**CD**		
	White																				
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	0.22	0.09, 0.34	**0.001**	0.08	-0.06, 0.22	0.235	0.28	0.09, 0.46	**0.003**	0.09	-0.05, 0.22	0.211	0.15	0.01, 0.29	0.038	0.10	-0.04, 0.24	0.156	0.26	-0.87, 1.39	0.652
DunedinPoAm	0.18	0.04, 0.31	**0.010**	0.12	-0.02, 0.27	0.090	0.10	-0.1, 0.3	0.320	0.06	-0.07, 0.19	0.372	0.11	-0.04, 0.25	0.157	0.01	-0.14, 0.15	0.945	-0.08	-1.07, 0.9	0.869
	Latinx																				
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	0.21	-0.02, 0.44	0.069	-0.03	-0.37, 0.3	0.841	0.26	-0.05, 0.58	0.104	0.08	-0.33, 0.49	0.700	0.10	-0.11, 0.31	0.339	0.03	-0.15, 0.21	0.737	-0.08	-0.26, 0.11	0.405
DunedinPoAm	0.28	0.07, 0.49	0.009	0.00	-0.34, 0.34	0.980	0.47	0.09, 0.84	0.014	-0.02	-0.26, 0.21	0.853	0.21	0.02, 0.4	0.034	0.02	-0.12, 0.17	0.742	0.06	-0.13, 0.26	0.521
	Latinx-White																				
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	-0.27	-0.5, -0.04	0.020	-0.01	-0.32, 0.3	0.935	-0.18	-0.5, 0.13	0.252	0.07	-0.14, 0.28	0.508	-0.02	-0.36, 0.33	0.917	0.19	-0.24, 0.61	0.387	0.10	-0.16, 0.36	0.438
DunedinPoAm	-0.07	-0.29, 0.15	0.523	0.05	-0.26, 0.36	0.756	-0.07	-0.4, 0.26	0.681	-0.11	-0.35, 0.13	0.356	0.09	-0.18, 0.35	0.525	0.12	-0.18, 0.42	0.442	0.04	-0.17, 0.25	0.693
	Black +																				
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	0.17	-0.44, 0.77	0.585	0.49	-0.3, 1.27	0.223	0.12	-0.5, 0.74	0.701	-0.05	-0.66, 0.56	0.872	-0.21	-0.62, 0.2	0.321	-0.30	-0.92, 0.32	0.342	0.52	-0.23, 1.28	0.175
DunedinPoAm	-0.04	-0.4, 0.31	0.813	-0.07	-0.36, 0.22	0.645	0.04	-0.39, 0.48	0.852	-0.15	-0.44, 0.15	0.326	0.14	-0.23, 0.52	0.459	0.20	-0.32, 0.73	0.450	0.68	0.13, 1.23	0.016
	Asian +																				
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	-0.14	-0.42, 0.13	0.308	-0.17	-0.65, 0.31	0.484	0.04	-0.27, 0.36	0.791	-0.25	-0.61, 0.12	0.186	0.04	-0.16, 0.25	0.696	-0.08	-0.37, 0.22	0.614	-0.11	-0.38, 0.17	0.439
DunedinPoAm	-0.28	-0.63, 0.08	0.130	-0.26	-0.75, 0.23	0.294	-0.29	-0.67, 0.1	0.149	-0.24	-0.61, 0.13	0.200	-0.08	-0.34, 0.18	0.541	-0.07	-0.35, 0.22	0.648	0.55	0.3, 0.8	**0.000**

Standardized regression coefficients (*r*) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and uncorrected *p*-value calculated by regressing parent-reported mental health on DNA-methylation measures within each racial/ethnic group. [a]All models included covariate adjustment for age, gender, and an age by gender interaction. Methylation scores were residualized for technical covariates (array, slide, batch, cell composition). *Note:* ADHD=attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder; ODD=oppositional defiant disorder; CD= conduct disorder.

Table S10. Associations between DNA-methylation with self-reported mental health for each racial/ethnic group.

	Internalizing			Attention Problems			Aggression			Rule-Breaking			ADHD			ODD			CD		
White																					
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	0.07	-0.1, 0.23	0.432	0.08	-0.07, 0.23	0.278	0.073	-0.08, 0.22	0.344	0.16	0.01, 0.32	0.038	0.12	-0.04, 0.28	0.137	0.00	-0.15, 0.14	0.956	0.08	0, 0.16	0.058
DunedinPoAm	-0.12	-0.29, 0.05	0.161	0.05	-0.1, 0.19	0.522	-0.01	-0.16, 0.15	0.938	0.05	-0.1, 0.2	0.497	-0.01	-0.16, 0.14	0.892	0.02	-0.15, 0.2	0.795	0.10	-0.01, 0.22	0.073
Latinx																					
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	-0.40	-0.76, -0.04	0.030	-0.08	-0.38, 0.22	0.587	0.05	-0.37, 0.46	0.823	-0.05	-0.38, 0.29	0.790	-0.24	-0.66, 0.18	0.269	-0.23	-0.52, 0.06	0.115	-0.14	-0.9, 0.61	0.714
DunedinPoAm	-0.03	-0.29, 0.24	0.853	0.02	-0.25, 0.29	0.903	0.14	-0.11, 0.38	0.266	-0.06	-0.26, 0.14	0.548	-0.07	-0.33, 0.2	0.616	0.05	-0.2, 0.3	0.705	-0.40	-1.11, 0.3	0.260
Latinx-White																					
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	-0.30	-0.67, 0.07	0.110	0.03	-0.27, 0.33	0.845	0.07	-0.34, 0.48	0.740	-0.05	-0.35, 0.26	0.768	-0.14	-0.56, 0.28	0.511	0.31	-0.17, 0.78	0.207	-0.41	-0.83, 0.01	0.058
DunedinPoAm	-0.02	-0.28, 0.24	0.889	0.03	-0.24, 0.3	0.839	0.14	-0.11, 0.39	0.262	-0.01	-0.26, 0.14	0.533	-0.03	-0.31, 0.25	0.828	0.08	-0.14, 0.3	0.463	-0.22	-0.94, 0.51	0.559
Black +																					
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	0.16	-0.39, 0.7	0.575	-0.28	-0.95, 0.39	0.411	0.33	-0.35, 1.01	0.344	0.29	-0.3, 0.89	0.330	-0.04	-0.8, 0.71	0.917	0.27	-0.16, 0.69	0.218	1.01	-2.43, 4.46	0.564
DunedinPoAm	-0.12	-0.41, 0.16	0.393	-0.28	-0.64, 0.08	0.125	0.18	-0.18, 0.53	0.325	-0.07	-0.35, 0.22	0.637	-0.27	-0.58, 0.04	0.089	0.28	-0.06, 0.62	0.104	-0.05	-2.92, 2.82	0.972
Asian +																					
	r	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*	*r*	CI	*p*
DNAm-CRP	0.13	-0.24, 0.49	0.496	0.14	-0.24, 0.51	0.474	0.09	-0.32, 0.49	0.664	0.08	-0.33, 0.49	0.714	-0.21	-0.47, 0.04	0.103	-0.19	-0.53, 0.14	0.255	-0.11	-0.55, 0.33	0.619
DunedinPoAm	-0.20	-0.62, 0.22	0.355	-0.10	-0.56, 0.37	0.689	-0.28	-0.77, 0.2	0.252	-0.25	-0.66, 0.17	0.251	-0.27	-0.56, 0.03	0.073	-0.40	-0.72, -0.08	0.014	-0.28	-0.78, 0.22	0.269

Standardized regression coefficients (*r*) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and uncorrected *p*-value calculated by regressing self-reported mental health on DNA-methylation measures within each racial/ethnic group. [a]All models included covariate adjustment for age, gender, and an age by gender interaction. Methylation scores were residualized for technical covariates (array, slide, batch, cell composition). *Note:* ADHD=attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder; ODD=oppositional defiant disorder; CD= conduct disorder.

Table S11. Co-twin-control associations between DNA-methylation and parent-reported mental health.

	DNAm-CRP			DunedinPoAm		
	***r*A**	**CI**	***p***	***r*A**	**CI**	***p***
Internalizing	0.28	-0.10, 0.66	0.146	0.30	-0.19, 0.78	0.226
Attention problems	0.23	-0.24, 0.70	0.339	0.21	-0.38, 0.80	0.488
Aggression	0.30	0.02, 0.58	**0.037**	0.15	-0.23, 0.53	0.431
Rule-breaking	0.19	-0.03, 0.41	0.086	0.12	-0.14, 0.38	0.375
ADHD	0.05	-0.09– 0.18	0.505	0.077	-0.08, 0.24	0.340
ODD	0.08	-0.10, 0.26	0.370	0.03	-0.30, 0.36	0.854
CD	0.26	-0.50, 1.02	0.502	0.40	-0.43, 1.22	0.348
	***r*C**	**CI**	***p***	***r*C**	**CI**	***p***
Internalizing	-1	-1, -1	<0.001	-0.48	-5.72, 4.75	0.857
Attention problems	-1	-1, -1	<0.001	0.18	-2.70, 3.06	0.904
Aggression	1	1, 1	<0.001	1	1, 1	<0.001
Rule-breaking	-0.96	-1.71, -0.22	0.011	1	1, 1	<0.001
ADHD	-0.96	-0.96, -0.96	<0.001	1	1, 1	<0.001
ODD	-0.78	-3.34, 1.78	0.553	1	1, 1	<0.001
CD	-1	-1, -1	<0.001	-1	-1, -1	<0.001
	***r*E**	**CI**	***p***	***r*E**	**CI**	***p***
Internalizing	-0.07	-0.19, 0.05	0.248	-0.03	-0.16, 0.10	0.671
Attention problems	-0.04	-0.17, 0.10	0.591	-0.05	-0.18, 0.08	0.470
Aggression	-0.12	-0.27, 0.03	0.117	-0.14	-0.28, 0.01	0.062
Rule-breaking	-0.09	-0.22, 0.03	0.145	-0.11	-0.23, 0.01	0.075
ADHD	0.08	-0.05, 0.21	0.221	0.09	-0.02, 0.20	0.106
ODD	0.02	-0.09, 0.12	0.766	-0.04	-0.13, 0.06	0.424
CD	0.04	-0.07, 0.15	0.436	0.01	-0.09, 0.10	0.915

Regression coefficients, 95% confidence intervals (CIs), and *p*-value calculated in a bivariate biometric model that decomposed the association between DNA-methylation and cognition into components representing additive genetic factors (*A*), environmental factors shared by twins living in the same home (*C*), and environmental factors unique to each twin (*E*). *r*A is the correlation between the *A* components of variation in DNA-methylation and cognition, which reflects the extent to which genetic variation in DNAm accounts for differences in cognitive functioning. *r*C is the correlation between the *C* components of variation in DNA-methylation and cognition, which reflects the extent to which shared environmental variation in DNAm accounts for differences in cognitive functioning. *r*E is the correlation between the *E* components of variation in DNA-methylation and cognition, which reflects the extent to which identical twins who differ from their co-twins in DNAm show corresponding differences in their cognitive functioning. *Note:* ADHD=attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder; ODD=oppositional defiant disorder; CD= conduct disorder.