

1 **Mutual relationships between head injury and conduct problems in children aged 9 months to**
2 **14 years in the UK Millennium Cohort Study**

3 Valerie Brandt, PhD¹, Charlotte Hall, MSc¹, Hedwig Eisenbarth, PhD², James Hall, DPhil³

4

5 ¹ School of Psychology, Center for Innovation in Mental Health, University of Southampton, UK

6 ² School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

7 ³ Southampton Education School, University of Southampton, UK

8

9 **Short title:** HEAD INJURIES AND CONDUCT PROBLEMS

10

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Research suggests a link between acquired head injury and signs of conduct disorder,
3 with a majority of findings based on retrospective reports and comparison samples. The relationship
4 between head injuries and conduct problems and how they may influence one another during
5 development is currently unclear. This study aimed to investigate direct and indirect associations
6 between head injury and conduct problems through to early adolescence.

7 **Methods:** Data from the UK Millennium Cohort Study was used to investigate the relationship
8 between conduct problems as assessed by the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire and parent
9 reported head injury over time, at ages 9 months, 3, 5, 7, 11 and 14 years, using a cross-lagged path
10 analysis. This is data from 18,552 children, participating in a UK cohort study that is representative of
11 the UK population. We included 7,041 (3,308 male) children, who had full information about head
12 injuries and conduct problems at age 14.

13 **Results:** We found a mutual association between childhood head injuries and conduct problems but
14 with distinct timings: Head injury between 5-7 years predicted greater chance of conduct problems at
15 age 11 and 14 years, while greater conduct problems at 5 years predicted a significantly greater
16 chance of a head injury at age 7-11 years.

17 **Conclusions:** These findings have important implications for the timing of preventive and
18 ameliorative interventions. Prior to school entry, interventions aiming to reduce conduct problems
19 would appear most effective at reducing likelihood of head injuries in future years. However,
20 equivalent interventions targeting head injuries would be better timed either as children are entering
21 formal primary education, or soon after they have entered.

22 **Keywords:** head injuries; conduct problems; longitudinal; gender; developmental impact

23

1 Introduction

2 Conduct problems encompass aggressive, destructive and deceptive behaviour, such as
3 violating rules or social norms or breaking the law. If these problems are an ongoing pattern, conduct
4 disorder can be diagnosed¹. Conduct disorder is associated with risk taking behaviour^{2,3}, probably due
5 to impaired fear conditioning, hyporeactivity to incentives and impairments of the paralimbic system⁴.
6 While research has shown that losing one's temper and displays of mild aggression are common
7 amongst healthy children⁵, aggressive behaviour that overcomes expected age-related and social
8 norms in childhood has a high degree of persistency^{6,7}. This is often followed by clinically significant
9 problems arising in adolescence and adulthood⁸⁻¹¹, such as greater delinquency, violence, poor mental
10 and physical health, and economic problems¹¹. Potential causes of conduct problems in young people
11 are diverse and include social, familial and neurodevelopmental risk factors¹¹. One of these risk
12 factors is head injury.

13 Head injury is the main cause of death and disability for children and adolescents in the UK
14 ¹². Up to 1.4 million individuals attend hospital for a head injury in England and Wales each year, and
15 around 33% to 50% of those are children and adolescents younger than 15 years old¹². Although head
16 injuries and TBIs are not clearly distinct, partially because most individuals with a head injury will
17 not receive a brain scan, a difference between mild head injuries and TBIs can be made based on
18 clinical criteria. The national institute for health and care excellence (NICE) define head injuries as
19 any trauma to the head excluding superficial facial injuries¹², while it defines TBIs as head injuries
20 resulting in structural damage and/or new onset or worsening disruption of brain function such as
21 amnesia or aphasia¹².

22 Some studies have found a relationship between head injuries and aggressive or delinquent
23 behaviour. For instance, some clinical studies have shown increased aggressive behaviour following
24 TBIs¹³⁻¹⁷, and TBIs have been shown to be more common in offenders than in non-offenders¹⁸⁻²⁰. Two
25 longitudinal studies showed that head injuries in adolescence predicted more interpersonal violence in
26 early adulthood²¹, and violent behaviour one year later²². However, pre-existing conduct problems
27 also have also been shown to be exacerbated by TBIs²³⁻²⁹ and it is therefore important to take into
28 account pre-injury levels of aggressive behaviour when assessing the effects of TBIs or head injuries
29 more generally.

30 Only 10.9% of TBIs that are reported to an emergency department are moderate or severe³⁰.
31 Mild head injuries without severe consequences (e.g. bumping one's head without losing
32 consciousness) are common in childhood³¹, and their often persistent and progressive long-term
33 consequences are less well understood³². It is therefore largely unclear how head injuries and conduct
34 problems may be related across development. Furthermore, the direction of the association between

1 head injury and conduct problems is currently unclear, i.e. does a head injury lead to more conduct
2 problems or do conduct problems increase the likelihood of head injuries? This is particularly true for
3 children. Reflecting on the source of the current uncertainty in the literature, there are a number of
4 methodological limitations including: a) frequent use of small and niche populations (clinical samples,
5 moderate – severe TBI, criminal offending populations), which limits generalisability; b) reliance on
6 retrospective, self-report data, which limits reliability and validity; and c) a use of cross-sectional
7 designs, which do not allow a developmental interpretation of the relationship between head injuries
8 and conduct problems.

9 Therefore, the current study uses a nationally representative UK cohort that were surveyed six
10 times from age 9 months to 14 years between 2000-2015 to investigate the relationship between head
11 injury and conduct problems in children over time. To account for other well-established risk factors
12 for conduct problems, such as male gender and low family income³³, these were included as
13 covariates in this study. Based on previous research we hypothesised that conduct problems and
14 incidence of head injury exacerbate each other over time.

15

16 **Methods**

17 This study uses Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) data³⁴⁻³⁸, which follows the development of
18 19,517 children born between 2000-2002 in the UK³⁹. Families were initially recruited via random
19 sampling using all listed parents on the UK Child Benefit registers. The study is disproportionately
20 stratified to allow areas of minority (e.g. ethnic minorities and disadvantaged areas) to be sufficiently
21 signified, resulting in a nationally representative cohort. The MCS includes weight variables to allow
22 for accurate representation of all population groups. Interviews with parents took place when the
23 children's age was 9 months (T1), 3 (T2), 5 (T3), 7 (T4), 11 (T5), and 14 years (T6). Parents gave
24 written informed consent. This secondary data analysis was approved by the University of
25 Southampton Ethics Committee.

26 **Participants**

27 Only first-born children were included in this study, to minimise family related extraneous
28 variables^{40,41}. After matching data across all time points for first-borns (T1-6), the dataset included $n =$
29 18,552 participants. In addition, children were excluded if they had a diagnosis of Attention Deficit
30 Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) or any indicators of epilepsy (e.g. seizures, Febrile fits and Fainting
31 due to seizures) at any MCS data sweep, due to the increased risk of head injury associated with both
32 diagnoses^{42,43}. $N = 497$ had an ADHD diagnosis, $n = 887$ had an epilepsy diagnosis, $n = 45$ had both,

1 overall excluded n = 1339. There are different possibilities to handle missing data. For our analyses,
2 only participants with no missing data for the outcome variables at the latest data sweep of the MCS
3 (T6) were included⁴⁴, resulting in n = 7041 (n = 3308 male) participants⁴⁵.

4 **Measures**

5 **Conduct Problems.** The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸ has 25 items
6 with a three-point rating scale (0 = not true, 1 = somewhat true, 3 = certainly true), and five subscales:
7 hyperactivity / inattention, emotional difficulties, conduct problems, peer problems and the prosocial
8 behaviour subscale, with good overall psychometric properties and good performance as screening
9 instruments for a number of psychiatric diagnoses^{49,50}. SDQ parent-rated data was collected from T2
10 (age 3). This study used the conduct problems subscale (5 items), with questions regarding aggressive
11 behaviour, e.g. *'often fights with other children or bullies them'*. A higher score indicates a higher
12 level of conduct problems (possible range: 0-10).

13 **Head injury.** At each data sweep parents reported if their child had experienced any
14 accidents or injuries since the last data sweep. If yes, the frequency of accidents/ injuries was recorded
15 and several injuries could be further defined: *'Thinking about the most severe (or only) accident or*
16 *injury, what sort of accident or injury was it?'* The responses were then coded into categories by
17 interviewers (For the full list of injury categories see supplement 1). For the current study, a binary
18 measure of Head Injury was constructed:

19 1. Bang to the head (coded 1) encompassing those coded with a 'loss of
20 consciousness/knocked out', or 'injury to the head without being knocked out',

21 2) No head injury (coded 0) including no injuries and every injury other than head injury.

22 **Covariates.** Income and gender have been found to be associated with problematic
23 behaviour³³. Cohort member's gender (n = 3308 male [47%]) and OECD equivalized household
24 income (mean = 315, SD = 205, n = 6968) from T1 were therefore included in the path analysis.
25 Males were coded 1, females 2.

26 **Data analysis.** Weights were used. Mplus 7.4⁵¹ was used to run a cross-lagged path analysis
27 (Figure 1) to test reciprocal influences on head injury and conduct problems, with weighted least
28 square means to account for missing data. Path analysis involves estimating direct, indirect, and total
29 effects (which is the sum of the direct effect plus all indirect effects). The indirect effects can also be
30 summed to produce a total indirect effect. For a classic primer on direct, indirect, and total effects see
31 ⁵². These effects are estimated as matter of course within the Mplus software.

1 Error terms were included for all indicators for consideration of extraneous factors.
2 Satisfactory model fit was evaluated via the model fit indicators: Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI;
3 satisfactory values ~0.96), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; satisfactory values ~0.95), WRMR, and
4 Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; satisfactory values <.06). Where the dependent
5 variable is continuous (CP), standardised beta values with significance levels are reported. For the
6 binary variable head injury, the standardised z-value (index of probit regression) is reported. Results
7 are considered significant with $\alpha=.05$.

8 **Data availability.** Data are available through the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) ³⁴⁻³⁸.

9 **Results**

10 *Cross-lagged path analysis*

11 Table 1 shows the descriptive data for number of head injuries and conduct disorder scores
12 over time. The cross-lagged path analysis of head injury and conduct problems for UK children aged
13 9 months – 14 years in the Millennium Cohort Study showed acceptable model fit⁵³ with an RMSEA
14 of .04, CFI of .94, TLI of .88 and WRMR of 2.04 ($\chi^2_{(36)} = 526.19, p < .001$).

15 Considering direct effects linking variables at time T to time T+1: conduct problems at each
16 time point significantly predicted conduct problems at the following time point as did head injury. For
17 direct and indirect effects linking variables at time T to variables at time points later than T+1: head
18 injury at age 7 had a significant direct effect on conduct problems at age 11 (Figure 1) and an indirect
19 effect on conduct problems at age 14 (Table 3). Conduct problems at age 3 had a significant indirect
20 effect on head injury at age 11 (Table 3) but there were no significant direct effects of conduct
21 problems on head injury (Figure 1, Table 3).

22

23 *Covariate effects*

24 Lower income was significantly related to higher conduct problem at all ages (3 – 14) but to
25 higher likelihood for head injury only at age 11 (Table 2). Male gender was significantly related to
26 higher conduct problems scores age 3-7 and to a higher likelihood for obtaining a head injury at all
27 ages from 3-14 years. Surprisingly, females showed greater average parent-reported conduct problems
28 at age 14 than males.

29

1 Discussion

2 This study aimed to characterise the relationship between conduct problems and head injuries
3 between age 9 months to 14 years in a sample of children representative of the general population in
4 the UK. The results show three ways in which head injuries and conduct problems are associated
5 across development. Most importantly though, head injuries at most ages did not lead to a direct
6 increase in conduct problems or vice versa. Only head injury between 5-7 years was a significant risk
7 factor for conduct problems (at age 11 and 14). Further, only greater conduct problems between 1-3
8 years was a risk factor for head injury (at age 11).

9 Setting these results in context, previous studies in community samples have found increased
10 problematic behaviour in adolescents following or associated with a head injury^{22,54}. However, the
11 initial assessment by Buckley & Chapman (2017) included adolescents with a mean age of 13.45,
12 whereas participants in the last wave of the current study were 14 years old. Ilie et al. (2014)
13 investigated cross-sectional data and only investigated head injuries with loss of consciousness, while
14 the majority of head injuries in general, and in this sample, did not result in loss of consciousness.
15 Severity of head injury (e.g. loss of consciousness, amnesia) may play a role with regard to conduct
16 problems but results have been mixed. A small study found that children with mild TBIs did not differ
17 from children with orthopaedic injuries and both were significantly less aggressive than children with
18 severe TBIs⁵⁵, while other studies found that TBIs of all severity were associated with more conduct
19 problems^{17,56}. Catroppa and colleagues (2008) showed that injury severity significantly predicted post-
20 injury behavioural problems in 2-6 year olds, however, behaviour pre-injury was the strongest
21 predictor and should be controlled for⁵⁷. While only a minority of head injuries in this study resulted
22 in loss of consciousness, injuries were significant enough that most children were taken to hospital.
23 The data are representative of the UK population and therefore provide a clearer picture of the
24 relationship between head injury and conduct problems, without focusing on severe cases. The
25 findings are important because head injuries are common but are mild in the majority of cases³¹. It
26 would be interesting to explore the difference between head injuries with and without a loss of
27 consciousness. However, the number of children with a severe head injury was too small for a
28 complex model, particularly at T1 (Table 1).

29 The exact relationship between age at injury and conduct problems has also remained unclear,
30 with some contradictory findings^{25,58,59}. A twin study showed that head injuries early in childhood
31 were associated with a delayed decline in impulsivity and greater increase in reactive aggressiveness
32 by adolescence⁶⁰. However, head injury was assessed retrospectively. Our results indicate that age at
33 injury plays a role. While head injuries do not lead to higher levels of conduct problems at most ages,
34 it appears that they can, if occurring between age 5-7. Our results also showed that there was an

1 indirect effect of conduct problems at age 3 on likelihood of head injury at age 11. This is roughly in
2 line with a previous study showing that aggressive behaviour predicts rate of any accidental injuries in
3 5-10 year olds⁶¹. Previous cross-sectional studies regarding the link between head injury and
4 aggressive behaviour^{21,22,28,54,59,62-64} were unable to determine whether head injury leads to aggression,
5 or if aggression leads to head injury⁶⁵. Our results suggest that both can be the case.

6 The results have important implications for the timing of preventive and ameliorative
7 interventions. Interventions aiming to reduce conduct problems might be most effectively tailored to
8 children before they enter school, to reduce likelihood of subsequent head injury. Interventions
9 targeting the prevention of head injury in order to reduce subsequent conduct problems might be most
10 effective when children enter formal primary education, or in the early period of primary education.
11 The education system could facilitate interventions in early primary school. For instance, accident
12 prevention, particularly in boys, might be an effective strategy to reduce head injuries. It would be
13 useful to identify where most head injuries occur (school or home setting, sports, etc.). Interventions
14 identifying and treating conduct problems prior to school entry may be more difficult and involve
15 parent training or screening by the GP. Existing parent trainings for conduct problems in children⁶⁶
16 should include head injury prevention aspects.

17 Conduct problems decreased from age 3 over time. Furthermore, conduct problems
18 significantly predicted conduct problems at each following time point. This finding is in line with
19 previous research, showing that physical aggression tends to decrease in early childhood in the
20 majority of children^{67,68} and that children typically follow stable trajectories^{67,69}; for review see⁷⁰.
21 Interestingly, females had greater average parent-reported conduct problems at age 14 than boys
22 (while controlling for income). Previous research in the MCS dataset has pointed to a group of
23 children who have a school-onset trajectory of conduct problems and this was more common in girls
24 than in boys⁷¹. Moreover, while physical aggression is more common in boys, other symptoms of
25 conduct problems, such as lying and cheating, can be more prevalent in girls⁷². Future research should
26 address the question which factors change girls' conduct problem trajectories during adolescence.

27 In line with previous research⁷³, our results also revealed that those who have experienced one
28 head injury, are likely to experience another. Several risk factors may play a role in repeated head
29 injuries. Some people may be more prone to having accidents than others⁷⁴. Particularly head injuries
30 are often followed by a range of, sometimes subtle, physical, cognitive, and affective changes⁷⁵. As
31 our data were based on general population interviews rather than clinical data, parental factors, such
32 as a higher likelihood to seek medical treatment by some parents, cannot explain this stable effect.
33 Another risk factor for head injury is physical abuse^{76,77}, which is also a risk factor for conduct
34 problems⁷⁸. If head injuries and conduct problems are not directly associated at most ages, previous

1 findings of associations between the two variables may be better explained by other common
2 variables that influence both head injury and conduct problems, such as environmental factors. We
3 did not determine specific risk factors for conduct problems and head injury other than gender and
4 income^{30,79}. Future studies could include further risk factors for conduct problems, such as other types
5 of adverse life events, in order to further dissociate specific impact of brain injury from environmental
6 factors.

7 Males were more likely than females to experience a head injury after the age of 9 months.
8 This is in line with previous research, showing that being male and having a lower SES increases the
9 risk for experiencing a head injury³⁰. Our data confirms that these factors also increase the risk of
10 displaying conduct problems³³ though income only played a minor role in the risk for head injury.
11 Future studies should investigate risk factors for repeated head injuries and their interactions in more
12 detail.

13 Strengths of this study are the large number of children, its longitudinal nature and its naturalistic
14 setting, i.e. all head injuries (with and without loss of consciousness) were compared to a control
15 group of all others (without injury and all injuries other than head injury). We can therefore draw
16 conclusions based on the general population, not on a clinical sample. Furthermore, head injuries and
17 conduct problems were assessed at each time point and should not be as biased by memory as other
18 retrospective data. Limitations include that head injuries were broadly defined, only first-borns were
19 included, and that we were unable to differentiate between severe and less severe head injuries.
20 Moreover, we used a fairly simple model, only controlling for the main risk factors for conduct
21 problems and head injuries, i.e. gender and family income. Future studies should take into account
22 further risk factors.

23 **Conclusions**

24 Based on longitudinal data from the general population in the UK, we find that head injuries
25 between 5-7 years are associated with increased conduct problems at ages 11 and 14 and that conduct
26 problems between 3-5 years are associated with an increased risk for head injuries at age 11 years.
27 These findings show which time windows during development might be most important for applying
28 interventions that target accident prevention and conduct problems with regard to their mutual
29 association over time.

1 References

- 2 1. DSM-5. *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*. 5 ed. Arlington, VA: American
3 Psychiatric Publishing; 2013.
- 4 2. Pharo H, Sim C, Graham M, Gross J, Hayne H. Risky business: executive function, personality,
5 and reckless behavior during adolescence and emerging adulthood. *Behav Neurosci*.
6 2011;125(6):970-978.
- 7 3. Sully K, Sonuga-Barke EJ, Savage J, Fairchild G. Investigating the Familial Basis of Heightened
8 Risk-Taking in Adolescents With Conduct Disorder and Their Unaffected Relatives. *Dev*
9 *Neuropsychol*. 2016;41(1-2):93-106.
- 10 4. Matthys W, Vanderschuren LJ, Schutter DJ. The neurobiology of oppositional defiant
11 disorder and conduct disorder: altered functioning in three mental domains. *Dev*
12 *Psychopathol*. 2013;25(1):193-207.
- 13 5. Girard LC, Tremblay RE, Nagin D, Cote SM. Development of Aggression Subtypes from
14 Childhood to Adolescence: a Group-Based Multi-Trajectory Modelling Perspective. *J Abnorm*
15 *Child Psychol*. 2019;47(5):825-838.
- 16 6. Moffitt TE, Houts R, Asherson P, et al. Is Adult ADHD a Childhood-Onset
17 Neurodevelopmental Disorder? Evidence From a Four-Decade Longitudinal Cohort Study.
18 *Am J Psychiatry*. 2015;172(10):967-977.
- 19 7. Moffitt TE, Caspi A. Childhood predictors differentiate life-course persistent and
20 adolescence-limited antisocial pathways among males and females. *Dev Psychopathol*.
21 2001;13(2):355-375.
- 22 8. Broidy LM, Nagin DS, Tremblay RE, et al. Developmental trajectories of childhood disruptive
23 behaviors and adolescent delinquency: a six-site, cross-national study. *Dev Psychol*.
24 2003;39(2):222-245.
- 25 9. Kokko K, Pulkkinen L. Aggression in childhood and long-term unemployment in adulthood: a
26 cycle of maladaptation and some protective factors. *Dev Psychol*. 2000;36(4):463-472.
- 27 10. Kokko K, Pulkkinen L, Huesmann LR, Dubow EF, Boxer P. Intensity of Aggression in Childhood
28 as a Predictor of Different Forms of Adult Aggression: A Two-Country (Finland and United
29 States) Analysis. *J Res Adolesc*. 2009;19(1):9-34.
- 30 11. Odgers CL, Moffitt TE, Broadbent JM, et al. Female and male antisocial trajectories: from
31 childhood origins to adult outcomes. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2008;20(2):673-716.
- 32 12. Excellence NifHaC. Head injury: assessment and early management
33 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg176>. Published 2014. Accessed 06/06/2020.
- 34 13. Roy D, Vaishnavi S, Han D, Rao V. Correlates and Prevalence of Aggression at Six Months and
35 One Year After First-Time Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*.
36 2017;29(4):334-342.
- 37 14. Rao V, Rosenberg P, Bertrand M, et al. Aggression after traumatic brain injury: prevalence
38 and correlates. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2009;21(4):420-429.
- 39 15. Brown S, O'Rourke S, Schwannauer M. Risk factors for inpatient violence and self-harm in
40 forensic psychiatry: the role of head injury, schizophrenia and substance misuse. *Brain Inj*.
41 2019;33(3):313-321.
- 42 16. Pastore V, Galbiati S, Recla M, Colombo K, Beretta E, Strazzer S. Psychological and
43 behavioural difficulties following severe TBI in adolescence: a comparison with a sample of
44 peers with brain lesions of other origin and with a control group. *Brain Inj*. 2018;32(8):1011-
45 1020.
- 46 17. Andrews TK, Rose FD, Johnson DA. Social and behavioural effects of traumatic brain injury in
47 children. *Brain Inj*. 1998;12(2):133-138.
- 48 18. Davies RC, Williams WH, Hinder D, Burgess CN, Mounce LT. Self-reported traumatic brain
49 injury and postconcussion symptoms in incarcerated youth. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*.
50 2012;27(3):E21-27.

- 1 19. Gordon WA, Spielman LA, Hahn-Ketter AE, Sy KTL. The Relationship Between Traumatic
2 Brain Injury and Criminality in Juvenile Offenders. *J Head Trauma Rehabil.* 2017;32(6):393-
3 403.
- 4 20. Chitsabesan P, Lennox C, Williams H, Tariq O, Shaw J. Traumatic brain injury in juvenile
5 offenders: findings from the comprehensive health assessment tool study and the
6 development of a specialist linkworker service. *J Head Trauma Rehabil.* 2015;30(2):106-115.
- 7 21. Stoddard SA, Zimmerman MA. Association of interpersonal violence with self-reported
8 history of head injury. *Pediatrics.* 2011;127(6):1074-1079.
- 9 22. Buckley L, Chapman RL. Associations between self-reported concussion with later violence
10 injury among Australian early adolescents. *J Public Health (Oxf).* 2017;39(1):52-57.
- 11 23. Greve KW, Sherwin E, Stanford MS, Mathias C, Love J, Ramzinski P. Personality and
12 neurocognitive correlates of impulsive aggression in long-term survivors of severe traumatic
13 brain injury. *Brain Inj.* 2001;15(3):255-262.
- 14 24. Tateno A, Jorge RE, Robinson RG. Clinical correlates of aggressive behavior after traumatic
15 brain injury. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci.* 2003;15(2):155-160.
- 16 25. Fishbein D, Dariotis JK, Ferguson PL, Pickelsimer EE. Relationships Between Traumatic Brain
17 Injury and Illicit Drug Use and Their Association With Aggression in Inmates. *Int J Offender
18 Ther Comp Criminol.* 2016;60(5):575-597.
- 19 26. Perron BE, Howard MO. Prevalence and correlates of traumatic brain injury among
20 delinquent youths. *Crim Behav Ment Health.* 2008;18(4):243-255.
- 21 27. Pitman I, Haddlesey C, Ramos SD, Oddy M, Fortescue D. The association between
22 neuropsychological performance and self-reported traumatic brain injury in a sample of
23 adult male prisoners in the UK. *Neuropsychol Rehabil.* 2015;25(5):763-779.
- 24 28. Farrer TJ, Frost RB, Hedges DW. Prevalence of traumatic brain injury in intimate partner
25 violence offenders compared to the general population: a meta-analysis. *Trauma Violence
26 Abuse.* 2012;13(2):77-82.
- 27 29. Vaughn MG, Salas-Wright CP, DeLisi M, Perron B. Correlates of traumatic brain injury among
28 juvenile offenders: a multi-site study. *Crim Behav Ment Health.* 2014;24(3):188-203.
- 29 30. Yates PJ, Williams WH, Harris A, Round A, Jenkins R. An epidemiological study of head
30 injuries in a UK population attending an emergency department. *J Neurol Neurosurg
31 Psychiatry.* 2006;77(5):699-701.
- 32 31. NICE. Guidance. Head injury: triage, assessment, investigation and early management of
33 head injury in children, young people and adults. 2014.
- 34 32. McKee AC, Daneshvar DH. The neuropathology of traumatic brain injury. *Handb Clin Neurol.*
35 2015;127:45-66.
- 36 33. Farrington DP. Childhood origins of antisocial behavior. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy.*
37 2005;12(3):177-190.
- 38 34. University of London Eol, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. Millenium Cohort Study: Fourth
39 Survey. In:2008.
- 40 35. University of London Eol, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. Millenium Cohort Study: Sixth
41 Survey. In:2015.
- 42 36. University of London Eol, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. Millenium Cohort Study: Fifth
43 Survey. In. 4 ed. UK Data Service SN 74642012.
- 44 37. University of London Eol, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. Millennium Cohort Study: Second
45 Survey. In. 9 ed. UK Data Service2003-2005.
- 46 38. University of London Eol, Centre for Longitudinal Studies. Millennium Cohort Study: First
47 Survey,. In. UK Data Service2001-2003.
- 48 39. Connelly R, Platt L. Cohort profile: UK Millennium Cohort Study (MCS). *Int J Epidemiol.*
49 2014;43(6):1719-1725.
- 50 40. McHale SM, Updegraff KA, Whiteman SD. Sibling Relationships and Influences in Childhood
51 and Adolescence. *J Marriage Fam.* 2012;74(5):913-930.

- 1 41. Mytton J, Towner E, Brussoni M, Gray S. Unintentional injuries in school-aged children and
2 adolescents: lessons from a systematic review of cohort studies. *Inj Prev*. 2009;15(2):111-
3 124.
- 4 42. Keenan HT, Hall GC, Marshall SW. Early head injury and attention deficit hyperactivity
5 disorder: retrospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2008;337:a1984.
- 6 43. Annegers JF, Coan SP. The risks of epilepsy after traumatic brain injury. *Seizure*.
7 2000;9(7):453-457.
- 8 44. Siddique J, Brown CH, Hedeker D, et al. Missing Data in Longitudinal Trials - Part B, Analytic
9 Issues. *Psychiatr Ann*. 2008;38(12):793-801.
- 10 45. Young R, Johnson DR. Imputing the Missing Y's: Implications for Survey Producers and
11 Survey Users. 2015.
- 12 46. Goodman R, Renfrew D, Mullick M. Predicting type of psychiatric disorder from Strengths
13 and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) scores in child mental health clinics in London and
14 Dhaka. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2000;9(2):129-134.
- 15 47. Goodman R. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note. *J Child Psychol*
16 *Psychiatry*. 1997;38(5):581-586.
- 17 48. Goodman R, Meltzer H, Bailey V. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a pilot study
18 on the validity of the self-report version. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 1998;7(3):125-130.
- 19 49. Stone LL, Otten R, Engels RC, Vermulst AA, Janssens JM. Psychometric properties of the
20 parent and teacher versions of the strengths and difficulties questionnaire for 4- to 12-year-
21 olds: a review. *Clin Child Fam Psychol Rev*. 2010;13(3):254-274.
- 22 50. Goodman R. Psychometric properties of the strengths and difficulties questionnaire. *J Am*
23 *Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2001;40(11):1337-1345.
- 24 51. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. Mplus User's Guide. In: sixth ed. Los Angeles 1998-2011.
- 25 52. Bollen KA. Total, direct, and indirect effects in structural equation models. *Sociological*
26 *methodology*. 1987;17:37-69.
- 27 53. Bentler PM, Bonett DG. Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance
28 structures. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1980;88(3):588 - 606.
- 29 54. Ilie G, Mann RE, Boak A, et al. Suicidality, bullying and other conduct and mental health
30 correlates of traumatic brain injury in adolescents. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(4):e94936.
- 31 55. Ong LC, Chandran V, Zasmani S, Lye MS. Outcome of closed head injury in Malaysian
32 children: neurocognitive and behavioural sequelae. *J Paediatr Child Health*. 1998;34(4):363-
33 368.
- 34 56. Scott C, McKinlay A, McLellan T, Britt E, Grace R, MacFarlane M. A comparison of adult
35 outcomes for males compared to females following pediatric traumatic brain injury.
36 *Neuropsychology*. 2015;29(4):501-508.
- 37 57. Catroppa C, Anderson VA, Morse SA, Haritou F, Rosenfeld JV. Outcome and predictors of
38 functional recovery 5 years following pediatric traumatic brain injury (TBI). *J Pediatr Psychol*.
39 2008;33(7):707-718.
- 40 58. Timonen M, Miettunen J, Hakko H, et al. The association of preceding traumatic brain injury
41 with mental disorders, alcoholism and criminality: the Northern Finland 1966 Birth Cohort
42 Study. *Psychiatry Res*. 2002;113(3):217-226.
- 43 59. Fazel S, Lichtenstein P, Grann M, Langstrom N. Risk of violent crime in individuals with
44 epilepsy and traumatic brain injury: a 35-year Swedish population study. *PLoS Med*.
45 2011;8(12):e1001150.
- 46 60. Fullerton AF, Jackson NJ, Tuvblad C, Raine A, Baker LA. Early childhood head injury
47 attenuates declines in impulsivity and aggression across adolescent development in twins.
48 *Neuropsychology*. 2019;33(8):1035-1044.
- 49 61. Bijur PE, Golding J, Haslum M. Persistence of occurrence of injury: can injuries of preschool
50 children predict injuries of school-aged children? *Pediatrics*. 1988;82(5):707-712.

- 1 62. Ferguson SD, Coccaro EF. History of mild to moderate traumatic brain injury and aggression
2 in physically healthy participants with and without personality disorder. *J Pers Disord.*
3 2009;23(3):230-239.
- 4 63. Walling SM, Meehan JC, Marshall AD, Holtzworth-Munroe A, Taft CT. The relationship of
5 intimate partner aggression to head injury, executive functioning, and intelligence. *J Marital*
6 *Fam Ther.* 2012;38(3):471-485.
- 7 64. Ilie G, Mann RE, Ialomiteanu A, et al. Traumatic brain injury, driver aggression and motor
8 vehicle collisions in Canadian adults. *Accid Anal Prev.* 2015;81:1-7.
- 9 65. Bellesi G, Barker ED, Brown L, Valmaggia L. Pediatric traumatic brain injury and antisocial
10 behavior: are they linked? A systematic review. *Brain Inj.* 2019;33(10):1272-1292.
- 11 66. Piotrowska PJ, Tully LA, Collins DAJ, et al. ParentWorks: Evaluation of an Online, Father-
12 Inclusive, Universal Parenting Intervention to Reduce Child Conduct Problems. *Child*
13 *Psychiatry Hum Dev.* 2020;51(4):503-513.
- 14 67. Cote SM, Vaillancourt T, Barker ED, Nagin D, Tremblay RE. The joint development of physical
15 and indirect aggression: Predictors of continuity and change during childhood. *Dev*
16 *Psychopathol.* 2007;19(1):37-55.
- 17 68. Petitclerc A, Boivin M, Dionne G, Zoccolillo M, Tremblay RE. Disregard for rules: the early
18 development and predictors of a specific dimension of disruptive behavior disorders. *J Child*
19 *Psychol Psychiatry.* 2009;50(12):1477-1484.
- 20 69. Bongers IL, Koot HM, van der Ende J, Verhulst FC. Developmental trajectories of
21 externalizing behaviors in childhood and adolescence. *Child Dev.* 2004;75(5):1523-1537.
- 22 70. Tremblay RE. Developmental origins of disruptive behaviour problems: the 'original sin'
23 hypothesis, epigenetics and their consequences for prevention. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry.*
24 2010;51(4):341-367.
- 25 71. Gutman LM, Joshi H, Parsonage M, Schoon I. Gender-Specific Trajectories of Conduct
26 Problems from Ages 3 to 11. *J Abnorm Child Psychol.* 2018;46(7):1467-1480.
- 27 72. Tiet QQ, Wasserman GA, Loeber R, McReynolds LS, Miller LS. Developmental and Sex
28 Differences in Types of Conduct Problems. *Journal of Child and Family Studies.* 2001;10:181-
29 197.
- 30 73. Swaine BR, Tremblay C, Platt RW, Grimard G, Zhang X, Pless IB. Previous head injury is a risk
31 factor for subsequent head injury in children: a longitudinal cohort study. *Pediatrics.*
32 2007;119(4):749-758.
- 33 74. Visser E, Pijl YJ, Stolk RP, Neeleman J, Rosmalen JG. Accident proneness, does it exist? A
34 review and meta-analysis. *Accid Anal Prev.* 2007;39(3):556-564.
- 35 75. Nolan A, Hennessy E, Krukowski K, et al. Repeated Mild Head Injury Leads to Wide-Ranging
36 Deficits in Higher-Order Cognitive Functions Associated with the Prefrontal Cortex. *J*
37 *Neurotrauma.* 2018;35(20):2425-2434.
- 38 76. Goldstein B, Kelly MM, Bruton D, Cox C. Inflicted versus accidental head injury in critically
39 injured children. *Crit Care Med.* 1993;21(9):1328-1332.
- 40 77. Hymel KP, Wang M, Chinchilli VM, et al. Estimating the probability of abusive head trauma
41 after abuse evaluation. *Child Abuse Negl.* 2019;88:266-274.
- 42 78. Litrownik AJ, Newton R, Hunter WM, English D, Everson MD. Exposure to Family Violence in
43 Young At-Risk Children: A Longitudinal Look at the Effects of Victimization and Witnessed
44 Physical and Psychological Aggression. *Journal of Family Violence.* 2003;18(1):59-73.
- 45 79. Amram O, Schuurman N, Pike I, et al. Socio Economic Status and Traumatic Brain Injury
46 amongst Pediatric Populations: A Spatial Analysis in Greater Vancouver. *Int J Environ Res*
47 *Public Health.* 2015;12(12):15594-15604.

48

49

1 Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for SDQ Conduct Problems and Head Injury

<i>MCS sweep</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Conduct Problems</i>		<i>Head Injury</i>			<i>Went to A & E n</i>
		<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>No Head injury n</i>	<i>All Head Injuries n (%)</i>	<i>Head injury with LOC n (%)</i>	
<i>1</i>	<i>9m</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>6746</i>	<i>295 (4.2)</i>	<i>3 (0.04) [1]</i>	<i>195</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3y</i>	<i>2.67 (1.98)</i>	<i>6153</i>	<i>5736</i>	<i>745 (11.5)</i>	<i>33 (0.5) [4.4]</i>	<i>607</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>5y</i>	<i>1.37 (1.39)</i>	<i>6435</i>	<i>6104</i>	<i>542 (8.2)</i>	<i>21 (0.3) [3.9]</i>	<i>470</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>7y</i>	<i>1.23 (1.42)</i>	<i>6329</i>	<i>6074</i>	<i>424 (6.5)</i>	<i>25 (0.4) [5.9]</i>	<i>356</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>11y</i>	<i>1.21 (1.43)</i>	<i>6547</i>	<i>5807</i>	<i>369 (6.0)</i>	<i>51 (0.8) [13.8]</i>	<i>300</i>
<i>6</i>	<i>14y</i>	<i>1.27 (1.48)</i>	<i>7041</i>	<i>6613</i>	<i>428 (6.1)</i>	<i>102 (1.4) [23.8]</i>	<i>356</i>

2 *Note. Columns on the right show: 1. how many children at each time point had no head injury; 2. a*
3 *head injury; 3. how many of those had a head injury with loss of consciousness (LOC); 4. how many*
4 *of those with a head injury went to casualty or A & E. Head injury group frequencies are shown as*
5 *total valid n, with percentages out of valid n responses shown in round brackets and percentage of*
6 *LOC in the Head Injury (HI) group in square brackets. Head Injury includes LOC; m = months, y =*
7 *years.*

8

Table 2: Direct (standardised) effects of gender and family income on head injury (HI) and conduct problems (CP) (statistically significant results are marked in bold)

	B	S.E.	P
Conduct Problems 2			
Income	- 0.20	0.01	< 0.001
Females	- 0.03	0.02	0.023
Conduct Problems 3			
Income	- 0.09	0.02	< 0.001
Females	- 0.04	0.01	0.004
Conduct Problems 4			
Income	- 0.05	0.02	0.001
Females	- 0.03	0.01	0.025
Conduct Problems 5			
Income	- 0.07	0.02	< 0.001
Females	- 0.01	0.01	0.530
Conduct Problems 6			
Income	-0.04	0.01	0.001
Females	0.04	0.01	0.002
	Z	S.E.	P
Head Injury 1			
Income	- 0.03	0.03	0.404
Females	- 0.01	0.03	0.711
Head Injury 2			
Income	- 0.02	0.03	0.335
Females	- 0.12	0.02	< 0.001
Head Injury 3			
Income	- 0.04	0.03	0.179
Females	- 0.08	0.03	0.003
Head Injury 4			
Income	- 0.07	0.03	0.038
Females	- 0.12	0.03	< 0.001
Head Injury 5			
Income	- 0.02	0.03	0.519
Females	- 0.06	0.03	0.042
Head Injury 6			

Income	- 0.01	0.03	0.719
Females	- 0.14	0.03	< 0.001

1 *Head injury at waves 1-6, Conduct problems (CP) at waves 2-6, see ages for each wave in Table 1.*

2

3

1


Table 3. Total indirect effects for head injury on conduct problems and for conduct problems on head injury

	Effect	β	S.E.	P
Head Injury T1				
Conduct Problems T3	Total indirect	0.03	0.02	0.136
Conduct Problems T4	Total indirect	0.02	0.02	0.158
Conduct Problems T5	Total indirect	0.02	0.01	0.130
Conduct Problems T6	Total indirect	0.01	0.01	0.120
Head Injury T2				
Conduct Problems T4	Total indirect	0.02	0.02	0.229
Conduct Problems T5	Total indirect	0.02	0.01	0.105
Conduct Problems T6	Total indirect	0.02	0.01	0.074
Head Injury T3				
Conduct Problems T5	Total indirect	0.01	0.02	0.710
Conduct Problems T6	Total indirect	0.01	0.01	0.426
Head Injury T4				
Conduct Problems T6	Total indirect	0.05	0.02	0.001
	Effect	Z	S.E.	P
Conduct Problems T2				
Head Injury T4	Total indirect	0.03	0.02	0.133
Head Injury T5	Total indirect	0.03	0.01	0.047
Head Injury T6	Total indirect	< 0.001	-0.01	0.992
Conduct Problems T3				
Head Injury T5	Total indirect	0.05	0.03	0.067
Head Injury T6	Total indirect	-0.001	0.02	0.940
Conduct Problems T4				
Head Injury T6	Total indirect	-0.01	0.02	0.728

2 *Note. Head Injury from time T1 to T6, and Conduct Problems from time T2 to T6 are shown, see ages*
3 *for each wave in Table 1.*

4

1



2

3 Figure 1: Cross-lagged path analysis of head injury (HI) and conduct problems (CP), over six time
 4 points aged 9 months – 14 years. Each arrow is accompanied by the appropriate standardised effect
 5 (Beta when CP is the dependent, Z when HI is the dependent). Standardized effects (same metrics)
 6 from the covariates can be found in Table 2.

7 * $p < .05$

8 ** $p < .01$

9 *** $p < .001$

10