

# **Lower Social Support is Associated with Accelerated Epigenetic Aging: Results from the Health and Retirement Study**

Kelly E. Rentscher<sup>a,b\*</sup>, Eric T. Klopach<sup>c</sup>, Eileen M. Crimmins<sup>c</sup>, Teresa E. Seeman<sup>d</sup>, Steve W. Cole<sup>b</sup>, Judith E. Carroll<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Medicine, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, 53226, USA

<sup>b</sup>Cousins Center for Psychoneuroimmunology, Semel Institute for Neuroscience and Human Behavior, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, 90095, USA

<sup>c</sup>Leonard Davis School of Gerontology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, 90089, USA

<sup>d</sup>Division of Geriatrics, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, 90095, USA

## **\*Corresponding author:**

Kelly E. Rentscher, Ph.D.

Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Medicine

Medical College of Wisconsin

1000 N. 92<sup>nd</sup> St.

Milwaukee, WI 53226

Phone: +14149554097

Email: krentscher@mcw.edu

## **Email addresses for other authors:**

Eric T. Klopach: klopach@usc.edu

Eileen M. Crimmins: crimmin@usc.edu

Teresa E. Seeman: TSeeman@mednet.ucla.edu

Steve W. Cole: steve.cole@ucla.edu

Judith E. Carroll: JCarroll@mednet.ucla.edu

**Keywords:** social support; social strain; biological aging; epigenetic age; DNA methylation

## Abstract

Growing evidence suggests that social relationship quality can influence age-related health outcomes, although how the quality of one's relationships directly relates to the underlying aging process is less clear. We hypothesized that lower social support and higher relationship strain would be associated with an accelerated epigenetic aging profile among older adults in the Health and Retirement Study. Adults ( $N = 3,647$ ) aged 50-96 years completed ratings of support and strain in relationships with their spouse, children, other family, and friends. They also provided a blood sample and DNA methylation profiling derived epigenetic aging measures: Horvath, Hannum, PhenoAge, GrimAge, and Dunedin Pace of Aging methylation (PoAm). Generalized linear models adjusting for age, sex, and race/ethnicity revealed that lower support from one's spouse, children, other family, and friends and higher strain with one's spouse, children, and friends was associated with an accelerated epigenetic aging profile. In secondary analyses that further adjusted for socioeconomic and lifestyle factors and following false discovery rate correction, support from other family members and friends was associated with epigenetic aging. Findings suggest that lower support within close relationships relates to epigenetic aging acceleration, offering one mechanism through which relationship quality might influence risk for age-related disease.

# 1. Introduction

A sizeable literature has established that the quality of one's social relationships can have a significant impact on health and well-being across the lifespan [1,2]. Current theoretical frameworks posit that social relationships promote health by fulfilling basic needs for social connection and by providing a buffering resource during times of stress; however, they can also be a source of conflict and strain [3–7]. Research has identified perceived social support and social strain as distinct dimensions of social relationship quality that can influence health [3,6–9]. Whereas social support is defined as the availability of resources, advice, understanding, or acceptance [3,10], social strain has been described as criticism, insensitivity, demands, or feeling let down within one's current relationships [6,11]. Social support and strain are concurrently and prospectively associated with age-related declines and disease in middle-aged and older adults, including functional limitations [12,13], poorer physical and cognitive functioning [14–16], greater number of chronic conditions [12], and incidence and progression of cardiovascular disease [17–20]. They are also reliable predictors of all-cause mortality [1,21–24] and mortality from cancer [25,26], stroke [27], and cardiovascular disease [23,28]. Together, this research suggests that social support and strain influence aging, although how these processes directly relate to the underlying aging process is less clear.

Epigenetic aging offers one approach to track the underlying aging process. Epigenetic aging refers to age-related alterations to the epigenome (i.e., chemical compounds that modify DNA but do not change its coding sequence), which include histone modifications, chromatin remodeling, and changes in DNA methylation patterns [29]. One of the most widely used approaches to measuring epigenetic aging, termed the 'epigenetic clock,' was developed by identifying distinct regions of the DNA that become hypo- or hyper-methylated with age, and

correlates with chronological age across a range of cell types and tissues [30–32]. More recent versions of the epigenetic clock were developed based on DNA methylation patterns that are associated with multiple aging biomarkers and are predictive of phenotypic aging outcomes (PhenoAge) [33] and time to death (GrimAge) [34]. In contrast to the epigenetic clock measures, the Dunedin Pace of Aging methylation (PoAm) measure was developed to estimate an individual's *rate* of biological aging at a single point in time, based on data from the Dunedin cohort and changes in 18 biomarkers of organ-system integrity assessed over a 12-year period [35]. Accelerated epigenetic aging, as assessed by these measures, has been associated with multiple age-related conditions, including frailty [36–38], physical limitations [34,35,39–42], cognitive decline [35,41,43,44], cancer [34,42,45–50], diabetes [34,50], stroke [51,52], and cardiovascular disease [34,42,50], as well as all-cause [34,35,58–60,37,42,50,53–57] and specific-cause (e.g., cancer; [42,47,49,57]) mortality.

The present study aimed to investigate whether perceived social support and strain were associated with accelerated epigenetic aging in a nationally representative sample older adults in the Health and Retirement Study (HRS). As part of the 2016 self-administered psychosocial questionnaire, participants completed ratings of support and strain in relationships with their spouse, children, other family members, and friends. As part of the 2016 Venous Blood Study, participants also provided a blood sample and DNA methylation profiling was performed to derive epigenetic aging measures. This investigation focused on five established, *a priori*-identified epigenetic measures: the Horvath, Hannum, PhenoAge, and GrimAge clocks, and the Dunedin PoAm. Based on previous research linking social relationship quality to age-related conditions, we hypothesized that higher perceived support within close relationships would be associated with a younger epigenetic aging profile, characterized by a younger Horvath,

Hannum, PhenoAge, and GrimAge epigenetic age and a slower Dunedin PoAm. We also expected that greater strain within close relationships would be associated with an accelerated epigenetic aging profile, characterized by an older Horvath, Hannum, PhenoAge, and GrimAge epigenetic age and a faster Dunedin PoAm in older adulthood.

## **2. Results**

### **2.1. Preliminary analyses**

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the social and epigenetic aging variables. On average, participants reported more support than strain for all relationship types. The average epigenetic age for the clock measures (Horvath, Hannum, PhenoAge, GrimAge) ranged from 54.04 to 67.20. The average Dunedin PoAm was 1.07 years of epigenetic age for each year of chronological age.

### **2.2. Support and strain with spouse**

Generalized linear models examined spousal support and strain as separate predictors of epigenetic aging variables, adjusting for age, sex, and race/ethnicity. Consistent with hypotheses, higher perceived spousal support was associated with a younger Hannum epigenetic age, PhenoAge, and GrimAge, and a slower Dunedin PoAm (Figure 1; Supplemental Information Table 1). A one-point increase on the spousal support scale was associated with a Hannum age 0.38 years younger, a PhenoAge 0.61 years younger, a GrimAge 0.34 years younger, and a Dunedin pace of aging 0.008 years younger per chronological year than same-aged peers. Spousal support was not associated with the Horvath clock. In secondary analyses that adjusted for educational attainment and lifestyle factors (BMI category, smoking status, and alcohol use), associations between spousal support and the Hannum, GrimAge and Dunedin PoAm measures were reduced to non-significance; only the association between spousal support and PhenoAge

remained statistically significant (Supplemental Information Table 1). However, this association was not significant following 5% false discovery rate (FDR) correction for multiple testing. Also as expected, greater spousal strain was associated with an accelerated Hannum epigenetic age (Figure 2; Supplemental Information Table 2). A one-point increase in spousal strain was associated with a Hannum age 0.35 years older than same aged peers. In secondary analyses, this association remained statistically significant after adjusting for educational attainment and lifestyle factors but was not significant following FDR correction for multiple testing (Supplemental Information Table 2). Spousal strain was not associated with the Horvath, PhenoAge, GrimAge, or Dunedin PoAm measures.

### **2.3. Support and strain with children**

Consistent with hypotheses, higher support from one's children was associated with a younger PhenoAge and GrimAge, and a slower Dunedin PoAm (Figure 1; Supplemental Information Table 3). A one-point increase in support from one's children was associated with a PhenoAge 0.47 years younger, a GrimAge 0.39 years younger, and a Dunedin pace of aging 0.008 years younger per chronological year than same-aged peers. In secondary analyses, the association between support from one's children and PhenoAge was reduced to non-significance after adjusting for educational attainment and lifestyle factors, but associations with GrimAge and Dunedin PoAm remained statistically significant (Supplemental Information Table 3). However, these associations were reduced to non-significance following FDR correction for multiple testing. Support from one's children was not associated with the Horvath or Hannum clocks. Also as expected, greater strain with one's children was associated with an accelerated GrimAge and faster Dunedin PoAm (Figure 2; Supplemental Information Table 4). A one-point increase in strain with one's children was associated with a GrimAge 0.32 years older, and a

Dunedin pace of aging 0.006 years older per chronological year than same-aged peers. However, in secondary analyses, these associations were reduced to non-significance after adjusting for educational attainment and lifestyle factors and FDR correction (Supplemental Information Table 4). Strain with children was not associated with the Horvath, Hannum, or PhenoAge measures.

## **2.4. Support and strain with other family members**

Consistent with hypotheses, higher support from other family members was associated with a younger GrimAge and slower Dunedin PoAm (Figure 1; Supplemental Information Table 5). A one-point increase in support from other family members was associated with a GrimAge 0.24 years younger, and a Dunedin pace of aging 0.006 years younger per chronological year than same-aged peers. In secondary analyses, these associations remained statistically significant after adjusting for educational attainment and lifestyle factors (Supplemental Information Table 5). The association between support from other family members and Dunedin PoAm also remained significant following FDR correction. Support from other family members was not associated with the Horvath, Hannum, or PhenoAge measures. Strain with other family members was not associated with any of the epigenetic aging measures (Figure 2; Supplemental Information Table 6).

## **2.5. Support and strain with friends**

Consistent with hypotheses, higher support from friends was associated with a younger GrimAge and slower Dunedin PoAm (Figure 1; Supplemental Information Table 7). A one-point increase in support from friends was associated with a GrimAge 0.38 years younger, and a Dunedin pace of aging 0.005 years younger per chronological year than same-aged peers. In secondary analyses, the association between support from friends and Dunedin PoAm was

reduced to non-significant after adjusting for educational attainment and lifestyle factors, but the association with GrimAge remained statistically significant (Supplemental Information Table 7). The association between support from friends and GrimAge also remained statistically significant following FDR correction. Support from friends was not associated with the Horvath, Hannum, or PhenoAge measures. Also as expected, greater strain with friends was associated with an accelerated GrimAge and faster Dunedin PoAm (Figure 2; Supplemental Information Table 8). A one-point increase in strain with friends was associated with a GrimAge 0.43 years older and a Dunedin pace of aging 0.013 years older per chronological year than same-aged peers. In secondary analyses, the associations between strain with friends and GrimAge and Dunedin PoAm were no longer statistically significant after adjusting for educational attainment and lifestyle factors and FDR correction (Supplemental Information Table 8). Strain within friendships was not associated with the Horvath, Hannum, or PhenoAge measures.

### 3. Discussion

The present study investigated associations between social relationship quality and epigenetic aging in a nationally representative sample of older adults in the Health and Retirement Study. Specifically, we examined whether lower perceived support and higher strain in relationships with one's spouse, children, other family members, and friends was concurrently related to an accelerated epigenetic aging profile. As hypothesized, individuals who reported feeling understood, that they could rely upon, or that they could open up to their spouse, children, family members, and friends had a younger epigenetic aging profile relative to same-aged peers. Also as expected, individuals who reported that their spouse, children, and friends made too many demands on them, criticized them, let them down, or got on their nerves had an accelerated aging profile relative to same-aged peers. On average, the difference in epigenetic

aging between individuals who reported the lowest and highest levels of social support ranged from 0.72 to 1.83 years, depending on the relationship type and the epigenetic measure. The average difference in epigenetic aging between individuals who reported the lowest and highest levels of social strain ranged from 0.42 to 1.29 years, depending on the relationship type and the epigenetic measure. It was somewhat surprising that social support and strain were less consistently or not at all associated with the Horvath and Hannum clocks, although it is noteworthy that both of these measures were developed to predict chronological age and may be capturing different aspects of the aging process than the PhenoAge, GrimAge, and Dunedin PoAm measures [50].

In secondary analyses that further adjusted for educational attainment and lifestyle factors that previous research found were associated with epigenetic aging [34,42,50,61,62], social support was more robustly associated with epigenetic aging than social strain. Specifically, there were unique associations between spousal support and PhenoAge, support from children and other family members and GrimAge and Dunedin PoAm, and support from friends and GrimAge that were over and above these well-established health risk factors. On the other hand, only spousal strain was uniquely associated with the Hannum clock. However, it is important to note that, following false discovery rate correction for multiple testing, only support from other family members and friends were associated with Dunedin PoAm and GrimAge, respectively. These findings are particularly noteworthy in this sample of older adults who may be experiencing declines in their health, as PhenoAge, GrimAge, and Dunedin PoAm are predictive of multiple age-related conditions such as cognitive decline, loss of physical function, cancer, cardiovascular disease, and time to death [34,42]. In addition, researchers have found that relationships with close others become more salient with age [63,64], and in some cases, they

may become more stable or involuntary (e.g., more difficult to choose to exit) as older adults who experience health declines may rely more on others for support [65]. Therefore, perceiving that close relationships with family and friends are lower in support and/or higher in conflict or strain may have a particular influence on health and well-being with increasing age—and these findings suggest that epigenetic aging may be one mechanism through which this occurs.

These findings are consistent with and contribute to a growing literature on the influence of social relationship quality on key biological aging processes. For instance, several studies have linked lower levels of social support and higher strain to increased activation of transcription factor NF- $\kappa$ B, which regulates the expression of inflammatory genes [66], and peripheral markers of inflammation (e.g., IL-6, IL-8, CRP, TNF- $\alpha$ ) in middle-aged and older adults [67–74]. Other research has suggested that lower social support and a greater number of ambivalent relationships (i.e., characterized by high positivity and negativity) are associated with shorter telomere length [75–77]. The present findings also extend an emerging literature on psychosocial stress and epigenetic aging, with several studies linking early life adversity [78–84], lower socioeconomic status [79,81,85–89], and traumatic stress [90,91] to an accelerated epigenetic aging profile. As low perceived social support and social strain have been considered a form of social stress, social relationship quality may affect epigenetic aging through similar mechanisms; however, the specific cellular and molecular mechanisms through which this might occur remain largely unknown. Chronic or repeated activation of the sympathetic nervous system (SNS) and the hypothalamus-adrenal-pituitary (HPA) axis in response to stress releases neuroendocrine mediators (e.g., catecholamines, glucocorticoids) that interact with receptors on the surface of cells [92]. Mounting evidence suggests that this stress signaling cascade can initiate various physiological processes within cells, including those that contribute to

accelerated biological aging, such as cell stress, DNA damage, inflammation, and mitochondrial dysfunction (Polsky, Rentscher, & Carroll, under revision). It will be important for future research to begin to delineate the biological pathways through which exposure to social adversity and associated neuroendocrine mediators may modify these DNA methylation patterns and other epigenetic processes to alter rates of aging.

This study has several limitations, which suggest directions for future research. Most notably, the single-occasion measurement of epigenetic aging limited our analysis to concurrent associations and precluded the investigation of the influence of social relationship quality on changes in epigenetic aging over time. On account of this, we were also unable to test the alternative hypothesis that changes in epigenetic aging, as a marker of an underlying aging process, might influence shifts in social relationship quality. Future research would benefit from testing the directionality of the observed effects and linking these associations to age-related health outcomes in later life. In addition, the social support measures for this study focused primarily on emotional support and did not address other forms of support, such as tangible or informational support.

Despite these limitations, this is the first study to demonstrate that lower perceived support in relationships with family members and friends are uniquely associated with an accelerated epigenetic aging profile in older adulthood, over and above well-established lifestyle factors such as smoking status and alcohol use. These findings extend previous research by identifying epigenetic aging as a biological aging mechanism through which social relationship quality might influence aging and age-related health outcomes such as cancer, cardiovascular disease, dementia, and early mortality. In addition, the present sample was relatively large, socioeconomically diverse, and nationally representative of the U.S. population of older adults,

which increases generalizability of the findings. Importantly, in light of emerging evidence that these epigenetic aging mechanisms may be sensitive to and modifiable by behavioral intervention [93,94], these findings suggest that close relationship quality—particularly with family members and friends—may represent a behavioral target for intervention in older adulthood that has the potential to prevent, slow, or reverse accelerated aging and extend the healthspan (number of years free from age-related disease and disability) and lifespan.

## **4. Methods**

### **4.1. Ethics Statement**

This investigation has been conducted in accordance with the ethical standards and according to the Declaration of Helsinki and according to national and international guidelines and has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Michigan.

### **4.2. Participants**

The present study used data from the University of Michigan Health and Retirement Study (HRS), a longitudinal, nationally representative study of nearly 20,000 U.S. adults over the age of 50 [95]. For this study, participants were 4,018 adults aged 50-96 years who provided a blood sample as part of the 2016 Venous Blood Study (VBS) that was used to assess epigenetic aging [96]. The epigenetic aging subsample of the VBS was designed to be representative of the U.S. population when weighted. For the present analysis, 285 participants were missing data for at least one social support or strain variable and an additional 86 participants were missing data for at least one covariate; therefore, the final sample size was 3,647. The weighted sample had a median age of 68.7 years and was 55.1% female. Participants were non-Hispanic white (79.5%), non-Hispanic Black (9.2%), Hispanic (7.9%), and non-Hispanic of another race (3.3%) respondents. The educational distribution of the participants included less than a high school

education (13.1%), high school diploma or GED (30.2%), some college (26.0%), and college diploma or higher (30.7%).

### **4.3. Procedures**

Participants in the HRS study complete core interviews every other year, and self-administered psychosocial questionnaires are also given to alternating random halves of the full sample every two years. As part of the 2016 self-administered psychosocial questionnaire, participants completed ratings of support and strain in their relationships with their spouse, children, other family members, and friends. If participants were missing social support and strain data from 2016, we used data from the 2014 questionnaire. If they were missing data from 2016 and 2014, we used data from the 2012 questionnaire, and so forth, to 2008 (when the social support and strain measures were first included in the questionnaire). Participants also provided a blood sample as part of the 2016 Venous Blood Study (VBS) and DNA methylation profiling was performed using the Illumina Infinium Methylation EPIC BeadChip (Illumina, San Diego, CA) to derive the epigenetic aging measures, as described in detail previously [96,97].

### **4.4. Measures**

#### **4.4.1. Social support and strain measures**

Participants completed ratings of perceived support and strain within four types of relationships: their spouse, children, other family, and friends. For each relationship type, three items assessed support: “How much do they really understand the way you feel about things?”, “How much can you rely on them if you have a serious problem?”, and “How much can you open up to them if you need to talk about your worries?”. Four items assessed strain: “How often do they make too many demands on you?”, “How much do they criticize you?”, “How much do they let you down when you are counting on them?”, and “How much do they get on your

nerves?”. Responses ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*a lot*). Items were averaged to create a composite score, with higher scores indicating greater support or strain.

#### 4.4.2. Epigenetic aging measures

The epigenetic aging measures for this study included the Horvath, Hannum, PhenoAge, and GrimAge clocks and the Dunedin Pace of Aging methylation (PoAm). The Horvath estimate of epigenetic age is based on DNA methylation levels at 353 cytosine-phosphate-guanine base pair (CpG) sites and was developed as a predictor of chronological age across multiple tissues and cell types [31]. The Hannum estimate of epigenetic age is based on DNA methylation levels at 71 CpG sites and was developed as a predictor of chronological age in whole blood samples [32]. Phenotypic epigenetic age—also referred to as PhenoAge—is estimated from DNA methylation levels at 513 CpG sites and was developed as a predictor of mortality risk based on 9 markers of tissue and immune function (albumin, creatinine, serum glucose, C-reactive protein [CRP], lymphocyte percent, mean (red) cell volume, red cell distribution width, alkaline phosphatase, and white blood cell count) and chronological age in whole blood samples [42]. GrimAge is estimated from DNA methylation levels at 1,030 total CpG sites and was developed as a predictor of time to death based on 7 DNA methylation surrogates of plasma proteins associated with physiological risk and stress factors (adrenomedullin, beta-2 microglobulin, cystatin C, growth differentiation factor 15 [GDF-15], leptin, plasminogen activation inhibitor 1 [PAI-1], tissue inhibitor metalloproteinase 1 [TIMP-1]) and a DNA methylation-based estimator of smoking pack years [34]. Dunedin Pace of Aging methylation (PoAm) is estimated from DNA methylation levels at 46 CpG sites and was developed to estimate an individual’s *rate* of biological aging, expressed in years of epigenetic aging per chronological year. DunedinPoAm is

based on a composite estimate of change in 18 biomarkers of organ-system integrity assessed over a 12-year period in the Dunedin cohort study [35].

#### **4.5. Covariates**

Several variables that might affect epigenetic aging estimates were evaluated as covariates in the main analyses based on previous research [34,42,50,61,62,98], including age, biological sex (male as the reference group), and race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, non-Hispanic other race, and non-Hispanic white as the reference group). Secondary analyses also considered educational attainment (less than high school, high school diploma or GED, some college, and a college diploma or higher as the reference group), BMI category (25 to < 30 as overweight, 30 to < 35 as obese I,  $\geq 35$  as obese II, and < 25 as normal or underweight as the reference group), smoking status (current, past, and never as the reference group), and alcohol use (1-4 drinks per day, 5+ drinks per day, and none as the reference group).

#### **4.6. Data analysis plan**

We conducted a set of generalized linear models (GLMs) by regressing the epigenetic aging measures on each support or strain measure and adjusting for age, sex, and race/ethnicity as covariates. We then performed an additional set of models as secondary analyses that further adjusted for educational attainment and lifestyle factors, including BMI category, smoking status, and alcohol use. For both sets of analyses, we applied a 5% false discovery rate correction for multiple testing [99] across the five epigenetic aging measures for each social support and strain domain. Observations were weighted to be nationally representative of older U.S. adults using sampling weights provided by HRS. For participants who did not have specific weights for the Venous Blood Sample, weights from the 2016 core interview were used. All analyses were conducted in R 4.1.3 “One Push-Up” using the tidyverse, jtools, and survey packages [100–103].

## **Author Contributions**

Kelly E. Rentscher: Conceptualization, Writing–Original Draft; Eric T. Klopach: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Writing–Review & Editing, Eileen M. Crimmins: Conceptualization, Writing–Review & Editing, Teresa E. Seeman: Writing–Review & Editing, Steve W. Cole: Writing–Review & Editing; Judith E. Carroll: Conceptualization, Writing–Review & Editing.

## **Acknowledgements**

The Health and Retirement Study is sponsored by the National Institute on Aging [U01AG009740] and is conducted by the University of Michigan.

## **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

## **Funding**

This research was supported by the USC/UCLA Center on Biodemography and Population Health through a grant from the National Institute on Aging [P30AG017265], the National Institute on Aging [R25AG053227, K01AG065485, T32AG00037, R01AGG060110], and the UCLA Cousins Center for Psychoneuroimmunology.

## References

1. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Layton JB. Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. *PLoS Med.* 2010; 7(7): e1000316. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316
2. Uchino BN, Bowen K, de Grey RK, Mikel J, Fisher EB. Social support and physical health: Models, mechanisms, and opportunities. In E.B. Fisher (Ed.) *Principles and concepts of behavioral medicine*. 2018 (pp. 341-372). Springer, New York, NY. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-93826-4\_12
3. Cohen S. Social relationships and health. *Am Psychol.* 2004; 59(8): 676–84. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.8.676
4. Pietromonaco PR, Collins NL. Interpersonal mechanisms linking close relationships to health. *Am Psychol.* American Psychological Association Inc.; 2017; 72: 531–42. doi:10.1037/amp0000129
5. Birmingham WC, Holt-Lunstad J. Social aggravation: Understanding the complex role of social relationships on stress and health-relevant physiology. *Int J Psychophysiol.* Elsevier; 2018; 131: 13–23. doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2018.03.023
6. Brooks KP, Dunkel Schetter C. Social Negativity and Health: Conceptual and Measurement Issues. *Soc Personal Psychol Compass.* 2011; 5: 904–18. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00395.x
7. Rook KS. Social Networks in Later Life: Weighing Positive and Negative Effects on Health and Well-Being. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci.* 2015; 24: 45–51. doi:10.1177/0963721414551364
8. Okun MA, Keith VM. Effects of positive and negative social exchanges with various sources on depressive symptoms in younger and older adults. *Journals Gerontol - Ser B*

- Psychol Sci Soc Sci. 1998; 53: 4–20.
9. Finch JF, Okun MA, Barrera M, Zautra AJ, Reich JW. Positive and negative social ties among older adults: Measurement models and the prediction of psychological distress and well-being. *Am J Community Psychol*. 1989; 17: 585–605.
10. Holt-Lunstad J. Social Connection as a Public Health Issue: The Evidence and a Systemic Framework for Prioritizing the “Social” in Social Determinants of Health. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2022; 43: 29–30. doi:0.1146/annurev-publhealth-052020-110732
11. Rook KS. The health effects of negative social exchanges in later life. *Gener J Am Soc Aging*. 2014; 38: 15–23. doi:10.2307/26556019
12. Newsom JT, Mahan TL, Rook KS, Krause N. Stable Negative Social Exchanges and Health. *Heal Psychol*. 2008; 27: 78–86. doi:10.1037/0278-6133.27.1.78
13. Mavandadi S, Rook KS, Newsom JT. Positive and negative social exchanges and disability in later life: An investigation of trajectories of change. *Journals Gerontol - Ser B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2007; 62: S361–70. doi:10.1093/geronb/62.6.S361
14. Seeman T, Chen X. Risk and protective factors for physical functioning in older adults with and without chronic conditions: MacArthur studies of successful aging. *Journals Gerontol - Ser B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2002; 57: S135–44. doi:10.1093/geronb/57.3.S135
15. Tun PA, Miller-Martinez D, Lachman ME, Seeman T. Social strain and executive function across the lifespan: The dark (and light) sides of social engagement. *Aging, Neuropsychol Cogn*. 2013; 20: 320–38. doi:10.1080/13825585.2012.707173
16. Seeman TE, Miller-Martinez DM, Stein Merkin S, Lachman ME, Tun PA, Karlamangla AS. Histories of social engagement and adult cognition: midlife in the U.S. study. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2011; 66B, Suppl 1: i141-52. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbq091

17. De Vogli R, Chandola T, Marmot MG. Negative aspects of close relationships and heart disease. *Arch Intern Med.* 2007; 167: 1951–7. doi:10.1001/archinte.167.18.1951
18. Angerer P, Siebert U, Kothny W, Mühlbauer D, Mudra H, Von Schacky C. Impact of social support, cynical hostility and anger expression on progression of coronary atherosclerosis. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2000; 36: 1781–8. doi:10.1016/S0735-1097(00)00944-X
19. Wang HX, Mittleman MA, Orth-Gomer K. Influence of social support on progression of coronary artery disease in women. *Soc Sci Med. Pergamon;* 2005; 60: 599–607. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.05.021
20. Orth-Gomer K, Rosengren A, Wilhelmsen L. Lack of social support and incidence of coronary heart disease in middle- aged Swedish men. *Psychosom Med.* 1993; 55: 37–43.
21. Blazer DG. Social support and mortality in an elderly community population. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1982; 115: 684–94.
22. Kroenke CH, Quesenberry C, Kwan ML, Sweeney C, Castillo A, Caan BJ. Social networks, social support, and burden in relationships, and mortality after breast cancer diagnosis in the Life after Breast Cancer Epidemiology (LACE) Study. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* 2013; 137: 261–71. doi:10.1007/s10549-012-2253-8
23. Barth J, Schneider S, Von Känel R. Lack of social support in the etiology and the prognosis of coronary heart disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychosom Med.* 2010; 72: 229–38. doi:10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181d01611
24. Birditt K, Antonucci TC. Life sustaining irritations? Relationship quality and mortality in the context of chronic illness. *Soc Sci Med.* 2008; 67: 1291–9. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.06.029

25. Ell K, Nishimoto R, Mediansky L, Mantell J, Hamovitch M. Social relations, social support and survival among patients with cancer. *J Psychosom Res.* 1992; 36: 531–41. doi:10.1016/0022-3999(92)90038-4
26. Pinquart M, Duberstein PR. Associations of social networks with cancer mortality: A meta-analysis. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol.* 2010; 75: 122–37. doi:10.1016/j.critrevonc.2009.06.003
27. Tanne D, Goldbourt U, Medalie JH. Perceived Family Difficulties and Prediction of 23-Year Stroke Mortality among Middle-Aged Men. *Cerebrovasc Dis.* 2004; 18: 277–82. doi:10.1159/000080352
28. Berkman LF, Leo-Summers L, Horwitz RI. Emotional support and survival after myocardial infarction: A prospective, population-based study of the elderly. *Ann Intern Med.* 1992; 117: 1003–9.
29. López-Otín C, Blasco MA, Partridge L, Serrano M, Kroemer G. The hallmarks of aging. *Cell.* 2013; 153: 1194-217. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2013.05.039
30. Bocklandt S, Lin W, Sehl ME, Sánchez FJ, Sinsheimer JS, Horvath S, Vilain E. Epigenetic predictor of age. *PLoS One.* 2011; 6: e14821. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0014821
31. Horvath S. DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types. *Genome Biol.* 2013; 14: R115. doi:10.1186/gb-2013-14-10-r115
32. Hannum G, Guinney J, Zhao L, Zhang L, Hughes G, Sada SV, Klotzle B, Bibikova M, Fan JB, Gao Y, Deconde R, Chen M, Rajapakse I, et al. Genome-wide Methylation Profiles Reveal Quantitative Views of Human Aging Rates. *Mol Cell.* 2013; 49: 359–67. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2012.10.016

33. Levine ME, Lu AT, Quach A, Chen BH, Assimes TL, Bandinelli S, Hou L, Baccarelli AA, Stewart JD, Li Y, Whitsel EA, Wilson JG, Reiner AP, et al. An epigenetic biomarker of aging for lifespan and healthspan. *Aging*. 2018; 10: 573–91. doi:10.18632/aging.101414
34. Lu AT, Quach A, Wilson JG, Reiner AP, Aviv A, Raj K, Hou L, Baccarelli AA, Li Y, Stewart JD, Whitsel EA, Assimes TL, Ferrucci L, et al. DNA methylation GrimAge strongly predicts lifespan and healthspan. *Aging*. 2019; 11: 303–27. doi:10.18632/aging.101684
35. Belsky DW, Caspi A, Arseneault L, Baccarelli A, Corcoran D, Gao X, Hannon E, Harrington HL, Rasmussen LJH, Houts R, Huffman K, Kraus WE, Kwon D, et al. Quantification of the pace of biological aging in humans through a blood test, the DunedinPoAm DNA methylation algorithm. *Elife*. 2020: 1–56. doi:10.7554/eLife.54870
36. Breitling LP, Saum KU, Perna L, Schöttker B, Holleczek B, Brenner H. Frailty is associated with the epigenetic clock but not with telomere length in a German cohort. *Clin Epigenetics*. 2016; 8: 21. doi:10.1186/s13148-016-0186-5
37. McCrory C, Fiorito G, Hernandez B, Polidoro S, O’Halloran AM, Hever A, Ni Cheallaigh C, Lu AT, Horvath S, Vineis P, Kenny RA. GrimAge outperforms other epigenetic clocks in the prediction of age-related clinical phenotypes and all-cause mortality. *J Gerontol A - Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2020; 76: 741-9. doi:10.1093/gerona/glaa286.
38. Verschoor CP, Lin DTS, Kobor MS, Mian O, Ma J, Pare G, Ybazeta G. Epigenetic age is associated with baseline and 3-year change in frailty in the Canadian Longitudinal Study on Aging. *Clin Epigenetics*. 2021; 13: 1–10. doi:10.1186/s13148-021-01150-1
39. Maddock J, Castillo-Fernandez J, Wong A, Cooper R, Richards M, Ong KK, Ploubidis

- GB, Goodman A, Kuh D, Bell JT, Hardy R. DNA methylation age and physical and cognitive aging. *Journals Gerontol - Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2020; 75: 504–11.  
doi:10.1093/gerona/glz246
40. Marioni RE, Shah S, McRae AF, Ritchie SJ, Muniz-Terrera G, Harris SE, Gibson J, Redmond P, Cox SR, Pattie A, Corley J, Taylor A, Murphy L, et al. The epigenetic clock is correlated with physical and cognitive fitness in the Lothian Birth Cohort 1936. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2015; 44: 1388–96. doi:10.1093/ije/dyu277
41. Belsky DW, Moffitt TE, Cohen AA, Corcoran DL, Levine ME, Prinz JA, Schaefer J, Sugden K, Williams B, Poulton R, Caspi A. Eleven Telomere, Epigenetic Clock, and Biomarker-Composite Quantifications of Biological Aging: Do They Measure the Same Thing? *Am J Epidemiol*. 2018; 187: 1220–30. doi:10.1093/aje/kwx346
42. Levine ME, Lu AT, Quach A, Chen BH, Assimes TL, Bandinelli S, Hou L, Baccarelli AA, Stewart JD, Li Y, Whitsel EA, Wilson JG, Reiner1 AP, et al. An epigenetic biomarker of aging for lifespan and healthspan. *Aging*. 2018; 10: 573-91.  
doi:10.18632/aging.101414
43. Beydoun MA, Shaked D, Tajuddin SM, Weiss J, Evans MK, Zonderman AB. Accelerated epigenetic age and cognitive decline among urban-dwelling adults. *Neurology. American Academy of Neurology*; 2020; 94: e613-25. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000008756
44. Degerman S, Josefsson M, Nordin Adolfsson A, Wennstedt S, Landfors M, Haider Z, Pudas S, Hultdin M, Nyberg L, Adolfsson R. Maintained memory in aging is associated with young epigenetic age. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2017; 55: 167–71.  
doi:0.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2017.02.009
45. Ambatipudi S, Horvath S, Perrier F, Cuenin C, Hernandez-Vargas H, Le Calvez-Kelm F,

- Durand G, Byrnes G, Ferrari P, Bouaoun L, Sklias A, Chajes V, Overvad K, et al. DNA methylome analysis identifies accelerated epigenetic ageing associated with postmenopausal breast cancer susceptibility. *Eur J Cancer*. 2017; 75: 299–307. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2017.01.014
46. Levine ME, Hosgood HD, Chen B, Absher D, Assimes T, Horvath S. DNA methylation age of blood predicts future onset of lung cancer in the women’s health initiative. *Aging*. 2015; 7: 690–700. doi:10.18632/aging.100809
47. Zheng Y, Joyce BT, Colicino E, Liu L, Zhang W, Dai Q, Shrubsole MJ, Kibbe WA, Gao T, Zhang Z, Jafari N, Vokonas P, Schwartz J, et al. Blood Epigenetic Age may Predict Cancer Incidence and Mortality. *EBioMedicine*. 2016; 5: 68–73. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2016.02.008
48. Durso DF, Bacalini MG, Sala C, Pirazzini C, Marasco E, Bonafé M, do Valle ÍF, Gentilini D, Castellani G, Faria AMC, Franceschi C, Garagnani P, Nardini C. Acceleration of leukocytes’ epigenetic age as an early tumor and sex-specific marker of breast and colorectal cancer. *Oncotarget*. 2017; 8: 23237–45. doi:10.18632/oncotarget.15573
49. Dugué PA, Bassett JK, Joo JHE, Jung CH, Ming Wong E, Moreno-Betancur M, Schmidt D, Makalic E, Li S, Severi G, Hodge AM, Buchanan DD, English DR, et al. DNA methylation-based biological aging and cancer risk and survival: Pooled analysis of seven prospective studies. *Int J Cancer*. 2018; 142: 1611–9. doi:10.1002/ijc.31189
50. Oblak L, van der Zaag J, Higgins-Chen AT, Levine ME, Boks MP. A systematic review of biological, social and environmental factors associated with epigenetic clock acceleration. *Ageing Res Rev*. 2021; 69: 101348. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2021.101348
51. Soriano-Tárraga C, Giralt-Steinhauer E, Mola-Caminal M, Vivanco-Hidalgo RM, Ois A,

- Rodríguez-Campello A, Cuadrado-Godia E, Sayols-Baixeras S, Elosua R, Roquer J, Jiménez-Conde J. Ischemic stroke patients are biologically older than their chronological age. *Aging*. 2016; 8: 2655–66. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC5191861/](#)
52. Soriano-Tárraga C, Mola-Caminal M, Giralt-Steinhauer E, Ois A, Rodríguez-Campello A, Cuadrado-Godia E, Gómez-González A, Vivanco-Hidalgo RM, Fernández-Cadenas I, Cullell N, Roquer J, Jiménez-Conde J. Biological age is better than chronological as predictor of 3-month outcome in ischemic stroke. *Neurology*. 2017; 89: 830–6. Available from: <https://n.neurology.org/content/89/8/830>
53. Marioni RE, Harris SE, Shah S, McRae AF, von Zglinicki T, Martin-Ruiz C, Wray NR, Visscher PM, Deary IJ. The epigenetic clock and telomere length are independently associated with chronological age and mortality. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2016; 45: 424–32. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/ije/article/45/2/424/2572710>
54. Wolf EJ, Logue MW, Stoop TB, Schichman SA, Stone A, Sadeh N, Hayes JP, Miller MW. Accelerated DNA Methylation Age: Associations with Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and Mortality. *Psychosom Med*. 2018; 80: 42–8.
55. Dugué PA, Bassett JK, Joo JE, Baglietto L, Jung CH, Wong EM, Fiorito G, Schmidt D, Makalic E, Li S, Moreno-Betancur M, Buchanan DD, Vineis P, et al. Association of DNA Methylation-Based Biological Age with Health Risk Factors and Overall and Cause-Specific Mortality. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2018; 187: 529–38. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/aje/article/187/3/529/4084321>
56. Chen BH, Marioni RE, Colicino E, Peters MJ, Ward-Caviness CK, Tsai PC, Roetker NS, Just AC, Demerath EW, Guan W, Bressler J, Fornage M, Studenski S, et al. DNA methylation-based measures of biological age: Meta-analysis predicting time to death.

- Aging. 2016; 8: 1844–65. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC5076441/](#)
57. Gao X, Zhang Y, Mons U, Brenner H. Leukocyte telomere length and epigenetic-based mortality risk score: associations with all-cause mortality among older adults. *Epigenetics*. 2018; 13: 846–57. doi:10.1080/15592294.2018.1514853
58. Chen BH, Marioni RE, Colicino E, Peters MJ, Ward-Caviness CK, Tsai PC, Roetker NS, Just AC, Demerath EW, Guan W, Bressler J, Fornage M, Studenski S, et al. DNA methylation-based measures of biological age: Meta-analysis predicting time to death. *Aging*. 2016; 8: 1844–65. Available from: [www.aging-us.com](#)
59. Liu Z, Kuo PL, Horvath S, Crimmins E, Ferrucci L, Levine M. A new aging measure captures morbidity and mortality risk across diverse subpopulations from NHANES IV: A cohort study. *PLoS Med*. 2018; 15: e1002718. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002718
60. Perna L, Zhang Y, Mons U, Holleczeck B, Saum KU, Brenner H. Epigenetic age acceleration predicts cancer, cardiovascular, and all-cause mortality in a German case cohort. *Clin Epigenetics*. 2016; 8: 1–7. doi:10.1186/s13148-016-0228-z
61. Crimmins EM, Thyagarajan B, Levine ME, Weir DR, Faul J. Associations of Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity, and Education With 13 Epigenetic Clocks in a Nationally Representative U.S. Sample: The Health and Retirement Study. *Journals Gerontol Ser A*. 2021; 76: 1117–23. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/biomedgerontology/article/76/6/1117/6102583>
62. Beach SRH, Dogan M V., Lei MK, Cutrona CE, Gerrard M, Gibbons FX, Simons RL, Brody GH, Philibert RA. Methylomic Aging as a Window onto the Influence of Lifestyle: Tobacco and Alcohol Use Alter the Rate of Biological Aging. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2015; 63: 2519–25. doi:10.1111/jgs.13830

63. Carstensen LL. Socioemotional Selectivity Theory: The Role of Perceived Endings in Human Motivation. *Gerontologist*. 2021; 61: 1188–96. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/gerontologist/article/61/8/1188/6412643>
64. Wrzus C, Hänel M, Wagner J, Neyer FJ. Social network changes and life events across the life span: A meta-analysis. *Psychol Bull*. 2013; 139: 53–80. Available from: /record/2012-13785-001. doi:10.1037/a0028601
65. Uchino BN. Understanding the Links Between Social Support and Physical Health: A Life-Span Perspective With Emphasis on the Separability of Perceived and Received Support. *Perspect Psychol Sci*. 2009; 4: 236–55. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01122.x
66. Robles TF, Repetti RL, Reynolds BM, Chung PJ, Arevalo JMG, Cole SW. Family environments and leukocyte transcriptome indicators of a proinflammatory phenotype in children and parents. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2018; 30: 235–53. doi:10.1017/S0954579417000591
67. Marsland AL, Walsh C, Lockwood K, John-Henderson NA. The effects of acute psychological stress on circulating and stimulated inflammatory markers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2017; 64: 208–19. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2017.01.011
68. Mezuk B, Diez Roux A V., Seeman T. Evaluating the buffering vs. direct effects hypotheses of emotional social support on inflammatory markers: The Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2010; 24: 1294–300. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2010.06.006
69. Yang YC, Schorpp K, Harris KM. Social support, social strain and inflammation: Evidence from a national longitudinal study of U.S. adults. *Soc Sci Med*. 2014; 107: 124–

35. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.02.013
70. Runsten S, Korkeila K, Koskenvuo M, Rautava P, Vainio O, Korkeila J. Can social support alleviate inflammation associated with childhood adversities? *Nord J Psychiatry*. 2014; 68: 137–44. doi:10.3109/08039488.2013.786133
71. Bajaj A, John-Henderson NA, Cundiff JM, Marsland AL, Manuck SB, Kamarck TW. Daily social interactions, close relationships, and systemic inflammation in two samples: Healthy middle-aged and older adults. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2016; 58: 152–64. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2016.06.004
72. Elliot AJ, Heffner KL, Mooney CJ, Moynihan JA, Chapman BP. Social Relationships and Inflammatory Markers in the MIDUS Cohort: The Role of Age and Gender Differences. *J Aging Health*. 2018; 30: 904–23. doi:10.1177/0898264317698551
73. Whisman MA, Sbarra DA. Marital adjustment and interleukin-6 (IL-6). *J Fam Psychol*. 2012; 26: 290–5. doi:10.1037/a0026902
74. Donoho CJ, Crimmins EM, Seeman TE. Marital Quality, Gender, and Markers of Inflammation in the MIDUS Cohort. *J Marriage Fam*. 2013; 75: 127–41. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.01023.x
75. Carroll JE, Diez Roux A V., Fitzpatrick AL, Seeman T. Low Social Support Is Associated With Shorter Leukocyte Telomere Length in Late Life. *Psychosom Med*. 2013; 75: 171–7. doi:10.1097/PSY.0b013e31828233bf
76. Barger SD, Cribbet MR. Social support sources matter: Increased cellular aging among adults with unsupportive spouses. *Biol Psychol*. 2016; 115: 43–9. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2016.01.003
77. Zalli A, Carvalho LA, Lin J, Hamer M, Erusalimsky JD, Blackburn EH, Steptoe A.

- Shorter telomeres with high telomerase activity are associated with raised allostatic load and impoverished psychosocial resources. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2014; 111: 4519–24.  
doi:10.1073/pnas.1322145111
78. Klopach ET, Crimmins EM, Cole SW, Seeman TE, Carroll JE. Accelerated epigenetic aging mediates link between adverse childhood experiences and depressive symptoms in older adults: Results from the Health and Retirement Study. *SSM - Popul Heal.* 2022; 17: 101071. doi:10.1016/j.ssmph.2022.101071
  79. Lawn RB, Anderson EL, Suderman M, Simpkin AJ, Gaunt TR, Teschendorff AE, Widschwendter M, Hardy R, Kuh D, Relton CL, Howe LD. Psychosocial adversity and socioeconomic position during childhood and epigenetic age: analysis of two prospective cohort studies. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2018; 27: 1301–8. doi:10.1093/hmg/ddy036
  80. Marini S, Davis KA, Soare TW, Zhu Y, Suderman MJ, Simpkin AJ, Smith ADAC, Wolf EJ, Relton CL, Dunn EC. Adversity exposure during sensitive periods predicts accelerated epigenetic aging in children. *Psychoneuroendocrinology.* 2020; 113: 104484. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2019.104484
  81. Palma-Gudiel H, Fañanás L, Horvath S, Zannas AS. Psychosocial stress and epigenetic aging. *Int Rev Neurobiol.* 2020; 150: 107–28. doi:10.1016/bs.irm.2019.10.020
  82. Brody GH, Yu T, Chen E, Kobor M, Beach SRH, Lei M-K, Barr A, Lin DT-S, Miller GE. Risky Family Climates Presage Increased Cellular Aging in Young Adulthood. *Psychoneuroendocrinology.* 2021; 105256. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2021.105256
  83. Jovanovic T, Vance LA, Cross D, Knight AK, Kilaru V, Michopoulos V, Klengel T, Smith AK. Exposure to Violence Accelerates Epigenetic Aging in Children. *Sci Rep.* 2017; 7: 1–7. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-09235-9

84. 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. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2019; 85: 268–78.  
doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.09.008
85. Fiorito G, Polidoro S, Dugué P-A, Kivimaki M, Ponzi E, Matullo G, Guarrera S, Assumma MB, Georgiadis P, Kyrtopoulos SA, Krogh V, Palli D, Panico S, et al. Social adversity and epigenetic aging: a multi-cohort study on socioeconomic differences in peripheral blood DNA methylation. *Sci Reports* 2017; 7: 1–12. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-16391-5
86. Simons RL, Lei MK, Beach SRH, Philibert RA, Cutrona CE, Gibbons FX, Barr A. Economic hardship and biological weathering: The epigenetics of aging in a U.S. sample of black women. *Soc Sci Med*. 2016; 150: 192–200. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.12.001
87. Chen E, Miller GE, Yu T, Brody GH. The Great Recession and health risks in African American youth. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2016; 53: 234–41. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2015.12.015
88. Hughes A, Smart M, Gorrie-Stone T, Hannon E, Mill J, Bao Y, Burrage J, Schalkwyk L, Kumari M. Socioeconomic Position and DNA Methylation Age Acceleration Across the Life Course. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2018; 187: 2346–54. doi:10.1093/aje/kwy155
89. Austin MK, Chen E, Ross KM, McEwen LM, Maclsaac JL, Kobor MS, Miller GE. Early-life socioeconomic disadvantage, not current, predicts accelerated epigenetic aging of monocytes. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2018; 97: 131–4.  
doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2018.07.007
90. Wolf EJ, Maniates H, Nugent N, Maihofer AX, Armstrong D, Ratanatharathorn A, Ashley-Koch AE, Garrett M, Kimbrel NA, Lori A, VA Mid-Atlantic MIRECC

- Workgroup, Aiello AE, Baker DG, et al. Traumatic stress and accelerated DNA methylation age: A meta-analysis. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2018; 92: 123–34. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2017.12.007
91. Verhoeven JE, Yang R, Wolkowitz OM, Bersani FS, Lindqvist D, Mellon SH, Yehuda R, Flory JD, Lin J, Abu-Amara D, Makotkine I, Marmar C, Jett M, et al. Epigenetic Age in Male Combat-Exposed War Veterans: Associations with Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Status. *Complex Psychiatry*. 2018; 4: 90–9. doi:10.1159/000491431
92. Irwin MR, Cole SW. Reciprocal regulation of the neural and innate immune systems. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2011; 11: 625–32. doi:10.1038/nri3042
93. Brody GH, Yu T, Chen E, Beach SRH, Miller GE. Family-centered prevention ameliorates the longitudinal association between risky family processes and epigenetic aging. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry Allied Discip*. 2016; 57: 566–74. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12495
94. Waziry R, Corcoran DL, Huffman KM, Kobor MS, Kothari M, Kraus VB, Kraus WE, Lin DTS, Pieper CF, Ramaker ME, Bhapkar M, Das SK, Ferrucci L, et al. Effect of Long-Term Caloric Restriction on DNA Methylation Measures of Biological Aging in Healthy Adults: CALERIE™ Trial Analysis. *medRxiv*. 2021; 09.21.21. doi:10.1101/2021.09.21.21263912
95. Health & Retirement Study. Produced and distributed by the University of Michigan with funding from the National Institute on Aging. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Grant number U01AG009740; 2021.
96. Crimmins EM, Kim JK, Fisher J, Faul JD. HRS Epigenetic Clocks. 2020.
97. Crimmins, E. M., Faul, J.D., Thyagarajan, B., Weir DR. Venous Blood Collection and

# Assay Protocol in the 2016 Health and Retirement Study 2016 Venous Blood Study

(VBS). 2017. Available from:

<https://hrsdata.isr.umich.edu/sites/default/files/documentation/data-descriptions/HRS2016VBSDD.pdf>

98. Philibert R, Beach SRH, Lei MK, Gibbons FX, Gerrard M, Simons RL, Dogan M V. Array-based epigenetic aging indices may be racially biased. *Genes*.2020; 11: 1–11. doi:10.3390/genes11060685
99. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: A Practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J R Stat Soc Ser B*. 1995; 57: 289–300. doi:10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x
100. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2022.
101. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, Grolemund G, Hayes A, Henry L, Hester J, Kuhn M, Pedersen T, Miller E, et al. Welcome to the Tidyverse. *J Open Source Softw*. 2019; 4: 1686. doi:10.21105/joss.01686
102. Long J. jtools: Analysis and Presentation of Social Scientific Data. 2020.
103. Lumley T. Analysis of complex survey samples. *J Stat Softw*. 2004; 9: 1–19. doi:10.18637/jss.v009.i08

### **Legend for Figure 1.**

Standardized coefficients for the association between social support within spousal, child, other family, and friend relationships and epigenetic aging measures, adjusting for age, sex, and race/ethnicity. Standard error bars represent 95% confidence intervals for each point estimate.

## **Legend for Figure 2.**

Standardized coefficients for the association between social strain within spousal, child, other family, and friend relationships and epigenetic aging measures, adjusting for age, sex, and race/ethnicity. Standard error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals for each point estimate.

## Supplemental Information

Table 1. Generalized linear models with spousal support predicting epigenetic aging.

Table 2. Generalized linear models with spousal strain predicting epigenetic aging.

Table 3. Generalized linear models with support from children predicting epigenetic aging.

Table 4. Generalized linear models with strain with children predicting epigenetic aging.

Table 5. Generalized linear models with support from other family members predicting epigenetic aging.

Table 6. Generalized linear models with strain with other family members predicting epigenetic aging.

Table 7. Generalized linear models with support from friends predicting epigenetic aging.

Table 8. Generalized linear models with strain with friends predicting epigenetic aging.


Table 1

Descriptive statistics for the main study variables.

	<i>M</i> / Proportion	<i>SD</i>	Range
Social variables			
Spousal support	3.44	0.68	1–4
Spousal strain	1.97	0.69	1–4
Children support	3.20	0.76	1–4
Children strain	1.74	0.65	1–4
Other family support	2.80	0.89	1–4
Other family strain	1.58	0.63	1–4
Friend support	3.03	0.77	1–4
Friend strain	1.40	0.47	1–4
Epigenetic aging variables			
Horvath	65.21	9.38	29.90–114.52
Hannum	54.04	8.89	32.01–107.79
PhenoAge	56.82	9.91	27.44–101.68
GrimAge	67.20	8.53	45.57–99.61
Dunedin PoAm	1.07	0.09	0.75–1.44
Educational attainment			
Less than high school	0.13	0.34	
High school diploma or GED	0.30	0.46	
Some college	0.26	0.44	
BMI category			
Overweight (25 to < 30)	0.37	0.48	
Obese I (30 to < 35)	0.22	0.42	
Obese II (> 35)	0.13	0.34	
Smoking status			
Current smoker	0.10	0.31	
Former smoker	0.45	0.50	
Alcohol use			
1–4 drinks per day	0.41	0.49	
5 or more drinks per day	0.03	0.16	

Note. PoAm = Pace of Aging methylation; BMI = body mass index.

**Figure 1.**



**Figure 2.**

