

## **Life-course socioeconomic factors are associated with markers of epigenetic aging in a population-based study**

Dusan Petrovic<sup>1,2</sup>, Cristian Carmeli<sup>3</sup>, José Luis Sandoval<sup>4</sup>, Barbara Bodinier<sup>2</sup>, Marc Chadeau-Hyam<sup>2</sup>, Stephanie Schrempft<sup>5</sup>, Georg Ehret<sup>6</sup>, Nasser Abdalla Dhayat<sup>7</sup>, Belén Ponte<sup>8</sup>, Menno Pruijm<sup>9</sup>, Emmanouil Dermitzakis<sup>10</sup>, Paolo Vineis<sup>2</sup>, Sémira Gonseth-Nusslé<sup>1</sup>, Idris Guessous<sup>5</sup>, Cathal McCrory<sup>11</sup>, Murielle Bochud<sup>1\*</sup>, Silvia Stringhini<sup>1,5\*</sup>

1. Department of Epidemiology and Health Systems (DESS), University Center for General Medicine and Public Health (UNISANTE), Lausanne, Switzerland
2. Centre for Environment and Health, School of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Imperial College London, London, UK
3. Population Health Laboratory, University of Fribourg, Fribourg, Switzerland
4. Department of Oncology, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland
5. Unit of Population Epidemiology, Division of Primary Care Medicine, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland
6. Department of Cardiology, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland
7. Kidney and Dialysis Center Männerdorf, Männerdorf, Switzerland
8. Department of Nephrology and Hypertension, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland
9. Department of Nephrology and Hypertension, Lausanne University Hospital and University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland
10. Computational Biology Department, GSK, Switzerland
11. Department of Medical Gerontology, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

\* Joint last authors

Correspondence:

Dusan Petrovic, PhD

Address:

Phone:

e-mail: [dusan.petrovic@unisantech](mailto:dusan.petrovic@unisantech)

Route de la corniche 10, 1010 Lausanne-CH

+41 21 314 73 76

## 1 **Abstract**

2 Adverse socioeconomic circumstances negatively affect the functioning of biological systems, but the  
3 underlying mechanisms remain only partially understood. Here, we explore the associations between  
4 life-course socioeconomic factors and four markers of epigenetic aging in a population-based setting.

5 We used data from a population-based study conducted in Switzerland (SKIPOGH) to assess the  
6 association between childhood, adulthood, and life-course socioeconomic indicators, and blood-  
7 derived markers of epigenetic aging (Levine's, DunedinPoAm38, GrimAge epigenetic age  
8 acceleration (EAA) and the mortality risk score (MS)). We used mixed regression to explore the  
9 associations between socioeconomic indicators and markers of epigenetic aging independently, and  
10 counterfactual mediation to investigate the mechanisms underlying the life-course socioeconomic  
11 gradient in epigenetic aging.

12 Individuals reporting a low father's occupation, adverse financial conditions in childhood, a low  
13 income, having financial difficulties, or experiencing unfavorable socioeconomic trajectories were  
14 epigenetically older than their more advantaged counterparts. Specifically, this corresponded to an  
15 average increase of 1.0-1.5 years for Levine's epigenetic age when compared to chronological age,  
16 1.1-1.5 additional years for GrimAge, 5%-8% higher DunedinPoAm38 EAA, and 2%-5% higher MS  
17 score. By exploring the life-course mechanisms underlying the socioeconomic gradient in epigenetic  
18 aging, we found that both childhood and adulthood socioeconomic factors contributed to epigenetic  
19 aging, and that detrimental lifestyle factors mediated the relation between socioeconomic  
20 circumstances in adulthood and EAA.

21 Our study provides novel empirical evidence for a "sensitive-period" life-course model, whereby  
22 adverse socioeconomic circumstances in childhood *and* adulthood negatively affected epigenetic  
23 aging. Counterfactual mediation analyses further showed that the effect of socioeconomic factors in  
24 adulthood operated through detrimental lifestyle factors, whereas associations involving early-life  
25 socioeconomic factors were less clear.

26

27 **Key words:** life-course socioeconomic factors, epigenetic age acceleration, Levine's

28 DNAmPhenoAge, DunedinPoAm38, GrimAge, Mortality Risk score

## 29 **1 Introduction**

30 The disruption of major physiological systems constitutes a key step in the biological “embedding” of  
31 the social environment, and plays a central role in the occurrence of disease and premature mortality  
32 [1, 2]. These processes include aberrant inflammation, hormonal dysregulation, impaired neural  
33 function, poor metabolic control, or allostatic load, with socially disadvantaged individuals  
34 consistently displaying adverse physiological patterns in a dose-response manner [1, 3-7].

35 Furthermore, the ever-growing evidence for a contribution of socially-driven epigenetic modifications  
36 has been the object of particular attention in recent years [1, 8, 9].

37 Epigenetic modifications may result from changes in DNA methylation, which refer to the addition or  
38 removal of methyl groups to Cytosine-phospho-Guanine (CpG) dinucleotides across the genome [10].

39 DNA methylation changes occur naturally during development and senescence, but may also result  
40 from environmental exposures, including lifestyle factors, pollutants, or socioeconomic adversity,  
41 eventually contributing to an increased disease risk [9, 11-15]. DNA methylation may therefore  
42 provide a candidate mechanism for the biological embedding of social exposures [15-17]. Recent  
43 years witnessed the development of the so-called *epigenetic clocks*, which are based on specific sets of  
44 age-dependent CpGs and allow for determination of whether an individual is experiencing *epigenetic*  
45 *age acceleration* (EAA), which has been related to adverse socioeconomic conditions across the life-  
46 course, but also to increased disease and mortality risk [9, 16, 18-21]. First generation epigenetic  
47 clocks were designed to be highly accurate predictors of chronological age, and measure changes in  
48 DNA methylation shared between individuals. More recently, second generation epigenetic clocks  
49 have been designed to gauge inter-individual variability in aging and were trained using health-related  
50 biomarkers in addition to age [15, 16, 22, 23].

51 In this study, we sought to characterize the associations between socioeconomic factors and markers of  
52 epigenetic aging using data from a Swiss population-based study.

53 Focusing on health-related second generation epigenetic markers, we first examine the associations  
54 between multiple socioeconomic indicators in childhood and adulthood, and Levine,

55 DunedinPoAm38, and GrimAge clocks, as well as the mortality risk score (MS). Second, we explore  
56 the life-course models and the contribution of intermediate factors through which socioeconomic  
57 factors operate to affect epigenetic aging. Using counterfactual mediation, we investigate the mutual  
58 relations involving childhood and adulthood socioeconomic indicators and epigenetic aging in the  
59 light of three life-course scenarios: the “critical period” model, which postulates that there are time  
60 windows throughout life when the body is particularly sensitive to adverse exposures (i.e. *in utero*  
61 development, the first year of life, adolescence, etc.); the “chains of risk” model, implying that a  
62 sequence of linked exposures eventually affect one’s disease risk; and the “social mobility” model,  
63 whereby the direction of socioeconomic mobility across the life-course (i.e. upward/downward) has an  
64 impact on subsequent biological processes and health events [24, 25]. Finally, we examine the  
65 contribution of lifestyle exposures (smoking, alcohol consumption, sedentary behavior, Body Mass  
66 Index (BMI)), which have been previously identified as important mediators of the socioeconomic  
67 gradient in health-related outcomes and epigenetic age acceleration [26-28].

68

69

## 70 **2 Material and methods**

### 71 *2.1 Study population*

72 We used data from the Swiss Kidney Project on Genes in Hypertension (SKIPOGH), a family- and  
73 population-based cohort investigating the genetic and environmental determinants of health-related  
74 outcomes in the Swiss population. Study participants were recruited in the city of Lausanne and the  
75 cantons of Geneva and Bern between 2009 and 2013 (SKIPOGH 1, baseline visit), and came for a  
76 follow-up visit three years later (SKIPOGH 2, present sample) [4]. Study inclusion criteria were: 1.  
77 Written informed consent; 2. 18 years of age; 3. Caucasian origin; 4. At least one first-degree family  
78 member willing to participate to the study. Women who reported being pregnant were excluded from  
79 the study. At both visits, included participants attended a medical examination after an overnight fast,  
80 provided blood and urine samples, and completed a self-administered questionnaire inquiring about  
81 their living standards, socioeconomic and financial circumstances in childhood and adulthood, lifestyle  
82 factors, and medical history. All participants provided written informed consent.

### 83 *2.2 Socioeconomic indicators*

84 We used nine socioeconomic indicators in early-life and adulthood as the main exposure variables.  
85 Socioeconomic indicators in early-life focused on participant's childhood, inquiring about father's  
86 occupational position, financial and material conditions the participants enjoyed in childhood, and  
87 father's and mother's highest achieved education (**Appendix A**). Socioeconomic indicators in  
88 adulthood included participant's own education, last known occupational position, monthly household  
89 income, reporting financial difficulties, and forgoing healthcare due to economic reasons. All nine  
90 indicators were self-reported following predefined categories, and subsequently recoded into three  
91 ("High"/"No financial difficulties" (Reference group - most favorable), "Middle"/"Average financial  
92 difficulties", and "Low"/"Important financial difficulties") or two groups ("Not forgoing healthcare"  
93 (Reference group - most favorable), "Forgoing healthcare"), as described in **Appendix A**. We further  
94 generated a proxy for life-course inter-generational social mobility based on father's occupational

95 position and participant's last known occupational position. Five socioeconomic trajectories were  
96 possible: "Stable high" (Reference group: high father's occupation and high own occupation),  
97 "Upward mobile" (low father's occupation and middle/high own occupation, or middle father's  
98 occupation and high own occupation), "Stable middle" (middle father's occupation, middle own  
99 occupation), "Downward mobile" (high father's occupation and middle/low own occupation, or  
100 middle father's occupation and low own occupation), "Stable low" (low father's occupation and low  
101 own occupation).

102

### 103 *2.3 CpG DNA methylation measurement and data pre-processing*

104 Epigenome-wide DNA methylation from white blood cells was measured in 242 SKIPOGH  
105 participants using the Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip microarray of Illumina (HM450),  
106 measuring the methylation status at 485,512 CpG sites. For a different set of 442 SKIPOGH  
107 participants, epigenome-wide DNA methylation was measured using a more recent Infinium  
108 MethylationEPIC v1.0 microarray (EPIC), including >90% of the CpG sites from the HM450 and an  
109 additional 413,743 CpGs (865,859 CpGs in total) [29]. For both arrays, CpG methylation data were  
110 summarized as  $\beta$  coefficients representing a ratio of the average signal for methylated CpG sites to the  
111 sum of methylated *and* unmethylated sites. To control for the noise introduced by technical factors  
112 (methylation array type, array position, and plate level), the CPACOR procedure was applied, yielding  
113 30 principal components to be used as fixed-effect covariates [30]. Missing data was imputed using  
114 the nearest averaging multiple imputation method [31]. The data preprocessing procedures eventually  
115 yielded 452,453 CpG sites available for analyses.

116

### 117 *2.4 Epigenetic age acceleration and mortality risk score*

118 Using blood-derived DNA methylation, we computed four markers of epigenetic aging: Levine's  
119 epigenetic clock (DNAmPhenoAge), Dunedin Pace of Aging Methylation (DunedinPoAm38),

120 GrimAge epigenetic clock, and the mortality risk score (MS) [16, 20, 22, 28]. The first three  
121 epigenetic clocks (Levine, DunedinPoAm38, GrimAge) display a continuous distribution and correlate  
122 positively with chronological age (**Supplementary Figure 1**), whilst the MS score displays a discrete  
123 distribution, ranging from 0 (lowest risk – no CpG in the risk quartile) to 10 (highest risk – all ten  
124 CpGs in the risk quartile). We subsequently computed *epigenetic age acceleration* (EAA) for Levine,  
125 DunedinPoAm38, and GrimAge epigenetic clocks, calculated as the residuals from the regression of  
126 epigenetic clocks (response) on chronological age, CPACOR principal components, and chip type  
127 (predictors), with positive EAA values representing an accelerated or mitigated epigenetic aging [9].  
128 Hereinafter, we will refer to EAA and MS (main outcome variables) as *markers of epigenetic aging*.  
129 We chose to include these markers as they have been specifically elaborated using CpGs related to  
130 chronological age *and* multiple health-related biomarkers, and may possibly reflect health  
131 deterioration as a result of external stressors, including socioeconomic adversity and poor lifestyle  
132 factors [9, 19, 32]. Further, all four markers have been developed using DNA methylation profiles  
133 derived from blood, which is routinely sampled in population-based studies [17, 18, 32]. Additional  
134 details on the calculation of the included markers are provided in **Appendix B**.

135

## 136 *2.5 Statistical analyses*

137 We applied mixed regression models to estimate the *total effect* of life-course socioeconomic factors  
138 (main exposure variables) on markers of epigenetic aging (main outcome variables). We used  
139 childhood, adulthood, and life-course socioeconomic factors as independent, *categorical* exposure  
140 variables. To further explore for potential dose-response effects driven by socioeconomic indicators  
141 and to implement counterfactual mediation analyses, we generated *continuous* summary measures for  
142 each socioeconomic indicator (lowest vs. highest, (LH)), hypothesizing a linear effect on markers of  
143 epigenetic aging [33]. We implemented mixed *linear* regression when using Levine, DunedinPoAm38,  
144 and GrimAge EAA as the outcome variables (continuous), and *Poisson* regression when using the MS  
145 score (discrete variable). All regression models were adjusted for age, sex, study center, seasonality of



146 blood sampling, and familial structure (random-effect variable). For analyses using adulthood  
147 socioeconomic indicators as the main exposure variable, we accounted for the potential confounding  
148 effect of *childhood* socioeconomic indicators by including them as additional covariates [2].

149 We imputed missing data (socioeconomic indicators in childhood, adulthood and life-course  
150 trajectories) through multiple imputation by chained equations (MICE) by hypothesizing missingness  
151 at random (5 imputed data sets, 50 iterations). All statistical analyses were carried out using the R  
152 statistical software and relevant CRAN and Bioconductor packages (R Foundation for Statistical  
153 Computing, Vienna, Austria).

154

## 155 *2.6 Counterfactual mediation analyses and life-course models*

156 To investigate the intermediate mechanisms through which life-course socioeconomic indicators affect  
157 epigenetic aging, we implemented two *counterfactual mediation models* in order to assess the  
158 contribution of intermediate factors (mediators) located on the causal pathway between the main  
159 exposure (socioeconomic indicators) and the main outcome (markers of epigenetic aging) variables.  
160 Briefly, counterfactual mediation analysis allows for decomposing the *total effect* estimated in the  
161 main analyses into a *Natural Direct Effect* (NDE), which represents the relation between the exposure  
162 and the outcome through pathways which *do not involve* the mediators, and a *Natural Indirect Effect*  
163 (NIE), which represents the relation between the exposure and outcome via pathways *involving* the  
164 mediators. The contribution of the mediators to the association between the exposure and the outcome  
165 is estimated via the *Proportion Mediated* parameter (PM), defined as the ratio between NIE and the  
166 *Marginal Total Effect* ( $MTE=NDE+NIE$ ) [34].

167 In the first mediation model, we sought to determine whether the association between socioeconomic  
168 factors *in childhood* (exposure: lowest vs. highest) and markers of epigenetic aging (outcome),  
169 operates through socioeconomic and lifestyle factors *in adulthood* (mediators: adulthood SE  
170 indicators, smoking, hazardous alcohol intake, sedentary behavior, BMI (**Appendix C**)) (**Figure 1A**).

171 We included these mediators as previous research has reported that early-life socioeconomic

172 circumstances act as determinants of socioeconomic status in adulthood, which in turn affect  
173 physiological and aging processes through lifestyle factors [2, 25, 26]. From the life-course  
174 perspective, the implementation of this model would allow disentangling whether childhood  
175 socioeconomic factors affect markers of epigenetic aging according to the “critical period” model,  
176 whereby adverse exposures leave a permanent imprint on physiological processes during periods when  
177 the body is particularly sensitive (i.e. *in utero* development, first year of life, adolescence), or  
178 according to “pathway models” (i.e. “chains of risk”), implying that childhood exposures affect  
179 physiological processes via subsequent exposures in adulthood [24, 25]. In this particular framework,  
180 a null indirect effect (NIE) would tend to support a “critical period” model, whereas the presence of a  
181 non-null indirect effect would support “chains of risk” models.

182 In the second mediation model, we aimed to specifically assess the contribution of self-reported  
183 lifestyle factors (**Appendix C**: smoking, hazardous alcohol intake, sedentary behavior, and BMI *in*  
184 *adulthood*) to the association between socioeconomic indicators *in adulthood* and markers of  
185 epigenetic aging (**Figure 1B**). We chose to include these mediators as previous research has  
186 consistently shown that socioeconomic factors in adulthood act as direct determinants of lifestyle  
187 factors, which in turn affect multiple biological processes, including epigenetic aging [9, 11, 18, 26].

188 For both counterfactual models, we adopted a “regression-based” counterfactual mediation analysis  
189 which incorporates interaction terms between the exposure and the mediators, and evaluated a joint  
190 mediating effect by the mediators (*en-bloc mediators*) [9, 35, 36]. Missing values were imputed using  
191 multiple imputation chained equations (in-built R package method) [36]. Standard errors for all  
192 mediation parameters (MTE, NDE, NIE, PM) were estimated through percentiles from 1000 bootstrap  
193 draws with replacement [36].

194

195

196 *2.7 Supplementary analyses*

197 Considering that white blood cells (WBC) composition may influence DNA methylation patterns, we  
198 repeated the main analyses by computing *intrinsic* epigenetic age acceleration and MS score, which  
199 calculates EAA residuals by including Houseman-estimated WBC composition as additional  
200 predictors, or by directly including WBC composition as additional covariates in the model (MS score)  
201 [37, 38].

202 Further, as epigenetic clocks may not be optimally calibrated for older individuals and since epigenetic  
203 age tends to increase at a different pace across age groups, we repeated the main regression models by  
204 stratifying the associations at 65 years of age [39, 40].

## 205 **3 Results**

### 206 *3.1 Characteristics of study population*

207 The mean age was 52.6 years, with 52% of the study population being female, as reported in **Table 1**.  
208 Approximately one quarter of included participants reported a high father's occupational position in  
209 childhood (24%), high financial conditions in childhood (26%), and a high father's education level  
210 (25%), whereas 13% of participants declared a high mother's education in childhood. In adulthood,  
211 39% reported having achieved high education, 21% reported a high occupational position, and 38%  
212 were in the high household income group. Related to everyday financial difficulties and their  
213 consequences, 67% declared experiencing no financial difficulties in everyday life, and 90% reported  
214 not having forgone healthcare during the previous year due to economic reasons. 25% of included  
215 participants were current smokers, 5% declared having a hazardous alcohol intake, 40% reported being  
216 sedentary, whereas the average BMI was 25.6 kg/m<sup>2</sup>. Finally, we observed that the GrimAge  
217 epigenetic clock displayed a mild deviation from the chronological age (54.6 years), while the average  
218 values of DunedinPoAm38 and MS score were 0.9 and 2, respectively.

219

### 220 *3.2 Socioeconomic factors and markers of epigenetic aging*

221 In **Figure 2**, we describe the associations between socioeconomic factors and markers of epigenetic  
222 aging. Reporting adverse financial conditions in childhood, important financial difficulties in  
223 adulthood, and experiencing less favorable socioeconomic trajectories across the life-course (all but  
224 stable high) were associated with increased Levine's epigenetic age acceleration (**Panel A**  
225 (*categories*): Adverse financial conditions in childhood: +1.49 years 95%CI[-0.04;3.04], Important  
226 financial difficulties in adulthood: 1.52 years 95%CI[0.05;2.98]; Upward socioeconomic trajectory:  
227 2.13 years 95%CI[0.37;3.90], Stable low socioeconomic trajectory: 2.23 years 95%CI[0.41;4.05]).  
228 Further examining "Lowest vs. Highest" regression gradients ( $\beta_{LH}$ ), we found no dose-response  
229 relationship between *linearized* socioeconomic indicators and Levine EAA. We observed similar

230 associations between adulthood and socioeconomic indicators in adulthood and across the life-course  
231 (household income, financial difficulties, forgoing healthcare due to economic reasons, stable low  
232 socioeconomic trajectory) with DunedinPoAm38 and GrimAge EAA markers (**Panels B-C**), with less  
233 favorable socioeconomic factors being associated with increased EAA, whereas reporting low  
234 financial conditions in childhood was associated with increased GrimAge EAA (1.20 years  
235 95%CI[0.17;2.23]). Using *linearized* socioeconomic indicators, we further observed consistent dose-  
236 response effects between socioeconomic factors in adulthood and DunedinPoAm38 and GrimAge  
237 EAA, as well as between adverse financial conditions in childhood and increased GrimAge EAA.  
238 Finally, we found that reporting low financial conditions in childhood, having a mid-level education, a  
239 low occupational position, a low household income, and experiencing less favorable socioeconomic  
240 trajectories across the life-course was consistently associated with an increased MS score (**Panel D**  
241 (*categories*): Low financial conditions in childhood: 0.19 (2.4% higher MS score) 95%CI[0.00;0.39];  
242 Low occupation: 0.20 95%CI[0.03;0.37], Low household income: 0.37 95%CI[0.20;0.54], Stable low  
243 trajectory: 0.29 95%CI[0.03;0.54]). Furthermore, examining regression coefficients for *linearized*  
244 socioeconomic indicators, we found that financial conditions in childhood and household income in  
245 adulthood displayed a consistent dose-response effect with the MS score.

246

### 247 *3.3 Counterfactual mediation analyses*

248 In **Table 2**, we present the counterfactual mediation estimates for the associations between  
249 socioeconomic indicators in childhood (exposure), socioeconomic and lifestyle factors in adulthood  
250 (mediators), and markers of epigenetic aging (outcome). We found no *total* (MTE), *direct* (NDE),  
251 *indirect* (NIE), nor *mediating effect* (PM) by socioeconomic and lifestyle factors in adulthood, except  
252 for an association between financial conditions in childhood and GrimAge EAA (MTE: 1.24  
253 95%CI[0.09;2.47]).

254 We further show the counterfactual mediation analyses for the association between socioeconomic  
255 factors in adulthood, lifestyle factors, and markers of epigenetic aging in **Table 3**. We found that the

256 associations between three socioeconomic indicators (household income, experiencing financial  
257 difficulties, and forgoing healthcare due to economic reasons) and DunedinPoAm38 and GrimAge  
258 EAA were jointly mediated by smoking, alcohol consumption, sedentary behavior, and BMI, with PM  
259 estimates ranging from 49% to 89%. Further, out of four socioeconomic indicators associated with the  
260 MS score, only associations involving occupational position were jointly mediated by lifestyle factors  
261 (own occupation: PM=31% 95% CI[6%;105%]).

262

### 263 *3.4 Supplementary analyses*

#### 264 **3.4.1 Intrinsic markers of epigenetic aging**

265 Further, we estimated *intrinsic* markers of epigenetic aging by accounting for WBC composition using  
266 the Houseman method, but found no major differences when compared to the main analyses  
267 (**Supplementary Figure 2**).

#### 268 **3.4.2 Stratification by age**

269 Finally, we repeated the main analyses by stratifying the associations between socioeconomic  
270 indicators and markers of epigenetic aging at 65 years of age (**Supplementary Figures 4-5**). Overall,  
271 we observed similar associations in individuals aged <65years (**Supplementary Figure 3**) and the  
272 complete study sample (Figures 1). In older individuals, we observed much weaker gradients for  
273 associations involving adulthood socioeconomic factors and markers of epigenetic aging, and no clear  
274 associations for childhood socioeconomic factors (**Supplementary Figure 4**).

## 275 **4 Discussion**

276 In this population-based study, we found that socioeconomic disadvantage, whether experienced in  
277 childhood or adulthood, was consistently associated with biological age acceleration, as indexed using  
278 markers of epigenetic aging. Overall, we observed that the obtained signals were stronger for financial  
279 conditions in childhood, as well as household income and experiencing financial difficulties in  
280 adulthood than for other socioeconomic measures. Additionally examining life-course socioeconomic  
281 trajectories, we concluded that individuals experiencing adversity in childhood *and* adulthood  
282 displayed detrimental epigenetic aging patterns, implying “scarring effects” which result from early-  
283 life privation, along with more “proximal” physiological consequences resulting from financial  
284 hardship experienced in everyday life. Finally, by investigating the intermediate mechanisms through  
285 which socioeconomic factors operate, we found strong mediating effects by lifestyle factors for the  
286 association between socioeconomic indicators in adulthood and markers of epigenetic aging.

287 Using childhood socioeconomic indicators, we found that adverse financial conditions in childhood  
288 and a low father’s occupation were associated with increased Levine EAA, GrimAge EAA, and MS  
289 score. These results are in line with previous investigations, which reported that early-life  
290 socioeconomic disadvantage was related to increased epigenetic age acceleration, pointing to the  
291 importance of early-life material and financial circumstances in shaping the epigenetic signature [32,  
292 41]. From a biological perspective, these findings may be related to the fact that epigenetic aging  
293 occurs faster in early-life, which may therefore represent a “critical” or “sensitive” period, when the  
294 body is more susceptible to adverse external exposures [24, 32]. To specifically determine whether  
295 childhood socioeconomic circumstances affect epigenetic aging via exposures in adulthood (“chains of  
296 risk model”) or by leaving a biological imprint in early-life (“critical period model”), we conducted a  
297 counterfactual mediation analysis using socioeconomic and lifestyle factors in adulthood as mediators.  
298 We found modest *marginal total effects* for the association between linearized childhood  
299 socioeconomic factors and markers of epigenetic aging, and no evidence for a mediating effect by  
300 exposures in adulthood [24]. Although some of the obtained results may support the “critical” period

301 model (null *indirect* effect), the exact life-course mechanisms cannot be inferred based on these  
302 analyses only, given the absence of a consistent *marginal total effect* between linearized childhood  
303 socioeconomic indicators (main exposure) and markers of epigenetic aging (main outcome) in this  
304 particular framework (please see *Strengths and limitations*) [24, 34].

305 Further examining the associations between socioeconomic indicators in adulthood and markers of  
306 epigenetic aging, we found that a low occupational position, a low household income, experiencing  
307 financial difficulties in everyday life, and forgoing healthcare due to economic reasons were  
308 associated with detrimental epigenetic aging patterns, independently of the effect of childhood  
309 socioeconomic circumstances. These findings complement the growing body of evidence for an  
310 association between adverse socioeconomic conditions in adulthood and epigenetic age acceleration,  
311 reporting that constant financial pressure, poor living conditions, and economic hardship lead to  
312 chronic stress, eventually resulting in biological weathering and premature aging [42, 43]. Using  
313 counterfactual mediation models, we found that an important proportion of the association between  
314 adulthood socioeconomic factors and markers of epigenetic aging was substantially mediated by  
315 health behaviors and BMI in adulthood. These findings are in line with previous research reporting a  
316 strong mediating effect by lifestyle-related factors, including smoking, alcohol consumption, and  
317 obesity, which display a strong social patterning, and were previously associated with aberrant  
318 epigenetic methylation patterns [17, 28, 44, 45].

319 To gain insight into the life-course mechanisms underlying the association between socioeconomic  
320 factors and epigenetic aging, we further included life-course socioeconomic trajectories as an  
321 additional exposure variable, whereby a stable low trajectory (low father's occupation in childhood  
322 and low own occupation in adulthood) was consistently associated with the highest levels of  
323 epigenetic age acceleration and mortality risk score. The joint analysis of childhood, adulthood, and  
324 life-course socioeconomic exposures thus showed that being *ever* exposed to socioeconomic adversity  
325 leads to detrimental epigenetic aging patterns, with early-life socioeconomic circumstances leaving a  
326 "scarring effect", whilst subsequent, financial and economic hardship in adulthood affect epigenetic  
327 aging through other mechanisms [24]. From a life-course perspective, these results tend to point out



328 towards the “sensitive period” effect model, a type of “chains of risk” model, implying that individuals  
329 experience periods or time-windows when the body is *more* sensitive to adverse external exposures  
330 than it would be at other times, although the observed physiological consequences may be influenced  
331 or modified by subsequent exposures [24].

332 Comparing the socioeconomic gradients across markers of epigenetic aging, we further observed that  
333 indicators of financial hardship in childhood and adulthood were consistently associated with  
334 mitigated epigenetic aging. These results suggest that all four epigenetic markers capture the same  
335 dimensions of socioeconomic status, namely financial and material deprivation across the life-course,  
336 despite the fact that the included aging markers have been developed using different training data and  
337 methodologies [16, 20, 22, 28].

338 Finally, when stratifying the associations between socioeconomic factors and markers of epigenetic  
339 aging by chronological age, we found similar associations in younger individuals (<65 years) and the  
340 full study set, while there were larger CIs for associations involving adulthood socioeconomic  
341 indicators and epigenetic markers in older individuals, and no clear associations involving childhood  
342 socioeconomic indicators. These results may be related to the much smaller sample size and lower  
343 statistical power in the “older” group ( $N_{<65y} = 509$ ,  $N_{\geq 65y} = 175$ ), but also to survival bias, as  
344 socioeconomically disadvantaged individuals “age” and die earlier, thus being less numerous in the  
345 “older” group [32, 46]. Furthermore, other plausible explanations may include age-related  
346 confounding factors, such as medication intake or menopausal status, which were previously  
347 associated with epigenetic age acceleration [47, 48].

348

#### 349 *4.1 Strengths and limitations*

350 Our study has several strengths, the first being the use of multiple socioeconomic indicators in  
351 childhood, adulthood, and across the life-course. This has allowed us to identify which dimensions of  
352 socioeconomic status were the most consistently related to markers of epigenetic aging: in this  
353 particular case, financial and material hardship in childhood and adulthood, likely operating according

354 to the “sensitive period” life-course model. Second, we compared four second generation markers of  
355 epigenetic aging, further highlighting the detrimental role of financial difficulties in childhood and  
356 adulthood for all included markers. Finally, this is one of the few studies formally quantifying the joint  
357 contribution of intermediate factors to the association between life-course socioeconomic indicators  
358 and markers of epigenetic aging.

359 Our study also has important limitations to acknowledge. First, the relatively small sample size has  
360 likely resulted in limited statistical power, which restricts the ability to detect smaller effect-size  
361 associations, particularly the ones between certain early-life socioeconomic factors and markers of  
362 epigenetic aging. Second, the reporting of early-life/childhood socioeconomic circumstances may be  
363 subject to recall bias, which may further “dilute” associations involving these indicators [49]. Third, in  
364 order to implement counterfactual mediation analysis, we assumed a linear (or dose-response) effect of  
365 the main exposure variables (childhood/adulthood socioeconomic factors) on markers of epigenetic  
366 aging, which may have led to biased associations, precluding the identification of specific life-course  
367 models. Finally, two out of four markers of epigenetic aging were computed using incomplete sets of  
368 CpGs, including GrimAge (947/1030 CpGs), and MS score (8/10 CpGs), which may have resulted in a  
369 suboptimal calculation of these scores.

370

## 371 *4.2 Conclusion*

372 In summary, our findings provide further evidence for an inverse gradient between socioeconomic  
373 circumstances across the life-course and detrimental epigenetic aging patterns, with an emphasis on  
374 intermediate and life-course mechanisms underlying this relation. Future research shall focus on  
375 further determining which socially-driven mechanisms lead to accelerated epigenetic aging,  
376 particularly focusing on the role of chronic stress, but also quantifying the overall contribution of  
377 altered epigenetic signals in the occurrence of diseases and mortality.

## 378 **5 Acknowledgments and funding**

379 The authors would like to express their gratitude to Dr. Ake Lu and Prof. Steve Horvath (UCLA –  
380 Department of Human Genetics) for providing precious assistance for the calculation of the GrimAge  
381 epigenetic clock.

382 This work was supported by the Lifepath project, which is funded by the European commission  
383 (Horizon 2020 grant 633666), the Swiss state secretariat for education, research and innovation –  
384 SERI, the Swiss National Science Foundation, the Medical Research Council and the Portuguese  
385 Foundation for Science. Silvia Stringhini was supported by the Ambizione PROSPER grant (Grant  
386 PZ00P3\_147998) from the Swiss National Science Foundation. Dusan Petrovic was supported by the  
387 Doc.Mobility grant (Grant P1LAP3\_178061) from the Swiss National Science Foundation. The  
388 SKIPOGH study is funded by a grant from the Swiss National Science Foundation (Grant 140331) and  
389 by intramural support of Lausanne, Geneva, and Bern University Hospitals. The funders hand no role  
390 in study design, data collection and analysis, manuscript writing, and in the decision to submit.

391

## 392 **6 Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest**

393 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

394

## 395 **7 Data and code availability**

396 SKIPOGH data is not public, but may be made available upon a formal request submitted to the  
397 SKIPOGH steering board. For further details about the study design and the phenotypes available in  
398 SKIPOGH, please see <https://www.maelstrom-research.org/study/skipogh>.

399 The computer code (R software scripts) may be made available upon a request submitted to Dusan  
400 Petrovic ([dusan.petrovic@unisante.ch](mailto:dusan.petrovic@unisante.ch)).

## 401 **8 Ethics statement**

402 The SKIPOGH study was approved by relevant local or national ethics committees and all procedures  
403 performed in these studies were in accordance with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later  
404 amendments or comparable ethical standards. All participants gave written informed consent. This  
405 work does not contain any studies with animals performed by any of the authors.

406

## 407 **9 Author contributions**

408 **Dusan Petrovic:** formal analysis, investigation, methodology, writing (original draft and  
409 review/editing). **Cristian Carmeli:** conceptualization, data curation (processing), formal analysis,  
410 investigation, methodology, supervision, writing (review & editing). **José Luis Sandoval:**  
411 investigation, methodology, writing (review & editing). **Barbara Bodinier:** methodology, software,  
412 writing (review & editing). **Marc Chadeau-Hyam:** methodology, software, writing (review &  
413 editing). **Stephanie Schrempft:** investigation, writing (review & editing). **Georg Ehret:** data curation,  
414 investigation, writing (review & editing). **Nasser Abdalla Dhayat:** data curation, investigation,  
415 writing (review & editing). **Belén Ponte:** data curation, investigation, writing (review & editing).  
416 **Menno Pruijm:** data curation, investigation, writing (review & editing). **Emmanouil Dermitzakis:**  
417 data curation, investigation, writing (review & editing). **Paolo Vineis:** project administration, funding  
418 acquisition, data curation, investigation, writing (review & editing). **Sémira Gonseth-Nusslé:** data  
419 curation, investigation, writing (review & editing), methodology. **Idris Guessous:** data curation,  
420 investigation, writing (review & editing). **Cathal McCrory:** investigation, methodology, supervision,  
421 writing (review & editing), **Murielle Bochud:** project administration, funding acquisition,  
422 conceptualization, data curation, methodology, supervision, writing (review & editing), **Silvia**  
423 **Stringhini:** conceptualization, project administration, funding acquisition, data curation, methodology,  
424 investigation, supervision, writing (original draft, review & editing).

425

## 426 **10 List of abbreviations**

BMI	Body mass index
CI	Confidence interval
CpG	Cytosine-phospho-Guanine dinucleotide
DAG	Directed acyclic graph
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
DNAmPhenoAge	Second generation <i>phenotypic</i> DNA methylation epigenetic clock (Levine)
DunedinPoAm	Second generation Dunedin Pace of Aging Methylation epigenetic clock
EAA	Epigenetic age acceleration
GrimAge	Second generation GrimAge epigenetic clock
MS	Mortality risk score
MTE	Marginal total effect
NDE	Natural direct effect
NIE	Natural indirect effect
OR	Odds ratio
PM	Proportion mediated
SD	Standard deviation
SE	Socioeconomic (factors)
SKIPOGH	Swiss Kidney Project on Genes in Hypertension
WBC	White blood cells

**Table 1:** General characteristics of the study population

<b>Age (<math>\mu \pm SD</math>, years)</b>	52.6 ( $\pm 15.5$ )
<b>Female</b>	359 (52%)
<b>Recruitment center (N, %)</b>	
Lausanne	307 (45%)
Geneva	279 (41%)
Bern	98 (14%)
<b>Childhood SE</b>	
<b>Father's occupational position (N, %)</b>	
High	164 (24%)
Middle	257 (38%)
Low	253 (38%)
<b>Financial conditions in childhood (N, %)</b>	
High	181 (26%)
Middle	360 (53%)
Low	143 (21%)
<b>Father's education (N, %)</b>	
High	171 (25%)
Middle	264 (39%)
Low	240 (36%)
<b>Mother's education (N, %)</b>	
High	86 (13%)
Middle	239 (35%)
Low	349 (52%)
<b>Adulthood SE</b>	
<b>Education (N, %)</b>	
High	267 (39%)
Middle	299 (44%)
Low	118 (17%)
<b>Occupational position (N, %)</b>	
High	133 (21%)
Middle	210 (33%)
Low	290 (46%)
<b>Household income (N, %)</b>	
High	222 (38%)
Middle	256 (43%)
Low	114 (19%)
<b>Financial difficulties (N, %)</b>	
No difficulties	451 (67%)
Average difficulties	148 (22%)
Important difficulties	77 (11%)
<b>Forgoing healthcare due to economic reasons (N, %)</b>	
No	585 (90%)
Yes	67 (10%)
<b>Life-course socioeconomic trajectories (N, %)</b>	
Stable high	55 (9%)
Upward	149 (24%)
Stable mid.	85 (14%)
Downward	202 (32%)
Stable low	132 (21%)

### Lifestyle factors

Current smoking (N, %)	171 (25%)
Hazardous alcohol intake (N,%) <sup>a</sup>	37 (5%)
Sedentary behavior (N,%) <sup>b</sup>	277 (40%)
BMI ( $\mu \pm$ SD, kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	25.6 ( $\pm$ 4.6)

### Markers of epigenetic aging

DNAmPhenoAge - Levine ( $\mu \pm$ SD, years)	52.6 ( $\pm$ 16.2)
DNAmPhenoAge EAA - Levine ( $\mu \pm$ SD, years)	0.0 ( $\pm$ 6.5)
DunedinPoAm38 ( $\mu \pm$ SD, years)	0.9 ( $\pm$ 0.1)
DunedinPoAm38 EAA ( $\mu \pm$ SD, years)	0.0 ( $\pm$ 0.1)
GrimAge ( $\mu \pm$ SD, years)	54.6 ( $\pm$ 12.9)
GrimAge EAA ( $\mu \pm$ SD, years)	0.0 ( $\pm$ 4.1)
Mortality risk score ( $\mu \pm$ SD)	2.0 ( $\pm$ 1.8)

---

Data are mean  $\pm$  SD for continuous variables and (N, %) for categorical variables; BMI, Body Mass Index; EAA, Epigenetic Age Acceleration, SE, Socioeconomic factors

<sup>a</sup> Hazardous alcohol use was defined as >21units of alcohol/week for men (1u~10g); >14units of alcohol/week for women)

<sup>b</sup> Regular physical activity was self-reported on a scale 1-10 (lowest-highest) and subsequently dichotomized at the median

**Table 2:** Counterfactual mediation estimates for the associations between childhood socioeconomic indicators, socioeconomic and lifestyle factors in adulthood, and markers of epigenetic aging (DAG: Figure 1A)

<b>DNA<sub>m</sub>PhenoAge acceleration (Levine)</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>NDE</b>	<b>NIE</b>	<b>PM</b>
Father's occupational position	1.43[-1.15;3.25]	0.63[-2.15;2.64]	0.08[-0.71;0.88]	0.06[-3.43;2.14]
Financial conditions in childhood	1.55[-0.16;3.42]	1.31[-0.50;3.30]	0.25[-0.53;1.16]	0.16[-1.17;1.28]
Father's education	2.09[-1.66;3.67]	1.48[-2.43;3.26]	-0.04[-0.70;0.67]	-0.02[-1.94;3.04]
Mother's education	-0.30[-2.45;3.25]	-1.17[-3.73;2.42]	0.06[-0.45;0.51]	-0.20[-2.22;2.78]
<b>DunedinPoAm38 age acceleration</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>NDE</b>	<b>NIE</b>	<b>PM</b>
Father's occupational position	0.02[-0.01;0.03]	0.01[-0.01;0.03]	0[-0.02;0.01]	-0.1[-3.72;3.30]
Financial conditions in childhood	0.02[-0.01;0.04]	0.01[-0.02;0.03]	0.01[-0.01;0.02]	0.36[-3.49;2.41]
Father's education	0.00[-0.03;0.04]	0.00[-0.04;0.04]	0.00[-0.01;0.01]	1.20[-4.67;4.59]
Mother's education	-0.01[-0.03;0.04]	-0.02[-0.05;0.03]	0.01[0.00;0.02]	-1.53[-5.4;10.10]
<b>GrimAge acceleration</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>NDE</b>	<b>NIE</b>	<b>PM</b>
Father's occupational position	0.57[-0.49;1.62]	0.27[-0.75;1.35]	-0.06[-0.79;0.54]	-0.1[-4.62;5.85]
Financial conditions in childhood	<b>1.24[0.09;2.47]</b>	0.86[-0.33;2.13]	0.35[-0.45;1.19]	0.29[-0.91;1.65]
Father's education	1.57[-1.29;2.15]	1.42[-1.23;2.02]	0.19[-0.66;0.79]	0.12[-5.88;4.46]
Mother's education	-0.42[-2.65;2.94]	-0.97[-3.26;2.51]	0.48[-0.09;1.03]	-1.12[-5.7;4.34]
<b>Mortality Risk Score</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>NDE</b>	<b>NIE</b>	<b>PM</b>
Father's occupational position	0.86[-2.30;3.09]	0.76[-2.44;2.96]	0.08[-0.14;0.17]	0.13[-0.99;0.56]
Financial conditions in childhood	-1.25[-5.75;1.17]	-1.4[-5.82;1.07]	0.07[-0.04;0.21]	-0.03[-1.48;1.44]
Father's education	0.65[-2.67;3.59]	0.53[-2.80;3.52]	0.03[-0.11;0.2]	0.06[-0.81;1.06]
Mother's education	0.31[-5.72;1.93]	0.17[-5.93;1.83]	0.12[-0.02;0.18]	0.43[-1.25;1.73]

SE, Socioeconomic; MTE, Marginal Total Effect; NDE, Natural Direct Effect; NIE, Natural Indirect Effect; PM, Proportion Mediated

Counterfactual mediation analysis for the association between early-life SE indicators (exposure), SE indicators and lifestyle factors in adulthood (en-bloc mediators: smoking, alcohol intake, sedentary behavior, BMI, adulthood SE indicators), and markers of epigenetic aging. All models included age, sex, and study center as fixed-effect confounders, and familial structure as random-effect confounder.



**Table 3:** Counterfactual mediation estimates for the associations between SE indicators in adulthood, lifestyle factors, and markers of epigenetic aging (DAG: Figure 1B)

<b>DNAmpHenoAge acceleration (Levine)</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>NDE</b>	<b>NIE</b>	<b>PM</b>
Education	0.44[-0.77;1.90]	0.04[-1.21;1.55]	0.00[-0.27;0.41]	-0.01[-2.78;2.27]
Occupational position	-0.07[-1.47;1.31]	-0.43[-1.81;0.96]	0.23[-0.02;0.57]	-3.31[-6.69;4.88]
Household income	1.01[-0.38;2.49]	0.83[-0.62;2.43]	0.06[-0.48;0.67]	0.05[-1.90;1.80]
Financial difficulties	1.16[-0.26;2.39]	0.45[-0.94;1.76]	0.25[-0.5;0.89]	0.21[-1.74;3.09]
Forgoing healthcare due to fin. diff.	0.39[-1.06;1.86]	0.06[-1.39;1.49]	0.40[-0.26;1.27]	1.02[-4.25;11.82]
<b>DunedinPoAm38 age acceleration</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>NDE</b>	<b>NIE</b>	<b>PM</b>
Education	0.01[-0.01;0.03]	0.00[-0.02;0.01]	0.01[-0.01;0.02]	1.41[-8.66;9.77]
Occupational position	0.00[-0.01;0.02]	0.00 [-0.02;0.02]	<b>0.01[0.00;0.02]</b>	4.53[-14.14;16.98]
Household income	<b>0.02[0.00;0.04]</b>	0.01[-0.01;0.02]	<b>0.01[0.00;0.03]</b>	<b>0.75[0.13;2.49]</b>
Financial difficulties	<b>0.03[0.01;0.05]</b>	0.01[-0.01;0.03]	<b>0.02[0.01;0.04]</b>	<b>0.71[0.39;1.45]</b>
Forgoing healthcare due to fin. diff.	<b>0.03[0.01;0.05]</b>	0.01[-0.01;0.03]	<b>0.01[0.00;0.03]</b>	<b>0.49[0.12;1.6]</b>
<b>GrimAge acceleration</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>NDE</b>	<b>NIE</b>	<b>PM</b>
Education	0.74[-0.21;1.63]	0.24[-0.59;1.06]	0.62[-0.18;1.26]	0.83[-2.17;3.26]
Occupational position	0.64[-0.31;1.39]	0.04[-0.77;0.9]	<b>0.79[0.16;1.14]</b>	1.24[-5.9;9.46]
Household income	<b>1.19[0.10;2.01]</b>	0.49[-0.38;1.3]	<b>1.06[0.14;1.66]</b>	<b>0.89[0.19;3.38]</b>
Financial difficulties	<b>1.65[0.66;2.64]</b>	0.53[-0.41;1.54]	<b>1.36[0.67;2.14]</b>	<b>0.83[0.45;1.65]</b>
Forgoing healthcare due to fin. diff.	<b>1.53[0.19;2.78]</b>	0.58[-0.51;1.63]	<b>1.08[0.20;2.11]</b>	<b>0.70[0.19;2.13]</b>
<b>Mortality Risk Score</b>	<b>MTE</b>	<b>NDE</b>	<b>NIE</b>	<b>PM</b>
Education	<b>0.18[0.03;0.37]</b>	0.16[-0.03;0.34]	0.04[-0.02;0.13]	0.25[-0.16;1.36]
Occupational position	<b>0.24[0.06;0.45]</b>	<b>0.19[0.00;0.39]</b>	<b>0.07[0.02;0.14]</b>	<b>0.31[0.06;1.05]</b>
Household income	<b>0.34[0.16;0.52]</b>	<b>0.25[0.06;0.41]</b>	0.06[-0.01;0.15]	0.21[-0.01;0.59]
Financial difficulties	0.07[-0.1;0.29]	-0.03[-0.22;0.16]	0.11[-0.01;0.26]	1.52[-6.66;9.46]
Forgoing healthcare due to fin. diff.	<b>0.27[0.02;0.47]</b>	0.15[-0.06;0.34]	0.09[-0.02;0.26]	0.39[-0.21;1.52]


SE, Socioeconomic; MTE, Marginal Total Effect; NDE, Natural Direct Effect; NIE, Natural Indirect Effect; PM, Proportion Mediated

Counterfactual mediation analysis for the association between adulthood indicators (exposure), lifestyle factors (en-bloc mediators: smoking, alcohol intake, sedentary behavior, BMI), and markers of epigenetic aging. All models included age, sex, early-life SE indicators and study center as fixed-effect confounders, and familial structure as random-effect confounder

**Figure 1:** Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAG) representing the causal structure of the counterfactual mediation models implemented in this study.

(A) DAG representing the association between childhood socioeconomic factors (exposure) and markers of epigenetic aging (outcome: EAA/MS), using adulthood socioeconomic factors and lifestyle factors (smoking, alcohol intake, physical inactivity, and BMI) as *en-bloc* mediators.

(B) DAG representing the association between socioeconomic factors in adulthood and markers of epigenetic aging, using lifestyle factors as *en-bloc* mediators.



E, Exposure; M, Mediators, O, Outcome.


NDE, Natural Direct Effect representing the relation between the exposure and outcome via pathways which do not involve the mediators.

NIE, Natural Indirect Effect representing the relation between the exposure and outcome via the mediators (*en-bloc*).

MTE, Marginal Total Effect (not depicted) computed as the sum of NDE and NIE.

Confounding variables (age, sex, study center, seasonality of blood sampling, and familial structure) are not represented for the sake of simplicity.

**Figure 2:** Regression coefficients for the associations between life-course socioeconomic factors and markers of epigenetic aging




EAA, Epigenetic age acceleration; Fin. cond., financial conditions; Fin. diff., Financial difficulties; Life-crs. SE traject, Life-course socioeconomic trajectories; LH, lowest versus highest; SE, socioeconomic indicators

Forgoing healthcare due to economic reasons was used as a two-categorical predictor: Not forgoing healthcare (Ref.); Forgoing healthcare (ABC, continuous outcome) and mortality risk score (D, discrete outcome), adjusted for sex, age, center, season, familial structure (random effect). Associations involving socioeconomic indicators in adulthood were additionally adjusted for early-life socioeconomic indicators

$\beta_{LH}$ : Regression coefficient for socioeconomic indicators used as *continuous (linearized)* predictors (Lowest vs. Highest)


Missing data was imputed for socioeconomic indicators (childhood, adulthood, life-course) using multivariate imputation by chained equations and by hypothesizing missingness at random (5 imputed datasets, 50 iterations)

**Supplementary Figure 1:** Scatterplots depicting linear associations between chronological age and second generation Levine, GrimAge, and DunedinPoAm38 epigenetic clocks (ACE), and between chronological age and epigenetic age acceleration (BDF)



$\alpha$ : Intercept;  $\beta$ : Slope;  $\rho$ : Correlation coefficient ; EAA, Epigenetic age acceleration

**Supplementary Figure 2:** Regression coefficients for the associations between life-course socioeconomic factors and *intrinsic* markers of epigenetic aging



EAA, Epigenetic age acceleration; Fin. cond., financial conditions; Fin. diff., Financial difficulties; Intr., Intrinsic; Life-crs. SE traject, Life-course socioeconomic trajectories; LH, lowest versus highest; SE, socioeconomic indicators


Forgoing healthcare due to economic reasons was used as a two-categorical predictor: Not forgoing healthcare (Ref.); Forgoing healthcare

Regression models for the association between life-course socioeconomic indicators (categorical predictor) and second generation *intrinsic* epigenetic age acceleration (ABC, continuous outcome) and mortality risk score (D, discrete outcome), adjusted for sex, age, center, season, familial structure (random effect). Associations involving socioeconomic indicators in adulthood were additionally adjusted for early-life socioeconomic indicators (father's occupation, financial conditions in childhood, father's education, and mother's education)

$\beta_{LH}$ : Regression coefficient for socioeconomic indicators used as *continuous (linearized)* predictors (Lowest vs. Highest)

Missing data was imputed for socioeconomic indicators (childhood, adulthood, life-course) using multivariate imputation by chained equations and by hypothesizing missingness at random (5 imputed datasets, 50 iterations)

**Supplementary Figure 3:** Regression coefficients for the associations between life-course socioeconomic factors and markers of epigenetic aging in individuals aged <65 years (N=509)



EAA, Epigenetic age acceleration; Fin. cond., financial conditions; Fin. diff., Financial difficulties; Life-crs. SE trajet, Life-course socioeconomic trajectories; LH, lowest versus highest; SE, socioeconomic indicators


Forgoing healthcare due to economic reasons was used as a two-categorical predictor: Not forgoing healthcare (Ref.); Forgoing healthcare

Regression model for the association between life-course socioeconomic indicators (categorical predictor) and second generation epigenetic age acceleration (ABC, continuous outcome) and mortality risk score (D, discrete outcome), adjusted for sex, age, center, season, familial structure (random effect). Associations involving socioeconomic indicators in adulthood were additionally adjusted for early-life socioeconomic indicators (father's occupation, financial conditions in childhood, father's education, and mother's education)

$\beta_{LH}$ : Regression coefficient for socioeconomic indicators used as *continuous (linearized)* predictors (Lowest vs. Highest)

Missing data was imputed for socioeconomic indicators (childhood, adulthood, life-course) using multivariate imputation by chained equations and by hypothesizing missingness at random (5 imputed datasets, 50 iterations)

**Supplementary Figure 4:** Regression coefficients for the associations between life-course socioeconomic factors and markers of epigenetic aging in individuals aged  $\geq 65$  years (N=175)



EAA, Epigenetic Age acceleration; Fin. cond., financial conditions; Fin. diff., Financial difficulties; Life-crs. SE trajet, Life-course socioeconomic trajectories; LH, lowest versus highest; SE, socioeconomic indicators

Forgoing healthcare due to economic reasons was used as a two-categorical predictor: Not forgoing healthcare (Ref.); Forgoing healthcare  
 Regression model for the association between life-course socioeconomic indicators (categorical predictor) and second generation epigenetic age acceleration (ABC, continuous outcome) and mortality risk score (D, discrete outcome), adjusted for sex, age, center, season, familial structure (random effect). Associations involving socioeconomic indicators in adulthood were additionally adjusted early-life socioeconomic indicators (father's occupation, financial conditions in childhood, father's education, and mother's education)

$\beta_{LH}$ : Regression coefficient for socioeconomic indicators used as *continuous (linearized)* predictors (Lowest vs. Highest)

Missing data was imputed for socioeconomic indicators (childhood, adulthood, life-course) using multivariate imputation by chained equations and by hypothesizing missingness at random (5 imputed datasets, 50 iterations)

## Appendix A:

### Socioeconomic factors in childhood (self-reported)

Father's occupational position (*"What was your father's socio-professional category when you were a child?"*) was self-reported using ten pre-defined categories and subdivided into three main groups: "High" (Reference group - most favorable: superior managers, liberal professions, CEO-directors, university professors), "Middle" (qualified non-manual workers, middle-level executives, self-employed (craftsman/trade)), "Low" (qualified manual and unqualified manual workers, farmers).

Father and mother's education (*"What is the highest level of education that your father/mother achieved when you were a child?"*) were self-reported using ten predefined categories, and further classified into three groups: "High" (Reference group - most favorable: university education, superior education (+3 years education after graduating high school)), "Middle" (high school graduates, education preparing for a profession: apprenticeship), "Low" (mandatory education, trade school diploma, no diploma).

Material and financial condition in childhood inquired whether participants had the following items/activities when they were a child (*"What were the items/activities your family had/benefited from when you were a child?"*): a car, a TV, a domestic worker, a dishwasher, a telephone, enough heat at home, participating to a social or cultural association, leaving home during annual vacation, home ownership. Owing  $\geq 7$  items was classified as "High" (Reference group - most favorable), 4-6 items was classified as "Middle", and  $\leq 3$  items was classified as "Low".

### Socioeconomic factors in adulthood and life-course trajectories (self-reported)

Own last known occupational position was inquired as *"What is your current/last occupation?"*, and subsequently classified using the European Socioeconomic Classification system as following [50]: "High" (Reference group - most favorable: superior managers, liberal professions, CEO-directors, university professors), "Middle" (lower level executives: teachers, qualified technicians, nurses), "Low" (qualified manual workers, sales-assistants, clerks and unqualified workers).

Own education was asked as *"What is the highest level of education that you have achieved so far?"* using the same predefined defined categories and groups as for father's or mother's education.

Financial difficulties inquired whether the participant would face difficulties paying food, rent, charges, insurance, and loans throughout the month (*"Are there times during the month when you are facing real financial to meet your needs (food, rent, bills, insurance, debt,...)?"*), and was coded as following: "No difficulties" (Reference group - most favorable: "This has never happened"), "Average difficulties" ("Not now, but this has happened in the past), "Important difficulties" ("This has happened in the recent past").

Forgoing healthcare due to financial reasons was asked as *"During the previous 12 months, has it ever happened to you, your partner, or your children to forgo using healthcare services due to financial reasons?"*, and self-reported by answering "No" (Reference group - most favorable) or "Yes". Socioeconomic trajectories across the life-course were classified as following: "Stable high" (Reference group: high father's occupation and high own occupation), "Upward mobile" (low father's occupation and middle/high own occupation, or middle father's occupation and high own occupation), "Stable middle" (middle father's occupation, middle own occupation), "Downward mobile" (high father's occupation and middle/low own occupation, or middle father's occupation and low own occupation), "Stable low" (low father's occupation and low own occupation).

## Appendix B: Markers of epigenetic aging

Levine's DNA methylation phenotypic age (DNAmPhenoAge) is a second generation clock which has been developed using CpGs related to both chronological age *and* ten health-related biomarkers [16]. In the present sample, all 513 CpGs required for Levine's DNAmPhenoAge calculation were available.

Dunedin Pace of Aging Methylation (DunedinPoAm38) is a second generation epigenetic clock, calibrated on changes in aging based on 18 physiological parameters for a period of 12 years (26y-38y) [28, 44]. All 46 CpGs required for DunedinPoAm38 were available in SKIPOGH's database.

GrimAge is a second generation epigenetic clock which incorporates multiple CpG sites related to plasma protein levels, smoking patterns, age, sex and mortality [22, 44]. GrimAge is computed based on 1030 CpG sites, out of which 947 were available in the SKIPOGH database.

The epigenetic mortality risk score (MS) is computed according to risk quartiles of ten health-related CpG sites, and has been previously related with disease occurrence, frailty, mortality but also Levine's DNAmPhenoAge [17, 20].

Out of the ten required CpGs, eight markers were available in SKIPOGH's methylation database and used to compute



a discrete score, ranging from zero (most favorable - no CpGs in the risk quartile) to eight (least favorable – all eight CpGs in the risk quartile).

Epigenetic age acceleration (EAA) was computed for Horvath's, Hannum's, Levine's, DunedinPoAm38, and GrimAge as the residuals from the regression of epigenetic clocks (response) by chronological age, and used as continuous outcome variable, whilst the MS score was untransformed and used as a discrete outcome variable.

#### **Appendix C: Reporting and grouping of health behaviors**

Smoking status was categorized as non-current vs. current smoking, the former including previous smokers. Alcohol intake was measured using questions on the number of alcoholic drinks usually consumed within a week and categorized as hazardous drinking (>3 daily alcoholic drinks for men; >2 daily alcoholic drinks for women) versus non-hazardous drinking. Physical activity was reported on a scale from 1 to 10, 1 corresponding to a complete sedentary lifestyle and 10 corresponding to manual work combined with sports practice. Based on this scale, three categories were subsequently defined: “Low” (1–4), “Middle” (5), and “High” (6–10).

## 11 References

1. Wolfe, B., W. Evans, and T.E. Seeman, *The biological consequences of socioeconomic inequalities*. 2012: Russell Sage Foundation.
2. Marmot, M. and R. Wilkinson, *Social determinants of health*. 2005: OUP Oxford.
3. Fraga, S., et al., *Association of socioeconomic status with inflammatory markers: a two cohort comparison*. Preventive medicine, 2015. **71**: p. 12-19.
4. Petrovic, D., et al., *Sociodemographic, behavioral and genetic determinants of allostatic load in a Swiss population-based study*. Psychoneuroendocrinology, 2016. **67**: p. 76-85.
5. Chan, M.Y., et al., *Socioeconomic status moderates age-related differences in the brain's functional network organization and anatomy across the adult lifespan*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2018. **115**(22): p. E5144-E5153.
6. Karimi, M., et al., *Early-life inequalities and biological ageing: a multisystem Biological Health Score approach in U-nderstanding S-ociety*. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 2019. **73**(8): p. 693-702.
7. Schrepft, S., et al., *Associations between life course socioeconomic conditions and the Pace of Aging*. The Journals of Gerontology: Series A, 2021.
8. Stringhini, S., et al., *Life-course socioeconomic status and DNA methylation of genes regulating inflammation*. International journal of epidemiology, 2015. **44**(4): p. 1320-1330.
9. Fiorito, G., et al., *The role of epigenetic clocks in explaining educational inequalities in mortality: a multi-cohort study and meta-analysis*. The Journals of Gerontology: Series A, 2022.
10. Bird, A., *DNA methylation patterns and epigenetic memory*. Genes & development, 2002. **16**(1): p. 6-21.
11. Guida, F., et al., *Dynamics of smoking-induced genome-wide methylation changes with time since smoking cessation*. Human molecular genetics, 2015. **24**(8): p. 2349-2359.
12. Mostafavi, N., et al., *Acute changes in DNA methylation in relation to 24 h personal air pollution exposure measurements: A panel study in four European countries*. Environment international, 2018. **120**: p. 11-21.
13. Tobi, E.W., et al., *DNA methylation differences after exposure to prenatal famine are common and timing-and sex-specific*. Human molecular genetics, 2009. **18**(21): p. 4046-4053.
14. Needham, B.L., et al., *Life course socioeconomic status and DNA methylation in genes related to stress reactivity and inflammation: The multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis*. Epigenetics, 2015. **10**(10): p. 958-969.
15. Horvath, S., *DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types*. Genome biology, 2013. **14**(10): p. 1-20.
16. Levine, M.E., et al., *An epigenetic biomarker of aging for lifespan and healthspan*. Aging (Albany NY), 2018. **10**(4): p. 573.
17. Zhang, Y., et al., *DNA methylation signatures in peripheral blood strongly predict all-cause mortality*. Nature communications, 2017. **8**(1): p. 1-11.
18. Fiorito, G., et al., *Socioeconomic position, lifestyle habits and biomarkers of epigenetic aging: a multi-cohort analysis*. Aging (Albany NY), 2019. **11**(7): p. 2045.
19. Fiorito, G., et al., *Social adversity and epigenetic aging: a multi-cohort study on socioeconomic differences in peripheral blood DNA methylation*. Scientific reports, 2017. **7**(1): p. 1-12.
20. Gao, X., et al., *Comparative validation of an epigenetic mortality risk score with three aging biomarkers for predicting mortality risks among older adult males*. International journal of epidemiology, 2019. **48**(6): p. 1958-1971.
21. Belsky, D.W., et al., *Eleven telomere, epigenetic clock, and biomarker-composite quantifications of biological aging: do they measure the same thing?* American Journal of Epidemiology, 2018. **187**(6): p. 1220-1230.

22. Lu, A.T., et al., *DNA methylation GrimAge strongly predicts lifespan and healthspan*. Aging (Albany NY), 2019. **11**(2): p. 303.
23. Crimmins, E.M., et al., *Associations of Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity, and Education With 13 Epigenetic Clocks in a Nationally Representative US Sample: The Health and Retirement Study*. The Journals of Gerontology: Series A, 2021. **76**(6): p. 1117-1123.
24. Kuh, D., et al., *Life course epidemiology*. Journal of epidemiology and community health, 2003. **57**(10): p. 778.
25. Carmeli, C., et al., *Mechanisms of life-course socioeconomic inequalities in adult systemic inflammation: Findings from two cohort studies*. Social Science & Medicine, 2020. **245**: p. 112685.
26. Petrovic, D., et al., *The contribution of health behaviors to socioeconomic inequalities in health: A systematic review*. Preventive Medicine, 2018. **113**: p. 15-31.
27. George, A., et al., *Life course socioeconomic position and DNA methylation age acceleration in mid-life*. J Epidemiol Community Health, 2021. **75**(11): p. 1084-1090.
28. Belsky, D.W., et al., *Quantification of the pace of biological aging in humans through a blood test, the DunedinPoAm DNA methylation algorithm*. Elife, 2020. **9**: p. e54870.
29. Pidsley, R., et al., *Critical evaluation of the Illumina MethylationEPIC BeadChip microarray for whole-genome DNA methylation profiling*. Genome biology, 2016. **17**(1): p. 1-17.
30. Lehne, B., et al., *A coherent approach for analysis of the Illumina HumanMethylation450 BeadChip improves data quality and performance in epigenome-wide association studies*. Genome biology, 2015. **16**(1): p. 1-12.
31. Hastie, T., et al., *Imputing missing data for gene expression arrays*. 1999.
32. McCrory, C., et al., *How does socio-economic position (SEP) get biologically embedded? A comparison of allostatic load and the epigenetic clock (s)*. Psychoneuroendocrinology, 2019. **104**: p. 64-73.
33. Stringhini, S., et al., *Age and gender differences in the social patterning of cardiovascular risk factors in Switzerland: the CoLaus study*. PloS one, 2012. **7**(11): p. e49443.
34. Valeri, L. and T.J. VanderWeele, *Mediation analysis allowing for exposure–mediator interactions and causal interpretation: theoretical assumptions and implementation with SAS and SPSS macros*. Psychological methods, 2013. **18**(2): p. 137.
35. VanderWeele, T. and S. Vansteelandt, *Mediation analysis with multiple mediators*. Epidemiologic methods, 2014. **2**(1): p. 95-115.
36. Shi, B., et al., *CMAverse: A Suite of Functions for Reproducible Causal Mediation Analyses*. Epidemiology, 2021. **32**(5): p. e20-e22.
37. Houseman, E.A., et al., *DNA methylation arrays as surrogate measures of cell mixture distribution*. BMC bioinformatics, 2012. **13**(1): p. 86.
38. Chen, B.H., et al., *DNA methylation-based measures of biological age: meta-analysis predicting time to death*. Aging (Albany NY), 2016. **8**(9): p. 1844.
39. Zhang, Y., et al., *Individual CpG sites that are associated with age and life expectancy become hypomethylated upon aging*. Clinical epigenetics, 2017. **9**(1): p. 1-6.
40. Horvath, S. and K. Raj, *DNA methylation-based biomarkers and the epigenetic clock theory of ageing*. Nature Reviews Genetics, 2018. **19**(6): p. 371-384.
41. McCrory, C., et al., *Early life adversity and age acceleration at mid-life and older ages indexed using the next-generation GrimAge and Pace of Aging epigenetic clocks*. Psychoneuroendocrinology, 2021: p. 105643.
42. Simons, R.L., et al., *Economic hardship and biological weathering: the epigenetics of aging in a US sample of black women*. Social Science & Medicine, 2016. **150**: p. 192-200.
43. Geronimus, A.T., et al., *Do US black women experience stress-related accelerated biological aging?* Human nature, 2010. **21**(1): p. 19-38.
44. McCrory, C., et al., *GrimAge outperforms other epigenetic clocks in the prediction of age-related clinical phenotypes and all-cause mortality*. The Journals of Gerontology: Series A, 2021. **76**(5): p. 741-749.

45. Schmitz, L.L., et al., *The Socioeconomic Gradient in Epigenetic Ageing Clocks: Evidence from the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis and the Health and Retirement Study*. *Epigenetics*, 2021; p. 1-23.
46. Crimmins, E.M., J.K. Kim, and T.E. Seeman, *Poverty and biological risk: the earlier “aging” of the poor*. *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biomedical Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 2009. **64**(2): p. 286-292.
47. Levine, M.E., et al., *Menopause accelerates biological aging*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2016. **113**(33): p. 9327-9332.
48. Kho, M., et al., *Accelerated DNA methylation age and medication use among African Americans*. *Aging (Albany NY)*, 2021. **13**(11): p. 14604.
49. Batty, G.D., et al., *Accuracy of adults’ recall of childhood social class: findings from the Aberdeen children of the 1950s study*. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 2005. **59**(10): p. 898-903.
50. Rose, D., E. Harrison, and D. Pevalin, *The European socio-economic classification: A prolegomenon*, in *Social Class in Europe*. 2014, Routledge. p. 31-66.