

1           **Association of childhood adversity with frailty and the mediating role of**  
2                           **unhealthy lifestyle: Findings from the UK biobank**

3  
4   **Authors:** Gan Yang<sup>1#</sup>, Xingqi Cao<sup>1#</sup>, Jie Yu<sup>1</sup>, Xueqin Li<sup>1</sup>, Liming Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Jingyun  
5 Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Chao Ma<sup>2</sup>, Ning Zhang<sup>3</sup>, Qingyun Lu<sup>4</sup>, Chenkai Wu<sup>5</sup>, Xi Chen<sup>6,7</sup>, Emiel O.  
6 Hoogendijk<sup>8</sup>, Thomas M. Gill<sup>9</sup>, Zuyun Liu<sup>1\*</sup>

7  
8   <sup>1</sup>School of Public Health and Second Affiliated Hospital, The Key Laboratory of  
9 Intelligent Preventive Medicine of Zhejiang Province, Zhejiang University School of  
10 Medicine, Hangzhou 310058, Zhejiang, China

11   <sup>2</sup>School of Economics and Management, Southeast University, Nanjing 211189,  
12 Jiangsu, China

13   <sup>3</sup>Department of Social Medicine School of Public Health and Center for Clinical Big  
14 Data and Analytics Second Affiliated Hospital, Zhejiang University School of Medicine,  
15 Hangzhou 310058, Zhejiang, China

16   <sup>4</sup>School of Public Health, Nantong University, Nantong 226007, JiangSu, China

17   <sup>5</sup>Duke Global Health Institute, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA.

18   <sup>6</sup>Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health, New  
19 Haven, CT 06520, United States of America

20   <sup>7</sup>Department of Economics, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520, United States of  
21 America

22   <sup>8</sup>Department of Epidemiology & Data Science, Amsterdam Public Health research  
23 institute, Amsterdam UMC – location VU University medical center, Amsterdam, the  
24 Netherlands

25   <sup>9</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT 06520,

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

26 United States of America

27 #These authors contributed equally to this work.

28 **Address for correspondence:**

29 Zuyun Liu, Professor, Department of Big Data in Health Science School of Public  
30 Health and Center for Clinical Big Data and Analytics Second Affiliated Hospital, The  
31 Key Laboratory of Intelligent Preventive Medicine of Zhejiang Province, Zhejiang  
32 University School of Medicine, 866 Yuhangtang Rd, Hangzhou, 310058, Zhejiang,  
33 China. Telephone: +86-0571-87077127. Email: [Zuyun.liu@outlook.com](mailto:Zuyun.liu@outlook.com) or  
34 [zuyunliu@zju.edu.cn](mailto:zuyunliu@zju.edu.cn)

35 **Abstract**

36 **Background:**

37 Childhood adversity and lifestyle have been associated with frailty in later life, but not  
38 much is known about factors that may explain these associations. An unhealthy lifestyle  
39 may play an important role in the pathway from childhood adversity to frailty. Therefore,  
40 this study aims to investigate the association of childhood adversity with frailty, and the  
41 mediating role of unhealthy lifestyle in the association.

42 **Methods:**

43 This lifespan analysis included 152914 adults aged 40-69 years old from the UK  
44 Biobank. We measured childhood adversity with five items: physical neglect, emotional  
45 neglect, sexual abuse, physical abuse, and emotional abuse through online mental  
46 health survey. Frailty was measured by the frailty index; an unhealthy lifestyle score  
47 (range: 0-5) was calculated based on unhealthy body mass index, smoking, drinking,  
48 physical inactivity, and unhealthy diet at the baseline survey. Multiple logistic  
49 regression and mediation analysis were performed.

50 **Results:**

51 A total of 10078 participants (6.6%) were defined as having frailty. Participants with  
52 any childhood adversity had higher odds of frailty. For example, in the fully adjusted  
53 model, with a one-point increase in cumulative score of childhood adversity, the odds  
54 of frailty increased by 41% (Odds Ratio: 1.41; 95% Confidence Interval: 1.39, 1.44).  
55 Unhealthy lifestyle partially mediated the associations of childhood adversity with  
56 frailty (mediation proportion: 4.4%-7.0%). The mediation proportions were largest for  
57 physical (8.2%) and sexual (8.1%) abuse.

58 **Conclusions:**

59 Among this large sample, childhood adversity was positively associated with frailty,

60 and unhealthy lifestyle partially mediated the association. This newly identified  
61 pathway highlights the potential of lifestyle intervention strategies among those who  
62 experienced childhood adversity (in particular, physical and sexual abuse) to promote  
63 healthy aging.

64 **Keywords:**

65 Aging; Childhood adversity; Lifestyle; Frailty; Mediation analysis

## 66 **Introduction**

67 With population aging increasing worldwide, the promotion of healthy aging has gained  
68 more attention in recent years. A crucial component of healthy aging is the prevention  
69 of geriatric syndromes, such as frailty. The importance of the frailty concept,  
70 characterized by the decline of physiological systems and the ability to regulate  
71 stressors, is increasingly being acknowledged [1]. Additionally, frailty accounts for  
72 many adverse health outcomes such as disability, falls, hospitalization, and mortality,  
73 which brings a huge burden to society, caregivers, and families [2, 3].

74 Life course theory indicates that early exposure to environmental, psychosocial,  
75 and physical factors can influence the aging process [4, 5], frailty [6-14], and late-life  
76 health [15] (e.g. cardiovascular disease [16], mortality [17]). To date, five  
77 epidemiological studies have found a positive association between childhood adversity  
78 and frailty [18-22] while one study indicated a null association [23]. The conflicting  
79 findings might be partially due to the limited sample size. More importantly, not much  
80 is known about factors that may explain the childhood adversity-frailty association (if  
81 it was established) [22]. Campbell et al. [24] found that people who had adverse  
82 childhood experiences were more likely to be binge drinkers, heavy drinkers, smokers,  
83 or obese. Recent evidence also highlights that unfavorable lifestyle including lack of  
84 physical activity, poor nutrition, and sleep deprivation may synergistically influence  
85 health in later life [25]. Thus, we hypothesize that childhood adversity may influence  
86 frailty through unhealthy lifestyle, which, however, previous studies have not explored.

87 Therefore, this study aimed to examine the relationship between childhood  
88 adversity and frailty as well as the mediating role of unhealthy lifestyle in this  
89 association using data from approximately 150000 UK adults.

90

## 91 **Methods**

### 92 **Study participants**

93 This lifespan analysis used data from the UK Biobank (UKB), a large population-  
94 based cohort study with approximately half a million participants aged 40-69 years at  
95 recruitment in 2006-2010 [26]. UKB was approved by the North West-Haydock  
96 Research Ethics Committee and all participants electronically wrote informed consent  
97 at recruitment. A total of 156749 adults who were healthier, better educated, and had  
98 higher socioeconomic status than the overall biobank sample participated in both the  
99 baseline survey and the subsequent 2016 online mental health survey [27]. We excluded  
100 participants with missing data on childhood adversity (N=3728) and frailty (N=107),  
101 leaving 152914 participants in the analytic sample (**Figure S1**).

### 102 **Childhood adversity**

103 Data on childhood adversity was sourced from the 2016 online mental health  
104 survey. Childhood adversity was characterized as physical neglect, emotional neglect,  
105 sexual abuse, physical abuse, and emotional abuse using the Childhood Trauma  
106 Screener [28] across five questions. Items were divided based on the options (“very  
107 often true”, “often true”, “sometimes true”, “rarely true”, “never true”), which were  
108 scored 0 or 1 according to the cut-off points shown in **Table S1** after inversely scoring  
109 two positive items (i.e., emotional neglect, physical neglect) [29]. The cumulative score  
110 of all five items ranged from 0 to 5, with a higher score indicating more childhood  
111 adversity. The items included are:

- 112 (1) Someone to take to doctor when needed as a child (physical neglect);
- 113 (2) Felt loved as a child (emotional neglect);
- 114 (3) Sexually molested as a child (sexual abuse);
- 115 (4) Physically abused by family as a child (physical abuse);

116 (5) Felt hated by family member as a child (emotional abuse).

### 117 **Frailty measures**

118 Frailty was assessed at the baseline survey, using frailty index following the  
119 methods of Rockwood et al. [30] based on a series of indicators of ill-health in  
120 physiological and mental domains including diagnosed diseases, symptoms, and  
121 disabilities. The frailty index is well-validated for predicting mortality [2] and  
122 calculated through 49 self-reported items covering sensory, cranial, mental well-being,  
123 infirmity, cardiometabolic, musculoskeletal, immunological, cancer, pain, and  
124 gastrointestinal [31]. A frailty score, a continuous value ranging from 0 to 1, was  
125 obtained by dividing the number of deficits by the total number of deficits. For instance,  
126 a participant who has 10 items that scored 1 as opposed to 0 would have frailty scored  
127  $10/49$  (i.e., 0.204). According to the literature [32], participants with a score over 0.21  
128 were categorized as frailty, and those with a score less than 0.21 were categorized as  
129 non-frailty.

### 130 **Assessment of unhealthy lifestyle**

131 An unhealthy lifestyle score was constructed according to five lifestyle factors (i.e.,  
132 smoking status, alcohol consumption, diet, body mass index (BMI), and physical  
133 activity) sourced from structured questionnaires and 24 hours dietary recalls at the  
134 baseline survey.

135 Based on the recommendations of the World Health Organization, smoking more  
136 than 100 cigarettes in life was considered as unhealthy [33]. The daily consumption of  
137 one alcoholic drink or more for females and two drinks or more for males was  
138 considered as unhealthy [33]. For diet, having not achieved the intake goals for more  
139 than half of the following components: vegetables, fruits, whole grains, (shell)fish,  
140 vegetable oils, dairy products, unprocessed meats, sugar-sweetened beverages, and

141 refined grains was considered as unhealthy [34]. A BMI out of the range of 18.5-24.9  
142 kg/m<sup>2</sup> was considered as unhealthy [35]. For physical activity, a) less than 150 minutes  
143 or 5 days per week of moderate physical activity; or b) less than 75 minutes or once per  
144 week of vigorous activity were considered as unhealthy levels of physical activity [36].

145 For each lifestyle factor, the unhealthy level was scored 1 and otherwise, was  
146 scored 0. The unhealthy lifestyle score ranged from 0 to 5 and a higher score indicated  
147 a higher level of unhealthy lifestyle.

#### 148 **Covariates**

149 The following covariates collected at baseline survey were included: chronological  
150 age, sex, ethnicity, educational level, occupation, Townsend deprivation index (TDI),  
151 and maternal smoking around birth. Ethnicity was classified as white, mixed, south  
152 Asian, black, Chinese, and others [37]. Educational level was defined as high (college  
153 or university degree), intermediate (A/AS levels or O levels/GCSEs or equivalent), and  
154 low (none of the aforementioned) [33]. The occupation was classified as working,  
155 retired, and others (unemployed, unpaid/voluntary work, full/part-time student, looking  
156 after home and/or family, unable to work because of sickness or disability, or did not  
157 answer) [38]. TDI consisted of data on housing, social class based on the postal code,  
158 and employment, with a higher TDI indicating a lower level of socioeconomic status  
159 [38].

#### 160 **Statistical Analyses**

161 The basic characteristics of the study participants were classed by frailty with  
162 mean±standard deviation (SD) for continuous variables and counts (percentage) for  
163 categorical variables. The basic characteristics across groups were compared by t-test  
164 for continuous variables and  $\chi^2$  test for categorical variables, respectively. We imputed  
165 the missing values of smoking status (N=1632), alcohol consumption (N=16299), diet



166 (N=1), physical activity (N=798), and covariates (N=20597) with the Multiple  
167 Imputation by Chained Equations [39], using five copies of imputation.

168 First, multiple logistic regression models were performed to estimate the  
169 associations between childhood adversity and frailty (**Figure 1**). We documented odds  
170 ratios (ORs) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) from three models.  
171 Model 1 was adjusted for age and sex. Model 2 was additionally adjusted for ethnicity,  
172 occupation, educational level, TDI, and maternal smoking around birth. Model 3 was  
173 additionally adjusted for unhealthy lifestyle score.

174 Second, to examine whether unhealthy lifestyle mediates the associations of  
175 childhood adversity with frailty, we performed a mediation analysis. First, we used  
176 linear regression models to evaluate the associations of childhood adversity with  
177 unhealthy lifestyle score in two models. We controlled for age and sex in Model 1 and  
178 further controlled for more covariates including ethnicity, occupation, educational level,  
179 TDI, and maternal smoking around birth in Model 2. Second, we used multiple logistic  
180 regression models to evaluate the associations between unhealthy lifestyle and frailty  
181 in two similar models. Finally, we performed a mediation analysis using R package  
182 “mediation” with 1000 simulations and documented the mediation proportions and  
183 corresponding 95% CIs in an age- and sex-adjusted model. The method for calculating  
184 the mediation proportions mediation was: average causal mediation effects/ (average  
185 causal mediation effects +average direct effects) [40].

186 To test the robustness of the findings, we conducted several sensitivity analyses.  
187 First, we repeated the primary analyses using another frailty measure — the frailty  
188 phenotype. Details on frailty phenotype are described in **supplemental methods**.  
189 Second, we re-estimated the associations of childhood adversity with frailty that was  
190 inputted as a continuous variable. Third, we used 0.25 as an alternative cutoff to define

191 frailty and repeated the main analyses [3]. Fourth, we repeated the main analyses after  
192 excluding participants with missing data on lifestyles and covariates.

193 We used SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) and R version 4.1.1 (2021-08-  
194 10) to conduct all analyses. P values less than 0.05 were considered statistically  
195 significant (two-tailed).

196

## 197 **Results**

### 198 **Characteristics of participants**

199 The characteristics of the participants are presented in **Table 1**. The age of  
200 participants was 56.4 (SD=7.7) years, and 6.6% (N=10078) of participants were defined  
201 as having frailty.

### 202 **Mediation analysis of unhealthy lifestyle on associations between childhood 203 adversity and frailty**

204 First, **Table 2** presents the associations of childhood adversity with unhealthy  
205 lifestyle. Both individual items of childhood adversity (except for physical neglect) and  
206 cumulative childhood adversity were associated with higher unhealthy lifestyle score  
207 in the fully adjusted model (Model 2).

208 Second, **Figure S2** shows the associations of unhealthy lifestyle with frailty. In  
209 Model 1, with a one-point increase in unhealthy lifestyle score, the odds increased by  
210 46% (OR: 1.46, 95% CI: 1.43, 1.48). In Model 2, the results remain unchanged after  
211 adjustment for other covariates.

212 Finally, **Figure 2** and **Figure S3** present the prevalence of frailty and frailty score  
213 by individual items and the cumulative score of childhood adversity. Compared with  
214 participants who did not experience any adversity, those who experienced adversity had  
215 a higher prevalence of frailty (P<0.001). **Table 3** shows significant associations of

216 childhood adversity with frailty and the mediation proportion of childhood adversity in  
217 frailty attributed to unhealthy lifestyle. We found that childhood adversity was  
218 positively associated with frailty. For example, compared with participants who did not  
219 experience any adversity, those who experienced sexual abuse had increased odds (OR:  
220 2.03; 95%CI: 1.91, 2.15) of frailty after adjustment for age and sex (Model 1). After  
221 further adjustment for ethnicity, educational level, occupation, TDI, and maternal  
222 smoking around birth, the strength of these associations decreased slightly but remained  
223 statistically significant (Model 2). After further adjusting for unhealthy lifestyle score,  
224 the associations remained robust (Model 3). For cumulative childhood adversity, a  
225 dose-response association was observed. With a one-point increase in cumulative score  
226 of childhood adversity, the odds of frailty increased by 41% (OR: 1.41; 95% CI: 1.39,  
227 1.44) (Model 3). The mediation proportion of unhealthy lifestyle in associations  
228 between childhood adversity and frailty ranged from 4.4%-7.0%. Regarding individual  
229 items of childhood adversity, physical (mediation proportion: 8.2%) and sexual abuse  
230 (mediation proportion: 8.1%) were more likely to influence frailty through unhealthy  
231 lifestyle than other items.

232

### 233 **Sensitivity analyses**

234 First, with another frailty measure (i.e., frailty phenotype), similar associations  
235 were observed with higher mediation proportion (ranging from 8.7%-17.2%) than that  
236 of frailty index (**Table S2-S4**). Second, **Table S5** shows the positive associations  
237 between cumulative childhood adversity and frailty score ( $\beta=0.010$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) in the  
238 fully adjusted model. Third, when using an alternative cutoff of 0.25 for frailty, the  
239 significant associations of childhood adversity with frailty and the mediating role of  
240 unhealthy lifestyle on the associations were maintained (**Table S6**). Fourth, after

241 excluding participants with missing data on lifestyles, these associations remained  
242 robust (**Table S7**).

243

## 244 **Discussion**

245 Our analyses of a large sample of 152914 participants of UKB aged 40-69 years,  
246 resulted in two main findings. First, we confirmed significant associations of childhood  
247 adversity with frailty, highlighting the importance of reducing traumatic experiences in  
248 early life. Second, for the first time we found that unhealthy lifestyle partially mediated  
249 the association between childhood adversity (in particular physical and sexual abuse)  
250 and frailty. The finding reveals a novel pathway and the potential of lifestyle  
251 interventions to prevent or reduce the severity of frailty among adults who have already  
252 experienced some childhood adversities.

253 The findings of the positive associations between childhood adversity and frailty  
254 are consistent with most previous studies [18-22]. However, one study among 182 older  
255 patients with affective disorder did not find any association of childhood adversity with  
256 frailty [23]. Our findings strengthen the associations in a large sample size of general  
257 population and have important public implications for interventions on childhood  
258 adversity in early life to diminish health inequality in late life. Frailty represents a  
259 decline of the function of multiple systems [22]. Our findings may suggest a potential  
260 of programs targeting childhood adversity in the prevention of frailty and physiological  
261 dysfunction.

262 To the best of our knowledge, this was the first study to demonstrate that unhealthy  
263 lifestyle partially mediated the associations of childhood adversity with frailty.  
264 Childhood adversity is linked to inadequate ability to regulate emotions and cope with  
265 stress from early-life to adulthood. As a way of managing feelings of anger and

266 powerless, people who experienced childhood adversity are more likely to adopt  
267 unhealthy behaviors (e.g., smoking, drinking, unhealthy diet) [41, 42]. Frailty is widely  
268 recognized to be linked with poor diet, sedentary lifestyles, physical inactivity, and  
269 obesity [3]. Also, several studies have demonstrated that adherence to healthy lifestyle  
270 is linked to a lower risk of frailty [43-45]. These observations support our findings that  
271 childhood adversity may lead to frailty through unhealthy lifestyle. The mediating role  
272 of unhealthy lifestyle highlights the importance of modifiable lifestyle interventions to  
273 mitigate accelerated functional aging process (proportions mediation: 4.4%-8.2%)  
274 among adults who have already experienced childhood adversity. Meanwhile, the  
275 partial mediation suggests that modifiable lifestyle interventions are insufficient, and  
276 more strategies should be explored.

277       Given the relatively large sample, we were able to further distinguish the mediation  
278 proportions of unhealthy lifestyle in the associations between individual items of  
279 childhood adversity and frailty. Relative to other items, physical and sexual abuse were  
280 pronouncedly associated with frailty through unhealthy lifestyle. Similar to our  
281 observation of the greater associations of physical and sexual abuse with unhealthy  
282 lifestyle, previous study found that physical and sexual abuse were associated with a  
283 higher risk of smoking [46]. This provides clues that pathways from childhood  
284 adversity to health outcomes may differ by individual item of childhood adversity. A  
285 longitudinal study has indicated that the association of physical abuse with glucose  
286 metabolism may be largely explained by adulthood obesity while the association of less  
287 severe adversities (e.g., emotional neglect) was mostly explained by childhood  
288 socioeconomic factors [47]. Moreover, given the relatively small mediation proportion  
289 in our study, other mediators of biological and psychological mechanisms including  
290 adult socioeconomic status [48], attachment and mood symptoms [49] may exist. Thus,

291 comprehensively understanding the character of diverse childhood adversities and the  
292 underlying mechanism of how they affect late-life health is necessary, and then we  
293 could tailor the programs targeting childhood adversity.

294 The present study has some strengths including the large sample size of middle-  
295 aged and older adults. Furthermore, a series of sensitivity analyses were performed to  
296 confirm the validity of the findings. This study also has limitations. First, the mediator  
297 (unhealthy lifestyle score) was assessed at the same time as the outcome (frailty) in the  
298 study. Longitudinal studies are needed to examine the causal relationship. Second,  
299 frailty was measured at baseline while the mental health survey was administered 6 to  
300 10 years later, which may introduce some healthy selection. Third, recall bias was  
301 inevitable given the retrospective information of childhood adversity. However,  
302 retrospective childhood adversity records are reported to have moderate associations  
303 between childhood adversity and adverse outcomes observed in perspective-records  
304 studies [50]. Fourth, due to a lack of detailed data on childhood adversity, our study is  
305 unable to assess the association of the duration and the severity of childhood adversity  
306 with frailty. Further studies were demanded to reinforce the findings of the study. Fifth,  
307 most participants in UKB are White and have relatively high socioeconomic status [51],  
308 which may lead to selection bias and potential confounders.

### 309 **Conclusions**

310 In this large sample of more than 150000 UK adults, childhood adversity was positively  
311 associated with frailty, and unhealthy lifestyle partially mediated the association,  
312 especially for the associations of physical and sexual abuse with frailty. Our findings  
313 highlight the potential of programs targeting on childhood adversity and lifestyle  
314 intervention strategies to promote healthy aging. A comprehensive understanding of the  
315 character of diverse childhood adversities and the underlying mechanism of how they

316 affect late-life health is needed.

### 317 **Availability of data and materials**

318 The datasets analysed during the current study are available in the UK Biobank  
319 repository, <http://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk>.

### 320 **Abbreviations**

321 **UKB:** UK Biobank

322 **BMI:** Body mass index

323 **TDI:** Townsend deprivation index

324 **SD:** Standard deviation

325 **OR:** Odds ratio

326 **CI:** Confidence interval

327

### 328 **Reference:**

- 329 1. Beard JR, Officer A, de Carvalho IA, Sadana R, Pot AM, Michel JP, Lloyd-Sherlock P,  
330 Epping-Jordan JE, Peeters GME, Mahanani WR *et al*: **The World report on ageing and**  
331 **health: a policy framework for healthy ageing.** *Lancet* 2016, **387**(10033):2145-2154.
- 332 2. Kojima G, Iliffe S, Walters K: **Frailty index as a predictor of mortality: a systematic**  
333 **review and meta-analysis.** *Age Ageing* 2018, **47**(2):193-200.
- 334 3. Hoogendijk EO, Afilalo J, Ensrud KE, Kowal P, Onder G, Fried LP: **Frailty: implications for**  
335 **clinical practice and public health.** *Lancet* 2019, **394**(10206):1365-1375.
- 336 4. Liu Z, Chen X, Gill TM, Ma C, Crimmins EM, Levine ME: **Associations of genetics,**  
337 **behaviors, and life course circumstances with a novel aging and healthspan**  
338 **measure: Evidence from the Health and Retirement Study.** *PLoS Med* 2019,  
339 **16**(6):e1002827.
- 340 5. Schrempft S, Belsky DW, Draganski B, Kliegel M, Vollenweider P, Marques-Vidal P,  
341 Preisig M, Stringhini S: **Associations between life course socioeconomic conditions**  
342 **and the Pace of Aging.** *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2021.
- 343 6. Gale CR, Booth T, Starr JM, Deary IJ: **Intelligence and socioeconomic position in**  
344 **childhood in relation to frailty and cumulative allostatic load in later life: the**  
345 **Lothian Birth Cohort 1936.** *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2016, **70**(6):576-582.
- 346 7. Alvarado BE, Zunzunegui MV, Beland F, Bamvita JM: **Life course social and health**  
347 **conditions linked to frailty in Latin American older men and women.** *J Gerontol A*



- 348 *Biol Sci Med Sci* 2008, **63**(12):1399-1406.
- 349 8. Stolz E, Mayerl H, Waxenegger A, Rasky E, Freidl W: **Impact of socioeconomic position**  
350 **on frailty trajectories in 10 European countries: evidence from the Survey of Health,**  
351 **Ageing and Retirement in Europe (2004-2013).** *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2017,  
352 **71**(1):73-80.
- 353 9. Soler-Vila H, García-Esquinas E, León-Muñoz LM, López-García E, Banegas JR,  
354 Rodríguez-Artalejo F: **Contribution of health behaviours and clinical factors to**  
355 **socioeconomic differences in frailty among older adults.** *J Epidemiol Community*  
356 *Health* 2016, **70**(4):354-360.
- 357 10. Herr M, Robine JM, Aegerter P, Arvieu JJ, Ankri J: **Contribution of socioeconomic**  
358 **position over life to frailty differences in old age: comparison of life-course models**  
359 **in a French sample of 2350 old people.** *Ann Epidemiol* 2015, **25**(9):674-680 e671.
- 360 11. Haapanen MJ, Perala MM, Salonen MK, Kajantie E, Simonen M, Pohjolainen P, Pesonen  
361 AK, Raikkonen K, Eriksson JG, von Bonsdorff MB: **Early life stress and frailty in old age:**  
362 **the Helsinki birth cohort study.** *BMC Geriatr* 2018, **18**(1):179.
- 363 12. Van der Linden BWA, Cheval B, Sieber S, Orsholits D, Guessous I, Stringhini S, Gabriel R,  
364 Aartsen M, Blane D, Courvoisier D *et al*: **Life Course Socioeconomic Conditions and**  
365 **Frailty at Older Ages.** *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2020, **75**(6):1348-1357.
- 366 13. Rogers NT, Blodgett JM, Searle SD, Cooper R, Davis DHJ, Pinto Pereira SM: **Early-Life**  
367 **Socioeconomic Position and the Accumulation of Health-Related Deficits by**  
368 **Midlife in the 1958 British Birth Cohort Study.** *Am J Epidemiol* 2021, **190**(8):1550-  
369 1560.
- 370 14. Ye C, Aihemaitijiang S, Wang R, Halimulati M, Zhang Z: **Associations between Early-**  
371 **Life Food Deprivation and Risk of Frailty of Middle-Age and Elderly People:**  
372 **Evidence from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study.** *Nutrients* 2021,  
373 **13**(9).
- 374 15. Jones NL, Gilman SE, Cheng TL, Drury SS, Hill CV, Geronimus AT: **Life Course**  
375 **Approaches to the Causes of Health Disparities.** *Am J Public Health* 2019,  
376 **109**(S1):S48-s55.
- 377 16. Suglia SF, Koenen KC, Boynton-Jarrett R, Chan PS, Clark CJ, Danese A, Faith MS,  
378 Goldstein BI, Hayman LL, Isasi CR *et al*: **Childhood and Adolescent Adversity and**  
379 **Cardiometabolic Outcomes: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart**  
380 **Association.** *Circulation* 2018, **137**(5):E15-E28.
- 381 17. Kelly-Irving M, Lepage B, Dedieu D, Bartley M, Blane D, Grosclaude P, Lang T, Delpierre  
382 C: **Adverse childhood experiences and premature all-cause mortality.** *Eur J*  
383 *Epidemiol* 2013, **28**(9):721-734.
- 384 18. Van Der Linden BWA, Sieber S, Cheval B, Orsholits D, Guessous I, Gabriel R, Von Arx M,  
385 Kelly-Irving M, Aartsen M, Blane D *et al*: **Life-Course Circumstances and Frailty in Old**  
386 **Age Within Different European Welfare Regimes: A Longitudinal Study With**  
387 **SHARE.** *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2020, **75**(6):1326-1335.
- 388 19. Li Y, Xue QL, Odden MC, Chen X, Wu C: **Linking early life risk factors to frailty in old**  
389 **age: evidence from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study.** *Age*  
390 *Ageing* 2020, **49**(2):208-217.
- 391 20. Mian O, Anderson LN, Belsky DW, Gonzalez A, Ma J, Sloboda DM, Bowdish DME,



- 392 Verschoor CP: **Associations of Adverse Childhood Experiences with Frailty in Older**  
393 **Adults: A Cross-Sectional Analysis of Data from the Canadian Longitudinal Study**  
394 **on Aging.** *Gerontology* 2021;1-10.
- 395 21. Wang Q: **Association of Adverse Childhood Experiences With Frailty Index Level and**  
396 **Trajectory in China.** *JAMA Netw Open* 2022, **5**(8):e2225315.
- 397 22. Dos Santos Gomes C, Pirkle CM, Zunzunegui MV, Taurino Guedes D, Fernandes De  
398 Souza Barbosa J, Hwang P, Oliveira Guerra R: **Frailty and life course violence: The**  
399 **international mobility in aging study.** *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2018, **76**:26-33.
- 400 23. Schmahl OC, Jeuring HW, Aprahamian I, Naarding P, Marijnissen RM, Hendriks GJ,  
401 Fluiters M, Rhebergen D, Lugtenburg A, Lammers MW *et al.* **Impact of childhood**  
402 **trauma on multidimensional frailty in older patients with a unipolar depressive-,**  
403 **anxiety- or somatic symptom disorder.** *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2021, **96**:104452.
- 404 24. Campbell JA, Walker RJ, Egede LE: **Associations Between Adverse Childhood**  
405 **Experiences, High-Risk Behaviors, and Morbidity in Adulthood.** *Am J Prev Med* 2016,  
406 **50**(3):344-352.
- 407 25. Vineis P, Kelly-Irving M, Rappaport S, Stringhini S: **The biological embedding of social**  
408 **differences in ageing trajectories.** *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2016, **70**(2):111-113.
- 409 26. Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, Danesh J, Downey P, Elliott P, Green J,  
410 Landray M *et al.* **UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a**  
411 **wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age.** *PLoS Med* 2015,  
412 **12**(3):e1001779.
- 413 27. Davis KAS, Coleman JRI, Adams M, Allen N, Breen G, Cullen B, Dickens C, Fox E, Graham  
414 N, Holliday J *et al.* **Mental health in UK Biobank - development, implementation and**  
415 **results from an online questionnaire completed by 157 366 participants: a**  
416 **reanalysis.** *BJPsych Open* 2020, **6**(2):e18.
- 417 28. Grabe HJ, Schulz A, Schmidt CO, Appel K, Driessen M, Wingenfeld K, Barnow S, Spitzer  
418 C, John U, Berger K *et al.* **[A brief instrument for the assessment of childhood abuse**  
419 **and neglect: the childhood trauma screener (CTS)].** *Psychiatr Prax* 2012, **39**(3):109-  
420 115.
- 421 29. Soares ALG, Hammerton G, Howe LD, Rich-Edwards J, Halligan S, Fraser A: **Sex**  
422 **differences in the association between childhood maltreatment and cardiovascular**  
423 **disease in the UK Biobank.** *Heart* 2020, **106**(17):1310-1316.
- 424 30. Mitnitski AB, Mogilner AJ, Rockwood K: **Accumulation of deficits as a proxy measure**  
425 **of aging.** *TheScientificWorldJournal* 2001, **1**:323-336.
- 426 31. Williams DM, Jylhava J, Pedersen NL, Hagg S: **A Frailty Index for UK Biobank**  
427 **Participants.** *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2019, **74**(4):582-587.
- 428 32. Searle SD, Mitnitski A, Gahbauer EA, Gill TM, Rockwood K: **A standard procedure for**  
429 **creating a frailty index.** *BMC Geriatr* 2008, **8**:24.
- 430 33. Zhang YB, Chen C, Pan XF, Guo J, Li Y, Franco OH, Liu G, Pan A: **Associations of healthy**  
431 **lifestyle and socioeconomic status with mortality and incident cardiovascular**  
432 **disease: two prospective cohort studies.** *Bmj* 2021, **373**:n604.
- 433 34. Said MA, Verweij N, van der Harst P: **Associations of Combined Genetic and Lifestyle**  
434 **Risks With Incident Cardiovascular Disease and Diabetes in the UK Biobank Study.**  
435 *JAMA Cardiol* 2018, **3**(8):693-702.

- 436 35. Li Y, Schoufour J, Wang DD, Dhana K, Pan A, Liu X, Song M, Liu G, Shin HJ, Sun Q *et al*.  
437 **Healthy lifestyle and life expectancy free of cancer, cardiovascular disease, and type**  
438 **2 diabetes: prospective cohort study.** *Bmj* 2020, **368**:l6669.
- 439 36. Lourida I, Hannon E, Littlejohns TJ, Langa KM, Hypponen E, Kuzma E, Llewellyn DJ:  
440 **Association of Lifestyle and Genetic Risk With Incidence of Dementia.** *JAMA* 2019,  
441 **322**(5):430-437.
- 442 37. Cao Z, Zheng X, Yang H, Li S, Xu F, Yang X, Wang Y: **Association of obesity status and**  
443 **metabolic syndrome with site-specific cancers: a population-based cohort study.** *Br*  
444 *J Cancer* 2020, **123**(8):1336-1344.
- 445 38. Chudasama YV, Khunti K, Gillies CL, Dhalwani NN, Davies MJ, Yates T, Zaccardi F:  
446 **Healthy lifestyle and life expectancy in people with multimorbidity in the UK**  
447 **Biobank: A longitudinal cohort study.** *PLoS Med* 2020, **17**(9):e1003332.
- 448 39. van Buuren S, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K: **mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained**  
449 **Equations in R.** *J Stat Softw* 2011, **45**(3):1 - 67.
- 450 40. Dustin Tingley TY, Kentaro Hirose, Luke Keele, Kosuke Imai: **mediation: R Package for**  
451 **Causal Mediation Analysis.** *J Stat Softw* 2014.
- 452 41. Duffy KA, McLaughlin KA, Green PA: **Early life adversity and health-risk behaviors:**  
453 **proposed psychological and neural mechanisms.** *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2018,  
454 **1428**(1):151-169.
- 455 42. Amianto F, Spalatro AV, Rainis M, Andriulli C, Lavagnino L, Abbate-Daga G, Fassino S:  
456 **Childhood emotional abuse and neglect in obese patients with and without binge**  
457 **eating disorder: Personality and psychopathology correlates in adulthood.**  
458 *Psychiatry Res* 2018, **269**:692-699.
- 459 43. Fan J, Yu C, Pang Y, Guo Y, Pei P, Sun Z, Yang L, Chen Y, Du H, Sun D *et al*: **Adherence**  
460 **to Healthy Lifestyle and Attenuation of Biological Aging in Middle-Aged and Older**  
461 **Chinese Adults.** *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2021, **76**(12):2232-2241.
- 462 44. Kehler DS, Theou O: **The impact of physical activity and sedentary behaviors on**  
463 **frailty levels.** *Mech Ageing Dev* 2019, **180**:29-41.
- 464 45. Abe T, Nofuji Y, Seino S, Murayama H, Yoshida Y, Tanigaki T, Yokoyama Y, Narita M,  
465 Nishi M, Kitamura A *et al*: **Healthy lifestyle behaviors and transitions in frailty status**  
466 **among independent community-dwelling older adults: The Yabu cohort study.**  
467 *Maturitas* 2020, **136**:54-59.
- 468 46. Chang X, Jiang X, Mkandawire T, Shen M: **Associations between adverse childhood**  
469 **experiences and health outcomes in adults aged 18-59 years.** *PLoS One* 2019,  
470 **14**(2):e0211850.
- 471 47. Thomas C, Hypponen E, Power C: **Obesity and type 2 diabetes risk in midadult life:**  
472 **the role of childhood adversity.** *Pediatrics* 2008, **121**(5):e1240-1249.
- 473 48. Yazawa A, Shiba K, Inoue Y, Okuzono SS, Inoue K, Kondo N, Kondo K, Kawachi I: **Early**  
474 **childhood adversity and late-life depressive symptoms: unpacking mediation and**  
475 **interaction by adult socioeconomic status.** *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2022,  
476 **57**(6):1147-1156.
- 477 49. Sideli L, Murray RM, Schimmenti A, Corso M, La Barbera D, Trotta A, Fisher HL:  
478 **Childhood adversity and psychosis: a systematic review of bio-psycho-social**  
479 **mediators and moderators.** *Psychol Med* 2020, **50**(11):1761-1782.

- 480 50. Reuben A, Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Belsky DW, Harrington H, Schroeder F, Hogan S,  
481 Ramrakha S, Poulton R, Danese A: **Let us not forget: comparing retrospective and**  
482 **prospective assessments of adverse childhood experiences in the prediction of**  
483 **adult health.** *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2016, **57**(10):1103-1112.  
484 51. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, Doherty N, Adamska L, Sprosen T, Collins R, Allen NE:  
485 **Comparison of Sociodemographic and Health-Related Characteristics of UK**  
486 **Biobank Participants With Those of the General Population.** *Am J Epidemiol* 2017,  
487 **186**(9):1026-1034.

488

## 489 **Acknowledgments**

490 This research has been conducted using the UK Biobank resource under application  
491 number 61856. We wish to acknowledge the UK Biobank participants who provided  
492 the sample that made the data available.

## 493 **Funding**

494 This research was supported by a grant from the National Natural Science Foundation  
495 of China (82171584), Key Laboratory of Intelligent Preventive Medicine of Zhejiang  
496 Province (2020E10004), and Zhejiang University Global Partnership Fund (188170-  
497 11103). This work was also supported by the Career Development Award  
498 (K01AG053408) from the National Institute on Aging. Dr. Gill is supported by the  
499 Claude D. Pepper Older Americans Independence Center at Yale School of Medicine  
500 from the National Institute on Aging (P30AG021342); and the National Center for  
501 Advancing Translational Sciences (UL1TR001863). The funders had no role in the  
502 study design; data collection, analysis, or interpretation; in the writing of the report; or  
503 in the decision to submit the article for publication.

## 504 **Authors' contributions**

505 ZL contributed to the conception and design of the work; ZL acquired the data; GY

506 and XC performed the analysis. All authors contributed to the interpretation of data.

507 GY wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors substantively revised the

508 manuscript, read and approved the final manuscript.

509 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:**

510 The UK Biobank study was approved by the North West Multi-Centre Research

511 Ethics Committee (11/NW/0382) and written informed consent was provided by each

512 participant before the study. UK Biobank also has approval from the North West

513 Multi-Centre Research Ethics Committee as a Research Tissue Bank (RTB) approval

514 in 2011 and is renewed every 5 years. According to RTB approval, researchers are

515 allowed to use data from UK Biobank without an additional ethical clearance.

516 **Consent for publication**

517 Not applicable.

518 **Competing interests**

519 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

**Table 1. Basic characteristics of study participants.**

Variables	Total (N=152914)	Without frailty (N=142836)	With frailty (N=10078)	P value
Age, years	56.4±7.7	56.3±7.7	57.7±7.4	<0.001
Sex				<0.001
Female	86142 (56.3)	80003 (56.0)	6139 (60.9)	
Male	66772 (43.7)	62833 (44.0)	3939 (39.1)	
Ethnicity				0.004
White	148599 (97.2)	138,823 (97.2)	9776 (97.0)	
Multiple	798 (0.5)	745 (0.5)	53 (0.5)	
South Asian	1262 (0.8)	1169 (0.8)	93 (0.9)	
Black	1071 (0.7)	1003 (0.7)	68 (0.7)	
Chinese	348 (0.2)	337 (0.2)	11 (0.1)	
Other <sup>a</sup>	836 (0.5)	759 (0.5)	77 (0.8)	
Educational level <sup>b</sup>				<0.001
High	70866 (46.3)	67488 (47.2)	3378 (33.5)	
Intermediate	50281 (32.9)	46688 (32.7)	3593 (35.7)	
Low	31767 (20.8)	28660 (20.1)	3107 (30.8)	
Occupation				<0.001
Working	97657 (63.9)	92871 (65.0)	4786 (47.5)	
Retired	45121 (29.5)	41542 (29.1)	3579 (35.5)	
Other	10136 (6.6)	8423 (5.9)	1713 (17.0)	
TDI	-1.7±2.8	-1.8±2.8	-1.0±3.2	<0.001
BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	26.8±4.6	26.6±4.4	29.7±6.0	<0.001
<18.5	857 (0.6)	806 (0.6)	51 (0.5)	
18.5-24.9	56952 (37.2)	54882 (38.4)	2070 (20.5)	
≥24.9	95105 (62.2)	87148 (61.0)	7957 (79.0)	
Smoking, yes	64140 (41.9)	58885 (41.2)	5255 (52.1)	<0.001
Drinking, yes	60764 (39.7)	56145 (39.3)	4619 (45.8)	<0.001
Physical inactivity, yes	39463 (25.8)	35669 (25.0)	3794 (37.6)	<0.001
Unhealthy diet, yes	94074 (61.5)	87675 (61.4)	6399 (63.5)	<0.001
Maternal smoking around birth, yes	44282 (29.0)	40481 (28.3)	3801 (37.7)	<0.001

Notes: BMI, body mass index; TDI, Townsend deprivation index.

<sup>a</sup>Other includes any races or ethnicities not otherwise specified.

<sup>b</sup>High educational level: college or university degree; Intermediate educational level: A/AS levels or equivalent, O levels/GCSEs or equivalent; Low educational level: none of the aforementioned.

1 **Table 2. Associations of childhood adversity with unhealthy lifestyle score.**

Childhood adversity	Model 1		Model 2	
	$\beta$ (95% CI)	P value	$\beta$ (95% CI)	P value
Physical neglect	0.066 (0.050, 0.082)	<0.001	0.012 (-0.004, 0.028)	0.147
Emotional neglect	0.153 (0.139, 0.167)	<0.001	0.115 (0.101, 0.129)	<0.001
Sexual abuse	0.200 (0.179, 0.221)	<0.001	0.171 (0.151, 0.192)	<0.001
Physical abuse	0.204 (0.189, 0.219)	<0.001	0.170 (0.155, 0.185)	<0.001
Emotional abuse	0.188 (0.172, 0.204)	<0.001	0.155 (0.139, 0.171)	<0.001
Cumulative childhood adversity score (0-5)	0.086 (0.081, 0.091)	<0.001	0.067 (0.062, 0.073)	<0.001
0	Ref.	—	Ref.	—
1	0.083 (0.069, 0.097)	<0.001	0.063 (0.049, 0.077)	<0.001
2	0.172 (0.153, 0.191)	<0.001	0.133 (0.114, 0.152)	<0.001
3	0.255 (0.230, 0.281)	<0.001	0.201 (0.175, 0.226)	<0.001
4	0.331 (0.296, 0.367)	<0.001	0.255 (0.220, 0.291)	<0.001
5	0.468 (0.405, 0.531)	<0.001	0.355 (0.292, 0.418)	<0.001

2 Notes: CI, confidence interval.

3 Model 1: adjusted for age and sex.

4 Model 2: further adjusted for ethnicity, educational level, occupation, TDI, and maternal smoking around birth based on Model 1.

5 **Table 3. Associations of childhood adversity with frailty and mediation proportion of childhood adversity in frailty attributed to**  
6 **unhealthy lifestyle.**

Childhood adversity	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Mediation proportion (%) (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	P value
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)		
Physical neglect	1.90 (1.81, 1.99)	1.64 (1.56, 1.72)	1.65 (1.57, 1.73)	3.1 (2.4, 4.0)	<0.001
Emotional neglect	2.34 (2.25, 2.44)	2.12 (2.03, 2.22)	2.07 (1.98, 2.16)	5.4 (4.8, 6.0)	<0.001
Sexual abuse	2.03 (1.91, 2.15)	1.84 (1.73, 1.95)	1.79 (1.69, 1.90)	8.1 (7.0, 9.0)	<0.001
Physical abuse	2.14 (2.05, 2.24)	1.96 (1.87, 2.05)	1.89 (1.80, 1.98)	8.2 (7.4, 9.0)	<0.001
Emotional abuse	2.76 (2.63, 2.88)	2.48 (2.37, 2.61)	2.41 (2.30, 2.53)	5.1 (4.6, 6.0)	<0.001
Cumulative childhood adversity score (0-5)	1.51 (1.49, 1.53)	1.44 (1.41, 1.46)	1.41 (1.39, 1.44)	—	—
0	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	—	—
1	1.60 (1.52, 1.69)	1.53 (1.45, 1.62)	1.52 (1.44, 1.60)	7.0 (5.7, 9.0)	<0.001
2	2.39 (2.25, 2.54)	2.18 (2.05, 2.33)	2.13 (2.00, 2.27)	6.6 (5.8, 7.0)	<0.001
3	3.48 (3.25, 3.74)	3.03 (2.82, 3.26)	2.92 (2.72, 3.15)	5.8 (5.1, 7.0)	<0.001
4	4.96 (4.55, 5.39)	4.02 (3.68, 4.40)	3.88 (3.55, 4.24)	5.0 (4.4, 6.0)	<0.001
5	8.04 (7.07, 9.14)	5.85 (5.10, 6.71)	5.49 (4.80, 6.29)	4.4 (3.8, 5.0)	<0.001


7 Notes: OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.

8 Model 1: adjusted for age and sex.


9 Model 2: further adjusted for ethnicity, educational level, occupation, TDI, and maternal smoking around birth based on Model 1.

10 Model 3: further adjusted for unhealthy lifestyle score based on Model 1.

11 A




12 B



13 **Figure 1. Roadmap for evaluating associations between childhood adversity,**  
14 **unhealthy lifestyle, and frailty.**





16  
17  
18

**Figure 2. Prevalence of frailty by individual items and the cumulative score of childhood adversity. A prevalence of frailty by individual items of childhood adversity (all  $P < 0.001$ ); B prevalence of frailty by the cumulative score of childhood adversity ( $P < 0.001$ ).**