

Childhood maltreatment and subsequent risk of hospitalization or death due to COVID-19: a cohort study in the UK Biobank

Yue Wang^{1,2*}; Fenfen Ge^{1,2*}; Thor Aspelund¹; Helga Ask^{3,4}; Arna Hauksdóttir¹; Kejia Hu²; Jóhanna Jakobsdóttir¹; Helga Zoega^{1,5}; Qing Shen^{6,7}; Heather C Whalley^{8,9}; Ole Birger Vesterager Pedersen^{10,11}; Kelli Lehto¹²; Ole A Andreassen^{13,14}; Fang Fang²; Huan Song^{1,15,16}; Unnur A Valdimarsdóttir^{1,2,17,#}

1. Center of Public Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Iceland, Reykjavík, Iceland.

2. Institute of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden.

3. Department of Mental Disorders, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway.

4. Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.

5. School of Population Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

6. Clinical Research Center for Mental Disorders, Shanghai Pudong New Area Mental Health Center, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China.

7. Institute for Advanced Study, Tongji University, Shanghai, China.

8. Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, UK.

9. Generation Scotland, Institute of Genetics and Cancer, University of Edinburgh, UK.

10. Department of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.

11. Department of Clinical Immunology, Zealand University Hospital, Denmark.

12. Estonian Genome Centre, Institute of Genomics, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.

13. NORMENT Centre, Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.

14. NORMENT Centre, Division of Mental Health and Addiction, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway.

15. West China Biomedical Big Data Center, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China.

16. Med-X Center for Informatics, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China.

17. Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T H Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA.

* Equal contribution

Corresponding to: Prof Valdimarsdóttir, Centre of Public Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Iceland, 102 Reykjavik, Iceland (E-mail: unnurav@hi.is).

Abstract

Childhood maltreatment has been associated with some infection-related outcomes, yet its potential role in severe COVID-19 outcomes has not been addressed. Therefore, leveraging longitudinal data from the population-based UK Biobank (N=151,427), our study aimed to explore the association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes (i.e., hospitalization or death due to COVID-19) and its underlying mechanisms. Our results *suggest* that childhood maltreatment, particularly physical neglect, is associated with a 54.0% increased risk of severe COVID-19 outcomes (i.e., hospitalization or death due to COVID-19), which was not modified by genetic predisposition to severe COVID-19 outcomes. *We* found that 50.9% of this association was mediated by suboptimal socioeconomic status, lifestyle and pre-pandemic somatic diseases or psychiatric disorders. These findings highlight the role of early life adversities in severe health consequences across the lifespan and call for increased clinical surveillance of people exposed to childhood maltreatment in COVID-19 outbreaks and future pandemics.

Introduction

Childhood maltreatment, such as sexual, physical and emotional abuse or neglect, is common worldwide, affecting 42.2% of children and adolescents in Europe and 58.4% in North America.¹ Emerging evidence indicates a role of childhood maltreatment in multiple adverse health outcomes across the lifespan, including psychiatric disorders, cardiovascular diseases, cancers, and some infectious diseases.² For example, children and adolescents who have experienced sexual abuse have an elevated risk of developing genitourinary, respiratory, and ear infections.³ Several case reports have further indicated a history of childhood abuse and neglect in fatal systemic *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection,⁴ meningitis,⁵ and recurrent sepsis.⁶

COVID-19 has now resulted in almost 7 million deaths and 100 million hospitalizations worldwide.^{7 8} Among the many assessed risk factors for severe COVID-19 outcomes, including psychosocial factors such as socioeconomic status⁹ and prepandemic history of psychiatric disorders,¹⁰ childhood maltreatment has largely been overlooked. Childhood maltreatment might impact COVID-19-related morbidity and mortality outcomes through social, behavioral, emotional, and biological pathways.^{11 12} For instance, childhood maltreatment has been associated with significantly higher odds of smoking,¹ obesity,¹ cardiometabolic diseases,¹ psychiatric disorders,¹³ and other chronic somatic diseases in adulthood,^{1 2} all of which are associated with severe COVID-19 outcomes (e.g., hospitalization).¹⁴ In addition, childhood maltreatment has been associated with immunological dysfunctions,¹⁵ which may reduce an individual's capacity to recover from COVID-19.¹⁶ On the other hand, genetic predisposition to severe COVID-19 outcomes may also play an important role in the risk of COVID-19-related morbidity and mortality. Indeed,

several major genetic risk factors for severe COVID-19 outcomes have been identified¹⁷ and suggested to be associated with an increased risk of severe respiratory failure and death.¹⁸

However, to our knowledge, only one ecological study has reported a suggestive link between the estimated number of adults with adverse childhood experiences and the number of COVID-19 deaths with county-level data in the US,¹⁹ leaving the potential role of childhood maltreatment in severe COVID-19 outcomes using individual-level data unravelled. To this end, leveraging the large population-based UK Biobank cohort with pre-pandemic data on childhood maltreatment, we aimed to explore the association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes, i.e., hospitalization or death due to COVID-19, as well as to elucidate the underlying mechanisms and potential role of genetic predisposition to severe COVID-19 outcomes in this association.

Methods

Study population and design

We used data from the prospective UK Biobank cohort, which recruited more than 500,000 participants aged 40–69 years from England, Scotland, and Wales between 2006 and 2010. At baseline, participants answered questions on demographic, socioeconomic, lifestyle and health-related factors and provided biological samples for genetic studies.²⁰ Then, 339,092 participants who agreed to be contacted again were invited to complete online mental health questionnaires during 2016 and 2017, including a retrospective measure of childhood maltreatment. Of the invited participants, 46.4% (n=157,366) responded to this online measure. Despite those respondents being of higher average socioeconomic status, the

reported mental health problems are comparable to the population prevalence estimates for the corresponding age group.²¹

Health-related outcomes (e.g., diagnosis, hospitalization and death) for the participants were obtained periodically through linkage with multiple national datasets. Specifically, hospital inpatient data were obtained from Hospital Episode Statistics for England (from 1997 to September 30th, 2021), the Scottish Morbidity Record for Scotland (from 1981 to July 31st, 2021), and the Patient Episode Database for Wales (from 1998 to February 28th, 2018). Mortality data were obtained from National Health Service (NHS) Digital for England as well as Wales (from 2006 to September 30th, 2021) and NHS Central Register for Scotland (from 2006 to October 31st, 2021). Records of COVID-19 test results (by RT-PCR of nose/throat swab samples) were obtained through linkage to Public Health England (i.e., PHE, from March 16th, 2020 to September 30th, 2021), Public Health Scotland (i.e., PHS, from March 16th, 2020 to August 31st, 2021), and the Secure Anonymised Information Linkage (SAIL) databank (from March 16th, 2020 to August 31st, 2021).

In the present study, we included 151,427 participants with information on childhood maltreatment who were alive on January 31st 2020 (i.e., first confirmed COVID-19 cases in the UK) in the analysis. When exploring potential effect modification by genetic predisposition to severe COVID-19 outcomes, we excluded participants of nonwhite British ancestry (n=4,764) or without eligible genotyping data (i.e., genotyping rate < 99%, abnormal heterozygosity level, or kinship coefficient ≥ 0.0884 , n=28,870),²² leaving 117,793 participants in this analysis. Supplementary Figure 1 shows details of the study population.

Childhood maltreatment

Childhood maltreatment was measured using the validated short version of the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ-5).²³ It consists of five items assessing whether and how often individuals were exposed to the following types of maltreatment during childhood: sexual abuse, physical neglect, physical abuse, emotional neglect, and emotional abuse, with response options ranging from '0' (never true) to '4' (very often true). The questions and threshold values to define each type of childhood maltreatment are shown in Supplementary Table 1 based on Glaesmer et al.'s study.²³ In our study, we generated three types of exposure variables: (1) a binary variable indicating any childhood maltreatment, coded as '0' (no) or '1' (yes); (2) a cumulative variable indicating the number of childhood maltreatment types (range from 0 to 5), which was coded as '0', '1', '2', or '≥3' childhood maltreatment types according to the distribution of the entire study sample; and (3) five binary variables for each type of childhood maltreatment, coded as '0' (no) or '1' (yes).

COVID-19 outcomes

The main outcome of interest was severe COVID-19 outcomes during the study period (i.e., from January 31st, 2020, to October 31st, 2021). Specifically, participants with a main diagnosis of COVID-19 (ICD-10: U07.1 or U07.2) in hospital inpatient data or with a cause of death recorded as COVID-19 in death registries were defined as having severe COVID-19 outcomes. A secondary outcome of interest was COVID-19 diagnosis, which was determined through records of positive COVID-19 test results in the PHE, PHS and SAIL databanks from March 16th, 2020, to September 30th, 2021.

Genetic predisposition to severe COVID-19 outcomes

We assessed genetic predisposition to severe COVID-19 outcomes by calculating the polygenic risk score (PRS) for COVID-19 hospitalization or death according to summary statistics (Version-5) from the COVID19 Host Genetics Initiative large-scale GWAS including critically ill COVID-19 patients (n=4,792) and the control population (n=1,054,664) among individuals with European ancestry after excluding UK Biobank and 23andme participants.²⁴ We calculated the PRS using the Clumping + Thresholding approach²⁵ under 10 p-value thresholds (i.e., 5×10^{-8} , 1×10^{-7} , 1×10^{-6} , 1×10^{-5} , 1×10^{-4} , 1×10^{-3} , 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1) and validated the association between PRS and severe COVID-19 outcomes in our dataset by fitting logistic regression models adjusting for birth year, sex, genotyping array and top ten ancestry principal components. We selected the PRS with the highest Nagelkerke R^2 for further analyses (i.e., p threshold= 5.00×10^{-8} ; odds ratio=1.21, 95% CI 1.11-1.32; Nagelkerke R^2 =2.01%; Supplementary Table 2). To avoid inflated Type I error from overfitting, we also performed a principal component (PC) analysis on the set of the 10 PRSs and used the first PRS-PC for sensitivity analyses.²⁶ In our dataset, the first PRS-PC for severe COVID-19 outcomes showed a strong association with the severe COVID-19 outcome phenotype (odds ratio=1.22, 95% CI 1.11-1.33; Nagelkerke R^2 =2.01%). More information about the PRS-PC analysis is shown in Supplementary Figure 2.

Covariates

We considered birth year (<1950, 1950-1959 or ≥ 1960), sex (female or male), ethnicity (Non-White, White, or Unknown) and recruitment region (Scotland, England or Wales) as potential confounders. We studied four variable clusters as potential mediators: 1) socioeconomic status (i.e., Townsend deprivation index [TDI], lower than median, higher than median, or

unknown], annual household income [\leq £ 180, £ 18000- £ 30999, £ 31000 - £ 51999, £ 52000 - £ 100000, \geq £ 100000, or unknown] and college education [no, yes, or unknown]); 2) lifestyle factors (i.e., smoking status [never, previous, current, or unknown] and body mass index [BMI, <25 kg/m², 25-29.9 kg/m², ≥ 30 kg/m², or unknown]); 3) prepandemic somatic diseases (no or yes) and 4) prepandemic psychiatric disorders (no or yes). All potential confounders and mediators were selected because of their suggested associations with both childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes (Supplementary Figure 3).

Specifically, TDI was calculated based on the postcode of participants' address, representing the deprivation at a population level.²⁷ BMI was calculated using kilograms (kg) divided by the square of height in meters (m²) using anthropometric data measured at the assessment center at baseline. We calculated the Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) based on Deyo's coding algorithm²⁸ using hospital inpatient data (before January 31st, 2020), and patients with a CCI ≥ 1 were considered to have prepandemic somatic diseases. Supplementary Table 3 provides more details about the diseases included in the calculation of the CCI. We defined prepandemic psychiatric disorders as any diagnosis of psychiatric disorders (ICD-10: F10-F99) in Hospital Inpatient Data before January 31st, 2020.

Statistical analysis

We performed binomial logistic regression to estimate the association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes, as well as COVID-19 diagnosis (i.e., secondary outcome), with the estimates reported as odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The basic model (Model 1) was adjusted for demographic factors (i.e., birth year, sex, ethnicity and recruitment region). In a stepwise approach, the four variable clusters of

mediators were additionally adjusted to examine whether and to what extent the ORs between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes were attenuated (Models 2-5). We then conducted a regression-based causal mediation analysis²⁹ to estimate the proportion of the mediation effect by the four variable clusters of mediators separately (M1-M4) and combined (M5). Specifically, the outcomes were regressed by the primary exposure variable (i.e., exposure to childhood maltreatment), specific variable cluster of mediators and demographic factors in a binomial logistic regression model. Each mediator was then regressed by exposure and demographic factors in either binomial (e.g., pre-pandemic psychiatric disorders) or multinomial (e.g., BMI) logistic regression models. The results of the outcome and mediator models were then combined to calculate the proportion of mediation.

To determine the association of specific types of childhood maltreatment with severe COVID-19 outcomes, we ran separate analyses for each of the five childhood maltreatment types. Furthermore, we stratified our analyses by tertile of the PRS or the first PRS-PC for severe COVID-19 outcomes (i.e., low: <1st tertile; intermediate: 1st-2nd tertile; high: >2nd tertile) to examine the potential effect modification by genetic predisposition. The statistical significance of the differences between ORs was assessed by introducing interaction terms (i.e., exposure*effect modifier) in the logistic regression adjusted for birth year, sex, ethnicity, and recruitment region, and we obtained a p value to indicate statistical significance through the Wald test.

In sensitivity analyses, we first restricted the analysis of the association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes on individuals with COVID-19 diagnosis to

address the potential impact of varying risk to COVID-19 across populations. Then, to address the potential impact of COVID-19 vaccination, which started on December 8th, 2020, in the UK,³⁰ we reran the main analysis by redefining the study period from January 31st, 2020, to December 8th, 2020 (i.e., before vaccination roll out). Additionally, given the difference in data coverage across registries (e.g., Hospital Inpatient Data and Death registries) and recruitment regions (i.e., England, Scotland, and Wales), we repeated the main analysis by excluding participants registered in Wales as well as by redefining the study period from January 31st, 2020 to July 31st, 2021. Finally, we performed separate analyses for hospitalization and death due to COVID-19, in addition to considering them as one group.

All analyses were completed using R (version 4.0) and Plink (version 1.9), and a two-tailed test with $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

Patient and public involvement

Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, dissemination plans of our research.

Results

Of 151,427 participants included in the present study, 56.5% were female, and the mean (SD) age at the start of the pandemic was 67.7 (7.72) years. Nearly one-third ($n=50,441$) of the participants reported at least one type of childhood maltreatment, and emotional neglect (22.2%) was the most commonly reported type, while physical neglect (5.6%) was the least commonly reported type (Supplementary Table 1). Compared with unexposed individuals, those who were exposed to childhood maltreatment tended to have a lower level of

education and annual household income. They were also more likely to be younger, female, obese (i.e., ≥ 30 kg/m²), and with prepandemic somatic diseases as well as psychiatric disorders (Table 1).

A total of 606 individuals were hospitalized (n=542) or died (n=64) as a result of COVID-19 during the study period. We observed increased odds of severe COVID-19 outcomes among patients exposed to any childhood maltreatment (OR=1.54 [95% CI 1.31-1.81]; Table 2) when compared with unexposed individuals in the basic model (Model 1). The association was amplified in a graded manner by the cumulative number of childhood maltreatment types (p for trend < 0.01). Specifically, those who experienced three or more childhood maltreatment types had the highest odds of severe COVID-19 outcomes (2.32 [1.73-3.05]), followed by those who experienced two (1.62 [1.22-2.10]) or one (1.33 [1.09-1.62]) type. Inclusion of potential mediators in the models attenuated the magnitude of the association, although ORs remained statistically significantly higher than one in the fully adjusted model (Model 5) among individuals with any childhood maltreatment (1.26 [1.07-1.48]) and those who experienced three or more types of childhood maltreatment (1.50 [1.11-1.98]). Of the five types of childhood maltreatment, physical neglect yielded the strongest association with severe COVID-19 outcomes in the basic model (Model 1, 2.04 [1.57-2.62]; Figure 1) as well as in the model adjusted for all variable clusters of mediators (Model 5, 1.52 [1.16-1.96]), although the difference was not statistically significant (p for difference > 0.05).

The majority of the association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes was mediated through lifestyle factors (27.8%; Figure 2), followed by socioeconomic factors (20.2%), prepandemic somatic diseases (17.4%) and psychiatric

disorders (16.6%). In total, 50.9% of the association was mediated by all studied mediators and ranged from 49.5% (after physical neglect) to 79.0% (after sexual abuse) across different types of childhood maltreatment.

We obtained largely comparable results when stratified by tertiles of PRS for severe COVID-19 outcomes (p for difference > 0.05; Figure 3). Specifically, exposure to any childhood maltreatment (ORs 1.41-1.88) and three or more types of childhood maltreatment (ORs 2.14-3.11) was consistently associated with significantly increased odds of severe COVID-19 outcomes, regardless of PRS for severe COVID-19 outcomes. We observed similar results when stratifying by the first PRS-PC for severe COVID-19 outcomes (Supplementary Figure 4).

In the sensitivity analyses, we obtained largely comparable results when restricting our analysis to individuals with a COVID-19 diagnosis (Supplementary Table 4), redefining the study period before vaccination roll out (Supplementary Table 5), excluding participants registered in Wales and redefining the study period from January 31st, 2020, to July 31st, 2021 (Supplementary Table 6), or after separating hospitalization and death due to COVID-19 as outcomes (Supplementary Table 7).

Finally, in the secondary analysis, we found a weak association between childhood maltreatment and COVID-19 diagnosis (Model 1, 1.06 [1.01-1.12]), which attenuated to null when adding potential mediators to the model (Models 2-5; Table 2).

Discussion

The findings of this cohort study with prepandemic data on childhood maltreatment suggest a robust dose-response association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes. Of the different types of childhood maltreatment, physical neglect in childhood yielded the strongest association with severe COVID-19 outcomes. The associations were partly mediated by suboptimal socioeconomic status, lifestyle and prepandemic psychiatric disorders or other chronic somatic conditions and were not modified by genetic predisposition to severe COVID-19 outcomes.

To our knowledge, this is the first study to explore the association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes with individual-level data. Our findings gain support from a previous ecological study¹⁹ reporting associations between adverse childhood experiences and county-level mortality, as well as a link between early adversity and susceptibility to infectious diseases.^{3 5 31} Our findings also gain support from other studies suggesting an increased risk of illness among women with HIV who were previously exposed to sexual or physical abuse.³² In contrast, we observed a weak or no association between childhood maltreatment and COVID-19 diagnosis, which may be due to the widespread transmission of COVID-19 across the population.⁷

Interestingly, we found that physical neglect, measured as being subjected to neglect for necessary medical care during childhood, yielded a somewhat stronger association with severe COVID-19 outcomes than other types of childhood maltreatment, including assault. Indeed, physical neglect has previously been identified as a strong predictor of long-term physical outcomes, including test-identified sexually transmitted infections, diabetes and lung disease.^{33 34} Although the mechanisms behind this finding remain unclear, physical

neglect often involves chronic situations that may have cumulative and lasting effects on subsequent health and the propensity to recover from infectious diseases.³⁵ In addition, studies have suggested that individuals who experience physical neglect may not receive necessary medical care in childhood and are less likely to seek medical help or treatment in general, contributing to the increased risk of adverse health consequences in adulthood.³⁶

We noted that more than half of the association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes was mediated by suboptimal socioeconomic status, lifestyle and comorbid psychiatric or other chronic somatic conditions. These results are consistent with previous findings suggesting that childhood maltreatment may increase the risk of health problems in adulthood through multiple factors, including adoption of health-harming behaviors and vulnerabilities to conditions such as obesity and other chronic medical conditions of relevance for COVID-19 severity.^{11 37} We also found the association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes to be mediated by psychiatric disorders. Indeed, there is strong evidence for the associations between childhood maltreatment and the risk of psychiatric disorders,² added by our¹⁰ and more recent findings³⁸ indicating a role of preexisting psychiatric disorders in severe COVID-19 outcomes. Of note, among the four studied variable clusters of mediators, lifestyle-related factors appear to have the strongest contribution to the association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes; however, there is an established link between lifestyle factors and socioeconomic status,³⁹ as well as multiple diseases, including cardiometabolic conditions⁴⁰ and mental disorders.⁴¹ Therefore, the proportion mediated by each cluster of mediators, as suggested in the causal mediation analysis, is likely confounded by the other mediating clusters. Nonetheless, knowledge on these potential mediating

factors could help inform targeted interventions and mitigate the harmful effects of childhood maltreatment on severe health consequences in the COVID-19 outbreak and future pandemics.

As the association between childhood maltreatment and severe COVID-19 outcomes was still robust after controlling for these potential mediators, other biological pathways through which childhood maltreatment may lead to lasting physiological changes, including disruption of inflammatory responses⁴² and hormonal dysregulation,⁴³ and contribute to the elevated risk of severe COVID-19 outcomes. For instance, recent evidence suggests that elevated IL-6 and TNF- α levels can predict disease severity and survival in patients with COVID-19.¹⁶ In addition, our findings indicate that the influence of childhood maltreatment on severe COVID-19 outcomes is not modified by genetic predisposition to such adverse outcomes, suggesting that additional environmental risk factors, such as childhood maltreatment, may play an equal role across groups with varying genetic liability to these adverse outcomes.

Strengths and limitations of this study

The major strength of our study is the use of a prospective study design, i.e., pre-pandemic individual data on childhood maltreatment and follow-up data on COVID-19, in a large population-based cohort. This ensures that the measures of childhood maltreatment indeed preceded any severe COVID-19 outcomes and hence minimizes the risk of reverse causality. Additionally, the primary outcome of interest was severe COVID-19 outcomes (i.e., hospitalization or death), and the secondary analysis was restricted to patients tested for COVID-19 (i.e., tested positive vs. tested negative); thus, the influence of surveillance bias

should be minor. Moreover, our consideration of genetic predisposition to severe COVID-19 outcomes and a wide range of mediators provides evidence of pathways linking childhood adversities to severe COVID-19 outcomes, with potential relevance for prevention and intervention strategies.

This study also has several limitations to be noted. First, as in most studies on childhood maltreatment, information on childhood maltreatment was recalled by participants in middle or older age rather than captured prospectively (in childhood), which may be liable to underreport^{44 45} and biased by current mental state.⁴⁶ However, to explain the observed results pattern, such measurement error would have to be systematically differential in relation to later severe COVID-19 outcomes. Second, several included mediators (e.g., smoking status, BMI) were only measured once at baseline and might have changed over the 10-year follow-up. Third, the incidence of COVID-19 varied across populations and geographical regions⁴⁷, potentially with a disproportionate size of the population exposed to childhood maltreatment. However, our sensitivity analysis, which was restricted to individuals with a COVID-19 diagnosis or excluded participants registered in Wales and redefined the study period from January 31st, 2020, to July 31st, 2021, suggested a minimal influence of these factors on the reported associations. Finally, there is evidence of a ‘healthy volunteer’ selection bias of UK participants, and most severe childhood maltreatment cases were probably not included in the cohort,⁴⁸ possibly resulting in underestimation of the studied association. Indeed, the UK Biobank cohort is not representative of the entire UK population in terms of socioeconomic status or lifestyle factors, and only approximately 30% of the UK Biobank participants were included in our analysis; thus, the generalization of our findings should be made with caution.

Conclusions

In conclusion, our findings suggest that childhood maltreatment, particularly physical neglect, is robustly associated with severe COVID-19 outcomes (i.e., hospitalization or death due to COVID-19). The association was partly mediated by suboptimal socioeconomic status, lifestyle factors and comorbidities and was not modified by genetic predisposition to severe COVID-19 outcomes. These findings highlight the role of early life adversities in severe health consequences across the lifespan and call for increased clinical surveillance of people exposed to childhood maltreatment in COVID-19 outbreaks and future pandemics.

Ethics statements

Ethical approval

This study was approved by the ethics review authority (2022-01516-01) in Sweden. The UK Biobank has approval from the North West Multi-Centre Research Ethics Committee as a Research Tissue Bank approval (11/NW/0382).

Data availability statement

Data from the UK Biobank (<http://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/>) are available to all researchers upon making an application.

Acknowledgments

This research was conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under Application Number 76517. The computations and data handling were partly enabled by resources provided by the National Academic Infrastructure for Supercomputing in Sweden (NAISS) and the

Swedish National Infrastructure for Computing (SNIC) at Uppsala Multidisciplinary Center for Advanced Computational Science (UPPMAX) partially funded by the Swedish Research Council through grant agreements no. 2022-06725 and no. 2018-05973.

Contributors

UAV designed the study. YW performed the phenotypic analysis, and FG performed the genotypic analysis, with support from UAV, TA, KH and FF. YW, FG and UAV drafted the manuscript, and all authors contributed to data interpretation. All authors approved the final manuscript as submitted and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Funding

This work was supported by NordForsk (NO. 105668/138929 to UAV) and a Horizon2020 grant (will provident). YW was supported by the China Scholarship Council (NO. 202106240012). HA was supported by the Research Council of Norway (RCN, #324620) and NordForsk (NO. 156298). OAA was supported by RCN (#223273, #324499). HZ was supported by an UNSW Scientia Program Award. KL was supported by the Estonian Research Council (NO. PSG615).

Competing interests

OAA is a consultant to cortechs.ai, and received speaker's honorarium from Lundbeck, Sunovion and Janssen. All other authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Bellis MA, Hughes K, Ford K, et al. Life course health consequences and associated annual costs of adverse childhood experiences across Europe and North America: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Public Health* 2019;4(10):e517-e28.
2. Hughes K, Bellis MA, Hardcastle KA, et al. The effect of multiple adverse childhood experiences on health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Public Health* 2017;2(8):e356-e66.
3. Dargan S, Daigneault I, Ovetchkine P, et al. Association between child sexual abuse and infectious disease diagnoses. *Child abuse & neglect* 2019;97:104142.
4. Senati M, Polacco M, Grassi VM, et al. Child abuse followed by fatal systemic *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection. *Leg Med (Tokyo)* 2013;15(1):28-31. doi: 10.1016/j.legalmed.2012.08.001 [published Online First: 2012/09/18]
5. Nguefack F, Awa DM, Dongmo R, et al. Child abuse: an underestimated health problem? A case report from Cameroon. *Med Sante Trop* 2016;26(2):216-20. doi: 10.1684/mst.2016.0556 [published Online First: 2016/07/15]
6. Rubin LG, Angelides A, Davidson M, et al. Recurrent sepsis and gastrointestinal ulceration due to child abuse. *Arch Dis Child* 1986;61(9):903-5. doi: 10.1136/adc.61.9.903 [published Online First: 1986/09/01]
7. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic World Health Organization [Available from: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-20192023>].
8. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Hospitalizations: Our World in Data; 2023 [Available from: <https://ourworldindata.org/covid-hospitalizations>].
9. Rodrigues W, da Costa Frizzera H, Trevisan DMdQ, et al. Social, economic, and regional determinants of mortality in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Brazil. *Frontiers in Public Health* 2022;10:856137.
10. Yang H, Chen W, Hu Y, et al. Pre-pandemic psychiatric disorders and risk of COVID-19: a UK Biobank cohort analysis. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity* 2020;1(2):e69-e79.
11. Kendall-Tackett K. The health effects of childhood abuse: four pathways by which abuse can influence health. *Child abuse & neglect* 2002;26(6-7):715-29.
12. Ho FK, Celis-Morales C, Gray SR, et al. Child maltreatment and cardiovascular disease: quantifying mediation pathways using UK Biobank. *BMC medicine* 2020;18:1-10.
13. Aas M, Henry C, Andreassen OA, et al. The role of childhood trauma in bipolar disorders. *Int J Bipolar Disord* 2016;4(1):2. doi: 10.1186/s40345-015-0042-0 [published Online First: 20160113]
14. Ko JY, Danielson ML, Town M, et al. Risk factors for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)-associated hospitalization: COVID-19-associated hospitalization surveillance network and behavioral risk factor surveillance system. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2021;72(11):e695-e703.
15. Danese A, McEwen BS. Adverse childhood experiences, allostasis, allostatic load, and age-related disease. *Physiology & behavior* 2012;106(1):29-39.
16. Del Valle DM, Kim-Schulze S, Huang H-H, et al. An inflammatory cytokine signature predicts COVID-19 severity and survival. *Nature medicine* 2020;26(10):1636-43.
17. Initiative C-HG. The COVID-19 host genetics initiative, a global initiative to elucidate the role of host genetic factors in susceptibility and severity of the SARS-CoV-2 virus pandemic. *European Journal of Human Genetics* 2020;28(6):715-18.
18. Nakanishi T, Pigazzini S, Degenhardt F, et al. Age-dependent impact of the major common genetic risk factor for COVID-19 on severity and mortality. *The Journal of clinical investigation* 2021;131(23)
19. Srivastav A, Richard CL, McRell AS, et al. The unintended consequence of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic on racial inequities associated with adverse childhood experiences (ACEs): findings from a population-based study. *Frontiers in Public Health* 2021:1586.

20. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, et al. The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature* 2018;562(7726):203-09. doi: 10.1038/s41586-018-0579-z [published Online First: 20181010]
21. Davis KA, Coleman JR, Adams M, et al. Mental health in UK Biobank—development, implementation and results from an online questionnaire completed by 157 366 participants: a reanalysis. *BJPsych open* 2020;6(2):e18.
22. Uffelmann E, Huang QQ, Munung NS, et al. Genome-wide association studies. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers* 2021;1(1) doi: 10.1038/s43586-021-00056-9
23. Glaesmer H, Schulz A, Häuser W, et al. The childhood trauma screener (CTS)-development and validation of cut-off-scores for classificatory diagnostics. *Psychiatrische Praxis* 2013;40(4):220-26.
24. COVID19-hg GWAS meta-analyses round 5 [Available from: <https://www.covid19hg.org/results/r5/> accessed January 18 2021.
25. Uffelmann E, Huang QQ, Munung NS, et al. Genome-wide association studies. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers* 2021;1(1):59.
26. Coombes BJ, Ploner A, Bergen SE, et al. A principal component approach to improve association testing with polygenic risk scores. *Genetic epidemiology* 2020;44(7):676-86.
27. Townsend P PP, Beattie A. Health and deprivation: inequality and the North: Routledge1988.
28. Deyo RA, Cherkin DC, Ciol MA. Adapting a clinical comorbidity index for use with ICD-9-CM administrative databases. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 1992;45(6):613-19.
29. Shi B, Choirat C, Coull BA, et al. CMAverse: A Suite of Functions for Reproducible Causal Mediation Analyses. *Epidemiology* 2021;32(5):e20-e22. doi: 10.1097/ede.0000000000001378
30. Landmark moment as first NHS patient receives COVID-19 vaccination National Health Service (NHS)2020 [Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/2020/12/landmark-moment-as-first-nhs-patient-receives-covid-19-vaccination/>.
31. Avitsur R, Levy S, Goren N, et al. Early adversity, immunity and infectious disease. *Stress* 2015;18(3):289-96.
32. Liebschutz JM, Feinman G, Sullivan L, et al. Physical and sexual abuse in women infected with the human immunodeficiency virus: increased illness and health care utilization. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 2000;160(11):1659-64.
33. Haydon AA, Hussey JM, Halpern CT. Childhood abuse and neglect and the risk of STDs in early adulthood. *Perspectives on sexual and reproductive health* 2011;43(1):16-22.
34. Widom CS, Czaja SJ, Bentley T, et al. A prospective investigation of physical health outcomes in abused and neglected children: New findings from a 30-year follow-up. *American journal of public health* 2012;102(6):1135-44.
35. Hildyard KL, Wolfe DA. Child neglect: developmental issues and outcomes☆. *Child abuse & neglect* 2002;26(6-7):679-95.
36. Hornor G. Child neglect: Assessment and intervention. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care* 2014;28(2):186-92.
37. Dube SR, Fairweather D, Pearson WS, et al. Cumulative childhood stress and autoimmune diseases in adults. *Psychosomatic medicine* 2009;71(2):243.
38. Taquet M, Luciano S, Geddes JR, et al. Bidirectional associations between COVID-19 and psychiatric disorder: retrospective cohort studies of 62 354 COVID-19 cases in the USA. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2021;8(2):130-40.
39. Stalling I, Albrecht BM, Foettinger L, et al. Associations between socioeconomic status and physical activity among older adults: cross-sectional results from the OUTDOOR ACTIVE study. *BMC geriatrics* 2022;22(1):1-9.
40. Said MA, Verweij N, van der Harst P. Associations of combined genetic and lifestyle risks with incident cardiovascular disease and diabetes in the UK Biobank Study. *JAMA cardiology* 2018;3(8):693-702.

41. Bahrami S, Steen NE, Shadrin A, et al. Shared Genetic Loci Between Body Mass Index and Major Psychiatric Disorders: A Genome-wide Association Study. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2020;77(5):503-12. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.4188
42. Danese A, Pariante CM, Caspi A, et al. Childhood maltreatment predicts adult inflammation in a life-course study. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2007;104(4):1319-24.
43. Gonzalez A. The impact of childhood maltreatment on biological systems: Implications for clinical interventions. *Paediatrics & child health* 2013;18(8):415-18.
44. Jones TM, Nurius P, Song C, et al. Modeling life course pathways from adverse childhood experiences to adult mental health. *Child abuse & neglect* 2018;80:32-40.
45. Reuben A, Moffitt TE, Caspi A, et al. Lest we forget: comparing retrospective and prospective assessments of adverse childhood experiences in the prediction of adult health. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 2016;57(10):1103-12.
46. Aas M, Ueland T, Lagerberg TV, et al. Retrospectively assessed childhood trauma experiences are associated with illness severity in mental disorders adjusted for symptom state. *Psychiatry Res* 2023;320:115045. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2022.115045 [published Online First: 20221228]
47. Interactive map of cases: GOV.UK Coronavirus (COVID-19) in the UK; 2023 [Available from: <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/details/interactive-map/cases>].
48. Fry A, Littlejohns TJ, Sudlow C, et al. Comparison of Sociodemographic and Health-Related Characteristics of UK Biobank Participants With Those of the General Population. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2017;186(9):1026-34. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwx246

Tables

Table 1 Characteristics of the study population.

	Childhood maltreatment		Overall (n=151427)
	No (n=100986)	Yes (n=50441)	
Age at measure of childhood maltreatment			
Mean (SD)	64.1 (7.69)	63.3 (7.75)	63.8 (7.72)
Median [Min, Max]	65.0 [46.0, 81.0]	64.0 [46.0, 80.0]	65.0 [46.0, 81.0]
Age at start of the pandemic (i.e., 2020)			
Mean (SD)	68.0 (7.69)	67.2 (7.75)	67.7 (7.72)
Median [Min, Max]	69.0 [50.0, 84.0]	68.0 [50.0, 84.0]	69.0 [50.0, 84.0]
Birth year			
<1950	44042 (43.6%)	19711 (39.1%)	63753 (42.1%)
1950-1959	36316 (36.0%)	18997 (37.7%)	55313 (36.5%)
≥1960	20628 (20.4%)	11733 (23.3%)	32361 (21.4%)
Sex			
Female	55882 (55.3%)	29709 (58.9%)	85591 (56.5%)
Male	45104 (44.7%)	20732 (41.1%)	65836 (43.5%)
Ethnicity			
Non-White	2013 (2.0%)	2250 (4.5%)	4263 (2.8%)
White	98688 (97.7%)	47975 (95.1%)	146663 (96.9%)
Unknown	285 (0.3%)	216 (0.4%)	501 (0.3%)
Recruitment region			
Scotland	7019 (7.0%)	3137 (6.2%)	10156 (6.7%)
Wales	3771 (3.7%)	1795 (3.6%)	5566 (3.7%)
England	90196 (89.3%)	45509 (90.2%)	135705 (89.6%)
Townsend deprivation index			
Lower than median (< -2.43)	52826 (52.3%)	22825 (45.3%)	75651 (50.0%)
Higher than median (≥ -2.43)	48041 (47.6%)	27540 (54.6%)	75581 (49.9%)
Unknown	119 (0.1%)	76 (0.2%)	195 (0.1%)
College education			
No	46757 (46.3%)	24230 (48.0%)	70987 (46.9%)
Yes	47047 (46.6%)	21806 (43.2%)	68853 (45.5%)
Unknown	7182 (7.1%)	4405 (8.7%)	11587 (7.7%)
Annual household income			
≤£ 18000	10924 (10.8%)	7478 (14.8%)	18402 (12.2%)
£ 18000-£ 30999	20838 (20.6%)	10886 (21.6%)	31724 (21.0%)
£ 31000-£ 51999	26403 (26.1%)	13223 (26.2%)	39626 (26.2%)
£ 52000-£ 100000	24926 (24.7%)	10946 (21.7%)	35872 (23.7%)
≥£ 100000	7812 (7.7%)	3195 (6.3%)	11007 (7.3%)
Unknown	10083 (10.0%)	4713 (9.3%)	14796 (9.8%)
Smoking status			
Never	61041 (60.4%)	26272 (52.1%)	87313 (57.7%)
Previous	33519 (33.2%)	19440 (38.5%)	52959 (35.0%)
Current	6215 (6.2%)	4589 (9.1%)	10804 (7.1%)
Unknown	211 (0.2%)	140 (0.3%)	351 (0.2%)
Body mass index, kg/m² ^a			
<25	40352 (40.0%)	18488 (36.7%)	58840 (38.9%)
25-29.9	41925 (41.5%)	20621 (40.9%)	62546 (41.3%)
≥30	18477 (18.3%)	11191 (22.2%)	29668 (19.6%)
Unknown	232 (0.2%)	141 (0.3%)	373 (0.2%)
Prepandemic somatic diseases ^b			
No	73538 (72.8%)	35050 (69.5%)	108588 (71.7%)
Yes	27448 (27.2%)	15391 (30.5%)	42839 (28.3%)

	Childhood maltreatment		Overall (n=151427)
	No (n=100986)	Yes (n=50441)	
Prepandemic psychiatric disorders			
No	94307 (93.4%)	44493 (88.2%)	138800 (91.7%)
Yes	6679 (6.6%)	5948 (11.8%)	12627 (8.3%)

a. The body mass index was calculated using weight kilograms (kg) by the square of height in meters (m²), using anthropometric data measured at the assessment center at baseline.

b. We calculated the Charlson Comorbidity Index using hospital inpatient data (before January 31st, 2020), and patients with a CCI ≥ 1 were considered to have prepandemic somatic diseases.

Table 2 Association between childhood maltreatment and COVID-19 outcomes (OR and 95% CI)

Case/N (%)	Model 1 ^a	Model 2 ^b	Model 3 ^c	Model 4 ^d	Model 5 ^e
Severe COVID-19 outcomes (i.e., Hospitalization or death due to COVID-19)					
Any childhood maltreatment					
No 345/100986 (0.34)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Yes 261/50441 (0.52)	1.54 (1.31-1.81)	1.42 (1.21-1.68)	1.33 (1.12-1.56)	1.28 (1.08-1.51)	1.26 (1.07-1.48)
Number of childhood maltreatment types					
0 345/100986 (0.34)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
1 141/30819 (0.46)	1.33 (1.09-1.62)	1.27 (1.04-1.54)	1.22 (1.00-1.48)	1.20 (0.98-1.46)	1.19 (0.97-1.44)
2 62/11586 (0.54)	1.62 (1.22-2.10)	1.47 (1.11-1.91)	1.34 (1.01-1.75)	1.29 (0.97-1.68)	1.27 (0.95-1.65)
≥3 58/8036 (0.72)	2.32 (1.73-3.05)	2.00 (1.49-2.63)	1.69 (1.26-2.24)	1.56 (1.16-2.06)	1.50 (1.11-1.98)
COVID-19 diagnosis^f					
Any childhood maltreatment					
No 5362/35050 (15.30)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Yes 2994/18028 (16.61)	1.06 (1.01-1.12)	1.02 (0.97-1.08)	1.01 (0.96-1.07)	1.02 (0.97-1.07)	1.02 (0.97-1.07)
Number of childhood maltreatment types					
0 5362/35050 (15.30)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
1 1735/10873 (15.96)	1.03 (0.97-1.10)	1.01 (0.95-1.07)	1.00 (0.94-1.06)	1.00 (0.94-1.07)	1.01 (0.95-1.07)
2 714/4209 (16.96)	1.08 (0.99-1.18)	1.04 (0.95-1.13)	1.02 (0.94-1.12)	1.03 (0.94-1.12)	1.03 (0.94-1.13)
≥3 545/2946 (18.50)	1.14 (1.03-1.26)	1.07 (0.97-1.18)	1.05 (0.94-1.16)	1.05 (0.95-1.17)	1.06 (0.96-1.18)

a. Model 1: adjusted for demographic factors (birth year, sex, ethnicity, and recruitment region).

b. Model 2: Model 1 and additionally adjusted for socioeconomic status (townsend deprivation index, college education, and annual household income).

c. Model 3: Model 2 and additionally adjusted for lifestyle-related factors (smoking status and body mass index).

d. Model 4: Model 3 additionally adjusted for prepandemic somatic diseases (Charlson Comorbidity Index ≥1, before January 31st, 2020).

e. Model 5: Model 4 and additionally adjusted for prepandemic psychiatric disorders (ICD-10: F10-F99; before January 31st, 2020).

f. COVID-19 diagnosis was determined through records of positive COVID-19 test results in the PHE, PHS and SAIL databanks (n=8356) and compared with individuals who had records of negative COVID-19 test results (n=44722).

Figure legends

Figure 1 Association between childhood maltreatment (CM) and severe COVID-19 outcomes

(i.e., hospitalization or death due to COVID-19) by types of childhood maltreatment.

Note: Model 1: Adjusted for demographic factors (birth year, sex, ethnicity, and recruitment region); Model 2: Model 1 and additionally adjusted for socioeconomic factors (townsend deprivation index, college education, and annual household income); Model 3: Model 2 and additionally adjusted for lifestyle-related factors (smoking status and body mass index); Model 4: Model 3 and additionally adjusted for prepandemic somatic diseases (Charlson Comorbidity Index ≥ 1 , before January 31st, 2020); Model 5: Model 4 and additionally adjusted for prepandemic psychiatric disorders (ICD-10: F10-F99; before January 31st, 2020).

Figure 2 Mediating role of socioeconomic status, lifestyle, prepandemic somatic diseases

and psychiatric disorders on the associations between childhood maltreatment and severe

COVID-19 outcomes (i.e., hospitalization or death due to COVID-19).


Note: M0: adjusted for demographic factors (birth year, sex, ethnicity, and recruitment region); M1: M0 and additionally adjusted for socioeconomic status (townsend deprivation index, college education, and annual household income); M2: M0 and additionally adjusted for lifestyle-related factors (smoking status and body mass index); M3: M0 and additionally adjusted for prepandemic somatic diseases (Charlson Comorbidity Index ≥ 1 , before January 31st, 2020); M4: M0 and additionally adjusted for prepandemic psychiatric disorders (ICD-10: F10-F99; before January 31st, 2020); M5: M0 and additionally adjusted for socioeconomic status, lifestyle, and prepandemic somatic diseases psychiatric disorders; Proportion of mediation: the proportion of the total effect that is mediated through the specified mediators.


Figure 3 Association between childhood maltreatment (CM) and severe COVID-19 outcomes

(i.e., hospitalization or death due to COVID-19) by levels of polygenic risk score (PRS) to

severe COVID-19 outcomes.

* Adjusted for demographic factors (birth year, sex, ethnicity, and recruitment region).





Case/N (%)

OR (95%CI) *

Low genetic risk

Any CM

No	65/26708 (0.24)	Ref.	
Yes	54/12557 (0.43)	1.88 (1.30-2.69)	

Number of CM types

0	65/26708 (0.24)	Ref.	
1	34/7857 (0.43)	1.81 (1.18-2.73)	
2	10/2812 (0.36)	1.60 (0.77-2.97)	
≥3	10/1888 (0.53)	2.68 (1.29-5.00)	

Intermediate genetic risk

Any CM

No	92/26910 (0.34)	Ref.	
Yes	58/12354 (0.47)	1.41 (1.01-1.95)	

Number of CM types

0	92/26910 (0.34)	Ref.	
1	34/7772 (0.44)	1.29 (0.86-1.89)	
2	12/2764 (0.43)	1.32 (0.68-2.31)	
≥3	12/1818 (0.66)	2.14 (1.11-3.78)	

High genetic risk

Any CM

No	103/26697 (0.39)	Ref.	
Yes	72/12567 (0.57)	1.55 (1.14-2.09)	

Number of CM types

0	103/26697 (0.39)	Ref.	
1	35/7803 (0.45)	1.18 (0.79-1.71)	
2	18/2891 (0.62)	1.71 (1.00-2.76)	
≥3	19/1873 (1.01)	3.11 (1.84-4.98)	

P for difference

Any CM * PRS	0.58
Number of CM types * PRS	0.73

