

## **Growing up in poverty, growing old with multimorbidity in America, Britain, China, Europe and Indonesia: a retrospective and prospective study in 31 countries**

**Gindo Tampubolon** 4 July 2024

NIHR Policy Research Unit on Healthy Ageing

[tampubolon@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:tampubolon@manchester.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** childhood poverty, multimorbidity, life course, fixed effects, America, Britain, China, Europe, Indonesia

### **Abstract**

The childhood poor in rich countries have reported worse cognitive, muscle and mental functions in old age. But it is uncertain whether the childhood poor around the world are at higher risks of multimorbidity because childhood recollections are often erroneous.

**METHODS:** Some 81,804 older adults over 50 years in 31 countries recalled their childhood conditions at ten to fourteen and prospectively reported their chronic conditions. Childhood conditions in Britain and Europe include numbers of books, rooms and people, presence of running hot water and central heating. Across in America, these are mostly replaced with financial hardship or family indebtedness, in China starvation to death due to government edict while in Indonesia presence of running cold water. Per prior practice childhood poverty is a latent construct of these error-laced recollections while multimorbidity is defined as at least two from a set of chronic conditions. Associations with multimorbidity are obtained with fixed effects probit model, controlling for age, education, wealth, marital status and youth illness. Extensive sensitivity analyses assessed robustness.

**RESULTS:** Childhood poverty associates with higher probabilities of multimorbidity (0.088, [95% confidence interval 0.057 – 0.118]) in 31 rich and developing countries. And women reported lower probabilities of multimorbidity (-0.071, [-0.096 – -0.047]). Frequencies of multimorbidity vary across countries, and likewise age profiles of multimorbidity in later life.

**DISCUSSION:** Evidence is accumulating that childhood lasts a life time in rich and developing nations. The various childhood recollections indicating poverty show that the childhood poor grow old with more chronic conditions. Because population ageing is posing a momentous challenge across the world, more research is needed on the life course shaping of healthy ageing. But this strong evidence calls for urgent actions to eliminate child poverty on account of its lifelong rewards. [287 + 4233 words]

### Introduction

Childhood poverty is a risk factor for old age disability, dysfunction and disease in America, Britain, China and Europe.(1–8) It raises question whether childhood poverty also marks multimorbidity – two or more chronic conditions – which often entails adverse clinical

outcomes, high costs of care and mortality, not least due to unoptimized treatment that is geared toward single-condition treatment. (9,10) Ongoing ageing surveys have provided ample materials to examine the reach of childhood poverty.(11,12) Twenty eight trans-Atlantic countries from America through Britain to Israel report life course links that persist, marking cognitive and muscle function and depression status of older adults over 50 years who grew up as children in poverty.(3) With such comparative design admitting many countries, new evidence on life course shaping of multimorbidity can be used to advance efforts during the UN Decade of Healthy Ageing.(13) This is urgent because multimorbidity reduces older adults' wellbeing and simultaneously increases costs of treatment and care placed on the patients, families and societies.(9,14,15)

This work aims to test the *hypothesis of life course shaping of multimorbidity* in America, Britain, China, Europe and Indonesia which posits that childhood poverty continues to mark multimorbidity in old age in 31 rich and developing nations even after adolescent health is considered – the lifelong association between poverty and multimorbidity remains. To achieve this five sister studies are used in a cross-country fixed effect design following earlier studies.(3,4) These are the Health & Retirement Study – HRS, English Longitudinal Study of Ageing – ELSA, Survey of Health Ageing & Retirement in Europe – SHARE, China Ageing, Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study – CHARLS, Indonesia Family Life Survey – IFLS.(16–20)

These 31 nations are chosen to encompass the span of ageing experience and its size: while Britain took eight decades to double the proportion of its 60 plus population, China only needs two decades to face the same predicament, a rapid velocity. Moreover these nations epitomise the momentous challenge posed by the ageing population: today this older population in China is fifteen times the size of its peer in Britain. But by the end of this

decade according to the UN, it will be nineteen times at 370 million

(<https://population.un.org/wpp/> accessed 21 June 2024). With such velocity and mass, the momentum of ageing is challenging the world.

To understand older adults' health, the frame of social determinants of health with links across the life course is adopted, defined as “conditions in the environments in which people are born and *raised*, live, learn, work, play, worship, and *age* that affect a wide range of health, functioning, and quality-of-life outcomes”.(21–23) The life course shaping hypothesis posits how one was *raised* materially has influence on the chance of experiencing multimorbidity as one *ages*.

When testing the hypothesis different concepts and indicators of childhood conditions are adopted in practice. Childhood poverty, childhood socioeconomic position and adverse childhood experience were some of them. Their indicators were often captured as scales or latent constructs. These indicators vary including parental social class, education and employment, self-report of family financial hardship or bankruptcy; being raised in a foster family; material facilities of childhood home such as number of rooms and people (indicating overcrowding), availability of books, running hot and cold water, central heating or indoor lavatory.(12,24–31) This study does not use the adverse childhood experience scale for two reasons. First, the scale is complementary to the other concepts. Second, the scale has more psychological or subjective elements which suggests more susceptibility to errors. I am not aware of any test of the magnitude of the errors, for instance by comparing a report of emotional abuse obtained during childhood with another report of the same experience obtained in later life, unlike childhood poverty which has undergone such veracity test in Britain.(1,2) Another veracity test of the childhood conditions recollection in a developing nation will be presented shortly. In sum, in rich and developing nations childhood

recollection is erroneous, thus following prior practice a latent construct of childhood poverty is used.(1–5,7)

By examining the life course shaping hypothesis in rich and developing nations, large and small, we support efforts to secure healthy ageing including in the UN Decade of Healthy Ageing, through evidence on the risk factor of childhood poverty.(13)

### Methods and materials

#### **Outcome: multimorbidity**

Following extensive empirical literature, a person has multimorbidity if two or more chronic conditions from a standard set are present; none and one chronic condition are considered together as the reference i.e. no multimorbidity; altogether making multimorbidity a binary outcome. The set lists diabetes, high cholesterol or dyslipidaemia, high blood pressure or hypertension, heart failure, stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cancer of any except skin kind, and memory problems. This set was present in all five sister surveys.

#### **Childhood information**

The participants were asked retrospectively about their childhood conditions up to eight decades earlier, then prospectively about their health. Retrospective indicators of childhood poverty, obtained from adults with average age of 66 year, raise concern about recall error. For example, in 2008 some 2500 Britons aged 50 were asked to recall the numbers of rooms and people in their homes when they were eleven (to assess overcrowding). Only one in three got both numbers right. Their mothers gave the objective answers when visited 39 years earlier; the families are Britain's National Child Development Study 1958 cohort.(1,2) Similarly, in 2015 all adult members of the IFLS (wave 5) were asked the same two questions

and water sources (cold running water, rain water etc.) when they were twelve. Of course, in 1993 (wave 1) the members were visited in their homes so matching can be made in order to check the answers – there were 1877 matches (aged twelve in 1993 and 34 in 2015). Fewer than one in ten (6%) got both numbers right. The best recalled is water sources (62%). In both rich and developing countries adults aged 34 – 50 years gave more erroneous answers than correct ones. It is scarcely plausible that an average 66 year old participant achieved perfect recall of childhood conditions. Assuming no errors in these retrospective surveys is unsafe.

Recent studies have responded to this concern by devising latent construct for childhood poverty, a practice followed here.(1–7) The alternative of using retrospective indicators as if they are perfectly recalled leads not only to unsafe inferences, it also prevents cross-country learning. For example, both Si and colleagues and Li and colleagues used childhood conditions collected in CHARLS to explain health in older Chinese.(8,32) The inclusion of death from starvation during the Great Leap Forward complicates comparison with other countries' experience because no other countries in the HRS, ELSA, SHARE or IFLS, imposed comparable edict. Similarly, the presence of running *hot* water indicator in ELSA and SHARE, *were it included as is*, will equally complicate the comparison because this was not asked in CHARLS. To overcome this researchers from America, Britain and Europe have devised latent construct for childhood poverty which enables it to be used as a risk factor to explain multimorbidity in older adults. (1–7)

ELSA collected life history in wave 3, while SHARE collected childhood information in its life history waves (3 and 7 for those who did not provide it the first time). The HRS, ELSA and SHARE indicators have been described elsewhere.(2,3,33,34) HRS collected

childhood information in the core interview at each wave but, crucially, this is not closely comparable with indicators from the other side of the Atlantic, instead opting to elaborate on financial situation. This information is augmented with the ad hoc Life History Mail Survey 2017. Such indicators were also used in the precursor of SHARE, the Survey of Income and Living Conditions in Europe which has been analysed with the same method used here.(12) CHARLS and IFLS both collected life history information in 2014. Although ageing studies in America, Britain, China, Europe and Indonesia have close family resemblance, the differences are worth listing (Table 1). (2,3,33,34)

### **Table 1. Retrospective childhood information in HRS, ELSA, CHARLS, SHARE & IFLS.**

#### **Non-response patterns for retrospective interviews**

The analytic sample comprises prospective sample members who agreed to retrospective interviews. Some declined and there may be significant differences between the analytic vs declined sample, tested using  $\chi^2$  and  $t$  tests for nominal and continuous variables as appropriate (table 2). In the HRS the analytic sample has 61% females and 39% males, with  $\chi^2_1 = 15.7$  and  $p$  value  $< 0.001$ ; a pattern also observed in IFLS. In contrast, in SHARE, ELSA and CHARLS analytic samples females are no more likely to agree to retrospective interviews. Meanwhile in the HRS the analytic sample has older members and this difference is significant while in SHARE, ELSA and IFLS the opposite is true while also significant; CHARLS is found in between, with no significant difference. In sum, there are no strong patterns of participation in retrospective interviews around the world – a notable finding.

**Table 2. Non-response patterns across analytic vs declined sample in HRS, ELSA, CHARLS, SHARE & IFLS.**

To test the life course shaping hypothesis, the latent variable of childhood poverty was matched with multimorbidity in 2020/2021 except for CHARLS and IFLS in 2014/2015. A set of social determinants is included as standard in the literature including age, sex, youth illness, education, marital status and wealth (2,3,5,35,36) Per prior practice studying America, Britain and Europe, all analyses control for differences between countries by including country fixed effects, and standard error correction was applied because the key exposure of childhood poverty is an estimated latent variable.(3,37) To check robustness of the results *sensitivity analyses* were conducted: random effects instead of fixed effects, gender-stratified analysis, alternative threshold of multimorbidity (three or more), count of chronic conditions with Poisson model (See Supplement). Statistical significance was set at 5% (95% confidence interval/CI) and Latent GOLD version 6 was used for estimation.(38)


**Results**

Table 3 collects features of the analytic sample which has 56% female and mean age 65.7 year. Among female participants 19.7% reported more multimorbidity; among males this figure is 20%. Importantly, one in five experienced poverty in childhood, giving power to estimation in fully adjusted model.

**Table 3. Summary features of the analytic sample with categorical variables in numbers (percentages) and continuous variables in means (standard deviations). Sources HRS, ELSA, CHARLS, SHARE and IFLS.**

## Multimorbidity profile across countries

Most older adults reported none or one chronic condition, except in America. Of those with two or more chronic conditions they are distributed differently across the national sample, compare for instance Estonia, Latvia and China in the first column. Together these reflect the histories and health systems variations across these nations, from the NHS in Britain to the largely private health system in America. The implications will be discussed shortly, comprising China and America as illustration.



Source: Tampubolon June 2024; HRS, ELSA, CHARLS, SHARE, IFLS; N = 81,804


The probit model coefficients explaining multimorbidity are collected in table 4 which shows that in America, Britain, China, Europe and Indonesia growing up in poverty accompanies growing old with multimorbidity (coefficient 0.088,  $p \leq 0.001$ ), females report lower probability of multimorbidity (-0.071,  $p \leq 0.001$ ) and the probabilities increase with age



(0.027,  $p \leq 0.001$ ). Briefly, the other covariates suggest that college education (compared to high school or lower) associates with lower probabilities of multimorbidity (-0.189,  $p \leq 0.001$ ). Being in the bottom third of wealth distribution associates with higher risks of multimorbidity. Importantly, reflecting the social determinants framework above, illness during adolescence is significant and in the expected direction (0.229,  $p \leq 0.001$ ). This leaves childhood poverty coefficient to be interpreted as a fully adjusted association with multimorbidity.

**Table 4. Probit coefficients explaining multimorbidity in HRS, ELSA, CHARLS, SHARE and IFLS. Constant includes the reference country Britain.**

To focus on the childhood poverty, for each nation the predicted probabilities of multimorbidity over the age of 70 to 90 are plotted as distinguished by childhood poverty, then these plots are collected in a trellis plot (Figure 1). This shows at a glance how childhood poverty shapes multimorbidity in old age across a wide range of history and health systems in the rich and developing nations.



Source: Tampubolon June 2024; HRS, ELSA, CHARLS, SHARE, IFLS; N = 81,804

Figure 1. Probabilities of multimorbidity among the childhood poor (dash) and non-poor (solid) in older people aged 70 to 90 years in Britain, Europe and America based on models in table 3 where all covariates are set at the sample averages. Analysis of HRS, ELSA, CHARLS, SHARE and IFLS.

The trellis plot reveals several key patterns including ones obtained for the first time here. (Statistical significance has been presented above.) First, age is an important risk factor though it works differently in different countries, validating the fixed effect design. For example, compare the levels and slopes of Slovakia and America (penultimate row). Second, childhood poverty puts people at a disadvantage in old age, putting the dashed lines always above the solid lines. Third, the regional patterns of Europe are discernible especially distinguishing the Scandinavian and Eastern European nations. Together, the variations in levels and slopes are marked (e.g. the penultimate row without Indonesia), preventing one single summary pattern from representing all rich countries.

Finally, the contrast between America and China is instructive while counter intuitive. The comparison apparently suggests that there are more older Americans than Chinese with multimorbidity for the same age, more than half versus less than one in ten at 70. Moreover, the slope in America is steeper. America being richer than China in income terms should have suggested the opposite if the well-known wealth and health association founded our intuition. Instead the pattern is a manifestation of survival bias or selective mortality.(39) The samples in the two countries differ markedly, giving rise to this counter intuitive pattern, where in China the history of the Great Leap Forward left only the strongest to survive until very old ages of 70 to 90. This determines the lower level and gentler slope of multimorbidity in the country. This is perhaps coupled with the less sensitive or comprehensive diagnostics in the country compared to those in America with its largely private health system. Together these result in a marked counter intuitive pattern obtained here for the first time. Sensitivity analyses were conducted and the results above stand (Supplement).

**Table 5. Sensitivity analysis: Probit coefficients with fixed effects explaining multimorbidity as three or more chronic conditions in America (HRS), Britain (ELSA), China (CHARLS), Europe (SHARE) and Indonesia (IFLS).**

**Supplement Tables 6, 7, 8 and 9. Sensitivity analyses: Poisson coefficients explaining number of chronic conditions (6); Probit coefficients with random effects (7) and stratified by sex (8 and 9), explaining multimorbidity in America (HRS), Britain (ELSA), China (CHARLS), Europe (SHARE) and Indonesia (IFLS)**

### **Discussion: life course links and global links**

Evidence is accumulating that the early life stage reaches into old age. Childhood poverty continues to shape the health of older people even in rich nations across many chronic conditions or multimorbidity. This is the first evidence from 31 nationwide representative

surveys of how childhood poverty plays a role in multimorbidity variations in older adults over 50. This operates in diverse health systems: in a national health system (UK), a largely private health system (US) and everything in between. The British National Health Service has a history that spans more than 75 years old and has accompanied Britons in the study participants throughout their life courses. Using latent construct to recover child poverty, the analysis shows important associations between childhood poverty and multimorbidity that are consistently observed across the world, enriching our appreciation of the life course shaping of health in old age.

What mechanism lies behind this shaping is an important question. I have tried to offer an epigenetic explanation and evidence for the role of childhood poverty as a risk factor.(3) Poverty in childhood is found to induce epigenetic change through increasing methylation rates which leaves a mark that lasts until old age in the American Venous Blood Sample.(3,40,41) Children with similar genetic make-up may nevertheless differ in their phenotypic expression, hence organ function, because their childhood conditions differ in ways that accumulate adverse methylation rates i.e. epigenetic changes in one child more than in another.(3,42) That childhood lasts a lifetime, we knew. Now we know it also shapes the chance of multimorbidity.

What happens in one stage of life shapes health in much later stage, likewise what happens in one country shapes what can happen in other countries regarding older people with multimorbidity, more specifically their long term care. Recall China and Britain. If China requires social care workers for its older population at the end of this decade (nineteen times that of Britain), for long term care associated with multimorbidity, and China invited care workers from overseas, then both countries will compete for these workers. Today Britain is already struggling to attract social care workers from overseas, despite their own

special visa lane.(43) The evidence here about the influence of childhood poverty on multimorbidity suggests that more older adults will need long term care, and the competition for social care workers is likely to get more intense.

Even with the preceding insights there are limits to what can be learned from this work. First, its framework is not a full structural framework,(4) although this has precedents.(2,5,44) That alternative has encouraged the authors to suggest that were more covariates considered, the association with childhood poverty would be entirely weakened. This suggestion is of course an eminently empirical question. The imperative remains that a fuller framework should be considered when all information on youth and adult conditions in all these countries are available. Second, this work is also limited in its focus on material lack in childhood, lacking psychological variables such as parent(adult)-child nurturing or abusive relationships. Cultivating psychological development is of course core to the life course stage of raising children.(45) Third, by including fixed effects this work controls for unobserved differences between nations such as their histories and health systems. Fourth, putting together these sister studies of HRS, SHARE, ELSA, CHARLS and IFLS which vary in their retrospective indicators may be a step too far. It is better to analyse each survey separately, one may suggest. Of course efforts to harmonise these sister studies (and more) are desirable and ongoing e.g. the Gateway to Aging initiative. This methodological approach of deriving a latent construct of childhood poverty complements such initiatives. Moreover, nation by nation analyses for these 31 nations can be done in future monographs. Last, a key limitation arises from the design being observational rather than a randomised study (to childhood material intervention and to control), preventing causal interpretation of these results. The childhood poor may differ from the non-poor in ways not observed. Moreover, some of the childhood poor may not have survived to take part in these longitudinal randomised ageing

studies. Although this survivor effect may suggest a direction of bias, its magnitude is unknown. See the comparison between America and China above.

The strengths were mentioned throughout but three need emphasis. First, this is the first analysis to study 31 countries in the family of Health and Retirement Study, with closely comparable key exposure and health outcomes that speak directly to the UN Decade of Healthy Ageing.(13) The geographic reach of the sample as well as the variety of health systems it encompasses, together strengthen the generalisation of the results to nations around the world. Second, all the parallel surveys are ongoing, making this work a unique pad to launch future works on the consequences of child poverty in old age, on age trajectories of myriad health outcomes and multimorbidity in ageing populations across nations.

Another advantage of this frame of life course shaping which constructs childhood poverty as a latent variable is it can handle disparate information collected across ageing surveys as indicators of childhood poverty, from lack of running hot or cold water to financial hardship to starving to death due to government edict. In turn this means three things. For example: it is possible to encompass childhood war experience such as the Russian war in Ukraine and the Hamas-Israel war in Palestine. Second, it can uncover critical difference across the world such as survival effects in China. Had these 31 countries not been put into the same frame, we would not have noticed the critical consequence of world history.

(3,46,47) Last, it offers parsimony without losing much theoretical insight along the way. Li et al 2020 use 11 childhood factors while Si et al add more, giving 13 factors, while giving similar results i.e. childhood disadvantage relates to worse health outcomes (more frailty and weaker intrinsic capacity, respectively). The framework can include unique factors such as starving to death due to government edict (Mao's Great Leap Forward) which is historically specific because few countries have comparable experience since the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. This

frame of life course shaping allows diverse and historically rooted childhood conditions to be explored as to their influences much later in life in many countries around the world, rich or otherwise.

### **Reflection on recent literature**

These findings echo recent studies in different countries though not all.(1–3,5–7,33,34) While consensus has not yet arrived, the evidence is largely supportive of a life course shaping of multimorbidity. The contrast with the new findings here can arise from the outcome studied or the special nature of the sample. Here nationally representative samples are used, comparable across 31 countries. Further, fixed effects capturing idiosyncratic country effects such as unique health system and history, are included. All agree in showing that the childhood poor experience more multimorbidity in old age.

But a few studies on the life course shaping of health in older ages have reported different results, which may be due to variations in variable construction, outcomes, methods, health systems and broader structures of societies. Vable and coauthors in America suggest that once socioeconomic mobility in adulthood is considered, no direct association remains between childhood economic status and old age health.(7) On this side of the Atlantic, studies in Sweden and Europe have also shown varying associations between poverty or economic status in childhood with old age health.(4–6) But the construct of childhood conditions vary. Lennartsson and colleagues depart from the usual practice of ignoring recall error by using latent construct of childhood poverty, in fact a full structural model to explain old age health indicated by pain, fatigue and breathing difficulty in Sweden; meanwhile Pakpahan and colleagues also used a structural model to explain self-rated health in old age in 13 European countries.(4,5)

In Sweden the authors suggest that childhood poverty is no longer binding on old age health once adult conditions are considered. This may be explained in two ways. The extensive welfare state of Sweden has been known to deliver exceptional health service to its older population. Our own work comparing 17 countries in Europe shows that Sweden has managed to break the link between economic position and sensory impairment.(48) Lennartsson and colleagues may have found a manifestation of Sweden's exceptionalism in ameliorating pain, fatigue and breathing difficulty. But this can sit with the results above: on multimorbidity childhood poverty continues to matter.(5) Sweden's exceptionalism may not have succeeded in breaking all the links between childhood poverty and the spectrum of health in old age. If indeed the mechanism involves epigenetic changes, amelioration is possible but perhaps the chance of complete elimination is slim.

It is worth demonstrating above that childhood recall is erroneous, putting empirical studies which ignore this onto unsafe inference.

### **Future research and policy including the UN Decade of Healthy Ageing**

Evidence from around the world laid here raises several implications for research and global health policy. First, retrospective childhood information is viable and can be fruitfully examined by recognising that this information is laced with error. Crucially, childhood poverty, a latent construct built on several retrospective indicators, can still be obtained.(1–3)

Second, this strong result from many countries speaks directly to global health policy such as the UN Decade of Healthy Ageing.(13) The initiative can grab the opportunity to emphasise the life course shaping of health in older ages around the world, showing the magnitudes and significance as obtained here. If rich countries with their advanced health systems have experienced this life course shaping of health, the many low and middle income countries are also likely to carry the long reach of childhood poverty. The 31 countries in this



study are mostly high income countries; those who grew rich before growing older. China and Indonesia are the only middle income countries in the study.

In Britain the Chief Medical Officer recently reported on critical plans to ensure healthy ageing in the country.(10) The report entitled "Health in an Ageing Society" emphasises within-country spatial disparity in multimorbidity, in particular showing older adult with greater need of care are found in coastal and rural areas. This constitutes specific care and research challenges. Overseas, the low and middle-income countries are in a decidedly different predicament of growing old before growing rich. Moreover, the WHO observed that the countries with the difficult predicament are growing old faster.(49) These countries should be the focus of future research on the life course shaping of health in older ages.

The findings are uniquely relevant to healthy ageing policies to reduce the burden of multimorbidity in older age through keener appreciations of its deep roots, lending support to global initiatives that aim to support families and communities in raising children outside poverty. While more knowledge is needed, especially on how economic development entails epigenetic changes operating across the life course, strong evidence is at hand to help secure a decade of healthy ageing for the world.

## Tables

Surveys	HRS (age <16)	ELSA & SHARE (age 10)
<b>Variable</b>	Number of rooms Number of people Number of books Ever experienced: being financially poor had to move or be helped because of financial difficulty, had to live with grandparents, father unemployed	Number of rooms Number of people Number of books Physical facilities: indoor toilet, fixed bath, central heating, hot & cold running water
Surveys	CHARLS (age <17)	IFLS (age 12)
<b>Variable</b>	Family member starved to death Had to move due of financial difficulty Experienced financial hardship Living in commune that is unsafe ... less willing to help others ... not close knit ... not clean	Number of rooms Number of people Had electricity Had cold running water Had indoor toilet Experienced hunger or famine

Table 1. Retrospective childhood information in HRS, ELSA, CHARLS, SHARE & IFLS.

Survey	Variable	Declined sample	Analytic sample
<b>HRS</b>	Female	58%	61%
	Male	42%	39%
	Mean age	64.6 year	68.8 year
		$\chi_1^2 = 15.7$	$p < 0.001$
<b>ELSA</b>	Female	56%	55%
	Male	44%	45%
	Mean age	65.1 year	64.4 year
		$\chi_1^2 = 2.0$	$p = 0.160$
<b>SHARE</b>	Female	56%	58%
	Male	44%	42%
	Mean age	72.2 year	67.1 year
		$\chi_1^2 = 1.9$	$p = 0.165$
<b>CHARLS</b>	Female	48%	51%
	Male	52%	49%
	Mean age	63.7 year	63.6 year
		$\chi_1^2 = 10.8$	$p = 0.001$
<b>IFLS</b>	Female	53%	59%
	Male	47%	41%
			$p = 0.776$

	$\chi_1^2 = 14.6$	$p < 0.001$
Mean age	71.6 year	59.9 year
		$p < 0.001$

Table 2. Non-response patterns across analytic vs declined sample in HRS, ELSA, CHARLS, SHARE & IFLS.

Table 3. Summary features of the analytic sample

	Male	Female	Total
	N=35770	N=46034	N=81804
	44%	56%	100%
Childhood			
Non-poor	28613 (80.0%)	35934 (78.1%)	64547 (78.9%)
Poor	7157 (20.0%)	10100 (21.9%)	17257 (21.1%)
Multimorbidity			
No	28558 (79.8%)	36948 (80.3%)	65506 (80.1%)
Yes	7212 (20.2%)	9086 (19.7%)	16298 (19.9%)
Age	65.7 (9.3)	65.7 (9.8)	65.7 (9.6)
Adol. illness	0.2 (0.6)	0.3 (0.7)	0.2 (0.6)
Education			
Lower	27404 (76.6%)	38225 (83.0%)	65629 (80.2%)
Higher	8366 (23.4%)	7809 (17.0%)	16175 (19.8%)
Married/union			
Never	1786 (5.0%)	1900 (4.1%)	3686 (4.5%)
Yes	27268 (76.2%)	27714 (60.2%)	54982 (67.2%)
Sep/widow	6716 (18.8%)	16420 (35.7%)	23136 (28.3%)
Bottom wealth quartile			
No	29289 (81.9%)	35569 (77.3%)	64858 (79.3%)
Yes	6481 (18.1%)	10465 (22.7%)	16946 (20.7%)
Country			
England	3207 (9.0%)	4019 (8.7%)	7226 (8.8%)
Austria	777 (2.2%)	1170 (2.5%)	1947 (2.4%)
Germany	1697 (4.7%)	1900 (4.1%)	3597 (4.4%)
Sweden	1291 (3.6%)	1502 (3.3%)	2793 (3.4%)
Netherlands	746 (2.1%)	959 (2.1%)	1705 (2.1%)
Spain	1335 (3.7%)	1641 (3.6%)	2976 (3.6%)
Italy	1439 (4.0%)	1766 (3.8%)	3205 (3.9%)
France	1415 (4.0%)	1942 (4.2%)	3357 (4.1%)
Denmark	1314 (3.7%)	1528 (3.3%)	2842 (3.5%)
Greece	332 (0.9%)	431 (0.9%)	763 (0.9%)
Switzerland	1042 (2.9%)	1267 (2.8%)	2309 (2.8%)
Belgium	1538 (4.3%)	1883 (4.1%)	3421 (4.2%)
Israel	333 (0.9%)	486 (1.1%)	819 (1.0%)
Czechia	1233 (3.4%)	1903 (4.1%)	3136 (3.8%)
Poland	1308 (3.7%)	1628 (3.5%)	2936 (3.6%)
Luxembourg	377 (1.1%)	461 (1.0%)	838 (1.0%)
Hungary	262 (0.7%)	413 (0.9%)	675 (0.8%)
Slovenia	937 (2.6%)	1356 (2.9%)	2293 (2.8%)
Estonia	1031 (2.9%)	1825 (4.0%)	2856 (3.5%)
Croatia	493 (1.4%)	635 (1.4%)	1128 (1.4%)

Lithuania	475 (1.3%)	861 (1.9%)	1336 (1.6%)
Bulgaria	348 (1.0%)	520 (1.1%)	868 (1.1%)
Cyprus	182 (0.5%)	311 (0.7%)	493 (0.6%)
Finland	520 (1.5%)	592 (1.3%)	1112 (1.4%)
Latvia	267 (0.7%)	470 (1.0%)	737 (0.9%)
Malta	335 (0.9%)	425 (0.9%)	760 (0.9%)
Romania	513 (1.4%)	694 (1.5%)	1207 (1.5%)
Slovakia	431 (1.2%)	508 (1.1%)	939 (1.1%)
America	2674 (7.5%)	4084 (8.9%)	6758 (8.3%)
Indonesia	1243 (3.5%)	1900 (4.1%)	3143 (3.8%)
China	6675 (18.7%)	6954 (15.1%)	13629 (16.7%)

Table 4. Probit coefficients of multimorbidity (2 or more, fixed effects, 31 countries, N=81,804)

Variable	Coef.	Std.Err.	P	Lower CI	Upper CI
Constant	-6.876	0.356	<0.001	-7.573	-6.179
Childhood poor	0.088	0.016	<0.001	0.057	0.118
Sex, F	-0.071	0.012	<0.001	-0.096	-0.047
Age	0.027	0.001	<0.001	0.026	0.029
Higher educated	-0.189	0.015	<0.001	-0.219	-0.159
Never married	-0.046	0.030	0.130	-0.106	0.013
Married	0.006	0.015	0.680	-0.023	0.036
Adol. illness	0.229	0.009	<0.001	0.211	0.247
Bottom wealth quart.	0.021	0.019	0.270	-0.017	0.058
Austria	4.514	0.353	<0.001	3.822	5.205
Germany	4.653	0.352	<0.001	3.962	5.343
Sweden	4.347	0.352	<0.001	3.657	5.038
Netherlands	4.287	0.353	<0.001	3.595	4.979
Spain	4.463	0.352	<0.001	3.773	5.153
Italy	4.480	0.352	<0.001	3.790	5.171
France	4.464	0.352	<0.001	3.774	5.154
Denmark	4.465	0.352	<0.001	3.774	5.155
Greece	4.723	0.354	<0.001	4.028	5.418
Switzerland	4.131	0.353	<0.001	3.439	4.822
Belgium	4.551	0.352	<0.001	3.861	5.241
Israel	4.764	0.354	<0.001	4.069	5.458
Czechia	4.675	0.352	<0.001	3.985	5.365
Poland	4.668	0.352	<0.001	3.978	5.359
Luxembourg	4.705	0.354	<0.001	4.011	5.400
Hungary	4.760	0.355	<0.001	4.064	5.456
Slovenia	4.685	0.352	<0.001	3.994	5.376
Estonia	4.560	0.352	<0.001	3.870	5.251
Croatia	4.668	0.354	<0.001	3.975	5.361
Lithuania	4.754	0.353	<0.001	4.061	5.446
Bulgaria	4.631	0.354	<0.001	3.936	5.325

Cyprus	4.775	0.356	<0.001	4.077	5.472
Finland	4.773	0.354	<0.001	4.080	5.466
Latvia	4.517	0.355	<0.001	3.822	5.213
Malta	4.558	0.355	<0.001	3.863	5.253
Romania	4.431	0.354	<0.001	3.737	5.125
Slovakia	4.268	0.355	<0.001	3.573	4.963
America	-0.044	0.733	0.950	-1.480	1.392
Indonesia	0.425	0.691	0.540	-0.929	1.778
China	0.130	0.530	0.810	-0.908	1.169

Table 5. Probit coefficients of multimorbidity (3 or more, fixed effects, 31 countries,

N=81,804)

Variable	Coef.	Std.Err.	P	Lower CI	Upper CI
Constant	-6.909	0.528	<0.001	-7.945	-5.874
Childhood poor	0.099	0.019	<0.001	0.061	0.136
Sex, F	-0.129	0.015	<0.001	-0.159	-0.099
Age	0.025	0.001	<0.001	0.023	0.026
Higher educated	-0.213	0.020	<0.001	-0.253	-0.174
Never married	-0.060	0.038	0.120	-0.135	0.016
Married	-0.015	0.019	0.410	-0.051	0.021
Adol. illness	0.251	0.010	<0.001	0.232	0.270
Bottom wealth quart.	0.029	0.023	0.210	-0.017	0.074
Austria	4.095	0.526	<0.001	3.065	5.126
Germany	4.213	0.525	<0.001	3.184	5.242
Sweden	3.911	0.525	<0.001	2.881	4.940
Netherlands	3.898	0.526	<0.001	2.867	4.929
Spain	3.999	0.525	<0.001	2.969	5.028
Italy	3.981	0.525	<0.001	2.951	5.010
France	3.989	0.525	<0.001	2.959	5.018
Denmark	4.037	0.525	<0.001	3.007	5.066
Greece	4.191	0.528	<0.001	3.157	5.225
Switzerland	3.703	0.526	<0.001	2.671	4.734
Belgium	4.045	0.525	<0.001	3.015	5.074
Israel	4.384	0.527	<0.001	3.351	5.416
Czechia	4.183	0.525	<0.001	3.154	5.212
Poland	4.250	0.525	<0.001	3.221	5.280
Luxembourg	4.307	0.527	<0.001	3.274	5.340
Hungary	4.100	0.528	<0.001	3.065	5.134
Slovenia	4.263	0.525	<0.001	3.233	5.292
Estonia	4.090	0.525	<0.001	3.061	5.120
Croatia	4.188	0.526	<0.001	3.156	5.219
Lithuania	4.260	0.526	<0.001	3.229	5.292
Bulgaria	3.989	0.528	<0.001	2.955	5.024
Cyprus	4.295	0.529	<0.001	3.259	5.331

Finland	4.349	0.526	<0.001	3.317	5.381
Latvia	3.926	0.529	<0.001	2.890	4.962
Malta	4.092	0.528	<0.001	3.058	5.127
Romania	3.881	0.527	<0.001	2.847	4.915
Slovakia	3.822	0.529	<0.001	2.786	4.858
America	0.046	1.095	0.970	-2.100	2.191
Indonesia	0.477	1.028	0.640	-1.538	2.491
China	0.191	0.791	0.810	-1.359	1.740

Table 6. Poisson coefficients of multimorbidity (number of chronic conditions, fixed effects, 31 countries, N=81,804)

Variable	Coef.	Std.Err.	P	Lower CI	Upper CI
Constant	-12.964	0.040	<0.001	-13.041	-12.886
Childhood poor	0.066	0.011	<0.001	0.045	0.088
Sex, F	-0.075	0.009	<0.001	-0.092	-0.058
Age	0.023	0.001	<0.001	0.022	0.024
Higher educated	-0.165	0.012	<0.001	-0.188	-0.143
Never married	-0.063	0.023	0.006	-0.108	-0.018
Married	0.005	0.011	0.650	-0.016	0.026
Adol. illness	0.183	0.006	<0.001	0.172	0.194
Bottom wealth quart.	0.014	0.013	0.270	-0.011	0.040
Austria	11.501	0.030	<0.001	11.442	11.560
Germany	11.611	0.026	<0.001	11.561	11.661
Sweden	11.327	0.028	<0.001	11.271	11.383
Netherlands	11.287	0.034	<0.001	11.220	11.354
Spain	11.443	0.026	<0.001	11.391	11.494
Italy	11.457	0.026	<0.001	11.406	11.509
France	11.426	0.027	<0.001	11.373	11.478
Denmark	11.389	0.029	<0.001	11.331	11.446
Greece	11.622	0.036	<0.001	11.552	11.693
Switzerland	11.111	0.033	<0.001	11.047	11.176
Belgium	11.488	0.026	<0.001	11.436	11.540
Israel	11.661	0.037	<0.001	11.588	11.735
Czechia	11.608	0.025	<0.001	11.558	11.658
Poland	11.611	0.027	<0.001	11.557	11.664
Luxembourg	11.641	0.039	<0.001	11.566	11.716
Hungary	11.639	0.037	<0.001	11.567	11.712
Slovenia	11.615	0.027	<0.001	11.562	11.668
Estonia	11.528	0.026	<0.001	11.477	11.579
Croatia	11.595	0.033	<0.001	11.530	11.660
Lithuania	11.661	0.032	<0.001	11.599	11.724
Bulgaria	11.546	0.036	<0.001	11.476	11.616
Cyprus	11.654	0.042	<0.001	11.572	11.736
Finland	11.702	0.033	<0.001	11.637	11.767

Latvia	11.472	0.040	<0.001	11.394	11.549
Malta	11.537	0.038	<0.001	11.462	11.612
Romania	11.428	0.036	<0.001	11.357	11.498
Slovakia	11.124	0.049	<0.001	11.028	11.219
America	-1.408	0.029	<0.001	-1.465	-1.351
Indonesia	-0.107	0.036	0.003	-0.177	-0.037
China	-0.973	0.025	<0.001	-1.023	-0.924

Table 7. Probit coefficients of multimorbidity, Female (2 or more, fixed effects, 31 countries, N=81,804)

Variable	Coef.	Std.Err.	P	Lower CI	Upper CI
Constant	-6.889	0.386	<0.001	-7.645	-6.133
Childhood poor	0.112	0.021	<0.001	0.071	0.153
Age	0.028	0.001	<0.001	0.027	0.030
Higher educated	-0.231	0.022	<0.001	-0.273	-0.188
Never married	-0.068	0.042	0.100	-0.150	0.014
Married	-0.006	0.019	0.740	-0.043	0.030
Adol. illness	0.219	0.012	<0.001	0.196	0.241
Bottom wealth quart.	0.057	0.024	0.018	0.010	0.105
Austria	4.402	0.381	<0.001	3.655	5.148
Germany	4.486	0.380	<0.001	3.741	5.231
Sweden	4.189	0.381	<0.001	3.443	4.934
Netherlands	4.162	0.382	<0.001	3.414	4.910
Spain	4.363	0.380	<0.001	3.618	5.108
Italy	4.384	0.380	<0.001	3.639	5.129
France	4.291	0.380	<0.001	3.546	5.036
Denmark	4.354	0.381	<0.001	3.608	5.100
Greece	4.548	0.384	<0.001	3.795	5.300
Switzerland	3.905	0.381	<0.001	3.158	4.653
Belgium	4.461	0.380	<0.001	3.716	5.206
Israel	4.625	0.384	<0.001	3.874	5.377
Czechia	4.546	0.380	<0.001	3.801	5.290
Poland	4.606	0.381	<0.001	3.860	5.352
Luxembourg	4.500	0.384	<0.001	3.748	5.253
Hungary	4.673	0.384	<0.001	3.919	5.426
Slovenia	4.521	0.381	<0.001	3.775	5.266
Estonia	4.470	0.380	<0.001	3.725	5.215
Croatia	4.604	0.382	<0.001	3.855	5.353
Lithuania	4.721	0.382	<0.001	3.973	5.469
Bulgaria	4.548	0.384	<0.001	3.796	5.299
Cyprus	4.745	0.386	<0.001	3.988	5.501
Finland	4.614	0.383	<0.001	3.864	5.364

Latvia	4.465	0.384	<0.001	3.712	5.217
Malta	4.514	0.384	<0.001	3.761	5.267
Romania	4.348	0.383	<0.001	3.598	5.099
Slovakia	4.223	0.384	<0.001	3.470	4.976
America	-0.070	0.780	0.930	-1.600	1.459
Indonesia	0.453	0.730	0.530	-0.977	1.883
China	0.112	0.594	0.850	-1.052	1.275

Table 8. Probit coefficients of multimorbidity, Male (2 or more, fixed effects, 31 countries, N=81,804)

Variable	Coef.	Std.Err.	P	Lower CI	Upper CI
Constant	-6.584	0.379	<0.001	-7.327	-5.841
Childhood poor	0.054	0.024	0.025	0.007	0.100
Age	0.026	0.001	<0.001	0.024	0.027
Higher educated	-0.152	0.022	<0.001	-0.196	-0.108
Never married	0.028	0.046	0.540	-0.063	0.119
Married	0.070	0.027	0.010	0.017	0.122
Adol. illness	0.249	0.015	<0.001	0.220	0.277
Bottom wealth quart.	-0.069	0.032	0.030	-0.131	-0.007
Austria	4.292	0.373	<0.001	3.561	5.022
Germany	4.488	0.371	<0.001	3.760	5.215
Sweden	4.185	0.372	<0.001	3.457	4.914
Netherlands	4.078	0.373	<0.001	3.347	4.809
Spain	4.234	0.372	<0.001	3.506	4.962
Italy	4.243	0.372	<0.001	3.514	4.971
France	4.323	0.372	<0.001	3.594	5.051
Denmark	4.247	0.372	<0.001	3.518	4.976
Greece	4.581	0.376	<0.001	3.844	5.319
Switzerland	4.030	0.373	<0.001	3.300	4.761
Belgium	4.307	0.371	<0.001	3.579	5.035
Israel	4.587	0.376	<0.001	3.850	5.325
Czechia	4.482	0.372	<0.001	3.754	5.211
Poland	4.408	0.372	<0.001	3.679	5.138
Luxembourg	4.594	0.376	<0.001	3.857	5.331
Hungary	4.502	0.379	<0.001	3.761	5.244
Slovenia	4.533	0.372	<0.001	3.804	5.262
Estonia	4.299	0.372	<0.001	3.570	5.028
Croatia	4.397	0.375	<0.001	3.663	5.131
Lithuania	4.401	0.375	<0.001	3.666	5.135
Bulgaria	4.396	0.377	<0.001	3.657	5.136
Cyprus	4.411	0.382	<0.001	3.662	5.160
Finland	4.610	0.374	<0.001	3.877	5.344
Latvia	4.186	0.380	<0.001	3.441	4.930



Malta	4.248	0.377	<0.001	3.509	4.987
Romania	4.199	0.376	<0.001	3.462	4.935
Slovakia	3.964	0.377	<0.001	3.225	4.703
America	0.001	0.769	0.990	-1.506	1.508
Indonesia	0.372	0.733	0.610	-1.064	1.808
China	0.136	0.531	0.800	-0.904	1.177

Table 9. Probit coefficients of multimorbidity (2+, random effects, 31 countries, N=81,804)

Variable	Coef.	Std.Err.	P	Lower CI	Upper CI
Constant	-2.682	0.081	<0.001	-2.841	-2.524
Childhood poor	0.231	0.027	<0.001	0.178	0.284
Sex, F	-0.068	0.026	0.010	-0.119	-0.016
Age	0.028	0.001	<0.001	0.026	0.030
Higher educated	-0.195	0.023	<0.001	-0.240	-0.151
Never married	-0.047	0.034	0.160	-0.114	0.019
Married	0.002	0.013	0.870	-0.024	0.028
Adol. illness	0.229	0.011	<0.001	0.206	0.251
Bottom wealth quart.	0.022	0.037	0.560	-0.051	0.095

### Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest in the production of this manuscript.

### Ethical review

The University of Manchester exempted the investigation from full ethical review as it uses publicly available deidentified secondary datasets.

### STROBE list

STROBE list is attached.

### Acknowledgement

I thank the participants in 31 countries around the world for providing information, time and in many visits blood biomarkers too, as well as the generous funding bodies over many decades. **HRS**: The HRS (Health and Retirement Study) is sponsored by the National Institute on Aging (grant number NIA U01AG009740) and is conducted by the University of Michigan. **ELSA**: The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing was developed by a team of researchers based at University College London, NatCen Social Research, the Institute for Fiscal Studies, the University of Manchester and the University of East Anglia. The data were collected by NatCen Social Research. The funding is currently provided by the National Institute on Aging in the US (grant numbers: 2R01AG7644 and 2R01AG017644-01A1), and a consortium of UK government departments coordinated by the National Institute for Health Research. **SHARE**: The SHARE data collection has been funded by the European Commission, DG RTD through FP5 (QLK6-CT-2001-00360), FP6 (SHARE-I3: RII-CT-2006-062193, COMPARE: CIT5-CT-2005-028857, SHARELIFE: CIT4-CT-2006-028812), FP7 (SHARE-PREP: GA N°211909, SHARE-LEAP: GA N°227822, SHARE M4: GA N°261982, DASISH: GA N°283646) and Horizon 2020 (SHARE-DEV3: GA N°676536, SHARE-COHESION: GA N°870628, SERISS: GA N°654221, SSHOC: GA N°823782, SHARE-COVID19: GA N°101015924) and by DG Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion through VS 2015/0195, VS 2016/0135, VS 2018/0285, VS 2019/0332, and VS 2020/0313. Additional funding from the German Ministry of Education and Research, the Max Planck Society for the Advancement of Science, the U.S. National Institute on Aging (U01\_AG09740-13S2, P01\_AG005842, P01\_AG08291, P30\_AG12815, R21\_AG025169, Y1-AG-4553-01, IAG\_BSR06-11, OGHA\_04-064, HHSN271201300071C, RAG052527A) and from various national funding sources is gratefully acknowledged (see [www.share-project.org](http://www.share-project.org)). CHARLS: the CHARLS research and field team coordinated by Peking University. IFLS: the RAND Corporation, University of Indonesia, University of Gadjah Mada, SurveyMETER Yogyakarta.

## Bibliography

1. Tampubolon G. Recall error and recall bias in life course epidemiology. MPRA Working Paper Series [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2010 Jul 12]; Available from: <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/23847/>
2. Tampubolon G. Growing up in poverty, growing old in infirmity: The long arm of childhood conditions in Great Britain. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(12):e0144722.
3. Tampubolon G. The long arm hypothesis: childhood poverty, epigenetic ageing, and late-life health in America, Britain, and Europe. In: Hoffmann R, editor. *Handbook of Health Inequalities across the Life Course*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar; 2023. p. 252–74.
4. Pakpahan E, Hoffmann R, Kröger H. The long arm of childhood circumstances on health in old age: Evidence from SHARELIFE. *Advances in Life Course Research*. 2017 Mar 1;31:1–10.
5. Lennartsson C, Eyjólfsson HS, Celeste RK, Fritzell J. Social class and infirmity. The role of social class over the life-course. *SSM - Population Health*. 2018 Apr 1;4:169–77.
6. Berndt H, Fors S. Childhood living conditions, education and health among the oldest old in Sweden. *Ageing & Society*. 2016 Mar;36(3):631–48.
7. Vable AM, Gilsanz P, Kawachi I. Is it possible to overcome the ‘long arm’ of childhood socioeconomic disadvantage through upward socioeconomic mobility? *Journal of Public Health*. 2019 Sep 30;41(3):566–74.
8. Si Y, Hanewald K, Chen S, Li B, Bateman H, Beard JR. Life-course inequalities in intrinsic capacity and healthy ageing, China. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2023 May 1;101(5):307-316C.
9. Sinclair DR, Maharani A, Chandola T, Bower P, Hanratty B, Nazroo J, et al. Frailty among Older Adults and Its Distribution in England. *J Frailty Aging*. 2022 Apr 1;11(2):163–8.
10. Whitty C. Chief Medical Officer’s Annual Report 2023: Health in an Ageing Society [Internet]. 2023 Nov [cited 2023 Nov 27]. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/chief-medical-officers-annual-report-2023-health-in-an-ageing-society>
11. Kuh D, Ben-Shlomo Y, editors. *A Life Course Approach to Chronic Disease Epidemiology*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2004. (Life Course Approach to Adult Health).
12. Tampubolon G. Recall error and recall bias in life course epidemiology. MPRA Working Paper Series [Internet]. 2010 Jul 12 [cited 2010 Jul 12]; Available from: <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/23847/>
13. WHO. UN Decade of Healthy Ageing 2021-2030 [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Jan 14]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/initiatives/decade-of-healthy-ageing>

14. Sinclair DR, Maharani A, Clegg A, Hanratty B, Tampubolon G, Todd C, et al. Differences in the risk of frailty based on care receipt, unmet care needs and socio-economic inequalities using a longitudinal analysis of the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing - NIHR. Manchester: NIHR Policy Research Unit on Older People and Frailty; 2020 Mar. Report No.: 2.
15. Sinclair DR, Maharani A, Clegg A, Bower P, Hanratty B, Nazroo J, et al. Care receipt, unmet need of care and frailty: a longitudinal analysis with multistate models - NIHR. Manchester: NIHR Policy Research Unit on Older People and Frailty; 2023 Sep. Report No.: 5.
16. Sonnega A, Faul JD, Ofstedal MB, Langa KM, Phillips JW, Weir DR. Cohort Profile: the Health and Retirement Study (HRS). *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2014 Apr 1;43(2):576–85.
17. Steptoe A, Breeze E, Banks J, Nazroo J. Cohort Profile: The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2013 Dec 1;42(6):1640–8.
18. Börsch-Supan A, Brandt M, Hunkler C, Kneip T, Korbmayer J, Malter F, et al. Data Resource Profile: The Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2013 Aug 1;42(4):992–1001.
19. Strauss J, Witoelar F, Sikoki B. The Fifth Wave of the Indonesia Family Life Survey: Overview and Field Report. RAND; 2016. Report No.: WR-1143/1-NIA/NICHD.
20. Zhao Y, Hu Y, Smith JP, Strauss J, Yang G. Cohort Profile: The China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS). *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2014 Feb 1;43(1):61–8.
21. Marmot M, Wilkinson RG, editors. *Social Determinants of Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2005.
22. Marmot M. *The Health Gap*. London: Bloomsbury; 2015.
23. Tampubolon G. The long arm hypothesis: childhood poverty, epigenetic ageing, and late-life health in America, Britain, and Europe. In: Hoffmann R, editor. *Handbook of Health Inequalities across the Life Course*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar; 2023. p. 252–74.
24. Tampubolon G. Growing up in poverty, growing old in infirmity: The long arm of childhood conditions in Great Britain. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(12):e0144722.
25. Tampubolon G. The long arm of childhood condition in America, Britain and Europe: epigenetic ageing hypothesis. In: *Handbook of Health Inequalities across the Life Course*. Edward Elgar; 2022.
26. Tampubolon G, Fajarini M. Does a poor childhood associate with higher and steeper inflammation trajectories in the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing? [Internet]. *bioRxiv*; 2018 [cited 2018 Feb 19]. p. 267559. Available from: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/267559v1>

27. Tampubolon G, Fajarini M. The strong grip of childhood conditions in older Europeans [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2018 [cited 2018 Feb 19]. p. 267526. Available from: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/267526v1>
28. Berndt H, Fors S. Childhood living conditions, education and health among the oldest old in Sweden. *Ageing & Society*. 2016 Mar;36(3):631–48.
29. Lennartsson C, Eyjólfsson HS, Celeste RK, Fritzell J. Social class and infirmity. The role of social class over the life-course. *SSM - Population Health*. 2018 Apr 1;4:169–77.
30. Pakpahan E, Hoffmann R, Kröger H. The long arm of childhood circumstances on health in old age: Evidence from SHARELIFE. *Advances in Life Course Research*. 2017 Mar 1;31:1–10.
31. McLoughlin S, Kenny RA, McCrory C. Psychosocial adversity and allostatic load burden in midlife and older ages. *Health Psychology*. 2021;40(7):468–71.
32. Li Y, Xue QL, Odden MC, Chen X, Wu C. Linking early life risk factors to frailty in old age: evidence from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. *Age and Ageing*. 2020 Feb 27;49(2):208–17.
33. Tampubolon G, Fajarini M. Does a poor childhood associate with higher and steeper inflammation trajectories in the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing? [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2018 [cited 2018 Feb 19]. p. 267559. Available from: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/267559v1>
34. Tampubolon G, Fajarini M. The strong grip of childhood conditions in older Europeans [Internet]. bioRxiv; 2018 [cited 2018 Feb 19]. p. 267526. Available from: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/267526v1>
35. Tampubolon G. Delineating the third age: joint models of older people’s quality of life and attrition in Britain 2002–2010. *Aging Ment Health*. 2015 Jul;19(7):576–83.
36. Tampubolon G. Cognitive ageing in Great Britain in the new century: Cohort differences in episodic memory. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(12):e0144907.
37. Vermunt JK. Latent class modeling with covariates: Two improved three-step approaches. *Political Analysis*. 2010 Jan 4;18(4):450–69.
38. Vermunt JK, Magidson J. *LG-Syntax User’s Guide version 6.0*. Arlington, MA: Statistical Innovations Inc.; 2021.
39. Moody-Ayers S, Lindquist K, Sen S, Covinsky KE. Childhood social and economic well-being and health in older age. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2007 Nov 1;166(9):1059–67.
40. Crimmins E, Faul J, Thyagarajan B, Weir D. Venous Blood Collection and Assay Protocol in the 2016 Health and Retirement Study. Ann Arbor, Michigan: HRS; 2017. Report No.: 9065.

41. Crimmins EM, Kim JK, Fisher J, Faul J. HRS Epigenetic Clocks. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan; 2020 Sep.
42. Ramakrishnan V. Why We Die: The New Science of Aging and the Quest for Immortality. New York, NY: William Morrow; 2024. 320 p.
43. The Economist. The silence of the bedpans: Why is social care barely talked about in Britain's election? The Economist. 2024 Jun 22;27.
44. Case A, Fertig A, Paxson C. The lasting impact of childhood health and circumstance. Journal of Health Economics. 2005 Mar 1;24(2):365–89.
45. Hoffmann R, editor. Handbook of Health Inequalities Across the Life Course. Cheltenham, UK Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd; 2023. 434 p.
46. Tampubolon G, Maharani A. When did old age stop being depressing? Depression trajectories of older Americans and Britons 2002–2012. The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry. 2017 Nov 1;25(11):1187–95.
47. Tampubolon G, Maharani A. Depression trajectories of older Americans and Britons 2002–2012: A rejoinder and a hope. The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry. 2017 Nov 1;25(11):1198.
48. Maharani A, Dawes P, Nazroo J, Tampubolon G, Pendleton N, the SENSE-Cog WP1 group. Healthcare system performance and socioeconomic inequalities in hearing and visual impairments in 17 European countries. European Journal of Public Health. 2021 Feb 1;31(1):79–86.
49. Beard JR, Araujo de Carvalho I, Sumi Y, Officer A, Thiyagarajan JA. Healthy ageing: moving forward. Bull World Health Organ. 2017 Nov 1;95(11):730-730A.