

Persistent financial adversity and cognitive ageing: A lifecourse investigation

Yiwen Liu¹, Jacques Wels^{1,2*}, Sarah-Naomi James¹, Sarah E Keuss³, Jane Maddock¹, Thomas D Parker^{3,4,5}, Jean Stafford¹, Jonathan M Schott³, Marcus Richards¹, Praveetha Patalay^{1,6}

Affiliations

¹MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing, Department of Population Science and Experimental Medicine, University College London, London, UK

²Centre Metices, Université libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, BE

³Dementia Research Centre, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, London, UK

⁴Department of Brain Sciences, Department of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, UK

⁵UK Dementia Research Institute Centre for Care Research and Technology, Imperial College London, UK

⁶Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Social Research Institute, University College London, London, UK

***Corresponding author:** Dr Jacques Wels, MRC Unit for Lifelong Health & Ageing, University College London, London, UK, WC1E 7HB. Email: w.jacques@ucl.ac.uk

Word count: 3157 (1 table, 4 figures)

Abstract

Background: Little is known about the effect of persistent financial adversity across adulthood on cognitive ageing, and whether these impacts vary based on sex, childhood socioeconomic circumstances (SEC) and genetic risk.

Methods: Using data from the 1946 Birth cohort study (N=2,759), with extensive data spanning over 70 years, as well as an embedded neuroimaging study (Insight46, N=356-468), we examined the prospective association between financial adversity (low household income, financial hardships; 26-53 years) and cognitive ageing (cognitive performance at 53 years; decline between 53-69 years, modelled using latent growth curve model; neuroimaging measures of brain health between 69-74 years), and the moderating role of sex, childhood SEC and APOE- ϵ 4. Covariates included sex at birth, childhood SEC, childhood cognition (8 years), symptoms of depression and anxiety (13-15 years), and educational attainment (26 years).

Findings: Increased exposure to low household income as well as financial hardships was associated with lower processing speed (SE: -0.07 [95% CI: -0.13, -0.02], -0.05 [-0.11, -0.00], respectively) and verbal memory at age 53 (-0.16 [-0.21, -0.11], -0.10 [-0.15, -0.05] respectively). Increased exposure to financial adversity was also associated with slower verbal memory decline from 53 to 69 years, due to already lower baseline scores at 53 years. Persistent financial adversity was associated with greater ventricular volume at 69-71 years, and stronger associations between financial adversity and brain atrophy were found for males, those with lower childhood SEC, and APOE- ϵ 4 carriers. APOE- ϵ 4 carriers in particular were consistently more vulnerable to the effect of persistent financial adversity on brain atrophy.

Interpretation: Persistent exposure to financial adversity influences cognitive performance by midlife and later-life brain atrophy, with impacts being larger for males, disadvantaged childhood SEC and individuals with greater genetic risk. These highlight the potential role of poverty reduction efforts in working-age adults for preventing dementia and promoting cognitive health in an ageing population.

Funding: This study is funded by the UK Medical Research Council which provides core funding for the NSHD (MC_UU_00019/1 and MC_UU_00019/3). Insight 46 is funded by grants from Alzheimer’s Research UK (ARUK-PG2014-1946, ARUK-PG2017-1946: JMS, MR), Alzheimer’s Association (SG-666374-UK BIRTH COHORT: JMS), the Medical Research Council Dementias Platform UK (CSUB19166: JMS, MR), The Wolfson Foundation (PR/ylr/18575: JMS), The Medical Research Council (MC-UU-12019/1: Kuh and MC-UU-12019/3: MR), Selfridges Group Foundation (22/3/18: JMS), and Brain Research Trust (UCC14191: JMS). JS, JM and PP are also supported by funding from Alzheimer’s Society (Ref:469). TDP is supported by a NIHR clinical lectureship. JW is funded by the Belgian National Scientific Fund (FNRS) Research Associate Fellowship (CQ) no. 40010931.

Key words: financial adversity; cognition; cognitive decline; neuroimaging; brain atrophy

Introduction

Dementia is one of the leading contributors to the global burden of disease,^{1,2} and the rates are estimated to triple to 150 million over the next three decades.³ There is a need to better understand how modifiable environmental exposures may be associated with cognitive ageing.⁴ The association between childhood and adulthood socioeconomic circumstances (SEC) and cognitive functioning has been shown at different stages of the lifecourse.⁵⁻⁸ Financial adversity – commonly defined as having a lack of money or resources to provide basic household necessities⁹ – is also associated with cognitive impairment and decline.^{5,10-14} Although there is evidence for lifecourse and intergenerational transmission of poverty^{15,16} most studies to date use a snapshot measure of financial adversity that does not capture the persistence of these experiences.

Financial adversity has been assessed using either objective (e.g., household income) or subjective (e.g., perceived financial hardships such as inability to pay bills) indicators, with only one study identified having examined both in relation to cognitive function in midlife.¹⁷ Although cognitive ageing is often assessed as cognitive impairments or individual rates of decline using neuropsychological measures, neuroimaging studies can also index brain health markers that are associated with cognitive decline and dementia.¹⁸⁻²¹ The association between persistent experiences of financial adversity and cognitive ageing may also be moderated by other biological or environmental factors, including sex, genetic risk, or childhood SEC, which remains to be investigated.

Testing the longitudinal association between persistent financial adversity and cognitive ageing requires the use of studies that have followed participants through multiple stages of development, such as the 1946 NSHD (National Survey of Health and Development) cohort. It is one of the world's oldest continuously running birth cohort studies with more than 70 years of follow-up since birth,²² with repeated measures of financial adversity and cognitive

function, and an embedded neuroimaging sub-study. Furthermore, extensive information collected in childhood allows controlling for potential confounder variables (particularly childhood cognitive ability) and enables testing of potential moderating effects of sex, genetic risk and childhood SEC.^{23,24}

The overall aim of this study was to examine the effect of persistent financial adversity across adulthood on indicators of cognitive ageing including cognitive decline and markers of brain health. We specifically investigated three questions: (1) what is the association between persistent financial adversity and cognitive function from mid-to-late adulthood; (2) what is the association between persistent financial adversity and markers of brain health; and (3) is there a moderating effect of sex, childhood SEC, and genetic risk (APOE- ϵ 4)?

Methods

Pre-registration with OSF: (<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/6Y9NV>).

Sample

The MRC 1946 NSHD ($N=5,362$) is a national British birth cohort of people born in one week of March 1946 (<http://www.nshd.mrc.ac.uk/nshd>).²² The main analytical sample included participants still alive at 69 years and with available cognitive assessments at age 53, 63, or 69 ($N=2,759$) (see supplement, Fig. S1). Ethical approval has been obtained from the Greater Manchester Local Research Ethics Committee and the Scotland Research Ethics Committee, and participants provided written informed consent at each data collection.

502 NSHD participants (mean [SD] age 70.7 [0.7] years) were recruited to the Insight 46 sub-study for β -amyloid (A β) positron emission tomography (PET) and MR imaging based on previously published criteria.^{25,26} Of those who took part, 471 completed a brain scan at

baseline and 369 completed a follow-up scan (mean [SD] scan interval 2.4 [0.2] years) (supplement, Fig. S1).

Measures

Financial adversity (26-53 years)

Household income

Total household income was assessed at 26, 43 and 53 years, and was comparable to the population average at the time (see supplement for details). A binary variable was derived at each time point by grouping those with household income in the bottom 20% of the analytical sample²⁷ into the low-income category. These were then summed across the three time points, providing a count of experiences of low household income (0 to 3) and further grouped into none (0), intermittent (1) or persistent experience (≥ 2).

Financial hardships

Financial hardships were assessed at 36, 43 and 53 years (see supplement). A binary variable was derived at each time point and summed across the three time points, providing a count of experiences of financial hardships (0 to 3). This was further grouped into none (0), intermittent (1) or persistent experience (≥ 2).

Cognitive function (53, 63, 69 years)

Processing speed and verbal memory were assessed using the same assessments at 53, 63 and 69 years, with scores standardised across all ages.

Processing speed

This was assessed using a timed-letter search task where participants had to cross out target letters “P” and “W” embedded among non-target letters within 1 minute. A score represented the position reached at the end of the trial (max = 600).

Verbal memory

This was a word learning task, where participants were shown a list of 15 words over 3 administrations and were asked to write down as many as they could remember at the end of each. A score indicated the number of words correctly recalled across all administrations (max = 45).

Brain health

The full neuroimaging protocol for Insight 46 has been published.²⁶ Structural MRI sequences first underwent correction for gradient non-linearity,²⁸ brain-masked N4-bias correction,²⁹ and visual inspection of image quality. The following measures were included (detailed description in supplement): (1) baseline (69-71 years) global white matter hyperintensity volume (WMHV); (2) baseline β -amyloid ($A\beta$) burden (standardized uptake value ratios [SUVR]) and status (positive/negative); (3) baseline whole brain, ventricular and total hippocampal volume; and (4) longitudinal changes in whole brain, ventricular, and hippocampal volume between baseline and repeat MRI (71-74yrs), calculated using the Boundary Shift Integral (BSI)³⁰⁻³² described elsewhere.³³

Covariates

Covariates included: (i) sex at birth; (ii) childhood SEC (paternal occupational status grouped into non-manual/skilled vs manual/unskilled/unemployed); (iii) childhood cognition (8 years, summary measure of 4 tests from the National Foundation for Educational Research); (iv) symptoms of depression and anxiety (13-15 years), rated by teachers and grouped into absent,

mild or severe; and (v) educational attainment (26 years), grouped into ordinary ('O')-level or below (equivalent to 11 years of education) vs. advanced ('A') level or above, with the latter as the reference. Total intracranial volume, calculated using Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM) 12,³⁴ was included as a covariate in models with volume outcomes, to adjust for head size.²³

Moderators

Sex, childhood SEC and APOE- ϵ 4 – which was genotyped using two SNPs (rs439358 and rs7412) at 53 years and grouped into non-carrier vs carrier (homozygous or heterozygous).

Statistical analysis

All statistical analysis was performed in R (version 3.6.2).

Cognitive function outcomes

A latent growth curve (LGC) model was used to examine changes in cognitive function over time.³⁵ Latent variables were generated for the intercept (baseline performance at 53 years) and slope (change from 53 to 69 years, with lower scores indicating greater decline). Time in the model was centred on the first assessment period (53 years) and converted to decades. Statistical formula can be found in supplement. Full information maximum likelihood (FIML) was used to estimate cognition intercept and slope within the LGC model.

After deriving cognition intercept and slope from LGC models, linear regressions were estimated to examine their association with persistent financial adversity (low household income and financial hardships, which were examined in separate models and treated as ordered variables to examine linear trends). These models were adjusted for all covariates.

To test for non-linearity in dose-response, low household income and financial hardships were additionally treated as categorical variables in regression models, and quantile

regression analysis investigated whether the effect of persistent financial adversity was similar across different quantiles (25th and 75th) of cognitive decline (see supplement).

To examine effect modification, we included interaction terms between indicators of financial adversity and each of the modifiers on cognition intercept and slope in separate models. Effect modifications with p-value <0.10 were visualised using predicted means from the model.

Brain health outcomes

The association between persistent financial adversity and markers of brain health were estimated using logistic regression (for A β status) and linear regression (all other outcomes). WMHV was log-transformed due to its positively skewed distribution. Longitudinal change in volumetric measures (BSI) were further adjusted for time interval between MRI scans by dividing each BSI metric by time (years) between scans (to represent change per year).

Three models were fitted for each marker of brain health: the first examined the main effect of financial adversity, adjusted for sex and intracranial volume (for volumetric measures). The second examined the main effect of each moderator, adjusted for all covariates. The third examined the interaction between financial adversity and each moderator, adjusting for all covariates. Significant interactions were plotted using predicted means from the model.

Missing data

To account for attrition, inverse probability weighting (see supplement) was used to calculate non-response weights for the analytic sample compared to the whole NSHD sample. Within the analytic sample, multivariable imputation by chained equations (MICE) was used (20 imputations) for other study variables (see supplement).^{36,37}

Additional and sensitivity analyses

Additional interactions were tested between the level of financial adversity (persistent or intermittent) associated with cognitive decline and each moderator, and between low household income and financial hardships (if both were associated with any outcome of interest). Four sensitivity analyses were also included to check the robustness of findings; primary analyses were repeated: (1) without sample weightings; (2) within Insight 46 participants only; (3) using a household size adjusted low income variable; (4) performing multiple imputation prior to performing LGC analysis.

Results

Of 2,759 participants included in the main analytical sample, 16% and 12% reported persistent low household income and financial hardships. The majority (73.6%) of those who never experienced low household income also never experienced financial hardships, and vice versa (66.9%) (Table 1).

Table 1. Sample characteristics

	Overall	Low household income			Financial hardships		
		<i>None</i>	<i>Intermittent</i>	<i>Persistent</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Intermittent</i>	<i>Persistent</i>
	2759	1574	733	426	1727	689	313
	N (% of total)	N (% of each group)			N (% of each group)		
Low household income							
None	1574 (57.6)	-	-	-	1150 (66.9)	322 (47.0)	90 (28.8)
Intermittent	733 (26.8)	-	-	-	412 (24.0)	223 (32.6)	93 (29.7)
Persistent	426 (15.6)	-	-	-	156 (9.1)	140 (20.4)	130 (41.5)
Financial hardships							
None	1727 (63.3)	1150 (73.6)	412 (56.6)	156 (36.6)	-	-	-
Intermittent	689 (25.2)	322 (20.6)	223 (30.6)	140 (32.9)	-	-	-
Persistent	313 (11.5)	90 (5.8)	93 (12.8)	130 (30.5)	-	-	-
Sex [Female]	1416 (51.3)	743 (47.2)	408 (55.7)	255 (59.9)	913 (52.9)	333 (48.3)	156 (49.8)
Childhood SEC [unskilled/unemployed]	241 (11.0)	104 (8.5)	75 (12.7)	58 (16.5)	135 (9.8)	61 (11.2)	44 (18.3)
Childhood symptoms of depression and anxiety							
Absent	1260 (51.2)	769 (55.1)	319 (48.6)	163 (41.3)	802 (51.5)	318 (53.0)	129 (45.3)
Mild	936 (38.0)	511 (36.6)	257 (39.2)	164 (41.5)	596 (38.3)	218 (36.3)	116 (40.7)
Severe	265 (10.8)	116 (8.3)	80 (12.2)	68 (17.2)	158 (10.2)	64 (10.7)	40 (14.0)
Educational attainment [O-level or below]	1655 (63.2)	819 (54.7)	488 (70.4)	336 (81.8)	982 (59.4)	442 (68.5)	218 (73.9)
APOE-ε4 status [Carrier]	702 (30.1)	413 (31.0)	186 (29.3)	102 (28.7)	452 (30.9)	173 (29.0)	77 (28.7)
Processing speed 53 years (mean (SD))	283.61 (75.35)	287.62 (73.55)	283.50 (76.09)	269.09 (78.41)	286.61 (74.35)	282.80 (77.66)	269.23 (74.19)
Processing speed 63 years (mean (SD))	267.12 (71.33)	271.39 (70.29)	266.79 (73.47)	249.46 (69.73)	268.05 (71.47)	268.31 (70.84)	255.76 (71.03)
Processing speed 69 years (mean (SD))	262.41 (74.18)	263.94 (70.54)	264.61 (80.39)	250.39 (75.96)	264.28 (73.49)	261.94 (75.60)	253.07 (73.95)
Verbal memory 53 years (mean (SD))	24.13 (6.25)	25.19 (6.01)	23.45 (6.42)	21.55 (5.86)	24.72 (6.14)	23.37 (6.26)	22.54 (6.37)
Verbal memory 63 years (mean (SD))	24.28 (6.10)	25.15 (6.05)	23.72 (5.99)	21.54 (5.65)	24.83 (6.06)	23.46 (6.09)	22.84 (6.02)
Verbal memory 69 years (mean (SD))	22.16 (6.07)	23.00 (5.97)	21.29 (6.02)	20.16 (5.87)	22.66 (5.92)	21.57 (6.06)	20.68 (6.55)

Cognitive function outcomes

Increased experience of financial adversity showed dose-response associations with processing speed (low household income: SE = -0.13, 95%CI [-0.18, -0.08]; financial hardships: -0.09 [-0.14, -0.04]) and verbal memory (low household income: -0.34 [-0.40, -0.29]; financial hardships: -0.24 [-0.30, -0.17]) at 53 years. These effect sizes were somewhat attenuated after adjusting for covariates (supplement Table S1).

There was overall weak evidence for an association between financial adversity and processing speed decline, but a small dose-response effect was found on verbal memory decline, with increased exposure associated with slower decline (low household income: 0.02 [0.01, 0.02]; financial hardships: 0.01 [0.01, 0.01]) (supplement Table S1). Further testing of non-linearity showed that only persistent experience of financial adversity (rather than intermittent) was associated with slower verbal memory decline (supplement Table S2, S3). This may be explained by those with lower baseline cognitive performance also showing a slower rate of decline over time. To illustrate this, we stratified the sample based on baseline cognition, and those scoring 1 SD or below at 53 years showed a slower rate of decline particularly if they also persistently experienced financial adversity (Fig.1; supplement Fig S3).




Fig. 1. Predicted means on verbal memory at baseline (53 years) and decline (stratified on cognition at baseline) by financial adversity exposure.

Sex moderated the effect of low household income on processing speed at baseline (53 years) ($p = 0.009$), and the effect of financial hardships on processing speed decline ($p = 0.075$) (supplement Table S4). Post-hoc analyses showed that, compared to females, males who persistently experienced low household income scored lower on processing speed at 53 years, but showed slower decline when persistently experiencing financial hardships (Fig. 2). No other evidence of interactions was found for childhood SEC or genetic risk.




Fig.2. Predicted means on processing speed at baseline (53 years) and decline (lower scores representing faster decline) by financial adversity exposure and sex.

Brain health outcomes

Increased low household income was associated with larger ventricular volume at 69-71 years ($b = 4.67 [1.01, 8.32]$). No other baseline associations were found (supplement Table S5). An interaction was found between financial hardships and APOE- ϵ 4 on A β burden (SUVR) ($p = 0.099$), with carriers persistently experiencing financial hardships showing the highest A β burden (Fig. 3g; supplement Table S5). An additional sex interaction was found with financial hardships on baseline ventricular volume ($p = 0.046$), with larger volume seen in males who persistently experienced financial hardships compared to females (Fig. 2e; supplement Table S5)

No direct associations were found between financial adversity and longitudinal changes in volumetric measures. However, several interactions were identified (supplement Table S6). First, financial hardships and sex interacted on total brain volume atrophy ($p = 0.003$) and ventricular expansion ($p = 0.005$), with males who persistently experienced financial hardships showed faster brain atrophy and ventricular expansion compared to females (Fig. 2c-d). Second, low household income and childhood SEC interacted on total hippocampal volume atrophy ($p = 0.033$) and ventricular expansion ($p = 0.031$), where those with disadvantaged childhood SEC who persistently experienced financial hardships across adulthood showed faster hippocampal atrophy and ventricular expansion compared to those with advantaged childhood SEC (Fig. 2a-b). Finally, APOE- ϵ 4 status showed both a main effect, as well as modified the effect of low household income and financial hardships on all volumetric changes (supplement Table S6). Carriers of APOE- ϵ 4 who persistently experienced low household income or financial hardships showed faster total brain and hippocampal volume atrophy, as well as increased ventricular expansion, compared to non-carriers. (Fig. 3a-f).




Fig. 2. Predicted means on longitudinal measures of brain atrophy and baseline ventricular volume by financial adversity exposure and sociodemographic (sex, SEC) variables.




Fig. 3. Predicted means on longitudinal measures of brain atrophy and baseline amyloid ($A\beta$) burden by financial adversity exposure and APOE- ϵ 4 status.

Additional and sensitivity analyses

No evidence of interactions was found for planned additional analyses (supplement Table S7, S8), and sensitivity analyses yielded similar effect sizes (outputs can be found in the supplement Tables S9-S15, Figures S4, S5).

Discussion

The aim of this study was to examine the effect of persistent financial adversity on cognitive ageing. Findings add to the existing evidence base in at least 4 ways: first, we investigated the persistence of both objective (low household income) and subjective (financial hardships) measures of financial adversity over many decades in the same individuals, and second, focused on cognitive decline over almost 2 decades rather than a single measure at baseline. The findings that increased experience of both indicators of financial adversity were associated with lower scores on processing speed and verbal memory at 53 years, but a slower rate of decline for verbal memory between 53 and 69 years, suggest substantial cognitive losses already present at midlife. One mechanism proposed for the role of financial adversity in cognitive impairment is that financial adversity may increase cognitive load, thus reducing the available cognitive bandwidth involved in processes such as attention and decision making.^{11,38-40} Persistent experience of financial adversity, therefore, may place chronic stress on systems involved in cognitive processing and lead to cognitive impairments over time. Third, we included neuroimaging data across two timepoints and found a dose-response association between low household income and increased ventricular volume at 69-71 years. Fourth, we examined interactions with sex, childhood SEC and APOE- ϵ 4, which all moderated the effect of financial adversity on cognitive ageing. APOE- ϵ 4 in particular modified all associations with brain atrophy, such that carriers who persistently experienced low household income or financial hardships showed the highest rates of brain atrophy.

Sex also moderated the effect of financial adversity on processing speed, with males who persistently experienced financial adversity showing worse performance at 53 years⁴¹ and further showed a slower rate of decline over time compared to females, consistent with our proposal that those with lower cognitive performance at baseline show less decline over time. It has been suggested that males may be more vulnerable to the effect of financial adversity and low education on physical health outcomes,^{42,43} and findings here suggest that they may also be more vulnerable on cognitive outcomes. This may also be explained by males in the current cohort occupying more traditionally gendered roles compared to females, and therefore may be more adversely affected by experiences of financial adversity compared to females.

A dose-response effect was also found between financial adversity and brain health, with increased experience of low household income associated with a 4.7ml increase in ventricular volume at 69-71 years. In addition, there was evidence for multiple vulnerabilities to brain atrophy. Males appeared more vulnerable to the effect of persistent financial hardships on larger ventricular volumes and increased ventricular expansion, as well as increased total brain volume atrophy compared to females. Those with disadvantaged childhood SEC also appeared more vulnerable to the effect of persistent low household income on both hippocampal volume atrophy and ventricular expansion, extending previous findings.^{44,45}

APOE- ϵ 4 carriers who were also persistently experiencing financial adversity showed higher rates of A β deposition (SUVRs), increased total brain and hippocampal atrophy, as well as ventricular expansion, highlighting a multiplicative effect where those with greater genetic risk are particularly vulnerable to the effects of persistent financial adversity.

Hence the impact of persistent financial adversity on markers of brain health may be more complex depending on other co-existing factors such as sex, childhood SEC and genetic risk. APOE- ϵ 4 has been shown previously to interact with educational attainment in its

association with cognitive impairments and dementia risk, where higher education may protect against genetic susceptibility conferred by the APOE- ϵ 4 allele.⁴⁶⁻⁴⁹ Similarly, our findings consistently showed that the association between APOE- ϵ 4 and increased brain atrophy was only evident for those who persistently experienced financial adversity. As APOE- ϵ 4 is hypothesised to act primarily via A β deposition⁵⁰ – an early pathological feature of Alzheimer’s disease⁵¹⁻⁵³ – the additional interaction found between financial hardships and APOE- ϵ 4 on A β burden in the current study further suggest that environmental exposure may exacerbate the effect of APOE- ϵ 4 on dementia risk. One potential mechanism for how APOE- ϵ 4 may moderate the effect of persistent financial adversity is that persistent adversity may reduce brain and cognitive reserve, which, when combined with genetic susceptibility to pathology, may render systems more vulnerable and decrease the threshold for clinical symptoms.^{46,54} Reducing the frequency of experiencing financial adversity could therefore improve cognitive performance and help protect against the expression of genetic vulnerability to brain atrophy and subsequent risk of dementia.

Some limitations of the study include selective attrition bias, with those who dropped out being more likely to have lower cognitive abilities and disadvantaged SEC,²² particularly within Insight 46, which is a healthier and more socially advantaged cohort compared to the general population.²⁵ This may lead to an underestimation of the effect of financial adversity on cognitive ageing. There is also a lack of ethnic diversity in this cohort, and further research is needed using more ethnically representative populations. Another limitation was the type of data collected for household income, which was a categorical variable indicating various income brackets rather than raw income values and not adjusted for household size; potentially reducing the precision of the low income variables derived.⁵⁵ Other pathways from financial adversity to markers of brain health were also not investigated in this study, with

one potential candidate being cerebrovascular dysfunction, which may precede neurodegenerative changes in the brain and cognitive decline.^{56,57}

Conclusion

Persistent financial adversity is associated with reduced cognitive function in midlife and subsequently slower decline into older age, highlighting substantial cognitive losses already present in midlife. Males, those with disadvantaged childhood SEC and greater genetic risk (APOE- ϵ 4) were also more susceptible to the effect of persistent financial adversity on brain atrophy. Given the current climate of cost-of-living crisis where a record number of households are reporting financial adversity,⁵⁸ these findings further illustrate the importance of supporting vulnerable households to prevent financial adversity from becoming chronic, which could also help protect against age-related cognitive impairments and disorders such as dementia.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all study members who took part in the NSHD as well as Insight 46, and to the NSHD and Insight 46 study team members who helped to collect the data over the last seven decades. We are also grateful to the radiographers and nuclear medicine physicians at the UCL Institute of Nuclear Medicine, and to the staff at the Leonard Wolfson Experimental Neurology Centre at UCL.

Author contributions

Conceptualisation: PP, all authors

Data curation and resources: SK, TP, JMS, MR

Funding acquisition and project administration: JMS, PP, MR

Methodology: YL, JW, S-NJ, JM, JS, PP

Formal analysis, visualisations: YL

Analysis verification: JW

Writing – first draft: YL

Writing – revision and final draft: all authors

Data availability

Data will be made available to researchers upon request to the NSHD Data Sharing Committee. For more information see: <http://www.nshd.mrc.ac.uk/data>.

Competing interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

- 1 Alzheimer's Association. 2015 Alzheimer's disease facts and figures. *Alzheimers Dement* 2015; **11**: 332–84.
- 2 Prince MJ, Wu F, Guo Y, *et al.* The burden of disease in older people and implications for health policy and practice. *The Lancet* 2015; **385**: 549–62.
- 3 Patterson C. World alzheimer report 2018. 2018.
- 4 Rossor M, Knapp M. Can we model a cognitive footprint of interventions and policies to help to meet the global challenge of dementia? *Lancet Lond Engl* 2015; **386**: 1008–10.
- 5 Koster A, Penninx BWJH, Bosma H, *et al.* Socioeconomic Differences in Cognitive Decline and the Role of Biomedical Factors. *Ann Epidemiol* 2005; **15**: 564–71.
- 6 Landy R, Head J, Richards M, Hardy R. The effect of life course socioeconomic position on crystallised cognitive ability in two large UK cohort studies: a structured modelling approach. *BMJ Open* 2017; **7**: e014461.
- 7 Lyu J, Burr JA. Socioeconomic Status Across the Life Course and Cognitive Function Among Older Adults: An Examination of the Latency, Pathways, and Accumulation Hypotheses. *J Aging Health* 2016; **28**: 40–67.
- 8 Migeot J, Calivar M, Granchetti H, Ibáñez A, Fittipaldi S. Socioeconomic status impacts cognitive and socioemotional processes in healthy ageing. *Sci Rep* 2022; **12**: 6048.
- 9 Mirowsky J, Ross CE. Age and the Effect of Economic Hardship on Depression. *J Health Soc Behav* 2001; **42**: 132–50.
- 10 Lee Y, Back JH, Kim J, Byeon H. Multiple Socioeconomic Risks and Cognitive Impairment in Older Adults. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord* 2010; **29**: 523–9.
- 11 Mani A, Mullainathan S, Shafir E, Zhao J. Poverty Impedes Cognitive Function. *Science* 2013; published online Aug 30. DOI:10.1126/science.1238041.
- 12 Peterson RL, Carvajal SC, McGuire LC, Fain MJ, Bell ML. State inequality, socioeconomic position and subjective cognitive decline in the United States. *SSM - Popul Health* 2019; **7**: 100357.
- 13 Kiely KM, Anstey KJ, Butterworth P. Within-Person Associations Between Financial Hardship and Cognitive Performance in the PATH Through Life Study. *Am J Epidemiol* 2019; **188**: 1076–83.
- 14 Anstey KJ, Peters R, Mortby ME, *et al.* Association of sex differences in dementia risk factors with sex differences in memory decline in a population-based cohort spanning 20-76 years. *Sci Rep* 2021; **11**: 7710.
- 15 Harper C, Marcus R, Moore K. Enduring Poverty and the Conditions of Childhood: Lifecourse and Intergenerational Poverty Transmissions. *World Dev* 2003; **31**: 535–54.
- 16 Moore K. Thinking About Youth Poverty Through the Lenses of Chronic Poverty, Life-Course Poverty and Intergenerational Poverty. *SSRN Electron J* 2005; published online July 1. DOI:10.2139/ssrn.1753655.

- 17 Zeki Al Hazzouri A, Elfassy T, Sidney S, Jacobs D, Pérez Stable EJ, Yaffe K. Sustained Economic Hardship and Cognitive Function: The Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults Study. *Am J Prev Med* 2017; **52**: 1–9.
- 18 Kloppenborg RP, Nederkoorn PJ, Geerlings MI, van den Berg E. Presence and progression of white matter hyperintensities and cognition: a meta-analysis. *Neurology* 2014; **82**: 2127–38.
- 19 Miquel S, Champ C, Day J, *et al*. Poor cognitive ageing: Vulnerabilities, mechanisms and the impact of nutritional interventions. *Ageing Res Rev* 2018; **42**: 40–55.
- 20 Prins ND, Scheltens P. White matter hyperintensities, cognitive impairment and dementia: an update. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2015; **11**: 157–65.
- 21 Ritchie SJ, Dickie DA, Cox SR, *et al*. Brain volumetric changes and cognitive ageing during the eighth decade of life. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2015; **36**: 4910–25.
- 22 Kuh D, Wong A, Shah I, *et al*. The MRC National Survey of Health and Development reaches age 70: maintaining participation at older ages in a birth cohort study. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2016; **31**: 1135–47.
- 23 Lu K, Nicholas JM, Collins JD, *et al*. Cognition at age 70: Life course predictors and associations with brain pathologies. *Neurology* 2019; **93**: e2144–56.
- 24 Richards M, James S-N, Sizer A, *et al*. Identifying the lifetime cognitive and socioeconomic antecedents of cognitive state: seven decades of follow-up in a British birth cohort study. *BMJ Open* 2019; **9**: e024404.
- 25 James S-N, Lane CA, Parker TD, *et al*. Using a birth cohort to study brain health and preclinical dementia: recruitment and participation rates in Insight 46. *BMC Res Notes* 2018; **11**: 1–9.
- 26 Lane CA, Parker TD, Cash DM, *et al*. Study protocol: Insight 46 – a neuroscience sub-study of the MRC National Survey of Health and Development. *BMC Neurol* 2017; **17**: 1–25.
- 27 Morelli S, Nolan B, Palomino JC, Van Kerm P. Inheritance, gifts and the accumulation of wealth for low-income households. *J Eur Soc Policy* 2021; **31**: 533–48.
- 28 Jovicich J, Czanner S, Greve D, *et al*. Reliability in multi-site structural MRI studies: Effects of gradient non-linearity correction on phantom and human data. *NeuroImage* 2006; **30**: 436–43.
- 29 Tustison NJ, Avants BB, Cook PA, *et al*. N4ITK: improved N3 bias correction. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging* 2010; **29**: 1310–20.
- 30 Freeborough PA, Fox NC. The boundary shift integral: an accurate and robust measure of cerebral volume changes from registered repeat MRI. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging* 1997; **16**: 623–9.
- 31 Leung KK, Barnes J, Ridgway GR, *et al*. Automated cross-sectional and longitudinal hippocampal volume measurement in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer’s disease. *NeuroImage* 2010; **51**: 1345–59.
- 32 Leung KK, Clarkson MJ, Bartlett JW, *et al*. Robust atrophy rate measurement in Alzheimer’s disease using multi-site serial MRI: Tissue-specific intensity normalization and parameter selection. *NeuroImage* 2010; **50**: 516–23.

- 33 Keuss SE, Coath W, Nicholas JM, *et al.* Associations of β -Amyloid and Vascular Burden With Rates of Neurodegeneration in Cognitively Normal Members of the 1946 British Birth Cohort. *Neurology* 2022; : 10.1212/WNL.0000000000200524.
- 34 Malone IB, Leung KK, Clegg S, *et al.* Accurate automatic estimation of total intracranial volume: A nuisance variable with less nuisance. *Neuroimage* 2015; **104**: 366–72.
- 35 Duncan TE, Duncan SC, Strycker LA. An Introduction to Latent Variable Growth Curve Modeling: Concepts, Issues, and Applications, 2nd edn. New York: Routledge, 2006
DOI:10.4324/9780203879962.
- 36 Azur MJ, Stuart EA, Frangakis C, Leaf PJ. Multiple imputation by chained equations: what is it and how does it work? *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res* 2011; **20**: 40–9.
- 37 Buuren SV, Groothuis-oudshoorn K. MICE: Multivariate imputation by chained equations in R. *J Stat Softw* 2011; **45**: 1–67.
- 38 Schilbach F, Schofield H, Mullainathan S. The Psychological Lives of the Poor. *Am Econ Rev* 2016; **106**: 435–40.
- 39 Shah AK, Mullainathan S, Shafir E. Some Consequences of Having Too Little. *Science* 2012; **338**: 682–5.
- 40 Sandi C. Stress and cognition. *WIREs Cogn Sci* 2013; **4**: 245–61.
- 41 Camarata S, Woodcock R. Sex differences in processing speed: Developmental effects in males and females. *Intelligence* 2006; **34**: 231–52.
- 42 Halim S, Kaplan HB, Pollack MS. Moderating effects of gender and vulnerability on the relationships between financial hardship, low education and immune response. *Stress Med* 2000; **16**: 167–77.
- 43 Odani S, Shinozaki T, Shibuya K, Tabuchi T. Economic Hardships and Self-reported Deterioration of Physical and Mental Health Under the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Cross-sectional Study, 2020, Japan. *J Epidemiol* 2022; **32**: 195–203.
- 44 Butterworth P, Cherbuin N, Sachdev P, Anstey KJ. The association between financial hardship and amygdala and hippocampal volumes: results from the PATH through life project. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* 2012; **7**: 548–56.
- 45 Elbejjani M, Fuhrer R, Abrahamowicz M, *et al.* Life-Course Socioeconomic Position and Hippocampal Atrophy in a Prospective Cohort of Older Adults. *Psychosom Med* 2017; **79**: 14–23.
- 46 Ferrari C, Xu W-L, Wang H-X, *et al.* How can elderly apolipoprotein E ϵ 4 carriers remain free from dementia? *Neurobiol Aging* 2013; **34**: 13–21.
- 47 Frank M, Hensel J, Baak L, *et al.* Interaction of Alzheimer’s Disease-Associated Genetic Risk with Indicators of Socioeconomic Position on Mild Cognitive Impairment in the Heinz Nixdorf Recall Study. *J Alzheimers Dis* 2021; **82**: 1715–25.
- 48 Arenaza-Urquijo EM, Gonneaud J, Fouquet M, *et al.* Interaction between years of education and APOE ϵ 4 status on frontal and temporal metabolism. *Neurology* 2015; **85**: 1392–9.

- 49 Wang H-X, Gustafson DR, Kivipelto M, *et al.* Education halves the risk of dementia due to apolipoprotein ε4 allele: a collaborative study from the Swedish Brain Power initiative. *Neurobiol Aging* 2012; **33**: 1007.e1-1007.e7.
- 50 Huang Y, Weisgraber KH, Mucke L, Mahley RW. Apolipoprotein E. *J Mol Neurosci* 2004; **23**: 189–204.
- 51 Bailey P. Biological Markers in Alzheimer’s Disease. *Can J Neurol Sci* 2007; **34**: S72–6.
- 52 Fox NC, Freeborough PA, Rossor MN. Visualisation and quantification of rates of atrophy in Alzheimer’s disease. *The Lancet* 1996; **348**: 94–7.
- 53 Kant IMJ, de Bresser J, van Montfort SJJ, Slooter AJC, Hendrikse J. MRI Markers of Neurodegenerative and Neurovascular Changes in Relation to Postoperative Delirium and Postoperative Cognitive Decline. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2017; **25**: 1048–61.
- 54 Stern Y. Cognitive Reserve. *Neuropsychologia* 2009; **47**: 2015–28.
- 55 Overton M, Pihlsgård M, Elmståhl S. Prevalence and Incidence of Mild Cognitive Impairment across Subtypes, Age, and Sex. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord* 2019; **47**: 219–32.
- 56 Kaufman CS, Morris JK, Vidoni ED, Burns JM, Billinger SA. Apolipoprotein E4 Moderates the Association Between Vascular Risk Factors and Brain Pathology. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord* 2021; **35**: 223–9.
- 57 McCorkindale AN, Mundell HD, Guennevig B, Sutherland GT. Vascular Dysfunction Is Central to Alzheimer’s Disease Pathogenesis in APOE e4 Carriers. *Int J Mol Sci* 2022; **23**: 7106.
- 58 Broadbent P, Thomson R, Kopasker D, *et al.* The public health implications of the cost-of-living crisis: outlining mechanisms and modelling consequences. *Lancet Reg Health – Eur* 2023; **0**. DOI:10.1016/j.lanepe.2023.100585.


1a. Predicted means on verbal memory by low household income

Grouped by
baseline
cognition

1SD above
(N=363)

-1 to 1SD
(N=2165)

-1SD below
(N=231)



Low household income None Intermittent Persistent


1b. Predicted means on verbal memory by financial hardships

Grouped by
baseline
cognition

1SD above
(N=363)

-1 to 1SD
(N=2165)


-1SD below
(N=231)




Financial hardships None Intermittent Persistent

Sex ● Male ▲ Female


Low household income by sex on processing speed intercept (baseline)




Financial hardships by sex on processing speed decline




3a. Low household income x childhood SEC on hippocampal volume atrophy




3b. Low household income x childhood SEC on ventricular expansion




3c. Financial hardships x sex on brain volume atrophy




3d. Financial hardships x sex on ventricular expansion




3e. Financial hardships x sex on baseline ventricular volume




4a. Low household income x genetic risk on brain volume atrophy




4d. Financial hardships x genetic risk on brain volume atrophy




4b. Low household income x genetic risk on hippocampal volume atrophy




4e. Financial hardships x genetic risk on hippocampal volume atrophy



4c. Low household income x genetic risk on ventricular expansion



4f. Financial hardships x genetic risk on ventricular expansion



4g. Financial hardships x genetic risk on Amyloid (SUVR)

