

1

2 **Prenatal exposure to genocide accelerates epigenetic aging as measured in second-**

3 **generation clocks among young adults**

4 Authors:

5 Glorieuse Uwizeye^{1*} email: guwizeye@uwo.ca

6 Luisa M. Rivera² email: luisa.rivera@dartmouth.edu

7 Hannah G. Stolrow³ email: hannah.stolrow@dartmouth.edu

8 Brock C. Christensen³ email: brock.c.christensen@dartmouth.edu

9 Julienne N. Rutherford⁴ email: jnrutherford@arizona.edu

10 Zaneta M. Thayer² email: zaneta.marie.thayer@dartmouth.edu

- 11
- 12 1. Arthur Labatt Family School of Nursing, Western University, London, ON, Canada,
- 13
- 14 2. Department of Anthropology, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH, USA.
- 15
- 16 3. Department of Epidemiology, Geisel School of Medicine, Dartmouth College, Lebanon,
- 17 ON, USA
- 18
- 19 4. Advanced Nursing Practice and Science Division, College of Nursing, University of
- 20 Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

21

22 * Corresponding author: Glorieuse Uwizeye, Arthur Labatt Family School of Nursing, Western

23 University, 1151 Richmond St, London, Ontario, Canada, N6A 3K7. Email: guwizeye@uwo.ca

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 **Prenatal exposure to genocide accelerates epigenetic aging as measured in second-**
31 **generation clocks among young adults**

32 **Abstract**

33 Prenatal exposure to trauma, including genocide and maternal rape, and adverse childhood
34 experiences (ACEs), are associated with lifespan reduction. We evaluated whether prenatal
35 exposure to genocide or genocidal rape, and ACEs among individuals conceived during the
36 1994 genocide against Tutsi in Rwanda were associated with differences in age acceleration in
37 three first-generation (Horvath, Hannum, PhenoAge) and four second-generation epigenetic
38 aging clocks (GrimAge, DunedinPace, YingDamAge, YingAdaptAge), given the association
39 between biological aging and mortality. No differences in age acceleration were observed with
40 first-generation age clocks. However, age acceleration was associated with prenatal exposure
41 to extreme stress for all second-generation clocks, with the greatest acceleration observed in
42 the genocidal rape conception group. For YingDamAge clock, acceleration effects were
43 strengthened after inclusion of ACEs. We suggest that prenatal trauma exposure is associated
44 with epigenetic age acceleration. Second-generation clocks may more accurately capture these
45 relationships.

46

47 **Keywords**

48 Epigenetic clocks, Prenatal exposure to stress, Genocide against the Tutsi, Adverse early life
49 experience, Rape, Rwanda

50

51

52

INTRODUCTION

53 Genocide has profound and long-lasting effects on humanity. In Rwanda, more than 1,000,000
54 lives were lost in a period of 100 days in the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi¹. The genocide not
55 only impacted the lives of those who directly experienced it but also those who were indirectly
56 exposed while in utero. Our previous studies demonstrated that young adults conceived during
57 the genocide against the Tutsi had worse mental and physical function and higher post-
58 traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) scores, anxiety, depression, pain intensity, and sleep
59 disturbance compared to age- and sex-matched young adults who were not prenatally exposed
60 to the genocide². Other studies conducted in Rwanda also reported significantly higher scores of
61 PTSD, depression and lower cortisol levels among Rwandans prenatally exposed to genocide
62 when compared with those whose parents were living outside the country during the time of
63 genocide^{3, 4}.

64 Rape was used as a systematic weapon during the 1994 genocide and affected approximately
65 350,000 women, of whom only one in six survived^{2, 5}. While the exact number of children born
66 as a result of genocidal rape will never be known, the total is estimated between 2,000-10,000⁵,
67 ⁶. Individuals conceived during the genocide, including those conceived through rape, were
68 exposed to this trauma during the first trimester, which is a critical stage of development. For
69 those conceived via genocidal rape, stress related to their birth origins extends beyond the
70 acute period of genocide and continues throughout childhood^{7, 8}. For example, studies
71 conducted in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia reported that children born of genocidal rape
72 face physical and emotional abuse from family and community members and endure poverty
73 and other socioeconomic hardships^{7, 9}. This can manifest in a significantly higher likelihood of
74 experiencing adverse childhood experiences².

75 While research has demonstrated associations between prenatal exposure to genocide and
76 mental and physical health outcomes^{2, 10}, it is possible that prenatal exposure to genocide and
77 rape also impacted various aspects of biological regulation, including patterns of DNA
78 methylation. We previously reported that individuals who were born of genocidal rape, relative to
79 controls, had DNA methylation that varied at CpGs in *BDNF* and *SLC6A4*, and methylation in
80 these sites was associated with adult mental health outcomes¹¹. While suggestive, site-specific
81 DNA methylation has not proven to be a useful prognosticator of health; by contrast, DNA
82 methylation-based aging estimators have been associated with mental health treatment
83 outcomes¹², cancer prognosis, and chronic disease mortality¹³. There are different machine-
84 learning algorithms to estimate biological aging. First-generation epigenetic age estimators were
85 created by training neural-net models to predict age by comparing the methylation status at
86 CpG sites present on arrays with chronological age (e.g., Horvath¹⁴, Hannum¹⁵); age
87 acceleration was conceptualized as the positive difference (either raw or residualized) between
88 estimated and actual age. Such estimators have been critiqued for low test-retest reliability,¹⁶ a
89 lack of generalizability beyond their training data,¹⁷ and a limited ability to capture biological
90 processes and/or epigenetic patterns related to healthy aging and longevity. In response, so-
91 called “second generation” epigenetic clocks have included phenotypic measures known to
92 associate with biological aging (e.g. PhenoAge) as well as known longitudinal mortality and
93 longevity data (GrimAge, DunedinPACE) and most recently, causally-constrained epigenetic
94 markers of adaptive aging or longevity (YingAdaptAge) and/or decreased lifespan or damage-
95 related aging (YingDamAge)¹⁸. In this paper, we categorize PhenoAge as a first-generation
96 clock; while it does include serum biomarkers associated with poor health, it does not include
97 longitudinal mortality data (e.g. GrimAge), longitudinal age-related decline (DunedinPACE) or
98 longitudinal age-related morbidity/mortality and longevity outcomes (YingDamAge,
99 YingAdaptAge) in its training data (see Supplemental Table 1). Though effect sizes vary

100 depending on the clock used, accelerated epigenetic age has been associated with decreased
101 lifespan and “healthspan”¹⁹. Notably, early life adversity (ELA, e.g. both prenatally and in
102 childhood) has been associated with accelerated epigenetic age, although these associations
103 frequently vary depending on the epigenetic clock used and the way adversity is measured²⁰.
104 For example, in a systematic review of ELA and epigenetic aging in the Horvath and Hannum
105 clocks, experiences of threat (vs. deprivation) were most related to biological aging²¹ in children.
106 In a separate analysis among Congolese newborns, prenatal exposure to general trauma and
107 war trauma was found to be associated with accelerated epigenetic age in the Hannum extrinsic
108 age (but not PhenoAge or GrimAge) clocks²². Lower birth weight has also been associated with
109 accelerated epigenetic aging in the Hannum, DNAmPhenoAge, DunedinPoAm, and DNAmTL
110 (but not GrimAge) in young male, but not female, adults in the Philippines²³. Here, we use DNA
111 methylation array data from our previously described cohort of individuals conceived during the
112 1994 genocide against the Tutsi¹¹ to evaluate epigenetic aging using all seven published
113 epigenetic age estimators.

114 *Hypotheses*

115 The primary aim of this study was to evaluate whether different patterns of prenatal exposure to
116 maternal stress are associated with epigenetic age. We evaluated three groups, 1) single-
117 exposed - maternal stress related to genocide; 2) double-exposed - maternal stress related to
118 genocide and rape; 3) control - not directly exposed to genocide or rape. In contrast to previous
119 work on similar samples, here we assess the influence of both prenatal exposures and postnatal
120 experiences of adversity, such as adverse childhood experiences (ACEs), on first- and second-
121 generation epigenetic age estimators. For our analysis, we hypothesized that adverse early life
122 experiences would be associated with accelerated epigenetic age. For the prenatal adversity
123 groups, we predict that single-exposed individuals will have a significantly accelerated

124 epigenetic age compared to unexposed individuals, and double-exposed individuals will have a
125 significantly accelerated epigenetic age relative to single-exposed and control individuals. We
126 explored this relationship using first generation (Horvath, Hannum, PhenoAge) and second
127 generation (GrimAge, DunedinPACE, YingDamAge, YingAdaptAge) epigenetic age estimators.

128 **RESULTS**

129 Sample descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. As noted earlier, all participants were 24
130 years of chronological age (mean= 24.1, sd = 0.10) and fairly evenly split by sex (n= 44 female,
131 n=45 male). The majority (73.7%) had some college education. Reported adverse childhood
132 events ranged from 1 to 11, with a mean of 5.00, and as previously reported, were highest in the
133 doubly exposed group².

134 *Epigenetic age*

135 *Caption: Fig 1: Violin plot of epigenetic age residuals by group*

136 The figure depicts the distribution of age residuals by group for each epigenetic clock.

137

138 Predicted epigenetic age ranges varied between clocks (see Supplemental Table 2). For
139 example, the mean PhenoAge predicted age for the sample was 12.8 years (sd=5.61). We
140 found no evidence of an association between epigenetic age acceleration and prenatal
141 genocide exposure (single or double) and/or ACEs in the Hannum, Horvath, or PhenoAge
142 clocks (Supplemental Tables 3.1- 3.6).

143 By contrast, epigenetic age acceleration calculated from YingDamAge, YingAdaptAge
144 DunedinPACE, and GrimAgeAccel clocks were all associated with prenatal genocide exposure
145 with stronger effects for the double-exposed group seen in the YingDamAge $\beta_{single} = 3.601$,
146 $\beta_{double} = 6.375$, $p < 0.05$) and YingAdaptAge clocks ($\beta_{single} = -6.482$, $\beta_{double} = -7.725$, $p < 0.001$).

147 The relationship between prenatal genocide exposure and epigenetic age acceleration
148 calculated from YingAdaptAge remained significant and increased in both exposed groups
149 ($\beta_{single} = -7.450$, $\beta_{double} = -9.436$, $p < 0.001$) even after controlling for ACEs. However, only the
150 double-exposed group had significant epigenetic age acceleration calculated from YingDamAge
151 after adjusting for ACEs, with the coefficient increasing after adjustment ($\beta_{double} = 6.349$, $p <$
152 0.01). The double-exposed group (but not single-exposed) was significantly associated with age
153 acceleration in the DunedinPACE ($\beta_{double} = 0.048$, $p < 0.05$) and GrimAgeAccel ($\beta_{double} = 1.448$, p
154 < 0.05) clocks. These effects were attenuated by adjustment for postnatal ACEs, especially in
155 the DunedinPace and GrimAge2 clocks (see Tables 2.1 - 2.8). Visual examination of regression
156 diagnostic plots in the performance package demonstrated good model performance for each
157 second generation clock.

158 We calculated the standardized mean difference to compare effect sizes across each of the
159 models tested (Figure 1). The confidence intervals for each of the Horvath, Hannum, and
160 PhenoAge models contained zero; in DunedinPACE and GrimAge, the single-exposed contrast,
161 but not the double-exposed, also contained zero. Effect sizes were progressively greater (and
162 greater for the double-exposed) in each second-generation clock tested. The largest effect size
163 was for reduced adaptive aging in the double-exposed (YingAdaptAge SMD = -0.98, (95% CI =
164 -1.54, -0.52) in Model 1 (unadjusted for ACEs) and Model 2 (YingAdaptAge SMD = -1.19, 95%
165 CI = -1.73, -0.66).

166 DISCUSSION

167 Previous research has demonstrated the sustained impacts of exposure to genocide and war-
168 related trauma on the epigenome of individuals^{4, 22, 24, 25}. Here, we reported the results of an
169 analysis of epigenetic age among two groups of individuals conceived in Rwanda during the
170 1994 genocide and one group of individuals conceived outside of Rwanda during that time. We

171 find a pattern of increased epigenetic aging between both prenatal exposure groups among
172 second generation but not first generation epigenetic aging clocks, with stronger effects for the
173 more severely exposed. Adjustment for postnatal adversity only slightly attenuated these
174 effects, confirming the importance of prenatal developmental conditions. Our findings are
175 provocative because they indicate that recent efforts to improve epigenetic clock construction by
176 capturing physiological and/or causal variation in aging related DNA methylation may also better
177 capture the impact of prenatal insults on healthspan. The effect sizes were greatest for the
178 YingDamAge and YingAdaptAge, with the former increasing with adjustment for ACEs. While all
179 of the second generation clocks were significantly different for the single-exposed group when
180 adjusting for sex and immune cell composition, YingAdaptAge was the only measure that was
181 significantly different once ACEs were added to the model. Similarly, effect sizes between
182 exposure and epigenetic aging were greater in the second generation clocks, with the largest
183 effect seen in reduced adaptive aging (YingAdaptAge) in the double-exposed. Links between
184 prenatal conditions and earlier onset of age-related disease and decreased lifespan have been
185 theorized within the Developmental Origins of Health and Disease (DOHaD) framework^{26, 27}.
186 Low birthweight, prenatal exposure to stress and famine, and other indicators of poor
187 developmental conditions have been associated with increased risk of chronic disease,
188 decreased healthspan, and premature death in a well-established literature^{28, 29}. Research
189 exploring epigenetic age acceleration in young adults and associations with early life or prenatal
190 conditions, however, is an emerging field; due to an individual's limited ability to report on their
191 own prenatal exposures, most studies in this field have investigated aging in children with
192 parental report of exposure, or childhood adversity as self-reported by adults. Epigenetic age
193 acceleration has been found in adults with in utero exposure to the Great Depression³⁰, the
194 Dutch Hunger Winter³¹, and other documented adverse developmental conditions. Our study
195 adds to this literature by demonstrating the impact of prenatal exposure to genocide and

196 genocidal rape in relatively healthy young adults. Whether these responses represent
197 constraint, adaptation, or pathology is currently unclear, and should be a focus of study in future
198 research³².

199 Our study also contributes to understanding some of the challenges and limitations of epigenetic
200 clocks³³, discerning causal relationships between epigenetic aging and healthspan, and the
201 generalizability of epigenetic aging algorithms to non-Western populations¹⁷. We note,
202 especially for the first generation clocks, the substantial variation in estimated age in these
203 measures. The Hannum and PhenoAge clocks predicted age ranges between 2.40 - 32.1 years
204 and 0.445 - 30.1 years, respectively. According to these predictions, some individuals had
205 epigenetic age deceleration on the order of 23 years, which is remarkable considering the study
206 participants were 24 years of chronological age at the time of assessment. It is also notable that
207 outliers demonstrated epigenetic age *deceleration* and not acceleration and that the most
208 extreme values were found in the double-exposed group. The Horvath clock had a more
209 reasonable range (23.0, 38.3), with a slightly longer right tail to the distribution, reflecting more
210 acceleration than deceleration results. It is worth noting that all the included epigenetic clocks
211 are trained on reference datasets that are not representative of the Rwandan population in
212 terms of ancestry and that were not exposed to such extreme prenatal and postnatal stress¹⁷.
213 As such, it is possible that these clocks are less accurate at estimating biological age in this
214 population, potentially due to confounding by cell type³⁴⁻³⁶. For example, the Hannum clock was
215 validated using a sample of 426 “Caucasian” and 230 “Hispanic” individuals, and the authors
216 found a correlation of 96% between chronological and epigenetic age¹⁵. In our sample, this
217 correlation was 3.9%. This finding highlights the limitations of creating epigenetic (or genetic, i.e.
218 polygenic risk scores) algorithms based on non-fully representative datasets, reflecting broader
219 anthropological critiques of biological normativity³⁷.

220 First generation clocks, trained only on chronological age, may be particularly vulnerable to
221 unmeasured confounding (e.g. population structure). The second generation clocks tested were
222 also trained on data not representative of our sample (see Supplementary Table 1), but each
223 include longitudinal measures of age-related decline, with the Ying clocks additionally
224 constraining CpGs in its algorithm to those most causally related to age-related traits. Our
225 findings suggest that these clocks are potentially more generalizable to other populations¹⁷.

226 *Limitations*

227 We note several limitations to our study. The relatively small sample size may limit the
228 generalizability of our findings. The majority of our participants had some college education
229 which may not be representative of the socioeconomic status of our target population, but which
230 we hypothesize would bias our results towards the null. Further, we utilized a cross-sectional
231 study design with self-report on ACEs in adulthood, which introduces some degree of
232 measurement error into our measure of ELA and limits causal inferences about the effect of
233 ELA on biological aging. Finally, while we adjusted for ACEs, other unmeasured confounders,
234 such as nutritional status, other environmental exposures, and genetic factors may have
235 influenced the results. Despite these limitations, the shared directionality of effect between the
236 multiple second-generation clocks tested, the highly impacted study population, and the use of
237 an unexposed comparison group lend strength to our study findings.

238 *Conclusions*

239 In sum, we found a relationship between maternal exposure to genocide-related trauma during
240 pregnancy and epigenetic age acceleration in young adult offspring using second-generation
241 but not first-generation epigenetic age estimators. Adjusting for adverse childhood experiences
242 does not attenuate most of these results, and in the case of YingAdaptAge increased the

243 coefficient. Future longitudinal research on larger samples should evaluate the potential
244 interactive or moderating effects of both positive and negative environmental experiences later
245 in the life course on epigenetic age acceleration.

246 **METHODS**

247 This analysis is part of a comparative and associational cross-sectional study that explored the
248 health impacts of prenatal exposure to genocide among Rwandan young adults conceived
249 during the 100 days of genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994^{2, 10}. Study approvals were
250 obtained from the Institutional Review Boards of the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC: 2018-
251 1497), the University of Rwanda (UR No 063/CMHS IRB/2019), and Dartmouth College
252 (STUDY0003231). All participants were given an information letter about the study and signed a
253 ^{2, 10}consent form before data collection. Rwandans aged 24 years old during the time of data
254 collection were enrolled in the study and categorized into three groups according to their level of
255 exposure: group 1: single-exposed - maternal stress-related genocide group 2: double-exposed
256 - maternal stress-related genocide and rape; and group 3: control - not directly exposed to
257 genocide or rape. The first participants in both exposed groups were recruited from the
258 Solidarity for the Development of Widows and Orphans to Promote Self-Sufficiency and
259 Livelihoods “SEVOTA” and Association of Genocide Widows Agahozo “AVEGA Agahozo”, non-
260 profit organizations that support genocide survivors². Participants in the group were
261 descendants of Rwandans who were living outside the country during the time of the genocide
262 and had no direct experience of the 1994 genocide. Each participant was invited to recommend
263 age- and sex-matched Rwandans who belonged to any of the three groups.

264 Data were collected by the first author, who is a Rwandan mental health nurse, in a private
265 room. Interviews were conducted in Kinyarwanda. A total of 91 participants completed
266 demographic and health-related surveys in Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap).

267 *Prenatal exposure to genocide*

268 To determine the level of exposure, we asked each participant if they were conceived by a
269 genocide survivor and whether they were conceived via genocidal rape. Most of the participants
270 in the exposed groups were referred to the study by an organization that supports survivors of
271 genocide and their offspring; these organizations hence knew and shared with us in which
272 category their referred potential participants belonged to. We verified these exposures with
273 participants during their interviews. We conducted screening interviews with participants in the
274 control group to determine if individuals were born to Tutsi women who were living outside the
275 country during the time of the genocide. We excluded participants if their parents left the country
276 due to the genocide or other political unrest in the months leading up to the genocide. We
277 backdated participants' dates of birth to estimate if they were conceived during the time of the
278 genocide: April 07 - July 4, 1994. An equal number of female and male participants were
279 enrolled in each group (Table 1).

280 *Early Life Adversity*

281 Adverse childhood experiences before age 18 were assessed using the Adverse Childhood
282 Experiences International Questionnaire (ACEs IQ)³⁸. This measure includes 13 items -
283 emotional abuse; physical abuse; sexual abuse; violence against household members; living
284 with household members who were substance abusers; living with household members who
285 were mentally ill or suicidal; living with household members who were imprisoned; one or no
286 parents, parental separation or divorce; emotional neglect; physical neglect; bullying; community
287 violence; and collective violence, resulting in an ACEs score of 0-13. This measure has been
288 validated in another African setting³⁹ and had acceptable internal consistency within our sample
289 ($\alpha = 0.70$).

290 *Dried Blood Spot Collection*

291 Dried blood spots (DBS) were collected for later DNA methylation analysis following the
292 interview. DBS is a minimally invasive and frequently used method that is convenient and cost-
293 effective in research in remote settings that requires long-distance transportation of samples⁴⁰.
294 The use of DBS has been validated in studies exploring DNAm⁴¹ (24). Whole blood drops were
295 collected from a finger stick by sterile lancet on Flinders Technology Associates cards (FTA),
296 with four sample areas of 125 μ L each per card. Samples were collected from March 07 to April
297 06, 2019. The drops were air-dried for at least four hours before placing each card in an airtight
298 envelope with silica-based desiccant and stored at room temperature in Rwanda. Samples were
299 then shipped to the University of Illinois on April 7, 2019, and later to Dartmouth College on
300 August 26, 2021, where they were stored at -80 °C prior to sample processing and DNA
301 methylation analysis in April 2022.

302 *DNA Methylation Sample Processing*

303 DNA was extracted from dried blood spots (DBS) using QIAamp DNA Investigator Kit (Qiagen,
304 Catalog #56504). The manufacturer's protocol was optimized to improve DNA yield. For each
305 sample (N = 91), two 6 mm hole punches were processed in individual 1.5 microcentrifuge
306 tubes (Eppendorf) and QIAamp MinElute columns (Qiagen). The elution buffer ATE (Qiagen)
307 was heated to 70°C to improve the release of DNA from the silica membrane. 60 μ L of ATE
308 were pipetted onto the silica membrane of the MinElute column and incubated at room
309 temperature (15–25°C) for 10 min. before centrifugation. The eluate was re-eluted onto the
310 silica membrane and incubated at room temperature (15–25°C) for 3 min. Following final
311 centrifugation, the eluates were combined into one 1.5 microcentrifuge tube and carefully
312 pipetted up and down to ensure sufficient mixture. Purified DNA was quantified using Invitrogen
313 Qubit 3.0 Fluorometer broad range assay (median = 259.6 ng of DNA). Infinium FFPE QC and

314 DNA Restoration kit (Illumina Inc., WG-321-1001, WG-321-1002) was used to evaluate sample
315 quality and restore degraded DNA, prior to bisulfite treatment (Zymo EZDNA Methylation Kit,
316 Zymo Research, Irvine, CA, USA). DNA methylation was measured using MethylationEPIC v.1
317 beadchip, and samples were randomized by the prenatal exposure group across chips.

318 *Data Preprocessing and Normalization*

319 DNA methylation microarray idat files were imported into R (version 4.2.1) and processed using
320 the *minfi* package (version 1.41.0)⁴². Quality control included estimating sex and calculating
321 mean detection p-value for CpGs across all samples to evaluate signal reliability. Beta and M
322 values were calculated using the normal-exponential out-of-band (Noob) method, recommended
323 for the 12-immune-cell-type extended deconvolution, which includes normalization and
324 background correction³⁶. Further preprocessing took place before any epigenomic analysis,
325 including filtering CpGs with low detection p-value across samples (20,170), filtering probes on
326 X and Y chromosomes (Y= 135, X = 18,588), and filtering SNPs/cross-hybridizing probes
327 (77,510). DNAm β -values and M-values were extracted and used in subsequent analysis.

328 *Epigenetic age acceleration*

329 All participants were 24 years of age during data collection. Epigenetic age was calculated from
330 the preprocessed methylation beta values across all samples using the *methyAge* function in
331 package *ENmix* (version 1.32.0), which includes *Horvath*, *Hannum*, and *PhenoAge* clocks.
332 *DunedinPACE*, *GrimAgeAccel*, *YingAdaptage*, and *YingDamAge* were similarly calculated using
333 the *Biolearn* library developed and maintained by the Biomarkers of Aging Consortium⁴³. While
334 several of these clocks were developed using the Illumina 450K array, each has been validated
335 for use with the EPIC microarray used in the present analysis⁴⁴. After calculating the predicted
336 epigenetic age, we regressed chronological age on the predicted age (except for *GrimAgeAccel*,

337 which produces its own residualized score), and the age-corrected residual difference was used
338 in all analyses as our epigenetic age acceleration measure.

339 *Immune cell type deconvolution*

340 Immune cell type proportions were estimated across all samples using a DNA methylation-
341 derived cell type deconvolution method. The package *FlowSorted.BloodExtended.EPIC* (version
342 2.0.0) infers proportions of 12 immune cell types; neutrophils (Neu), monocytes (Mono),
343 basophils (Bas), eosinophils (Eos), CD4T naïve cells (CD4nv), CD4T memory cells (CD4mem),
344 B naïve cells (Bnv), B memory cells (Bmem), CD8T naïve cells (CD8nv), CD8T memory cells
345 (CD8mem), T regulatory cells (Treg), and natural killer cells (NK)³⁶. The monocyte-to-
346 lymphocyte and neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratios were calculated based on the deconvoluted cell
347 proportions and were used as primary outcomes. To summarize immunophenotype, a principal
348 component analysis was conducted on all cell types; the first principal component explained
349 68.2% of the variance and was used to control for cell-type composition. The first immune cell
350 type principal component (PC) was included as a covariate in the epigenetic age analysis.

351 *Data Analysis*

352 All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 4.3.1. Descriptive statistics were run across
353 the exposure groups before analysis, and epigenetic aging measures were plotted by the
354 exposure group and visually inspected (see Supp Fig 1a & 1b). All participants had complete
355 data. For each epigenetic clock, we conducted a two-step multiple linear regression to
356 determine the relationship between the exposure group and epigenetic age acceleration, with
357 the control group serving as the reference category. In the first step, we adjusted for sex and the
358 first immune cell-type PC; in the second, we added the ACE total score as an additional
359 predictor alongside the exposure group. We also produced overlapping density plots and within-

360 individual Pearson correlations between the clocks to assess the consistency of the predictions
361 (Supplemental Figure 2 & 3). To compare effects across different epigenetic clocks, we
362 calculated the standard mean difference of the regression coefficients for single or double-
363 exposed group status vs. control contrast for models and plotted them together in a forest plot
364 (see Figure 1).

References

1. Ministere de l'Administration Locale, de l'Information et des Affaires Sociales . *Denombrement des Victimes du Genocide*. Minaloc, Kigali, 1–145 (2002).
2. Removed for double-anonymized peer review process
3. Musanabaganwa, C. *Intergenerational and epigenetic effects of trauma and PTSD following exposure to the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda*. PhD diss (2023).
4. Perroud, N. *et al.* The Tutsi genocide and transgenerational transmission of maternal stress: epigenetics and biology of the HPA axis. *The World Journal of Biological Psychiatry* **15**, 334–345 (2014).
5. Nowrojee, B. in *Shattered lives: Sexual violence during the Rwandan genocide and its aftermath*. Human Rights Watch, Geneva (1996).
6. Bijleveld, C., Morssinkhof, A. & Smeulers, A. Counting the countless: Rape victimization during the Rwandan genocide. *International Criminal Justice Review* **19**, 208–224 (2009).
7. Removed for double-anonymized peer review process
8. Mukamana, D. & Brysiewicz, P. The lived experience of genocide rape survivors in Rwanda. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* **40**, 379–384 (2008).
9. Nyirandamutsa, F. *et al.* Are the Offspring Still Affected by their Mothers' Genocidal Rape 28 Years Ago?: Thematic Analysis of Offspring Experience. *Rwanda Journal of Medicine and Health Sciences* **6**, 251–263 (2023).
10. Removed for double-anonymized peer review process
11. Removed for double-anonymized peer review process
12. Sullivan, A. D. *et al.* Intervening After Trauma: Child–Parent Psychotherapy Treatment Is Associated With Lower Pediatric Epigenetic Age Acceleration. *Psychological Science*, 09567976241260247 (2024).
13. Zheng, C., Berger, N. A., Li, L. & Xu, R. Epigenetic age acceleration and clinical outcomes in gliomas. *PLoS One* **15**, e0236045 (2020).
14. Horvath, S. DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types. *Genome Biol.* **14**, 1–20 (2013).
15. Hannum, G. *et al.* Genome-wide methylation profiles reveal quantitative views of human aging rates. *Mol. Cell* **49**, 359–367 (2013).

16. Higgins-Chen, A. T. *et al.* A computational solution for bolstering reliability of epigenetic clocks: Implications for clinical trials and longitudinal tracking. *Nature aging* **2**, 644–661 (2022).
17. Watkins, S. H. *et al.* Epigenetic clocks and research implications of the lack of data on whom they have been developed: a review of reported and missing sociodemographic characteristics. *Environmental epigenetics* **9**, dvad005 (2023).
18. Ryan, C. P. “Epigenetic clocks”: Theory and applications in human biology. *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* **33**, e23488 (2021).
19. Parrott, B. B. & Bertucci, E. M. Epigenetic aging clocks in ecology and evolution. *Trends in Ecology & evolution* **34**, 767–770 (2019).
20. Joshi, D., Gonzalez, A., Lin, D. & Raina, P. The association between adverse childhood experiences and epigenetic age acceleration in the Canadian longitudinal study on aging (CLSA). *Aging Cell* **22**, e13779 (2023).
21. Colich, N. L., Rosen, M. L., Williams, E. S. & McLaughlin, K. A. Biological aging in childhood and adolescence following experiences of threat and deprivation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychol. Bull.* **146**, 721 (2020).
22. Quinn, E. B., Hsiao, C. J., Maisha, F. M. & Mulligan, C. J. Prenatal maternal stress is associated with site-specific and age acceleration changes in maternal and newborn DNA methylation. *Epigenetics* **18**, 2222473 (2023).
23. Kuzawa, C. W. *et al.* Birth weight and maternal energy status during pregnancy as predictors of epigenetic age acceleration in young adults from metropolitan Cebu, Philippines. *Epigenetics* **17**, 1535–1545 (2022).
24. Musanabaganwa, C. *et al.* Leukocyte methylomic imprints of exposure to the genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda: a pilot epigenome-wide analysis. *Epigenomics* **14**, 11–25 (2022).
25. Kertes, D. A. *et al.* BDNF methylation in mothers and newborns is associated with maternal exposure to war trauma. *Clinical epigenetics* **9**, 1–12 (2017).
26. Feltes, B. C., de Faria Poloni, J. & Bonatto, D. The developmental aging and origins of health and disease hypotheses explained by different protein networks. *Biogerontology* **12**, 293–308 (2011).
27. Thayer, Z. & Gildner, T. in *The Routledge Handbook of Anthropology and Reproduction* 36–51 (Routledge, 2021).
- Thayer, Z., & Gildner, T. Developmental origins of health and disease: Evidence, proposed mechanisms, and ideas for future applications. In Han S., & Tomori, C. *The Routledge Handbook of Anthropology and Reproduction* (pp. 36-51). Routledge. London 2021
28. Hoffman, D. J., Powell, T. L., Barrett, E. S. & Hardy, D. B. Developmental origins of metabolic diseases. *Physiol. Rev.* **101**, 739–795 (2021).

29. Wang, N. *et al.* Exposure to severe famine in the prenatal or postnatal period and the development of diabetes in adulthood: an observational study. *Diabetologia* **60**, 262–269 (2017).
30. Schmitz, L. L. & Duque, V. In utero exposure to the Great Depression is reflected in late-life epigenetic aging signatures. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **119**, e2208530119 (2022).
31. Cheng, M. *et al.* Accelerated biological aging six decades after prenatal famine exposure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **121**, e2319179121 (2024).
32. Ellison, P. T. & Jasienska, G. Constraint, pathology, and adaptation: how can we tell them apart? *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* **19**, 622–630 (2007).
33. Bell, C. G. *et al.* DNA methylation aging clocks: challenges and recommendations. *Genome Biol.* **20**, 1–24 (2019).
34. Zhang, Z. *et al.* Deciphering the role of immune cell composition in epigenetic age acceleration: Insights from cell-type deconvolution applied to human blood epigenetic clocks. *Aging Cell* **23**, e14071 (2024).
35. Nissen, E. *et al.* Assessment of immune cell profiles among post-menopausal women in the Women’s Health Initiative using DNA methylation-based methods. *Clinical epigenetics* **15**, 69 (2023).
36. Salas, L. A. *et al.* Enhanced cell deconvolution of peripheral blood using DNA methylation for high-resolution immune profiling. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 1–13 (2022).
37. Wiley, A. S. Biological normalcy. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* **52**, 223–238 (2023).
38. World Health Organization. Adverse childhood experiences international questionnaire. *Adverse childhood experiences international questionnaire (ACE-IQ)*, 245–258 (2018).
39. Kazeem, O. T. A validation of the adverse childhood experiences scale in Nigeria. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* **5**, 18–23 (2015).
40. McClendon-Weary, B., Putnick, D. L., Robinson, S. & Yeung, E. Little to give, much to gain—what can you do with a dried blood spot? *Current environmental health reports* **7**, 211–221 (2020).
41. Sasaki, A., Kim, B., Murphy, K. E. & Matthews, S. G. Impact of ex vivo sample handling on DNA methylation profiles in human cord blood and neonatal dried blood spots. *Frontiers in Genetics* **11**, 224 (2020).
42. Aryee, M. J. *et al.* Minfi: a flexible and comprehensive Bioconductor package for the analysis of Infinium DNA methylation microarrays. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 1363–1369 (2014).

43. Ying, K. *et al.* Biolearn, an open-source library for biomarkers of aging. *bioRxiv*, 2023.12.02.569722 (2023).

44. McEwen, L. M. *et al.* Systematic evaluation of DNA methylation age estimation with common preprocessing methods and the Infinium MethylationEPIC BeadChip array. *Clinical epigenetics* **10**, 1–9 (2018).

Additional Information

The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Forest plot comparing the effect of prenatal genocide exposure (vs. control) and epigenetic age acceleration across first and second generation epigenetic clocks

Caption: Comparison of effect sizes (standardized mean difference in age acceleration) across epigenetic age estimators and exposure groups. Model 1 is adjusted for sex and cell type; Model two is adjusted for sex, cell type, and ACEs.

Tables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	Double Exposed (N=30)	Single Exposed (N=31)	Control (N=30)	Overall (N=91)
Sex				
Female	15 (50.0%)	16 (51.6%)	15 (50.0%)	46 (50.5%)
Male	15 (50.0%)	15 (48.4%)	15 (50.0%)	45 (49.5%)
Education Level				
primary level	0 (0%)	3 (9.7%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.3%)
secondary level	29 (96.7%)	20 (64.5%)	25 (83.3%)	74 (81.3%)
university level	1 (3.3%)	8 (25.8%)	5 (16.7%)	14 (15.4%)
Socioeconomic Status				
Poorest	6 (20.0%)	2 (6.5%)	0 (0%)	8 (8.8%)
Poor	17 (56.7%)	14 (45.2%)	4 (13.3%)	35 (38.5%)
Middle Class	7 (23.3%)	15 (48.4%)	26 (86.7%)	48 (52.7%)
ACEs Total				
Mean (SD)	7.20 (2.12)	5.74 (2.45)	3.87 (2.29)	5.60 (2.65)

Median [Min, Max]	8.00 [4.00, 11.0]	6.00 [1.00, 10.0]	3.00 [1.00, 10.0]	5.00 [1.00, 11.0]
-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

*Single exposed - maternal stress related to genocide; **Double-exposed - maternal stress related to genocide and rape; ***control - not directly exposed to genocide or rape;
 Socioeconomic categories Income**** - Rwandans are classified into four socio-economic categories (Ibyiciro by'Ubudehe) by the Rwandan government based on income/consumption and household assets: Category 1: poorest, Category 2: poor, Category 3: middle class and Category 4: wealthy.

Table 2. Second Generation Age Acceleration Models by Group

2.1. YingDamAge Model 1

	Estimate	Standard Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	-4.685	1.475	-3.176	0.0021	**
Single Exposed	3.601	1.796	2.005	0.0481	*
Double Exposed	6.375	1.811	3.519	0.0007	***
Male	2.743	1.471	1.865	0.0656	.
PC1	0.289	0.072	4.037	0.0001	***

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

Residual standard error: 7.004 on 86 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.2706, Adjusted R-squared: 0.2367

F-statistic: 7.975 on 86 and 4 DF, p-value: 0.0000

2.2. YingDamAge Model 2

	Estimate	Standard Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	-4.716	1.966	-2.399	0.0186	*
ACES Total	0.008	0.328	0.024	0.9807	
Single Exposed	3.586	1.909	1.879	0.0637	.
Double Exposed	6.349	2.123	2.990	0.0036	**
Male	2.744	1.480	1.854	0.0672	.
PC1	0.289	0.072	4.013	0.0001	***

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

Residual standard error: 7.045 on 85 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.2706, Adjusted R-squared: 0.2277

F-statistic: 6.306 on 85 and 5 DF, p-value: 0.0001

2.3. YingAdaptAge Model 1

	Estimate	Standard Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	6.042	1.512	3.995	0.0001	***
Single Exposed	-6.482	1.841	-3.521	0.0007	***
Double Exposed	-7.725	1.857	-4.159	0.0001	***
Male	-2.602	1.508	-1.725	0.0881	.
PC1	0.032	0.073	0.435	0.6650	

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

Residual standard error: 7.181 on 86 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.2123, Adjusted R-squared: 0.1756

F-statistic: 5.793 on 86 and 4 DF, p-value: 0.0004

2.4. YingAdaptAge Model 2

	Estimate	Standard Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	4.018	1.988	2.021	0.0464	*
ACES Total	0.515	0.332	1.552	0.1243	
Single Exposed	-7.450	1.930	-3.861	0.0002	***
Double Exposed	-9.436	2.147	-4.395	0.0000	***
Male	-2.536	1.497	-1.694	0.0939	.
PC1	0.035	0.073	0.482	0.6308	

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

Residual standard error: 7.123 on 85 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.234, Adjusted R-squared: 0.1889

F-statistic: 5.192 on 85 and 5 DF, p-value: 0.0003

2.5. GrimAgeAccel Model 1

	Estimate	Standard Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	-0.933	0.558	-1.673	0.0979	.
Single Exposed	0.313	0.679	0.461	0.6461	
Double Exposed	1.448	0.685	2.114	0.0374	*
Male	0.706	0.556	1.269	0.2077	
PC1	0.150	0.027	5.561	0.0000	***

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

Residual standard error: 2.648 on 86 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.2995, Adjusted R-squared: 0.2669

F-statistic: 9.191 on 86 and 4 DF, p-value: 0.0000

2.6. GrimAgeAccel Model 2

	Estimate	Standard Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	-0.933	0.558	-1.673	0.0979	.
Single Exposed	0.313	0.679	0.461	0.6461	
Double Exposed	1.448	0.685	2.114	0.0374	*
Male	0.706	0.556	1.269	0.2077	
PC1	0.150	0.027	5.561	0.0000	***

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

Residual standard error: 2.648 on 86 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.2995, Adjusted R-squared: 0.2669

F-statistic: 9.191 on 86 and 4 DF, p-value: 0.0000

2.7. DunedinPACE Model 1

	Estimate	Standard Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	0.003	0.016	0.194	0.8463	
Single Exposed	-0.020	0.020	-0.985	0.3275	
Double Exposed	0.048	0.020	2.369	0.0201	*
Male	-0.025	0.016	-1.511	0.1345	
PC1	0.003	0.001	4.326	0.0000	***

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

Residual standard error: 0.07778 on 86 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.2545, Adjusted R-squared: 0.2199

F-statistic: 7.341 on 86 and 4 DF, p-value: 0.0000

2.8. DunedinPACE Model 2

	Estimate	Standard Error	t value	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	0.001	0.022	0.045	0.9641	
ACES Total	0.001	0.004	0.154	0.8783	
Single Exposed	-0.021	0.021	-0.976	0.3317	
Double Exposed	0.046	0.024	1.943	0.0554	.
Male	-0.025	0.016	-1.497	0.1380	
PC1	0.003	0.001	4.304	0.0000	***

*Signif. codes: 0 <= '***' < 0.001 < '**' < 0.01 < '*' < 0.05*

Residual standard error: 0.07823 on 85 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.2547, Adjusted R-squared: 0.2109

F-statistic: 5.811 on 85 and 5 DF, p-value: 0.0001