



Social Determinants of Cardiovascular Health: Early Life Adversity as a Contributor to Disparities in Cardiovascular Diseases

Shakira F. Suglia, ScD¹, Rebecca A. Campo, PhD², Alison G. M. Brown, PhD², Catherine Stoney, PhD², Cheryl A. Boyce, PhD², Allison A. Appleton, ScD, MPH³, Maria E. Bleil, PhD⁴, Renée Boynton-Jarrett, MD, ScD⁵, Shanta R. Dube, PhD, MPH⁶, Erin C. Dunn, ScD, MPH^{7,8,9}, Bruce J. Ellis, PhD¹⁰, Christopher P. Fagundes, PhD^{11,12,13}, Nia J. Heard-Garris, MD, MSc^{14,15}, Sara R. Jaffee, PhD¹⁶, Sara B. Johnson, PhD, MPH¹⁷, Mahasin S. Mujahid, PhD, MS, FAHA¹⁸, Natalie Slopen, ScD¹⁹, Shaoyong Su, PhD²⁰, and Sarah E. Watamura, PhD²¹

Social determinants of health (SDoH), factors related to the conditions in which people are born, live, work, play, age, and the systems that shape the conditions of daily life, have emerged as key drivers of health and health disparities.^{1,2} A strong body of research supports that SDoH are associated with cardiovascular risk factors and outcomes, independently or in conjunction with more traditionally recognized risk factors. As a result, efforts to improve cardiovascular health are predicated on improved understanding of the impact of SDoH on cardiovascular disease (CVD) over the life course.

Early life adversity encompasses a variety of SDoH and has been recognized as a contributor to poor cardiometabolic health.^{3,4} Early life adversity and adverse childhood experiences are terms often used interchangeably. Early life adversity includes external stressors and experiences of child maltreatment, household dysfunction,⁵ bullying, exposure to crime, discrimination, bias, and victimization.⁶⁻⁸ These are highly prevalent (46% of children, ages 0-17 and 61% of adults are estimated to have experienced at least 1 early life adversity⁹) and disproportionately affect racial/ethnic minorities and families of lower socioeconomic status (SES).⁹ Early life adversity has been linked to an elevated risk of CVD outcomes in adults, including myocardial infarction, stroke, ischemic heart disease, and coronary heart disease, as well as type 2 diabetes mellitus.¹⁰⁻¹³ The 2018 American Heart Association Scientific Statement on Childhood and Adolescent Adversity and Cardiometabolic Outcomes highlighted 3 overall mechanisms of how early life adversity may impact cardiometabolic health, including behavioral, biological, and mental health pathways.¹⁴ These mechanisms have also been implicated in stress research and influence interrelated physiological systems (eg, neural, autonomic, neuroendocrine, immune responses) through different pathways (ie, direct biological pathways with feedback loops, gene-

environment interactions, and indirect behavioral pathways).¹⁵ Dysregulation of these systems early in life can result in biological imprints and behavioral patterns that have lasting effects over the lifespan and may be passed on to the next generation.¹⁶

Examining the role of early life adversity as a SDoH in the pathogenesis of CVD across the lifespan aligns with the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) Strategic Vision.¹⁷ To support this Strategic Vision, the NHLBI Division of Cardiovascular Sciences (DCVS) created an implementation plan that includes 3 priority areas applicable to this early life adversity topic: (1) addressing social determinants of cardiovascular health and health inequities; (2) promoting cardiovascular health and preventing CVD across the lifespan; and (3) enhancing resilience for cardiometabolic health.¹⁸ In alignment with these priorities, NHLBI convened an interdisciplinary panel of experts in childhood adversity (<https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/events/2018/social-determinants-health-contributions-early-life-adversity-cardiovascular>), SDoH, and CVD for a

CVD	Cardiovascular disease
DCVS	Division of Cardiovascular Sciences
NHLBI	National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute
SDoH	Social determinants of health
SES	Socioeconomic status

From the ¹Department of Epidemiology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA; ²National Institutes of Health, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, Bethesda, MD; ³Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University at Albany School of Public Health, State University of New York, Albany, NY; ⁴Department of Family and Child Nursing, University of Washington, Seattle, WA; ⁵Department of Pediatrics, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston Medical Center, Boston, MA; ⁶Department of Population Health Sciences, School of Public Health, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA; ⁷Psychiatric and Neurodevelopmental Genetics Unit, Massachusetts General Hospital; ⁸Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School; ⁹Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research, The Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT, Boston, MA; ¹⁰Departments of Psychology and Anthropology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT; ¹¹Department of Psychology, Rice University, Houston; ¹²Department of Behavioral Science, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston; ¹³Department of Psychiatry, Baylor College of Medicine, Waco, TX; ¹⁴Division of Academic General Pediatrics, Department of Pediatrics, Ann and Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago and Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine; ¹⁵Mary Ann and J. Milburn Smith Child Health Research, Outreach, and Advocacy Center, Stanley Manne Children's Research Institute, Ann and Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago, Chicago, IL; ¹⁶Department of Psychology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; ¹⁷Division of General Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD; ¹⁸Division of Epidemiology, Berkeley School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, CA; ¹⁹Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Maryland School of Public Health, College Park, MD; ²⁰Department of Population Health Sciences, Georgia Prevention Institute, Medical College of Georgia, Augusta University, Augusta, GA; and ²¹Department of Psychology, University of Denver, Denver, CO

The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; the National Institutes of Health; or the US Department of Health and Human Services. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

0022-3476/\$ - see front matter. © 2020 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2019.12.063>

collaborative workshop on current research knowledge, opportunities for innovation and gap areas, entitled the “*Social Determinants of Health: Early Life Adversity as a Contributor to Disparities in Cardiovascular Diseases*.” This manuscript reports workshop proceedings addressing key topics including (1) disparities in early life adversity and CVD risk; (2) appropriate models to explain early life adversity contributions to CVD risk across the lifespan; (3) potential mechanisms underlying elevated risk of CVD (ie, behavioral, inflammatory, genetic, and hormonal); (4) potential factors that may modify the impact of early life adversity on CVD risk; (5) understanding the role of resilience for CVD in the face of early life adversity; and finally, (6) recommendations for future research to advance understanding of the impact of early life adversity on cardiovascular health across the lifespan.

Disparities in Early Life Adversity and CVD Risk

Disparities in cardiovascular health across the life course have been well documented. African American and Hispanic children, as well as children of lower SES, have a higher prevalence of obesity, diabetes, and hypertension.¹⁹ Although obesogenic behaviors, such as low levels of physical activity, diets high in fat and sugar, and short sleep duration contribute to these associations, it is also important to focus on the antecedent causes of obesogenic behaviors, as well as other biological and behavioral factors that increase the risk of adverse cardiometabolic health outcomes²⁰ and disproportionately impact racial/ethnic minorities and children in lower SES households.

Studies of children^{21,22} and retrospective studies of adults^{5,9} indicate that childhood adversities are common in the US, with pronounced differences by race/ethnicity, and SES.¹⁶ For example, based on parental reports in the 2016 National Survey of Children’s Health, black and Hispanic children had greater prevalence of exposure to 1 or more adverse experiences (ie, 61% and 51%, respectively) relative to non-Hispanic white and Asian children (ie, 40% and 23%, respectively).²³ Merrick et al analyzed data from 214 157 adult respondents in the 2011-2014 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System from 23 states, which indicated that early life adversity was highest among those with less than a high school education and those with a household income less than \$15 000.⁹

Notably, disparities in exposure to early life adversity vary by country of birth, gender identity, and other factors. For example, children of foreign-born parents report experiencing fewer types of early life adversity relative to children of US-born parents in the National Survey of Children’s Health.^{21,24} In addition, as reported in the 2011-2014 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, childhood adversities are disproportionately high among individuals identifying as a sexual minority.⁹ Despite these reports of disparities in early life adversity exposure, there has been limited research to understand the variation in the associations between early

life adversity and CVD risk across vulnerable populations, and even fewer prevention or treatment studies focused on these concerns. Innovative studies examining these associations and their underlying mechanisms specifically among racial and ethnic minorities,^{21,22} sexual minorities,²⁵ and children with special healthcare needs,²⁶ as well as consideration of intersectionality (eg, synergy of multiple social identities), are needed for these most vulnerable groups.

Furthermore, research on early life adversity and CVD across population subgroups will need to extend beyond traditional measures of income and education to include the contextual factors (eg, social environment and neighborhood physical conditions) that differ across groups.

Mechanisms Linking Early Life Adversity with CVD Risk

There are several potential mechanisms, ranging from behavioral factors to dysregulation of physiological systems, that could explain how early life adversity increases the risk for CVD. We propose a few here, recognizing this is not an exhaustive list and future research is needed.

Behavioral and Psychological

Studies in the field of psychology and psychiatry have shown that troubled early relationship experiences negatively impact mental health and health behaviors across the lifespan²⁷⁻³¹, which can lead to increased risk of CVD.

Early life adversity may lead to deficits in self-regulation, which is the ability to manage one’s emotions, attention, and behavior in adaptive ways.³² Individuals exposed to early life adversity are more likely to display poor self-regulatory behaviors that are consistent with higher reward thresholds, fewer pleasure responses to rewarding substances, and poorer regulation of appetitive behaviors.³³ This may translate into choices to engage in adverse health behaviors that contribute to increased CVD risk in the longterm.³⁴⁻³⁶ Nonetheless, individuals exposed to early life adversity who develop strong self-regulatory capacities do not experience reductions in CVD risk.³⁷⁻³⁹

Systemic Inflammation

Inflammation is a key mechanism underlying cardiovascular disease and is a potential mechanism linking early life adversity and CVD.⁴⁰ There is extensive evidence linking chronic stress and depression, which are common outcomes with early life adversity, to systemic inflammation.⁴¹ Furthermore, although social support or positive quality relationships may buffer stress, individuals who report stressful relationships exhibit dysregulated immune function across the life-span, which can increase the likelihood of developing CVD and other chronic diseases.⁴¹

Epigenetics

The molecular mechanisms that regulate gene expression without changing DNA sequences could be a potential explanation for the impact of early life adversity.⁴²

Specifically, studies in both animals and humans have found that exposure to early life adversity is associated with changes in DNA methylation levels in certain genes in the hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal axis and immune system, some of which may contribute to cardiometabolic disorders (eg, *NR3C1*, *FKBP5*, *TLR2*, and *IL6*).⁴³⁻⁴⁵ Few studies, however, have extensively examined the relationships among early life adversity, DNA methylation, and cardiometabolic risks simultaneously, especially in the context of health disparities.

Hormonal

Early life adversity exposures also appear to shape the timing and pace of significant developmental transitions such as puberty,⁴⁶ even independent of well-established correlates of pubertal onset such as prepubertal nutrition and body size and maternal menarcheal age. Specifically, early life adversity exposures have been related to earlier pubertal timing, which is a risk factor for postpubertal weight gain, worsening CVD risk factor profiles, incident cardiometabolic disease, and early mortality.⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹ Although the biological connections between early life adversity, pubertal development, and cardiometabolic risk have not been fully elucidated, particular pathobiological processes (ie, hyperandrogenism, insulin resistance, and inflammation) may play a role.⁵⁰⁻⁵⁴

Further examination of the various factors that may mediate the relation between early life adversity and cardiometabolic health is needed. Given that vulnerable populations are exposed to adversities at multiple levels along with other factors also detrimental to their mental and physical health, there is a need to design studies that examine potential mechanisms with consideration of other exposures that may impact similar pathways as those targeted by early life adversities. This work may entail for example, the consideration of moderated-mediation models or the consideration of contextual factors as potential moderators in studies that examine mechanisms.

Models of Risk

Several life course theoretical models have described the emergence of health problems across the lifespan. Although not meant to be exhaustive, we highlight models pertaining to sensitive periods and the accumulation of risk-focused on the timing, frequency, and chronicity of relevant exposures over the life course, inclusive of a range of biological and socio-environmental factors.^{55,56,57} Multiple life course frameworks exist for studying critical and sensitive periods (eg, in utero, puberty) during which time the occurrence of risk exposures is hypothesized to be particularly salient in programming biological and cognitive systems.⁵⁸⁻⁶⁰ Using a developmental approach is key for identifying how the timing of risk exposure influences outcomes and when such effects emerge, including if there are delayed or “ sleeper ” effects.⁶¹ Developmental approaches are inclusive of socioemotional, cognitive, and neurobiological outcomes and consider both maturational (eg, normative brain development, pubertal timing) and

environmentally-mediated effects (eg, how early life experiences program biological and cognitive systems for future environments the individual is likely to encounter).

Cumulative risk life course models consider the total number of risk exposures⁵ and may include consideration of risk duration and severity, as well as sequence (“chains of risk”) and potential clustering.^{56,62-64} One specific example of an accumulation of risk model that addresses social and racial health inequalities is the “weathering” hypothesis. This model proposes that stress exposures experienced disproportionately (and some uniquely—ie, racial discrimination) in marginalized groups may accumulate over time, resulting in excessive wear and tear on the body, accelerated aging and sexual development including early puberty and childbearing, and subsequent increased risk for poor health and disease.^{65,66} In support of this model, a significant body of research has documented associations between experiences of racial discrimination and deleterious health outcomes among African Americans.^{16,63,67,68} Consideration of multiple models of risk may explain how early life risk factors across multiple developmental contexts may independently, in sequence, and/or in interaction with other social and biological risk factors increase the likelihood of disease, death, and disability across the life course.

Potential Moderators of the Early Life Adversity and CVD Association

Associations between stress and disease are stronger among some individuals or groups than others in the empirical literature and have historically been treated as inevitable population variability, necessitating larger sample sizes to detect the expected stress-disease effects.⁶⁹ Thus, scholars have increasingly argued that understanding why stress impairs the health of some individuals more than others is a critical unanswered question in the field.

For example, although evidence for the link between early life adversity and increased inflammation exists, this pathway is not evident for all individuals. Numerous studies assessing childhood stress and inflammation have failed to find associations between these 2 variables, or have found this link only among select subsets of youths, such as those with high adiposity, certain cognitive appraisal styles, SES backgrounds, or among particular racial or ethnic groups.⁷⁰⁻⁷⁵ Furthermore, differential response to early life adversity may be due to differences in biological sensitivity to a range of environmental influences. For example, the Biological Sensitivity to Context theory⁷⁶ proposes that children differ in their susceptibility to environmental influence in a “for better and for worse” manner, depending on their psychobiologic reactivity to stress.

Understanding why stress impacts the health of some but not others may also be explained by differential social context. Children who experience 1 early life adversity are often also experiencing additional hardships, such as poor housing conditions, poor neighborhood environments, and/or poor school environments, which exacerbate the

potential effects of early life adversity on health.⁷⁷ Children who belong to racial/ethnic minority and lower SES households may not only be experiencing early life adversity at the individual level but also disproportionally experience other societal adverse circumstances in their communities, at school and their neighborhoods further contributing to disparities in CVD.³⁷ The potential moderating effects of sex and gender is also an important consideration.^{78,79}

Resilience

Although mechanistic studies of the early life adversity-CVD pathway are needed, so too are studies that elucidate resilience or protective factors within the early life adversity-CVD pathway. Early life adversity contributes to adverse health outcomes, yet personal and social resources and the contexts within which they operate have the potential to offset adverse outcomes. Thus, resilience, or better than expected outcomes in the face of adversity or risk,⁸⁰ can result through an intersection of individual, relational, and environmental characteristics. Research relies predominantly on group comparisons between early life adversity-exposed vs non-early life adversity-exposed individuals, rather than a focus on differences in protective and resiliency factors among early life adversity-exposed individuals who do not develop adverse outcomes such as CVD.⁸¹ Therefore, research is needed to address this limited understanding of biological and psychosocial resilience among persons who have experienced early life adversity.

Resilience encompasses the factors that define both individual and collective resources.^{81,82} For example, Kim et al identified CVD resilient neighborhoods among the black population as those having a high percentage of persons

with some college or college completion, fewer residents with incomes below the federal poverty threshold and significantly lower Gini index (measure of the distribution of income across population-level income percentiles) than at-risk census tracts.⁸² Thus, research on the developmental pathophysiological mechanisms of early life adversity on CVD must appropriately address the psychosocial and biological mechanisms that can promote health and reduce CVD risks, at multiple levels, while taking into account the level, timing, and chronicity of early life adversity among exposed individuals.⁷³

When addressing CVD and disparities, understanding individual and group differences is particularly salient for preventive intervention efforts. As argued by Sapolsky, the robust evidence for the detrimental health effects of early life adversity is matched by similarly robust evidence for developmental plasticity in the expression of these effects.⁶⁹ Hence, the earlier in life we can identify which individuals, under which stressors, develop biobehavioral CVD risk factors, the sooner we can tailor interventions to attenuate these effects and promote long-term cardiovascular health. Further, by understanding group differences in the stress-health link, we can more effectively tackle systemic health disparities disproportionately affecting low income and minority populations who historically face an increased burden of stressors.^{37,38}

Recommendations

Although a substantial body of research has established an association between early life adversity and CVD risk, research is needed to inform the development of public health and clinical interventions. As summarized

Table. Early life adversity and CVD disparities: Research gaps and research recommendations

Identified research gaps	Research recommendations
Developmental Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand how early life adversity may differentially impact or imprint physiological systems at developmental time points, from the prenatal to late adulthood period, to influence CVD risk.
Interdisciplinary approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage interdisciplinary approaches to examine the impact of early life adversity across multiple, related biological systems (genomic, neuroendocrine, cardiovascular, etc), rather than examining individual systems using a silo-based approach. Utilize an interdisciplinary approach that recognizes other SDoH factors (eg, adverse physical environment) often co-occur with early life adversity exposure and can compound CVD risk.
Critical populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examine differential early life adversity impact and intersectionality considerations for racial and ethnic minorities, sexual minorities, and children with special healthcare needs as these populations may experience multiple and chronic forms of early life adversity and differential risk because of social and structural conditions.
Inclusion of resilience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore modifiable resilience factors in early life and investigate their impact on CVD. Examine psychological, behavioral, neurologic, genetic, biochemical, or physiological factors that characterize the resilience pathway among persons with early life adversity histories who do not develop CVD.
Study design considerations	
Prospective cohort studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design studies starting in pregnancy or infancy to understand mechanisms by which early life adversity impacts cardiovascular health across the life course as well as understand risk and protective factors which may inform intervention starting earlier in the life course.
Natural experiments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote research studies that occur in traumatic and stressful environments settings, such as foster care, community-based resilience programs, home visiting programs, or after natural disasters as natural experiments for prospective data.
Intervention studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage studies aimed at prevention or reducing the impact of early life adversity to examine their impact on cardiometabolic health and health behaviors. Conduct intervention research studies on early life adversity that focus on multiple levels of analyses; (ie, individual or family levels, school/community levels, or at home).
Multilevel studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider study designs that capture cumulative risk across all levels of the ecosystem (interpersonal, familial, community, and structural exposures).

(Table), this workshop highlighted several gaps and opportunities for expanded research inquiry and reduce health disparities.

Explaining links between early life adversity and child and adult physical health benefits from a developmental approach, beginning with an understanding of biopsychosocial processes operating as early as the prenatal period and continuing into late adulthood. More consideration is also necessary to examine the individual and group differences in susceptibility, including individual, relational, and contextual promoters of resilience. Future research should also focus on resilience within high-risk populations as well as early life adversity that may be more prevalent in specific subgroups of the population (eg, structural inequity, racial discrimination, bullying, immigration, sexual abuse). National, longitudinal, cohort study datasets should consider including questions that address social factors, as well as biological outcomes, to allow for the meaningful examination of early life adversity at the population level. Although measurement of early life adversity is beyond the scope of this manuscript, by leveraging these resources researchers can consider various factors related to the measurement and conceptualization of early life adversity, including but not limited to the use of retrospective vs prospective reports, exclusion of SES as an early life adversity and the use of traditional unweighted summary scores among other considerations. Considering that SES can be both a moderator of the early life adversity and health relation as well as a contributor to increased exposure to early life adversities, researchers should derive early life adversity measures that consider adversity apart from SES and pursue refined measures that capture more information than traditional unweighted adversity summary scores.^{83,84} Furthermore, given the long latency period between early life adversity and CVD, prospective measures of adversity may not always be available, thus, use of valid and reliable questionnaires to assess childhood experiences retrospectively is needed.

The study of early life adversity and CVD requires multiple disciplines and new approaches to advance the field. Translation of early life adversity research findings to practice and policy focused on CVD prevention or intervention has been limited. Addressing early life adversity through prevention efforts, mitigating the consequences, and building resilience factors and buffers will be informed by longitudinal, prospective, and multilevel interdisciplinary studies. Multilevel interdisciplinary studies would include addressing all levels of the ecosystem including interpersonal, familial, community, and structural factors. The outcomes of these studies should be used to inform best practices for intervention research and then the translation to implementation science.

The NHLBI strategic vision addresses the scientific challenges related to elevated cardiovascular risk associated with SDoH and health inequities throughout the lifespan. The NHLBI encourages innovative, inspired, multidisciplinary research and evidence-based prevention and treat-

ment strategies that advance the field towards implementation research to improve cardiovascular health starting in early life and continuing throughout the life span. ■

Submitted for publication Oct 28, 2019; last revision received Dec 16, 2019; accepted Dec 30, 2019.

Reprint requests: Shakira F. Suglia, ScD, Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA. E-mail: shakira.suglia@emory.edu

References

1. CSDH. Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health. Final Report of the Commission on Social Determinants of Health. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2008.
2. Havranek EP, Mujahid MS, Barr DA, Blair IV, Cohen MS, Cruz-Flores S, et al. Social Determinants of risk and outcomes for cardiovascular disease. *Circulation* 2015;132:873.
3. Su S, Jimenez MP, Roberts CT, Loucks EB. The role of adverse childhood experiences in cardiovascular disease risk: a review with emphasis on plausible mechanisms. *Curr Cardiol Rep* 2015;17:88.
4. Loria A, Ho D, Pollock J. A mechanistic look at the effects of adversity early in life on cardiovascular disease risk during adulthood. *Acta Physiol (Oxf)* 2014;210:277-87.
5. Felitti VJ, Anda RF, Nordenberg D, Williamson DF, Spitz AM, Edwards V, et al. Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. *Am J Prev Med* 1998;14: 245-58.
6. Midei AJ, Matthews KA. Interpersonal violence in childhood as a risk factor for obesity: a systematic review of the literature and proposed pathways. *Obes Rev* 2011;12:e159-72.
7. Slopen N, Koenen KC, Kubzansky LD. Cumulative adversity in childhood and emergent risk factors for long-term health. *J Pediatr* 2014;164:631-8.e2.
8. Suglia SF, Sapra KJ, Koenen KC. Violence and cardiovascular health: a systematic review. *Am J Prev Med* 2015;48:205-12.
9. Merrick MT, Ford DC, Ports KA, Guinn AS. Prevalence of Adverse Childhood Experiences From the 2011-2014 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System in 23 States. *JAMA Pediatr* 2018;172:1038-44.
10. Huffhines L, Noser A, Patton SR. The Link Between Adverse Childhood Experiences and Diabetes. *Curr Diab Rep* 2016;16:54.
11. Basu A, McLaughlin KA, Misra S, Koenen K. Child maltreatment and cardiovascular disease and type 2 diabetes mellitus in adults: a systematic review. *Clin Psychol (New York)* 2017;24:125-39.
12. Rich-Edwards JW, Spiegelman D, Lavidoti Hibert EN, Jun HJ, Todd TJ, Kawachi I, et al. Abuse in childhood and adolescence as a predictor of type 2 diabetes in adult women. *Am J Prev Med* 2010;39:529-36.
13. Jakubowski KP, Cundiff JM, Matthews KA. Cumulative childhood adversity and adult cardiometabolic disease: a meta-analysis. *Health Psychol* 2018;37:701.
14. Suglia SF, Koenen KC, Boynton-Jarrett R, Chan PS, Clark CJ, Danese A, et al. Childhood and adolescent adversity and cardiometabolic outcomes: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2018;137:e15-28.
15. Taylor SE. Mechanisms linking early life stress to adult health outcomes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2010;107:8507.
16. Goosby BJ, Heidbrink C. The transgenerational consequences of discrimination on African American health outcomes. *Sociol Compass* 2013;7:630-43.
17. National Heart Lung and Blood Institute. Charting the Future Together The NHLBI Strategic Vision U.S. Department of Health & Human Services; 2016.

18. Goff DC, Buxton DB, Pearson GD, Wei GS, Gosselin TE, Addou EA, et al. Implementing the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institutes strategic vision in the division of cardiovascular sciences. *Circ Res* 2019;124:491-7.
19. Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Kit BK, Flegal KM. Prevalence of childhood and adult obesity in the United States, 2011-2012. *JAMA* 2014;311:806-14.
20. Lumeng JC, Taveras EM, Birch L, Yanovski SZ. Prevention of obesity in infancy and early childhood: a National Institutes of Health workshop. *JAMA Pediatr* 2015;169:484-90.
21. Slopen N, Shonkoff JP, Albert MA, Yoshikawa H, Jacobs A, Stoltz R, et al. Racial disparities in child adversity in the US: interactions with family immigration history and income. *Am J Prev Med* 2016;50:47-56.
22. Loria H, Caughy M. Prevalence of Adverse childhood experiences in low-income latino immigrant and nonimmigrant children. *J Pediatr* 2018;192:209-15.e1.
23. Sacks V, Murphey D. The prevalence of adverse childhood experiences, nationally, by state, and by race or ethnicity. *Child Trends*, 2018. <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/about/strategic-vision>. Accessed September 23, 2019.
24. Caballero TM, Johnson SB, Buchanan CRM, DeCamp LR. Adverse childhood experiences among hispanic children in immigrant families versus US-native families. *Pediatrics* 2017;140:e20170297.
25. Friedman MS, Marshal MP, Guadamuz TE, Wei C, Wong CF, Saewyc EM, et al. A meta-analysis of disparities in childhood sexual abuse, parental physical abuse, and peer victimization among sexual minority and sexual nonminority individuals. *Am J Public Health* 2011;101:1481-94.
26. Heard-Garris N, Davis MM, Szilagyi M, KJ Kan. Childhood adversity and parent perceptions of child resilience. *BMC Pediatr* 2018;18:204.
27. Miller GE, Chen E, Parker KJ. Psychological Stress in childhood and susceptibility to the chronic diseases of aging: moving toward a model of behavioral and biological mechanisms. *Psychol Bull* 2011;137:959-97.
28. Fagundes CP, Glaser R, Kiecolt-Glaser JK. Stressful early life experiences and immune dysregulation across the lifespan. *Brain Behav Immun* 2013;27:8-12.
29. Perroud N, Paoloni-Giacobino A, Prada P, Olié E, Salzmann A, Nicastro R, et al. Increased methylation of glucocorticoid receptor gene (NR3C1) in adults with a history of childhood maltreatment: a link with the severity and type of trauma. *Transl Psychiatry* 2011;1:e59.
30. Heard-Garris N, Winkelman TN, Choi H, Miller AK, Kan K, Schlafer R, et al. Health care use and health behaviors among young adults with history of parental incarceration. *Pediatrics* 2018;142:e20174314.
31. Dube SR, Felitti VJ, Dong M, Giles WH, Anda RF. The impact of adverse childhood experiences on health problems: evidence from four birth cohorts dating back to 1900. *Prev Med* 2003;37:268-77.
32. Wideman L, Calkins SD, Janssen JA, Lovelady CA, Dollar JM, Keane SP, et al. Rationale, design and methods for the RIGHT Track Health Study: pathways from childhood self-regulation to cardiovascular risk in adolescence. *BMC Public Health* 2016;16:459.
33. Michopoulos V, Powers A, Moore C, Villarreal S, Ressler KJ, Bradley B. The mediating role of emotion dysregulation and depression on the relationship between childhood trauma exposure and emotional eating. *Appetite* 2015;91:129-36.
34. Pechtel P, Pizzagalli DA. Effects of early life stress on cognitive and affective function: an integrated review of human literature. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2011;214:55-70.
35. Kaiser R, Clegg R, Goer F, Pechtel P, Beltzer M, Vitaliano G, et al. Childhood stress, grown-up brain networks: corticolimbic correlates of threat-related early life stress and adult stress response. *Psychol Med* 2018;48:1157-66.
36. Francis LA, Susman EJ. Self-regulation and rapid weight gain in children from age 3 to 12 years. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2009;163:297-302.
37. Brody GH, Yu T, Chen E, Miller GE, Kogan SM, Beach SR. Is resilience only skin deep? Rural African Americans' socioeconomic status-related risk and competence in preadolescence and psychological adjustment and allostatic load at age 19. *Psychol Sci* 2013;24:1285-93.
38. Chen E, Miller GE, Brody GH, Lei M. Neighborhood poverty, college attendance, and diverging profiles of substance use and allostatic load in rural African American youth. *Clin Psychol Sci* 2015;3:675-85.
39. Miller GE, Yu T, Chen E, Brody GH. Self-control forecasts better psychosocial outcomes but faster epigenetic aging in low-SES youth. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2015;112:10325-30.
40. Libby P. Inflammation in atherosclerosis. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol* 2012;32:2045-51.
41. Fagundes CP, Way B. Early-life stress and adult inflammation. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 2014;23:277-83.
42. Dunn EC, Soare TW, Zhu Y, Simpkin AJ, Suderman MJ, Klengel T, et al. Sensitive periods for the effect of childhood adversity on DNA methylation: results from a prospective, longitudinal study. *Biol Psychiatry* 2019;85:838-49.
43. Ross DA, Arbuckle MR, Travis MJ, Dwyer JB, van Schalkwyk GI, Ressler KJ. An integrated neuroscience perspective on formulation and treatment planning for posttraumatic stress disorder: an educational review. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2017;74:407-15.
44. Klengel T, Mehta D, Anacker C, Rex-Haffner M, Pruessner JC, Pariante CM, et al. Allele-specific FKBP5 DNA demethylation mediates gene-childhood trauma interactions. *Nat Neurosci* 2013;16:33.
45. Hao G, Youssef NA, Davis CL, Su S. The role of DNA methylation in the association between childhood adversity and cardiometabolic disease. *Int J Cardiol* 2018;255:168-74.
46. Saban KL, Mathews HL, DeVon HA, Janusek LW. Epigenetics and social context: implications for disparity in cardiovascular disease. *Aging Dis* 2014;5:346.
47. Belsky J, Steinberg L, Draper P. Childhood experience, interpersonal development, and reproductive strategy: an evolutionary theory of socialization. *Child Dev* 1991;62:647-70.
48. Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Belsky J, Silva PA. Childhood experience and the onset of menarche—a test of a sociobiological model. *Child Develop* 1992;63:47-58.
49. Ellis BJ. Timing of pubertal maturation in girls: an integrated life history approach. *Psychol Bull* 2004;130:920.
50. Frontini M, Srinivasan S, Berenson G. Longitudinal changes in risk variables underlying metabolic syndrome X from childhood to young adulthood in female subjects with a history of early menarche: the Bogalusa Heart Study. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2003;27:1398.
51. Feng Y, Hong X, Wilker E, Li Z, Zhang W, Jin D, et al. Effects of age at menarche, reproductive years, and menopause on metabolic risk factors for cardiovascular diseases. *Atherosclerosis* 2008;196:590-7.
52. Cooper GS, Ephross SA, Weinberg CR, Baird DD, Whelan EA, Sandler DP. Menstrual and reproductive risk factors for ischemic heart disease. *Epidemiology* 1999;10:255-9.
53. Lakshman R, Forouhi NG, Sharp SJ, Luben R, Bingham SA, Khaw K-T, et al. Early age at menarche associated with cardiovascular disease and mortality. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2009;94:4953-60.
54. Jacobsen B, Oda K, Knutsen S, Fraser G. Age at menarche, total mortality and mortality from ischaemic heart disease and stroke: the Adventist Health Study, 1976-88. *Int J Epidemiol* 2009;38:245-52.
55. Ben-Shlomo Y, Kuh D. A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology: conceptual models, empirical challenges and interdisciplinary perspectives. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2002;31:285-93.
56. Kuh D, Ben-Shlomo Y, Lynch J, Hallqvist J, Power C. Life course epidemiology. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2003;57:778.
57. Dunn EC, Soare TW, Raffeld MR, Busso DS, Crawford KM, Davis KA, et al. What life course theoretical models best explain the relationship between exposure to childhood adversity and psychopathology symptoms: recency, accumulation, or sensitive periods? *Psychol Med* 2018;48:2562-72.
58. Barker DJ. The fetal and infant origins of adult disease. *BMJ* 1990;301:1111.
59. Bleil ME, Appelhans BM, Latham MD, Irving MA, Gregorich SE, Adler NE, et al. Neighborhood socioeconomic status during childhood versus puberty in relation to endogenous sex hormone levels in adult women. *Nurs Res* 2015;64:211.

60. Jasik CB, Lustig RH. Adolescent obesity and puberty: the “perfect storm”. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2008;1135:265-79.
61. Clarke ADB, Clarke AM. “Sleeper effects” in development: fact or artifact? *Dev Rev* 1981;1:344-60.
62. Dong M, Anda RF, Felitti VJ, Dube SR, Williamson DF, Thompson TJ, et al. The interrelatedness of multiple forms of childhood abuse, neglect, and household dysfunction. *Child Abuse Negl* 2004;28:771-84.
63. Goosby BJ, Malone S, Richardson EA, Cheadle JE, Williams DT. Perceived discrimination and markers of cardiovascular risk among low-income African American youth. *Am J Hum Biol* 2015;27:546-52.
64. Goosby BJ, Cheadle JE, McDade T. Birth weight, early life course BMI, and body size change: chains of risk to adult inflammation? *Soc Sci Med* 2016;148:102-9.
65. Geronimus AT, Hicken MT, Pearson JA, Seashols SJ, Brown KL, Cruz TD. Do US black women experience stress-related accelerated biological aging? *Hum Nat* 2010;21:19-38.
66. Geronimus AT. The weathering hypothesis and the health of African American women and infants: evidence and speculations. *Ethn Dis* 1992;2:207-21.
67. Bronfenbrenner U, Morris PA. The Bioecological Model of Human Development. In: Lerner RM, Damon W, eds. *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development*. John Wiley & Sons Inc; 2006. p. 793-828.
68. Bronfenbrenner U. *The ecology of human development experiments by nature and desing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1979.
69. Sapolsky RM. Stress and the brain: individual variability and the inverted-U. *Nat Neurosci* 2015;18:1344.
70. Blevins CL, Sagui SJ, Bennett JM. Inflammation and positive affect: examining the stress-buffering hypothesis with data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health. *Brain Behav Immun* 2017;61:21-6.
71. Chiang JJ, Bower JE, Irwin MR, Taylor SE, Fuligni AJ. Adiposity moderates links from early adversity and depressive symptoms to inflammatory reactivity to acute stress during late adolescence. *Brain Behav Immun* 2017;66:146-55.
72. Giletta M, Slavich GM, Rudolph KD, Hastings PD, Nock MK, Prinstein MJ, et al. Peer victimization predicts heightened inflammatory reactivity to social stress in cognitively vulnerable adolescents. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2018;59:129-39.
73. Hostinar CE, Ross KM, Chen E, Miller GE. Early-life socioeconomic disadvantage and metabolic health disparities. *Psychosom Med* 2017;79:514.
74. Ehrlich KB, Miller GE, Rohleder N, Adam EK. Trajectories of relationship stress and inflammatory processes in adolescence. *Dev Psychopathol* 2016;28:127-38.
75. Low CA, Matthews KA, Hall M. Elevated CRP in adolescents: roles of stress and coping. *Psychosom Med* 2013;75:449.
76. Boyce WT, Ellis BJ. Biological sensitivity to context: I. An evolutionary-developmental theory of the origins and functions of stress reactivity. *Dev Psychopathol* 2005;17:271-301.
77. Evans GW, Kim P. Childhood poverty and young adults’ allostatic load: the mediating role of childhood cumulative risk exposure. *Psychol Sci* 2012;23:979-83.
78. Suglia SF, Pamplin JR II, Forde AT, Shelton RC. Sex differences in the association between perceived stress and adiposity in a nationally representative sample. *Ann Epidemiol* 2017;27:626-31.
79. Suglia SF, Duarte CS, Chambers EC, Boynton-Jarrett R. Cumulative social risk and obesity in early childhood. *Pediatrics* 2012;129:e1173-9.
80. Masten AS. Resilience in children threatened by extreme adversity: Frameworks for research, practice, and translational synergy. *Dev Psychopathol* 2011;23:493-506.
81. Dube SR, Rishi S. Utilizing the salutogenic paradigm to investigate well-being among adult survivors of childhood sexual abuse and other adversities. *Child Abuse Negl* 2017;66:130-41.
82. Kim JH. Identification of Resilient and At-Risk Neighborhoods for Cardiovascular Disease Among Black Residents: the Morehouse-Emory Cardiovascular (MECA) Center for Health Equity Study. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2019;16:E57.
83. Appleton AA, Holdsworth E, Ryan M, Tracy M. Measuring childhood adversity in life course cardiovascular research: a systematic review. *Psychosom Med* 2017;79:434-40.
84. Reuben A, Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Belsky DW, Harrington H, Schroeder F, et al. Lest we forget: comparing retrospective and prospective assessments of adverse childhood experiences in the prediction of adult health. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2016;57:1103-12.