Parental socioeconomic status is linked to cortical microstructure and language abilities in children and adolescents

Linn B. Norbom, PhD^{a,b,c,*}, Jamie Hanson, PhD^{d,e}, Dennis van der Meer, PhD^{b,f}, Lia Ferschmann, PhD^a, Espen Røysamb, PhD^{a,i}, Tilmann von Soest, PhD^a, Ole A. Andreassen, MD, PhD^{g,h}, Ingrid Agartz, PhD^{b,c,g,k}, Lars T. Westlye, PhD^{g,h,i}, Christian K. Tamnes, PhD^{a,b,c}

^a PROMENTA Research Center, Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Norway

^b NORMENT, Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Norway

^c Department of Psychiatric Research, Diakonhjemmet Hospital, Oslo, Norway

^d Learning Research and Development Center University of Pittsburgh, USA

^e Department of Psychology, University of Pittsburgh

^f School of Mental Health and Neuroscience, Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences, Maastricht University, The Netherlands

^g K.G Jebsen Center for Neurodevelopmental Disorders, University of Oslo, Norway

^h NORMENT, Division of Mental Health and Addiction, Oslo University Hospital & Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Norway

ⁱ Department of Psychology, University of Oslo, Norway

^j Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Norway

^k Centre for Psychiatry Research, Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet & Stockholm Health Care Services, Stockholm Region, Stockholm, Sweden

* Corresponding author: P.O. box 1094 Blindern, 0317 Oslo, Norway.

l.c.b.norbom@psykologi.uio.no

Abstract

Gradients in parental socioeconomic status (SES) are closely linked to important life outcomes in children and adolescents, such as cognitive abilities, school achievement, and mental health. Parental SES may also influence brain development, with several magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) studies reporting associations with youth brain morphometry. However, MRI signal intensity metrics have not been assessed, but could offer a microstructural correlate, thereby increasing our understanding of SES influences on neurobiology. We computed a parental SES score from family income, parental education and parental occupation, and assessed relations with cortical microstructure as measured by T1w/T2w ratio ($n=504$, age=3-21 years). We found negative age-stable relations between parental SES and T1w/T2w ratio, indicating that youths from lower SES families have higher ratio in widespread frontal, temporal, medial parietal and occipital regions, possibly indicating a more developed cortex. Effect sizes were small, but larger than for conventional morphometric properties i.e. cortical surface area and thickness, which were not significantly associated with parental SES. Youths from lower SES families had poorer language related abilities, but microstructural differences did not mediate these relations. T1w/T2w ratio appears to be a sensitive imaging marker for further exploring the association between parental SES and child brain development.

Keywords: Structural cortical development, parental socioeconomic status, T1w/T2w-ratio, childhood, adolescence.

Introduction

Childhood and adolescence are central periods for brain development, encompassing maturational processes characterized by re-organization and optimization (Jernigan et al., 2016; Lebel & Deoni, 2018; Norbom et al., 2021). These same periods, and adolescence in particular, also mark the onset for most mental disorders (Kessler et al., 2005; Steinhausen & Jakobsen, 2019). It is therefore vital to study environmental factors and experiences that, in complex interplay with genetic factors, influence brain development (Johnson et al., 2016). Socioeconomic status (SES) is a central environmental factor, though certainly showing high heritability (Ørstavik et al., 2014; Tambs et al., 2012), and predictor of important life outcomes such as intelligence, academic achievement, and mental health (Letourneau et al., 2013; Reiss, 2013; Sirin, 2005; von Stumm & Plomin, 2015; Zhang et al., 2020). Examining how SES is related to the developing brain in childhood and adolescence is therefore of importance for probing the underlying mechanisms of these effects.

SES is often quantified by some form of income metric, as well as education, and occupation, which are moderately correlated with each other (Farah, 2017). Low parental SES is associated with a broad array of negative outcomes for children and adolescents, including lower intelligence, a discrepancy that widens across childhood (Duyme et al., 1999; von Stumm & Plomin, 2015), lower school performance (Sirin, 2005), and poorer cognitive functioning (Zhang et al., 2020), including language and self-regulatory abilities (Palacios-Barrios & Hanson, 2019; Schwab & Lew-Williams, 2016). Moreover, youths in families with lower SES are 2-3 times more likely to suffer from mental health problems than their peers with higher SES (Letourneau et al., 2013; Reiss, 2013). Although the associations between parental SES and youth cognition and psychopathology are well established, the neurobiology relaying these relationships remains poorly understood.

Although SES has historically been viewed as a nuisance variable in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) studies (Farah, 2017), a growing literature reports associations between parental SES and brain structure and function of children and adolescents (Buckley et al., 2019; Farah, 2017; Johnson et al., 2016). Findings include positive relations with amygdala (Hanson et al., 2015; Machlin et al., 2020; McDermott et al., 2019; Merz et al., 2018), hippocampal (Assari, 2020; Hanson et al., 2011, 2015; Judd et al., 2020; Noble et al., 2012), and global grey matter volume (Hanson et al., 2013; Luby et al., 2013; McDermott et al., 2019), and surface area (Brito et al., 2018; Judd et al., 2020; McDermott et al., 2019; Noble et al., 2015; Rakesh & Whittle, 2021). A recent study assessing relations between a broad range of cognitive, behavioral, clinical, psychosocial, and socioeconomic measures and child brain structure, found strongest relations between SES factors and complex multimodal patterns involving cortical thickness, area, and volume (Alnæs et al., 2020).

The cerebral cortex, with its characteristic folding pattern, comprises the outermost part of the cerebrum (Destrieux et al., 2010). It is considered to be a principal neural structure for human cognitive abilities (Harris & Shepherd, 2015; Rakic, 2009). The cortex shows a lengthy developmental trajectory, with regions supporting lower level sensorimotor abilities generally preceding maturation of regions supporting higher-order functions (Norbom et al., 2021; Sydnor et al., 2021). Although there are numerous reports of associations between parental SES and cortical macrostructure, no MRI based study has previously assessed cortical microstructure.

As detected from MRI, a prominent feature of the developing brain is an increase in its brightness, and assessments of such signal intensity variation in the T1-weighted (T1w) and T2-weighted (T2w) image, could add neurobiological specificity to the reported relation between parental SES and youth cortical macrostructure. Although debated (Hagiwara et al., 2018; Ritchie et al., 2018; Uddin et al., 2019), the T1w/T2w ratio has been suggested as a proxy measure of cortical myelination (Glasser & Van Essen, 2011; Van Essen & Glasser, 2014) while having the benefit, as compared to quantitative relaxometry, of being based on conventional MRI sequences (Nerland et al., 2021). Cortical myelination is a crucial feature of postnatal brain development, allowing for efficient signal transmission and structural support (Bartzokis, 2012; Baumann & Pham-Dinh, 2001; Liu et al., 2019; Waxman & Bennett, 1972). Several studies substantiate the utility of T1w/T2w ratio for mapping global and regional cortical maturational patterns (Baum et al., 2021; Grydeland et al., 2013, 2019; Norbom, Rokicki, Alnæs, et al., 2020; Shafee et al., 2015), with ratios being positively associated with age across childhood and adolescence, as well as for assessing associations with cognitive performance in youth (Grydeland et al., 2013; Norbom, Rokicki, Alnæs, et al., 2020; Vandewouw et al., 2019).

Although the T1w/T2w ratio shows promise for capturing distinct patterns of cortical development, no previous study has tested the measure in relation to parental SES. To this end, we first assessed whether there is a relation between parental SES and youth cortical microstructure as measured by vertex wise T1w/T2w ratio. We also performed comparisons to standard morphometry, assessing relations to vertex wise cortical thickness and surface area. Second, due to previous reports of SES-brain relations interacting with age, we assessed whether the relations between parental SES and T1w/T2w ratio depended on age. Finally, we tested if individual differences in cortical microstructure mediated associations between parental SES and specific cognitive abilities in childhood and adolescence. We hypothesized positive associations between parental SES and T1w/T2w ratio within frontal regions, as this has been reported for surface area (Noble et al., 2015). Next, based on previous cortical and subcortical assessments of the PING sample, we anticipated that the relations between parental SES and T1w/T2w ratio would interact with participant age, so that effects are stronger for younger participants (Merz et al., 2018; Piccolo et al., 2016). Finally, we hypothesized that the association between parental SES and cognitive abilities is partly mediated by T1w/T2w ratio, i.e., an average causal mediation effect.

Materials and Methods

Participants

The current study investigated participants from the publicly available Pediatric Imaging, Neurocognition, and Genetics (PING) study (<http://ping.chd.ucsd.edu>), which consists of typically developing youths aged 3–21 years, with available behavioral and genetic data, as well as multimodal imaging for a large subgroup (Akshoomoff et al., 2014; Jernigan et al., 2016). Participants were recruited through local initiatives from the metropolitan areas of Baltimore, Boston, Honolulu, Los Angeles, New Haven, New York, Sacramento, and San Diego in the USA. Exclusion criteria were major developmental, psychiatric (except ADHD) or neurological disorders, head trauma, pregnancy, prematurity, severe prenatal exposure to

illicit drugs or alcohol, and contraindications for MRI. Written informed consent was attained for all participants 18 years of age or older, while written parental informed consent was additionally attained for younger participants.

From 998 participants with available T1w MRI data, 322 participants were excluded due to missing or insufficient image resolution (voxel size >1.2 mm) of T2w data. 55 participants were subsequently excluded during quality control (QC) as described below, another 90 participants were excluded due to missing socioeconomic information, 16 participants due to missing genetic ancestry information, and 11 participants from a single scanner were removed. This yielded a final sample of 504 participants (238 female) aged 3-21 years (mean = 12.2, SD = 4.7) See Figure 1A and Supplementary Table 1 for further information on sample demographics. Four participants had completely missing cognitive test data and were excluded from relevant analyses.

Figure 1. Age and sex distribution of sample ($n = 504$). Plot (A) depicts the age and sex distribution of the final sample, while plot (B) depicts the age distribution within each scanner.

Genetic ancestry factors (GAFs)

DNA extraction and genotyping from saliva samples were performed by Scripps Translational Research Institute (STRi), as described in detail elsewhere (Bakken et al., 2012). PING ancestry assessments were performed using a supervised clustering approach, and resulted in six continuous variables, each corresponding to major continental populations as defined by a reference panel created from publicly available data of individuals of known global ancestry (Alexander & Lange, 2011). The six GAFs were labelled African, Central Asian, East Asian, European, Native American, and Oceanic.

Measurements of socioeconomic status

Parental SES is challenging to quantify, and as no study have assessed relations to T1w/T2w ratio, we chose to calculate a single overarching composite score, using household income, guardian education and guardian occupation. This information was reported by a guardian or the participant themselves if aged 18 years or over, in the «PING Study Demographics and Child Health History Questionnaire» (Jernigan et al., 2016). As the guardian in most cases was either the biological (94.8%), or adoptive/step- (2.8%) parent of the child, we use the term “parental”.

Total yearly family income was measured on a 12-point categorical scale (from <5000\$ to >300.000\$), while parental education and occupation was measured on separate 7-point scales (from <7 years of school to holding professional degree such as MA/MD/PhD, and unskilled employee to higher executive/major professional, respectively) (Khundrakpam et al., 2020). In order to include as many participants and as much data as possible, we used the highest reported education and occupation of either parent. The distribution of each specific SES measure in the current sample is shown in Figure 2 and further details are reported in Supplementary Tables 2-4. Income and education, which were reported based on categorical ranges, were re-coded as the midpoint in dollars and approximate total years of schooling, respectively, then income was log10 transformed due to a positively skewed distribution (skewness = 1.32), and lastly, the SES variables were z-standardized.

To calculate the composite score, using all subjects from our MRI sample with accessible SES data (n=531); household income, parental education and parental occupation were included in a principal component analysis (PCA) using the prcomp package in R. The first component explained 70.9% of the variance and loadings were z-normalized, inverted so that higher loading represented higher SES, and extracted as a general measure of parental SES. PCA details are shown in Supplementary Figure 1, and a partial correlation matrix, controlling for age, between SES measures, scanner and GAFs is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 2. Distribution of raw SES measures in the current sample. The figure shows histograms of the distribution of household income, parental education, and parental occupation.

Figure 3. Partial correlation matrix of SES relations. The figure shows a partial correlation matrix of the relation between SES metrics, scanner, and GAFs, while controlling for age.

MRI acquisition and processing

For the current study, imaging data were attained on six separate 3T scanners from two different manufacturers; GE medical systems (Signa HDx and Discovery MR750) and Siemens (TrioTim). Figure 1B depicts scanner specific age distributions. Across sites, the scan protocol included a 3D T1w inversion prepared RF-spoiled gradient echo scan, and a 3D T2w variable flip angle fast spin echo scan (voxel sizes $\approx 0.9\text{--}1.2\text{mm}^3$), both acquired with prospective motion correction (PROMO) (Jernigan et al., 2016; White et al., 2010). Care and safety procedures included exposure and habituation to the MRI machine and environment while accompanied by a parent or technician, additional head padding for the youngest individuals, and behavioral support including breaks in between scans if needed. Participants were presented with a movie of their choice during the structural protocol, and no participants were sedated for imaging (Brown & Jernigan, 2012).

Imaging data were processed using the three step HCP pipeline (Glasser et al., 2013). Briefly, for each subject, step 1 produces an undistorted native space, aligns the T1w and the T2w image, performs bias field correction, and register the native- to MNI space. Then, with certain default setting modifications of FreeSurfer (Fischl, 2012) version 6.0, step 2 performs volume segmentations, surface reconstructions of amongst others the white- and pial surface and registers all surfaces to the common template (fsaverage). Cortical thickness is computed as the shortest vertex-wise distance between the white and pial surface, while surface area is computed by the amount of vertex-wise expansion and contraction needed for the white surface to fit fsaverage (Dale et al., 1999; Fischl et al., 1999). Finally, step 3 produces NIFTI volume- and GIFTI surface files, including the T1w/T2w ratio maps as based on methods by Glasser and Van Essen (2011). First, the T1w volume is divided by T2w volume. Then, all resulting cortical ribbon voxels are selected by a cylinder with a height and radius of the local cortical thickness. Voxels suspected of being highly affected by blood vessel- and CSF partial voluming effects (T1w/T2w ratio $> \pm 1$ SD of all ribbon values) are excluded, and, centering the cylinder on each vertex of a native surface called midthickness, the remaining voxels are mapped onto it and averaged using a Gaussian weighted function to produce a single value per vertex. The medial wall is assigned values of zero. The final outputs include standard, as well as bias-corrected, non-smoothed and smoothed (full width at half maximum = 4 mm) maps.

Quality control of imaging data

All T1w and T2w NIFTI images were Qced using MRIQC (Esteban et al., 2017). For each image, this pipeline returns both a binary flagging, and a dimensional quality index, based on measures of noise, spatial and tissue distribution, artifacts such as motion, and sharpness (Esteban et al., 2017). Then, a single trained rater visually inspected flagged datasets, and subjects were either included, tagged for detailed re-assessment post T1w/T2w ratio map creation, or excluded unless replacement with another satisfactory run was possible. The remaining images were subsequently processed through the HCP pipeline. Finally, all T1w/T2w ratio maps were visually inspected by the same trained rater, and subjects with

poor maps were excluded. The 55 subjects excluded during this process were demographically similar to the larger included sample (Supplementary Table 1).

Assessment of cognitive abilities

Cognitive abilities were assessed using the computerized NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery (Akshoomoff et al., 2014; Weintraub, Bauer, et al., 2013; Weintraub, Dikmen, et al., 2013). This assessment consists of seven tasks, measuring eight key cognitive abilities and is presumed to be valid within the age range of the current study (Weintraub, Bauer, et al., 2013; Weintraub, Dikmen, et al., 2013). See Table 1 and Supplementary materials for an overview of the tests and in-detailed description of each test, respectively. We used the sum scores of each test, which were calculated and described in detail elsewhere (Akshoomoff et al., 2014) and performed z-standardization. Keeping as much data as possible, we imputed 72 missing cognitive scores from 58 subjects in a slightly larger sample (n=531) in R, using the “mice” package (Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2011), which in our final sample translated to 41 imputed values for 17 subjects. Also, as previously described, four participants in our final sample had completely missing cognitive data, resulting in a sample size of 500 participants for all statistical tests involving cognitive scores.

Test	Cognitive dimension
Dimensional change card sort test	Cognitive flexibility
Flanker inhibitory control and attention test	Inhibitory control
	Visual attention
Picture sequence memory test	Episodic memory
Pattern comparison processing speed test	Processing speed
Oral Reading recognition test	Oral reading skill
List sorting working memory test	Working memory
Picture vocabulary test	Vocabulary knowledge

Table 1. Cognitive tests. The table shows cognitive tests from the computerized NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery, in order of presentation to subjects, and the dimensions tested.

Statistical analyses

Relationships between parental SES and vertex wise T1w/T2w ratio were tested using linear models as implemented in the Permutation Analysis of Linear Models (PALM) toolbox (Winkler et al., 2014). First, we tested for the main effect of SES on T1w/T2w ratio covarying for age, sex, continuous GAF scores, and scanners dummy coded as 6 separate variables. In order to compare possible relations with commonly studied measures of cortical morphometry, we also tested the main effect of SES on vertex-wise cortical thickness and vertex wise cortical surface area using the same model setup. Second, using PALM, we tested for interactions between SES and age on vertex-wise T1w/T2w ratio, adding sex, GAFs, scanners and the main effect of SES and age as covariates.

To robustly assess statistical significance without holding assumptions of data distribution, we shuffled the data using 10.000 permutations. Since each scanner should be considered as a separate variance group, block exchangeability restrictions were added so that

data was shuffled within each scanner only. Thus, instead of t-statistics, the Aspin-Welch v-statistic is outputted. Moreover, to control for multiple comparisons, we employed family wise error (I) correction with threshold-free cluster enhancement (Smith & Nichols, 2009), and corrected across each contrast, and both hemispheres, using a significance threshold of $p < .05$

Finally, we tested if T1w/T2w ratio mediated associations between parental SES and specific youth cognitive abilities. We first tested for possible relation between SES and eight specific cognitive abilities using z-standardized sum scores and linear models, with age, sex, and six GAFs included as covariates. The false discovery rate (FDR) was adjusted using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure and using a significance threshold of $p < .05$. Then, cognitive scores showing a significant association with SES were included in separate mediation analyses using the package “mediation” in R. Here, SES was added as an independent variable, and cognitive ability as a dependent variable. The regions showing a significant relation in the initial parental SES-T1w/T2w ratio analyses were averaged within hemisphere and added as mediator in separate models. Age, sex, GAFs (and scanner when imaging data was assessed) were added as covariates, and nonparametric bootstrapping was employed using 1000 Monte Carlo draws. Mean T1w/T2w ratio from relevant regions were extracted using the “metric-stats” command from the HCP workbench. More specifically, individual T1w/T2w ratio maps were masked by the significance map outputted by PALM from the main effect SES-T1w/T2w analysis, and mean T1w/T2w ratio was extracted from these regions for each hemisphere separately.

Analyses of each SES indicator (income, education and occupation) on T1w/T2w ratio, total surface area, and mean cortical thickness are described and reported in the supplementary materials.

Results

Relations between parental SES and cortical T1w/T2w ratio

Permutation testing revealed significant negative associations between SES and T1w/T2w ratio, indicating that lower SES was associated with higher ratio, in widespread frontal-, insular-, superior temporal-, medial parietal- and occipital regions (Figure 3). The associations showed a left hemispheric spatial dominance. Supplementary analyses of each SES sub-factor on T1w/T2w ratio revealed similar findings for parental education and occupation (Supplementary Figure 2-3), but no significant associations for family income, indicating that youths who have parents with lower education or occupation have higher T1w/T2w ratio, as compared to having parents with higher educational and occupational attainment. Concordant results were also found for mean T1w/T2w ratio (Supplementary Table 5, Supplementary Figure 4).

Relations between parental SES and cortical morphology

To compare the T1w/T2w ratio results with cortical morphometry, we next performed similar analyses assessing associations between parental SES and vertex-wise cortical thickness and surface area. The analyses revealed no significant associations between parental SES and cortical thickness or cortical surface area. Supplementary analyses were in concordance with

vertex-wise results, i.e., no significant associations were found between parental SES or its indicators (family income, parental education or parental occupation) and mean cortical thickness or total surface area (Supplementary Table 5, Supplementary Figure 4). Z-tests revealed significantly larger effect sizes for mean T1w/T2w ratio as compared to mean cortical thickness (z-statistic = -2.42, corrected p = 0.046), but not compared with total surface area (z-statistic=-0.8, corrected p=0.426) (Supplementary Table 6).

Figure 4. Relations between parental SES and youth T1w/T2w ratio. The figure shows a v-statistics map, masked by the familywise error corrected significance map with a threshold of $\geq 1.6 \log\text{-}p$ (thus including corrections across hemispheres), of the association between parental SES and youth T1w/T2w ratio. Cold colors represent low ratio.

Interactions between parental SES and youth age on T1w/T2w ratio

We next tested whether the relation between parental SES and vertex-wise T1w/T2w ratio was dependent on age. The results showed no significant interaction effect between parental SES and subject age on vertex wise T1w/T2w ratio.

T1w/T2w ratio as a potential mediator of the parental SES- cognitive ability relations

We finally tested possible relations between parental SES and eight cognitive abilities in youths and whether T1w/T2w ratio could mediate these relations. Parental SES was positively related to reading ($\beta = 0.14$, $t = 4.94$, corrected $p < .001$) and vocabulary ($\beta = 0.17$, $t = 5.67$, corrected $p < .001$), indicating that children and adolescents from lower SES families perform poorer on tasks measuring language abilities. We found no significant relations between parental SES and performance on the other cognitive tests (see Supplementary Table 7). Reading and vocabulary were then included as dependent variables

in separate mediation analyses with parental SES and mean ROI based T1w/T2w ratio as independent and mediator variable, respectively. There was no significant mediation effect of T1w/T2w ratio on the SES-reading or SES-vocabulary relationship (see Supplementary Table 8).

Discussion

We assessed the relation between parental SES and cortical microstructure as reflected by T1w/T2w ratio in youth and found widespread negative associations that appeared stable across childhood and adolescence. These neurobiological differences did not however mediate SES related differences in reading and vocabulary knowledge. Moreover, we found no relations between parental SES and cortical thickness or surface area, suggesting that T1w/T2w ratio might be a particularly sensitive measure for assessing SES-brain relations.

Parental SES was negatively associated with youth T1w/T2w ratio, indicating that children and adolescents of families with lower SES have higher ratios, particularly in frontal, temporal and occipital regions, that is most widespread in the left hemisphere. As hypothesized, some of the strongest relations between parental SES and T1w/T2w ratio were within frontal cortical regions. The intracortical myelination of the frontal lobe shows an extended developmental trajectory (Nieuwenhuys, 2013; Yakovlev et al., 1967), and it is plausible that cortical regions with wider developmental windows are particularly sensitive for accumulating environmental influences. We also found associations within the temporal lobe, which also shows a particularly lengthy myelination process (Bartzokis, 2004). On the other hand, we also found relations with T1w/T2w ratio within the visual cortex, a region known to extensively myelinate during the first years of life (Miller et al., 2012; Yakovlev et al., 1967). This suggests associations between parental SES and microstructural properties of both early and late developing cortical regions. The spatial distribution of our findings partly overlap with previous findings reported between SES and cortical surface area (Rakesh & Whittle, 2021).

The negative association between parental SES and T1w/T2w ratio is counterintuitive. Our results indicated that children and adolescents in lower SES families have a higher T1w/T2w ratio. As it has been shown that T1w/T2w ratio appear to globally and steadily increase from 3 years of age and until young adulthood (Grydeland et al., 2019; Norbom et al., 2021; Norbom, Rokicki, Alnæs, et al., 2020), one could infer that youths from lower SES families appear to have a more developed cortex. Although this is the first assessment of T1w/T2w ratio in relation to SES, previous studies have found negative associations between T1w/T2w ratio and cognition in youth. For instance, Grydeland and colleagues (2013) reported lower ratios with greater cognitive performance stability in youths aged 8 to 19 years, and a prior study using the PING sample found negative associations between T1w/T2w ratio and general and several specific cognitive abilities (Norbom, Rokicki, Alnæs, et al., 2020). Possible reasons for the direction of findings are fourfold. First, excess levels of cortical myelin beyond a normative range could be disadvantageous due to its inhibitory qualities for neural plasticity (Snidero & Simons, 2017). Second, separate tissue properties besides myelin may account for outcome variations related T1w/T2w ratio, particularly in regions known to have low levels of myelin in youth (Norbom, Rokicki, Alnæs, et al., 2020). Third, misclassification of deep cortical matter by imaging analysis

software's, thereby resulting in an underestimation of the true cortical thickness, could yield lower ratio in association with beneficial outcomes (Norbom, Rokicki, Alnæs, et al., 2020). Finally, corroborating a recognized theory within social science, exposure to poverty and other early life adversaries, can foster accelerated maturation, as compared to their lower exposed peers (Belsky, 2019; Colich et al., 2020). Such patterns have been found previously using multiple biological- and MRI based metrics (Colich et al., 2020). Future studies should use quantitative relaxometry to further probe the underlying neurobiology of SES related links to T1w/T2w ratio, ideally combined with a prospective longitudinal design for assessing the impact of early life exposures on individual brain microstructural development over time.

There was no evidence for associations between parental SES and T1w/T2w ratio interacting with age. Our findings are thus not in line with previous research reporting that SES has a stronger impact on younger-, as compared to older brains (Merz et al., 2018; Piccolo et al., 2016). Still, due to our sample consisting of few children within the youngest age brackets, the statistical power to detect such an interaction is limited and caution is thus warranted when interpreting these results.

Parental SES and T1w/T2w ratio was associated within regions known to be highly relevant for higher-order cognitive functions. Moreover, the left hemisphere spatial dominance could signify links to language abilities, which have been extensively documented as varying with parental SES (Schwab & Lew-Williams, 2016). For instance, the increase in vocabulary is slower for children from lower-SES families than other children (Arriaga et al., 1998; Morgan et al., 2015), presumably due to both quantitative and qualitative exposure differences, with reports of young affluent children by 4 years of age hearing on average about 30 million more words than children from less affluent families (Hart & Risley, 1995), with higher lexical diversity and conversational fluency (Huttenlocher et al., 2010; Rowe, 2008, 2012). Congruently, we found that children and adolescents of parents with lower SES were poorer readers and had poorer vocabulary knowledge. Such SES-related variability in language abilities must somehow transit the brain. Nevertheless, counter to our hypothesis, we found no indication of microstructural differences explaining socioeconomic differences in language abilities. This could either indicate that our microstructural findings are related to other untested outcomes, or that we had insufficient power to detect such mediatory effects. Indeed, mediation was only assessed in regions shown to be significant in our main SES-T1w/T2w ratio analysis, and ratio values were, within each hemisphere, averaged across these regions, yielding subpar specificity. As we demonstrate parental SES- T1w/T2w ratio associations, future studies should attain higher statistical power to perform more elaborate and vertex-wise mediation assessments, further tapping into what relations could be relayed.

There was no relation between parental SES and youth cortical morphometry as assessed by cortical thickness and surface area. In line with a recent review (Rakesh & Whittle, 2021), vertex wise analysis revealed no relation between parental SES and cortical thickness. Counter to previous findings (Brito et al., 2018; Judd et al., 2020; McDermott et al., 2019) and our hypothesis, however, we also did not find an association between parental SES and surface area. A previous study using an overlapping and larger sample than the current study, reported a logarithmic association between family income-, and a linear association with parental education and global cortical surface area in youths, which partly mediated socioeconomic differences in certain cognitive abilities (Noble et al., 2015). Our

supplementary analyses on each sub-factor of SES and total surface area did not replicate these findings, and instead we show that intensity metrics perhaps are more sensitive than cortical morphology when examining the association of parental SES on youth brain development. Indeed, statistical tests revealed stronger effects for mean T1w/T2w ratio as compared to mean cortical thickness, albeit no difference between mean T1w/T2w ratio and total surface area, or mean cortical thickness and total surface area. Reasons for the discrepancies between our and previous results include that the effect sizes are small and might change depending on sample size or subset, and methodological differences, such as image processing and statistical analyses, including correction for multiple testing.

SES is a construct consisting of partly distinct sub-factors. Concordantly, each aspect of SES have been reported to show somewhat unique associations with brain structure (Rakesh & Whittle, 2021). Our reasoning for choosing a composite score for quantifying SES was twofold. First, composite scores generally show stronger relations with brain metrics (Rakesh & Whittle, 2021), and second, a composite score mimics the actual SES construct better than any subcomponent alone. Beyond our overarching parental SES findings, specific assessments of each sub-component revealed similar relations between cortical microstructure and parental occupation, and highly spatially widespread associations with parental education. This indicates that the development of cortical microstructure in childhood and adolescence appear to be more closely linked to parental position within the social hierarchy (Khundrakpam et al., 2020), and parent to child stimulation such as cognitive-, and language related input (Duncan & Magnuson, 2012). In our study, family income, a suggested proxy for access to material resources (Duncan & Magnuson, 2012), was not significantly associated with youth cortical microstructure. Future studies should further examine which specific SES factors that are particularly relevant for child brain development, as well as the mechanisms underlying these effects, information which could be valuable from a sociopolitical awareness and targeting standpoint.

SES is a broad multidimensional concept. One could argue that our component was too narrow, disregarding factors like neighborhood metrics which capture variability related to crime, pollution, greenery, and access to libraries and so on (Farah, 2017). There are also subjective and cultural aspects to SES, and in this context the genetic origin of the participants may be less central as compared to their self-reported and subjective ethnic identification and how they are perceived by others. Importantly, a number of twin and family studies also show that SES is highly heritable (Ørstavik et al., 2014; Tambs et al., 2012) and recent GWAS studies indicate that heritable phenotypes such as intelligence might link molecular genetic inheritance and phenotypic gradients in SES (Hill et al., 2019). Therefore, future studies could use genetically informed designs and intervention studies to test the relative importance of social causation versus selection processes on child brain structure and function.

To conclude, we report widespread and age-stable associations between parental SES and cortical microstructure in childhood and adolescence. We also found relations between parental SES and youth language abilities, but cortical microstructure did not mediate these associations. Probing the neurobiology underlying the associations between parental SES and central life outcomes in childhood in adolescence may provide new ways to understand and eventually reduce societal disparities. The results of the present study suggest that T1w/T2w

ratio might be a particularly sensitive neuroimaging metric for capturing SES-related differences in the child brain.

Acknowledgments and disclosures

This work was supported by the Research Council of Norway (#223273, #276082, #288083, 300767, #323951), and the South-Eastern Norway Regional Health Authority (#2019069, #2019101, #2021070, #500189), the ERA-Net Cofund through the ERA PerMed project ‘IMPLEMENT’, Stiftelsen Kristian Gerhard Jebsen, and the European Research Council under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and Innovation program (ERC StG, Grant 802998). The Pediatric Imaging, Neurocognition and Genetics Study (PING) provided data. The National Institutes of Health (Grant RC2DA029475), and the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development funded collection and sharing. PING data are disseminated by the PING Coordinating Center at the Center for Human Development, University of California, San Diego.

Conflict of interest

The authors report no conflicts of interest. OAA is a consultant to HealthLytix.

References

- Akshoomoff, N., Newman, E., Thompson, W. K., McCabe, C., Bloss, C. S., Chang, L., Amaral, D. G., Casey, B. J., Ernst, T. M., Frazier, J. A., Gruen, J. R., Kaufmann, W. E., Kenet, T., Kennedy, D. N., Libiger, O., Mostofsky, S., Murray, S. S., Sowell, E. R., Schork, N., ... Jernigan, T. L. (2014). The NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery: Results from a large normative developmental sample (PING). *Neuropsychology*, 28(1), 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/neu0000001>
- Alexander, D. H., & Lange, K. (2011). Enhancements to the ADMIXTURE algorithm for individual ancestry estimation. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 12(1), 246.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-12-246>
- Alnæs, D., Kaufmann, T., Marquand, A. F., Smith, S. M., & Westlye, L. T. (2020). Patterns of sociocognitive stratification and perinatal risk in the child brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(22), 12419–12427.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2001517117>
- Arriaga, R. I., Fenson, L., Cronan, T., & Pethick, S. J. (1998). Scores on the MacArthur Communicative Development Inventory of children from low and middle-income families. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 19(2), 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400010043>
- Assari, S. (2020). Race, Ethnicity, Family Socioeconomic Status, and Children's Hippocampus Volume. *Research in Health Science*, 5(4), p25.
<https://doi.org/10.22158/rhs.v5n4p25>
- Bakken, T. E., Roddey, J. C., Djurovic, S., Akshoomoff, N., Amaral, D. G., Bloss, C. S., Casey, B. J., Chang, L., Ernst, T. M., Gruen, J. R., Jernigan, T. L., Kaufmann, W. E., Kenet, T., Kennedy, D. N., Kuperman, J. M., Murray, S. S., Sowell, E. R., Rimol, L. M., Mattingsdal, M., ... Pediatric Imaging, Neurocognition, and Genetics Study. (2012). Association of common genetic variants in GPCPD1 with scaling of visual cortical surface area in humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(10), 3985–3990.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1105829109>
- Bartzokis, G. (2004). Age-related myelin breakdown: A developmental model of cognitive decline and Alzheimer's disease. *Neurobiology of Aging*, 25(1), 5–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2003.03.001>
- Bartzokis, G. (2012). Neuroglial pharmacology: Myelination as a shared mechanism of action of psychotropic treatments. *Neuropharmacology*, 62(7), 2137–2153.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropharm.2012.01.015>
- Baum, G. L., Flournoy, J. C., Glasser, M. F., Harms, M. P., Mair, P., Sanders, A., Barch, D. M., Buckner, R. L., Bookheimer, S., Dapretto, M., Smith, S., Thomas, K. M., Yacoub, E., Van Essen, D. C., & Somerville, L. H. (2021). *Graded Variation In Cortical T1w/T2w Myelination During Adolescence* [Preprint]. Neuroscience.
<https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.06.471432>
- Baumann, N., & Pham-Dinh, D. (2001). Biology of Oligodendrocyte and Myelin in the Mammalian Central Nervous System. *Physiological Reviews*, 81(2), 871–927.
<https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.2001.81.2.871>
- Belsky, J. (2019). Early-Life Adversity Accelerates Child and Adolescent Development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 28(3), 241–246.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721419837670>

Brito, N. H., Noble, K. G., & the Pediatric Imaging, Neurocognition, Genetics Study. (2018). The independent and interacting effects of socioeconomic status and dual-language use on brain structure and cognition. *Developmental Science*, 21(6), e12688. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12688>

Brown, T. T., & Jernigan, T. L. (2012). Brain Development During the Preschool Years. *Neuropsychology Review*, 22(4), 313–333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-012-9214-1>

Buckley, L., Broadley, M., & Cascio, C. N. (2019). Socio-economic status and the developing brain in adolescence: A systematic review. *Child Neuropsychology*, 25(7), 859–884. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09297049.2018.1549209>

Buuren, S. van, & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. (2011). **mice**: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 45(3). <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v045.i03>

Colich, N. L., Rosen, M. L., Williams, E. S., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2020). Biological aging in childhood and adolescence following experiences of threat and deprivation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(9), 721–764. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000270>

Dale, A. M., Fischl, B., & Sereno, M. I. (1999). Cortical Surface-Based Analysis. *NeuroImage*, 9(2), 179–194. <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.1998.0395>

Destrieux, C., Fischl, B., Dale, A., & Halgren, E. (2010). Automatic parcellation of human cortical gyri and sulci using standard anatomical nomenclature. *NeuroImage*, 53(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.06.010>

Duncan, G. J., & Magnuson, K. (2012). Socioeconomic status and cognitive functioning: Moving from correlation to causation: Socioeconomic status and cognitive functioning. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 3(3), 377–386. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1176>

Duyme, M., Dumaret, A.-C., & Tomkiewicz, S. (1999). How can we boost IQs of “dull children”? A late adoption study. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 96(15), 8790–8794. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.96.15.8790>

Esteban, O., Birman, D., Schaer, M., Koyejo, O. O., Poldrack, R. A., & Gorgolewski, K. J. (2017). MRIQC: Advancing the automatic prediction of image quality in MRI from unseen sites. *PLOS ONE*, 12(9), e0184661. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0184661>

Farah, M. J. (2017). The Neuroscience of Socioeconomic Status: Correlates, Causes, and Consequences. *Neuron*, 96(1), 56–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.08.034>

Fischl, B. (2012). FreeSurfer. *NeuroImage*, 62(2), 774–781. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.01.021>

Fischl, B., Sereno, M. I., & Dale, A. M. (1999). Cortical Surface-Based Analysis. *NeuroImage*, 9(2), 195–207. <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.1998.0396>

Glasser, M. F., Sotiropoulos, S. N., Wilson, J. A., Coalson, T. S., Fischl, B., Andersson, J. L., Xu, J., Jbabdi, S., Webster, M., Polimeni, J. R., Van Essen, D. C., & Jenkinson, M. (2013). The minimal preprocessing pipelines for the Human Connectome Project. *NeuroImage*, 80, 105–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.04.127>

Glasser, M. F., & Van Essen, D. C. (2011). Mapping Human Cortical Areas In Vivo Based on Myelin Content as Revealed by T1- and T2-Weighted MRI. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 31(32), 11597–11616. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2180-11.2011>

Grydeland, H., Vértes, P. E., Váša, F., Romero-Garcia, R., Whitaker, K., Alexander-Bloch, A. F., Bjørnerud, A., Patel, A. X., Sederevičius, D., Tamnes, C. K., Westlye, L. T., White, S. R., Walhovd, K. B., Fjell, A. M., & Bullmore, E. T. (2019). Waves of Maturation and Senescence in Micro-structural MRI Markers of Human Cortical Myelination over the Lifespan. *Cerebral Cortex*, 29(3), 1369–1381. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhy330>

Grydeland, H., Walhovd, K. B., Tamnes, C. K., Westlye, L. T., & Fjell, A. M. (2013). Intracortical Myelin Links with Performance Variability across the Human Lifespan: Results from T1- and T2-Weighted MRI Myelin Mapping and Diffusion Tensor Imaging. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 33(47), 18618–18630. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2811-13.2013>

Hagiwara, A., Hori, M., Kamagata, K., Warntjes, M., Matsuyoshi, D., Nakazawa, M., Ueda, R., Andica, C., Koshino, S., Maekawa, T., Irie, R., Takamura, T., Kumamaru, K. K., Abe, O., & Aoki, S. (2018). Myelin Measurement: Comparison Between Simultaneous Tissue Relaxometry, Magnetization Transfer Saturation Index, and T1w/T2w Ratio Methods. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 10554. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-28852-6>

Hanson, J. L., Chandra, A., Wolfe, B. L., & Pollak, S. D. (2011). Association between Income and the Hippocampus. *PLoS ONE*, 6(5), e18712. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0018712>

Hanson, J. L., Hair, N., Shen, D. G., Shi, F., Gilmore, J. H., Wolfe, B. L., & Pollak, S. D. (2013). Family Poverty Affects the Rate of Human Infant Brain Growth. *PLoS ONE*, 8(12), e80954. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0080954>

Hanson, J. L., Nacewicz, B. M., Sutterer, M. J., Cayo, A. A., Schaefer, S. M., Rudolph, K. D., Shirtcliff, E. A., Pollak, S. D., & Davidson, R. J. (2015). Behavioral Problems After Early Life Stress: Contributions of the Hippocampus and Amygdala. *Biological Psychiatry*, 77(4), 314–323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.04.020>

Harris, K. D., & Shepherd, G. M. G. (2015). The neocortical circuit: Themes and variations. *Nature Neuroscience*, 18(2), 170–181. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3917>

Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Paul H Brookes Publishing.

Hill, W. D., Davies, N. M., Ritchie, S. J., Skene, N. G., Bryois, J., Bell, S., Di Angelantonio, E., Roberts, D. J., Xueyi, S., Davies, G., Liewald, D. C. M., Porteous, D. J., Hayward, C., Butterworth, A. S., McIntosh, A. M., Gale, C. R., & Deary, I. J. (2019). Genome-wide analysis identifies molecular systems and 149 genetic loci associated with income. *Nature Communications*, 10(1), 5741. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13585-5>

Huttenlocher, J., Waterfall, H., Vasilyeva, M., Vevea, J., & Hedges, L. V. (2010). Sources of variability in children's language growth. *Cognitive Psychology*, 61(4), 343–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2010.08.002>

Jernigan, T. L., Brown, T. T., Hagler, D. J., Akshoomoff, N., Bartsch, H., Newman, E., Thompson, W. K., Bloss, C. S., Murray, S. S., Schork, N., Kennedy, D. N., Kuperman, J. M., McCabe, C., Chung, Y., Libiger, O., Maddox, M., Casey, B. J., Chang, L., Ernst, T. M., ... Dale, A. M. (2016). The Pediatric Imaging, Neurocognition, and Genetics (PING) Data Repository. *NeuroImage*, 124, 1149–1154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.04.057>

Johnson, S. B., Riis, J. L., & Noble, K. G. (2016). State of the Art Review: Poverty and the Developing Brain. *Pediatrics*, 137(4), e20153075. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2015-3075>

Judd, N., Sauce, B., Wiedenhoeft, J., Tromp, J., Chaarani, B., Schliep, A., van Noort, B., Penttilä, J., Grimmer, Y., Insensee, C., Becker, A., Banaschewski, T., Bokde, A. L. W., Quinlan, E. B., Desrivieres, S., Flor, H., Grigis, A., Gowland, P., Heinz, A., ... Klingberg, T. (2020). Cognitive and brain development is independently influenced by socioeconomic status and polygenic scores for educational attainment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(22), 12411–12418. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2001228117>

Kessler, R. C., Berglund, P., Demler, O., Jin, R., Merikangas, K. R., & Walters, E. E. (2005). Lifetime Prevalence and Age-of-Onset Distributions of DSM-IV Disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 62(6), 593. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.62.6.593>

Khundrakpam, B., Choudhury, S., Vainik, U., Al-Sharif, N., Bhutani, N., Jeon, S., Gold, I., & Evans, A. (2020). Distinct influence of parental occupation on cortical thickness and surface area in children and adolescents: Relation to self-esteem. *Human Brain Mapping*, 41(18), 5097–5113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.25169>

Lebel, C., & Deoni, S. (2018). The development of brain white matter microstructure. *NeuroImage*, 182, 207–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.12.097>

Letourneau, N. L., Duffett-Leger, L., Levac, L., Watson, B., & Young-Morris, C. (2013). Socioeconomic Status and Child Development: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 21(3), 211–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426611421007>

Liu, S., Li, A., Zhu, M., Li, J., & Liu, B. (2019). Genetic influences on cortical myelination in the human brain. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*, 18(4), e12537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gbb.12537>

Luby, J., Belden, A., Botteron, K., Marrus, N., Harms, M. P., Babb, C., Nishino, T., & Barch, D. (2013). The Effects of Poverty on Childhood Brain Development: The Mediating Effect of Caregiving and Stressful Life Events. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 167(12), 1135. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.3139>

Machlin, L., McLaughlin, K. A., & Sheridan, M. A. (2020). Brain structure mediates the association between socioeconomic status and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Developmental Science*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12844>

McDermott, C. L., Seidlitz, J., Nadig, A., Liu, S., Clasen, L. S., Blumenthal, J. D., Reardon, P. K., Lalonde, F., Greenstein, D., Patel, R., Chakravarty, M. M., Lerch, J. P., & Raznahan, A. (2019). Longitudinally Mapping Childhood Socioeconomic Status Associations with Cortical and Subcortical Morphology. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 39(8), 1365–1373. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1808-18.2018>

Merz, E. C., Tottenham, N., & Noble, K. G. (2018). Socioeconomic Status, Amygdala Volume, and Internalizing Symptoms in Children and Adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 47(2), 312–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2017.1326122>

Miller, D. J., Duka, T., Stimpson, C. D., Schapiro, S. J., Baze, W. B., McArthur, M. J., Fobbs, A. J., Sousa, A. M. M., Sestan, N., Wildman, D. E., Lipovich, L., Kuzawa, C. W., Hof, P. R., & Sherwood, C. C. (2012). Prolonged myelination in human neocortical evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(41), 16480–16485. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1117943109>

Morgan, P. L., Farkas, G., Hillemeier, M. M., Hammer, C. S., & Maczuga, S. (2015). 24-Month-Old Children With Larger Oral Vocabularies Display Greater Academic and

Behavioral Functioning at Kindergarten Entry. *Child Development*, 86(5), 1351–1370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12398>

Nerland, S., Jørgensen, K. N., Nordhøy, W., Maximov, I. I., Bugge, R. A. B., Westlye, L. T., Andreassen, O. A., Geier, O. M., & Agartz, I. (2021). Multisite reproducibility and test-retest reliability of the T1w/T2w-ratio: A comparison of processing methods. *NeuroImage*, 245, 118709. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.118709>

Nieuwenhuys, R. (2013). The myeloarchitectonic studies on the human cerebral cortex of the Vogt–Vogt school, and their significance for the interpretation of functional neuroimaging data. *Brain Structure and Function*, 218(2), 303–352. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-012-0460-z>

Noble, K. G., Houston, S. M., Brito, N. H., Bartsch, H., Kan, E., Kuperman, J. M., Akshoomoff, N., Amaral, D. G., Bloss, C. S., Libiger, O., Schork, N. J., Murray, S. S., Casey, B. J., Chang, L., Ernst, T. M., Frazier, J. A., Gruen, J. R., Kennedy, D. N., Van Zijl, P., ... Sowell, E. R. (2015). Family income, parental education and brain structure in children and adolescents. *Nature Neuroscience*, 18(5), 773–778. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3983>

Noble, K. G., Houston, S. M., Kan, E., & Sowell, E. R. (2012). Neural correlates of socioeconomic status in the developing human brain: Neural correlates of socioeconomic status. *Developmental Science*, 15(4), 516–527. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2012.01147.x>

Norbom, L. B., Doan, N. T., Alnæs, D., Kaufmann, T., Moberget, T., Rokicki, J., Andreassen, O. A., Westlye, L. T., & Tamnes, C. K. (2019). Probing Brain Developmental Patterns of Myelination and Associations With Psychopathology in Youths Using Gray/White Matter Contrast. *Biological Psychiatry*, 85(5), 389–398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.09.027>

Norbom, L. B., Ferschmann, L., Parker, N., Agartz, I., Andreassen, O. A., Paus, T., Westlye, L. T., & Tamnes, C. K. (2021). New insights into the dynamic development of the cerebral cortex in childhood and adolescence: Integrating macro- and microstructural MRI findings. *Progress in Neurobiology*, 204, 102109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2021.102109>

Norbom, L. B., Rokicki, J., Alnæs, D., Kaufmann, T., Doan, N. T., Andreassen, O. A., Westlye, L. T., & Tamnes, C. K. (2020). Maturation of cortical microstructure and cognitive development in childhood and adolescence: A T1w/T2w ratio MRI study. *Human Brain Mapping*, 41(16), 4676–4690. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.25149>

Norbom, L. B., Rokicki, J., Meer, D. van der, Alnæs, D., Doan, N. T., Moberget, T., Kaufmann, T., Andreassen, O. A., Westlye, L. T., & Tamnes, C. K. (2020). Testing relationships between multimodal modes of brain structural variation and age, sex and polygenic scores for neuroticism in children and adolescents. *Translational Psychiatry*, 10(1), 251. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-020-00931-1>

Ørstavik, R. E., Czajkowski, N., Røysamb, E., Knudsen, G. P., Tambs, K., & Reichborn-Kjennerud, T. (2014). Sex Differences in Genetic and Environmental Influences on Educational Attainment and Income. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 17(6), 516–525. <https://doi.org/10.1017/thg.2014.68>

Palacios-Barrios, E. E., & Hanson, J. L. (2019). Poverty and self-regulation: Connecting psychosocial processes, neurobiology, and the risk for psychopathology. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 90, 52–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2018.12.012>

Piccolo, L. R., Merz, E. C., He, X., Sowell, E. R., Noble, K. G., & Pediatric Imaging, Neurocognition, Genetics Study. (2016). Age-Related Differences in Cortical Thickness Vary by Socioeconomic Status. *PLOS ONE*, *11*(9), e0162511. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162511>

Rakesh, D., & Whittle, S. (2021). Socioeconomic status and the developing brain – A systematic review of neuroimaging findings in youth. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *130*, 379–407. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.08.027>

Rakic, P. (2009). Evolution of the neocortex: A perspective from developmental biology. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *10*(10), 724–735. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2719>

Reiss, F. (2013). Socioeconomic inequalities and mental health problems in children and adolescents: A systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*, *90*, 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.04.026>

Ritchie, J., Pantazatos, S. P., & French, L. (2018). Transcriptomic characterization of MRI contrast with focus on the T1-w/T2-w ratio in the cerebral cortex. *NeuroImage*, *174*, 504–517. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.03.027>

Rowe, M. L. (2008). Child-directed speech: Relation to socioeconomic status, knowledge of child development and child vocabulary skill. *Journal of Child Language*, *35*(1), 185–205. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000907008343>

Rowe, M. L. (2012). A Longitudinal Investigation of the Role of Quantity and Quality of Child-Directed Speech in Vocabulary Development: Child-Directed Speech and Vocabulary. *Child Development*, *83*(5), 1762–1774. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01805.x>

Schwab, J. F., & Lew-Williams, C. (2016). Language learning, socioeconomic status, and child-directed speech: Language learning, socioeconomic status, and child-directed speech. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, *7*(4), 264–275. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1393>

Shafee, R., Buckner, R. L., & Fischl, B. (2015). Gray matter myelination of 1555 human brains using partial volume corrected MRI images. *NeuroImage*, *105*, 473–485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.10.054>

Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic Status and Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analytic Review of Research. *Review of Educational Research*, *75*(3), 417–453. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075003417>

Smith, S., & Nichols, T. (2009). Threshold-free cluster enhancement: Addressing problems of smoothing, threshold dependence and localisation in cluster inference. *NeuroImage*, *44*(1), 83–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.03.061>

Snaidero, N., & Simons, M. (2017). The logistics of myelin biogenesis in the central nervous system: Myelin Biogenesis. *Glia*, *65*(7), 1021–1031. <https://doi.org/10.1002/glia.23116>

Steinhausen, H.-C., & Jakobsen, H. (2019). Incidence Rates of Treated Mental Disorders in Childhood and Adolescence in a Complete Nationwide Birth Cohort. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *80*(3). <https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.17m12012>

Sydnor, V. J., Larsen, B., Bassett, D. S., Alexander-Bloch, A., Fair, D. A., Liston, C., Mackey, A. P., Milham, M. P., Pines, A., Roalf, D. R., Seidlitz, J., Xu, T., Raznahan, A., & Satterthwaite, T. D. (2021). Neurodevelopment of the association cortices: Patterns, mechanisms, and implications for psychopathology. *Neuron*, *109*(18), 2820–2846. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2021.06.016>

Tambs, K., Kendler, K. S., Reichborn-Kjennerud, T., Aggen, S. H., Harris, J. R., Neale, M. C., Hettema, J. M., Sundet, J. M., Battaglia, M., & Røysamb, E. (2012). Genetic and environmental contributions to the relationship between education and anxiety disorders - a twin study: Common genes for education and anxiety. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 125(3), 203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2011.01799.x>

Uddin, Md. N., Figley, T. D., Solar, K. G., Shatil, A. S., & Figley, C. R. (2019). Comparisons between multi-component myelin water fraction, T1w/T2w ratio, and diffusion tensor imaging measures in healthy human brain structures. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 2500. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-39199-x>

Van Essen, D. C., & Glasser, M. F. (2014). In vivo architectonics: A cortico-centric perspective. *NeuroImage*, 93, 157–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.04.095>

Vandewouw, M. M., Young, J. M., Shroff, M. M., Taylor, M. J., & Sled, J. G. (2019). Altered myelin maturation in four year old children born very preterm. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 21, 101635. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2018.101635>

von Stumm, S., & Plomin, R. (2015). Socioeconomic status and the growth of intelligence from infancy through adolescence. *Intelligence*, 48, 30–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2014.10.002>

Waxman, S. G., & Bennett, M. V. L. (1972). Relative Conduction Velocities of Small Myelinated and Non-myelinated Fibres in the Central Nervous System. *Nature New Biology*, 238(85), 217–219. <https://doi.org/10.1038/newbio238217a0>

Weintraub, S., Bauer, P. J., Zelazo, P. D., Wallner-Allen, K., Dikmen, S. S., Heaton, R. K., Tulsky, D. S., Slotkin, J., Blitz, D. L., Carlozzi, N. E., Havlik, R. J., Beaumont, J. L., Mungas, D., Manly, J. J., Borosh, B. G., Nowinski, C. J., & Gershon, R. C. (2013). I. NIH TOOLBOX COGNITION BATTERY (CB): INTRODUCTION AND PEDIATRIC DATA: NIH TOOLBOX COGNITION BATTERY (CB). *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 78(4), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mono.12031>

Weintraub, S., Dikmen, S. S., Heaton, R. K., Tulsky, D. S., Zelazo, P. D., Bauer, P. J., Carlozzi, N. E., Slotkin, J., Blitz, D., Wallner-Allen, K., Fox, N. A., Beaumont, J. L., Mungas, D., Nowinski, C. J., Richler, J., Deocampo, J. A., Anderson, J. E., Manly, J. J., Borosh, B., ... Gershon, R. C. (2013). Cognition assessment using the NIH Toolbox. *Neurology*, 80(Issue 11, Supplement 3), S54–S64. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872ded>

White, N., Roddey, C., Shankaranarayanan, A., Han, E., Rettmann, D., Santos, J., Kuperman, J., & Dale, A. (2010). PROMO: Real-time prospective motion correction in MRI using image-based tracking. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, 63(1), 91–105. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mrm.22176>

Winkler, A. M., Ridgway, G. R., Webster, M. A., Smith, S. M., & Nichols, T. E. (2014). Permutation inference for the general linear model. *NeuroImage*, 92, 381–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.01.060>

Yakovlev, P., Lecours, A.-R., Minkowski, A., & _Davis, F. (1967). *Regional development of the brain in early life*.

Zhang, H., Lee, Z. X., White, T., & Qiu, A. (2020). Parental and social factors in relation to child psychopathology, behavior, and cognitive function. *Translational Psychiatry*, 10(1), 80. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-020-0761-6>

Supplementary Material:
**Parental socioeconomic status is linked to cortical microstructure and language abilities
in children and adolescents**

Linn B. Norbom, PhD, Jamie Hanson, PhD, Dennis van der Meer, PhD, Lia Ferschmann, PhD, Espen Røysamb, PhD, Tilmann von Soest, PhD, Ole A. Andreassen, MD, PhD, Ingrid Agartz, PhD, Lars T. Westlye, PhD, Christian K. Tamnes, PhD

Introduction

In our first set of supplementary analyses, we in separate models assessed the associations between family income, parental education, parental occupation, and youth cortical microstructure as measured by vertex wise T1w/T2w ratio. We expect positive associations within frontal regions, possibly extending into temporal regions for parental education and household income (Noble et al., 2015), and generally with smaller effects sizes than for the composite parental SES score (Rakesh & Whittle, 2021).

In our second set of supplementary analyses, we assessed the association between parental SES and each sub-component, and total surface area, mean cortical thickness and mean T1w/T2w ratio. We expect positive associations between family income and total surface area, and between parental education and total surface area. Further, we expect no relations with mean cortical thickness (Noble et al., 2015), and although exploratory we hypothesize that there will be a positive relation between parental SES and mean T1w/T2w ratio.

Materials and Methods

	Included	Excluded	t/x ²	p
Total n	504	55	-	-
Age in years	3.2–21.0 (mean = 12.2, <i>SD</i> = 4.7)	3.4–20.6 (mean = 10.8, <i>SD</i> = 5.4)	1.9	0.062
Sex	Female = 238	Female = 24	0.02	0.901
	Male = 266	Male = 29	0.02	0.901
Genetic ancestry	Europe = 285 (56.4%)	Europe = 29 (55.8%)	0.00	1
	Africa = 41 (8.1%)	Africa = 5 (9.6%)	0.01	0.917
	Native American = 1 (0.2%)	Native American = 0 (0%)	0.00	1
	East Asian = 26 (5.2%)	East Asian = 2 (3.8%)	0.01	0.937
	Oceanic = 0 (0%)	Oceanic = 0 (0%)	-	-
	Central Asia = 6 (1.2%)	Central Asia = 2 (3.8%)	0.85	0.358
	Mixed ancestry = 145 (28.8%)	Mixed Ancestry = 14 (26.9%)	0.01	0.905
Raw SES measures	Income = 1-12 (mean = 7.0, <i>SD</i> = 2.4)	Income = 1-12 (mean = 6.8, <i>SD</i> = 2.0)	0.49	0.629
	Education = 1-7 (mean = 5.8, <i>SD</i> = 1.2)	Education = 1-7 (mean = 5.7, <i>SD</i> = 1.3)	0.74	0.463
	Occupation = 1-7 (mean = 5.3, <i>SD</i> = 1.5)	Occupation = 1-7 (mean = 5.2, <i>SD</i> = 1.5)	0.57	0.569

Supplementary Table 1. Sample demographics of quality control (QC)-excluded subjects. The table depicts subjects included and excluded during the MRI QC procedure. Within the table, participants with a genomic similarity ≥ 0.8 are classified as belonging to that ancestral population, while the remaining subjects are classified as mixed ancestry. Note that these groupings are for the table only, and that for all statistical analyses genetic ancestry is assessed using continuous variables. All numbers are based on subjects with complete data for the relevant variable thus for the excluded subjects age and sex are based on $n=53$, genetic ancestry scores $n=52$, and raw SES measures $n=49$. For continuous data t -values are depicted (t), while for categorical data, chi square (χ^2) with Yates continuity correction is depicted, both statistics are accompanied by p values.

Measurements of socioeconomic status

See Supplementary Tables 2, 3 and 4 for scale levels of family income, parental education and parental occupation (Khundrakpam et al., 2020). See Supplementary Figure 1 for PCA related explained variance and contributions of each specific SES sub-factor.

Scale level	Description
1	<\$5,000
2	\$5,000 – 9,999
3	\$10,000 – 19,999
4	\$20,000 – 29,999
5	\$30,000 – 39,999
6	\$40,000 – 49,999
7	\$50,000 – 99,999
8	\$100,000 – 149,999
9	\$150,000 – 199,999
10	\$200,000 – 249,999
11	\$250,000 – 299,999
12	\$300,000+

Supplementary Table 2. Measurement of family income. The table shows the scale levels for family income.

Scale level	Description
-------------	-------------

1	Less than 7 years of school
2	7–9 years of school
3	10–11 years of school
4	High school graduate
5	1–3 years of college (also business school)
6	4-year college graduate (BA, BS, BM)
7	Professional (MA, MS, MD, PhD, , and the like)

Supplementary Table 3. Measurement of parental education. The table shows the scale levels for parental education.

Scale level	Description
1	Unskilled employees
2	Machine operators and semi-skilled employees
3	Skilled manual employees
4	Clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses (<2 employees)
5	Administrative personnel, owners of small businesses, and minor professionals
6	Business managers, proprietors of medium-sized businesses, and lesser professionals
7	Higher executives of large concerns, proprietors, and major professionals

Supplementary Table 4. Measurement of parental occupation. The table shows the scale levels for parental occupation.

Supplementary Figure 1. Principal component analysis bar plots. The bar plot on the left-hand side shows the explained variance for each of the principal components, and the bar plot on the right-hand side shows the contribution of each specific SES sub-factor to first principal component chosen as the overarching SES measure.

MRI acquisition

Standardized multiple modality high-resolution protocols identical or close to identical to the pulse sequence parameters implemented at UC San Diego were installed across scanners. At UCSD, data were obtained on a GE 3T Signa HDx scanner and a 3T Discovery 750x scanner (GE Healthcare, Waukesha, WI) using eight-channel phased array head coils. The protocol included a sagittal 3D inversion recovery spoiled gradient echo (IR-SPGR) T1-weighted volume which was optimized for maximum gray/white matter contrast (TE = 3.5 ms, TR = 8.1 ms, TI = 640 ms, flip angle = 8°, receiver bandwidth = ± 31.25 kHz, FOV = 24 cm, freq = 256, phase = 192, slice thickness = 1.2 mm). It additionally included a sagittal 3D cube T2-weighted volume (TE = 69.3 ms, TR = 1500 ms, echo train = 40, FOV = 24 cm, freq = 256, phase = 192, slice thickness = 1.2 mm). Scanning durations were 8:05 and 4:25 minutes for the T1w and T2w sequence respectively (Brown & Jernigan, 2012). For further details we refer to previous publications (Brown & Jernigan, 2012; Jernigan et al., 2016; White et al., 2010).

MRI quality assessment

From 998 subjects with available MRI data, several were first directly excluded due to lack of a T2 sequence, for having unsatisfactory T1w or T2w resolution (> 1.2 mm voxel size in any direction), and for having runs within the same folder, highly suspected of being of different individuals (n=322 in total). Subject folders could include several duplicate-, and unique NIFTI images from the same, and from different sessions, i.e. after re-positioning in the scanner, and all T1w and T2w NIFTIs were processed through the quality assessment pipeline MRIQC (Esteban et al., 2017). After visual inspection of flagged images (n=99) by a

single experienced rater, flagged subjects were either included, tagged for re-assessment after T1w/T2w ratio map creation, or excluded due to poor image quality (n=17) when there was no option to replace the image with another satisfactory run. For non-flagged subjects with several images, the highest quality sequence was selected, based on having a superior “quality index” number outputted from MRIQC. The remaining subjects were consequently processed through the full Human Connectome Project (HCP) pipeline (Glasser et al., 2013), of which a few (n= 4) subjects failed completion and were excluded. Quality assessment of the T1w/T2w ratio maps were performed by careful visual inspection of previously tagged images by the same trained researcher, followed by inspection of lateral and medial snapshots of all T1w/T2w ratio maps. Several subjects were excluded at this final step due to poor T1w/T2w ratio maps (n=34), resulting in 621 subjects with complete MRI data.

Cognitive assessment

For in detailed descriptions of cognitive assessments see (Jernigan et al., 2016). In short, subjects had to match a picture to shape- or color-based targets during the “Dimensional Change Card Sort Test”, and the sum score was based on accuracy and reaction time incorporated by a two-vector method.

During the “Flanker Inhibitory Control and Attention Test”, presumed to measure both inhibition and attention, subjects had to assess symbol orientation while ignoring proximate and at times incongruent stimuli. While the youngest children were presented only with fish, subjects aged nine and above were presented smaller arrows. The attention score was based on congruent trials only, while the inhibition sum score was based on congruent and incongruent trials, both derived using a two-vector model.

The “Picture Sequence Memory Test” involved remembering sequences of pictured objects and activities in the presented order. The length of the sequences was age-dependent, and the sum score was based on the total number of pairs (two following pictures) ordered correctly.

During the “Pattern Comparison Processing Speed Test” subjects were presented with pairs of pictures, and the sum score was based on total correct assessments of whether the pictures were identical or not. While subjects aged 8 and above pressed “yes” or “no” buttons, younger subjects correspondingly pressed a smiley or frowny face.

During the “Oral Reading Recognition Test” a word/letter was presented to read aloud. For pre-and low literacy readers, letters and other multiple-choice items were presented. The sum score was based on the total number of correct aloud readings.

The “List Sorting Working Memory Test” was a two-condition assignment where subjects had to remember a series of presented objects and repeat them in size order. The sum score was based on total correctly remembered objects repeated in size order across conditions.

Finally, the “Picture Vocabulary Test” consisted of responding to which picture most closely represented a word and the sum score was an item response theory theta conversion.

Statistical analyses

Associations between family income, parental education, parental occupation, and vertex wise T1w/T2w ratio were tested in separate linear models as implemented in the Permutation

Analysis of Linear Models (PALM) toolbox (Winkler et al., 2014). For each model, age, sex, continuous GAF scores, and scanners dummy coded as 6 separate variables, were added as co-variates.

Attempting to corroborate previous findings where the PING sample was used (Noble et al., 2015), we next, in separate linear models in R, tested the associations between parental SES and its sub-factors, and total surface area, mean cortical thickness, and additionally mean T1w/T2w ratio. Age, sex, continuous GAF scores, and scanners were added as covariates. The false discovery rate (FDR) was adjusted using the Benjamini-Hochberg Procedure and a significance threshold of $p < .05$. In order to test whether effect sizes outputted from the parental SES analyses only, were significantly different from each other, we computed the z-statistic (Clogg et al., 1995) for each pair of comparisons, resulting in 3 tests. The FDR was adjusted using the Benjamini-Hochberg Procedure and a significance threshold of $p < .05$

Results

Relations between household income, parental education, parental occupation and T1w/T2w ratio

Permutations revealed an almost global negative association between parental education and T1w/T2w ratio (Supplementary Figure 2), indicating that youths of parents with low education have higher ratio across most of the cortex, as compared to having parents with higher educational attainment. Moreover, maximum v-statistics were higher than for analyses employing the parental SES score.

Parental occupation showed a negative relation with T1w/T2w ratio, with a similar spatial distribution as findings from analyses using the parental SES score (Supplementary Figure 3). This indicates that children and adolescents of parents with lower occupation show higher ratio mainly in left frontal and right temporal-occipital regions as compared to having parents with higher occupational status.

We found no statistically significant effects of household income on vertex-wise T1w/T2w ratio.

Supplementary Figure 2. Relations between parental education and youth T1w/T2w ratio. The figure shows a v-statistics map, masked by the familywise error corrected significance map with a threshold of $\geq 1.6 \log\text{-}p$ (thus including corrections across hemispheres), of the relation between parental education and youth T1w/T2w ratio. Cold colors represent low ratio.

Supplementary Figure 3. Relations between parental occupation and youth T1w/T2w ratio. The figure shows a v-statistics map, masked by the familywise error corrected significance map with a threshold of $\geq 1.6 \log\text{-}p$ (thus including corrections across hemispheres), of the relation between parental occupation and youth T1w/T2w ratio. Cold colors represent low ratio.

Relations between SES and total cortical area, mean cortical thickness and mean T1w/T2w ratio

Converging with our vertex-wise findings, there were no significant relation between parental SES, nor sub-factors and total cortical surface area or mean cortical thickness. There were, however, associations between parental SES, parental education, parental occupation and mean T1w/T2w ratio (Supplementary Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 5).

Supplementary Figure 4. Scatterplot of socioeconomic status (SES) and total cortical surface area, mean cortical thickness and mean cortical T1w/T2w-ratio. The figure shows SES plotted against total surface area, mean cortical thickness and mean T1w/T2w ratio. All brain metrics are residualized by age, sex, scanners and genetic ancestry factors (GAFs).

Relationship	β	t	p	Corrected p
Parental SES - total surface area	0.03	0.80	0.426	0.933
Education - total surface area	-0.01	-0.16	0.872	0.933
Occupation - total surface area	0.02	0.49	0.623	0.933
Income - total surface area	0.07	1.63	0.104	0.933
Parental SES - mean cortical thickness	-0.01	-0.41	0.684	0.933
Education - mean cortical thickness	0.01	0.28	0.783	0.933
Occupation - mean cortical thickness	-0.04	-1.12	0.262	0.933
Income - mean cortical thickness	0.00	-0.08	0.933	0.933
Parental SES - mean T1w/T2w ratio	-0.05	-2.98	0.003*	0.033*
Education - mean T1w/T2w ratio	-0.06	-3.65	<.001*	0.004*
Occupation - mean T1w/T2w ratio	-0.04	-2.92	0.004*	0.036*
Income - mean T1w/T2w ratio	-0.01	-0.57	0.567	0.933

Supplementary Table 5. Effect of socioeconomic status (SES) on total cortical surface area, mean cortical thickness and mean cortical T1w/T2w ratio. The table depicts standardized beta coefficients, t statistics and uncorrected and corrected p values from linear models testing the relation between SES metrics and global cortical measures. * = Significant p values when using a threshold of $p < .05$

T1w/T2w ratio as a potential mediator of the parental SES- cognitive ability relations

See Supplementary Table 7 and 8 and the main text for a presentation and discussion of findings regarding the effect of parental SES on specific cognitive abilities in youths, and non-significant mediatory effects of T1w/T2w ratio.

Parental SES model comparison	z-statistic	p-value	Corrected p value
Mean T1w/T2w-ratio - mean cortical thickness	-2.42	0.015*	0.046*
Mean T1w/T2w-ratio – total surface area	-0.8	0.426	0.426
Mean cortical thickness – total surface area	-0.8	0.426	0.426

Supplementary Table 6. Effect size comparisons from the global MRI metric analyses and parental SES. The table shows the z-statistic and accompanying p values, from analyses comparing each of the models which assessed relations between parental SES and the global MRI metric, i.e. mean T1w/T2w ratio, total surface area and mean cortical thickness.

Cognitive ability	β	t	p	Corrected p
Cognitive flexibility	-0.01	-0.18	0.858	0.992
Inhibitory control	0	-0.11	0.910	0.992
Visual attention	0	-0.01	0.992	0.992
Episodic memory	-0.01	-0.36	0.718	0.992
Processing speed	0.08	2.09	0.037	0.225
Oral reading skill	0.14	5.06	<.001*	<.001*
Working memory	0.07	1.79	0.074	0.371
Vocabulary knowledge	0.18	5.75	<.001*	<.001*

Supplementary Table 7. Effect of SES on cognitive abilities. The table depicts standardized beta coefficients, t statistics and uncorrected and corrected p values from linear models testing the relation between SES metrics and specific cognitive abilities. * = Significant p values when using a threshold of $p < .05$

Language ability	Hemispheric ROI	ACME	p	ADE	p	Total effect	p	Prop. mediated	p
Reading	lh	0.28	0.13	6.62	<.001	6.90	<.001	0.04	0.13
	rh	0.28	0.12	6.62	<.001	6.90	<.001	0.04	0.12
Vocabulary	lh	<.01	0.98	0.17	<.001	0.17	<.001	<.01	0.98
	rh	<.01	0.78	0.17	<.001	0.17	<.001	<.01	0.78

Supplementary Table 8. Mediation effect of T1w/T2w ratio on the relation between socioeconomic status (SES) and language abilities. The table shows coefficients, confidence intervals and p-values for the mediation model of T1w/T2w ratio on the relation between parental SES and reading and vocabulary. ACME= “average causal mediation effects”, ADE= “average direct effect”, Prop.Mediated= “proportion mediated”.

References

- Brown, T. T., & Jernigan, T. L. (2012). Brain Development During the Preschool Years. *Neuropsychology Review*, 22(4), 313–333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-012-9214-1>
- Clogg, C. C., Petkova, E., & Haritou, A. (1995). Statistical Methods for Comparing Regression Coefficients Between Models. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100(5), 1261–1293. JSTOR.
- Esteban, O., Birman, D., Schaer, M., Koyejo, O. O., Poldrack, R. A., & Gorgolewski, K. J. (2017). MRIQC: Advancing the automatic prediction of image quality in MRI from unseen sites. *PLOS ONE*, 12(9), e0184661. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0184661>
- Glasser, M. F., Sotiropoulos, S. N., Wilson, J. A., Coalson, T. S., Fischl, B., Andersson, J. L., Xu, J., Jbabdi, S., Webster, M., Polimeni, J. R., Van Essen, D. C., & Jenkinson, M. (2013). The minimal preprocessing pipelines for the Human Connectome Project. *NeuroImage*, 80, 105–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.04.127>
- Jernigan, T. L., Brown, T. T., Hagler, D. J., Akshoomoff, N., Bartsch, H., Newman, E., Thompson, W. K., Bloss, C. S., Murray, S. S., Schork, N., Kennedy, D. N., Kuperman, J. M., McCabe, C., Chung, Y., Libiger, O., Maddox, M., Casey, B. J., Chang, L., Ernst, T. M., ... Dale, A. M. (2016). The Pediatric Imaging, Neurocognition, and Genetics (PING) Data Repository. *NeuroImage*, 124, 1149–1154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.04.057>
- Khundrakpam, B., Choudhury, S., Vainik, U., Al-Sharif, N., Bhutani, N., Jeon, S., Gold, I., & Evans, A. (2020). Distinct influence of parental occupation on cortical thickness and surface area in children and adolescents: Relation to self-esteem. *Human Brain Mapping*, 41(18), 5097–5113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.25169>
- Noble, K. G., Houston, S. M., Brito, N. H., Bartsch, H., Kan, E., Kuperman, J. M., Akshoomoff, N., Amaral, D. G., Bloss, C. S., Libiger, O., Schork, N. J., Murray, S. S., Casey, B. J., Chang, L., Ernst, T. M., Frazier, J. A., Gruen, J. R., Kennedy, D. N., Van Zijl, P., ... Sowell, E. R. (2015). Family income, parental education and brain structure in children and adolescents. *Nature Neuroscience*, 18(5), 773–778. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3983>
- Rakesh, D., & Whittle, S. (2021). Socioeconomic status and the developing brain – A systematic review of neuroimaging findings in youth. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 130, 379–407. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.08.027>
- White, N., Roddey, C., Shankaranarayanan, A., Han, E., Rettmann, D., Santos, J., Kuperman, J., & Dale, A. (2010). PROMO: Real-time prospective motion correction in MRI using image-based tracking. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, 63(1), 91–105. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mrm.22176>
- Winkler, A. M., Ridgway, G. R., Webster, M. A., Smith, S. M., & Nichols, T. E. (2014). Permutation inference for the general linear model. *NeuroImage*, 92, 381–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.01.060>