Normative range parenting and the developing brain: A scoping review and recommendations for future research

Madeline J. Farber, M.S.¹, Dylan G. Gee, Ph.D.², & Ahmad R. Hariri, Ph.D.¹

¹ *Laboratory of NeuroGenetics, Department of Psychology & Neuroscience, Duke University*

² *Clinical Affective Neuroscience & Development Laboratory, Department of Psychology, Yale University*

Corresponding Author:

Madeline J. Farber, M.S.

Laboratory of NeuroGenetics

Department of Psychology and Neuroscience

Duke University

Durham, NC 27708

Phone: 703-627-1584

Email: madeline.farber@duke.edu

ORCID-ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-2861-4720

Abstract word count: 179

Word count: 4,406

Tables: 3

Figures: 2

Supplemental tables: 4

Supplemental figures: 0

ABSTRACT

Studies of early adversity such as trauma, abuse, and neglect highlight the critical importance of quality caregiving in brain development and mental health. However, the impact of normative range variability in caregiving on such biobehavioral processes remains poorly understood. Thus, we lack an essential foundation for understanding broader, population-representative developmental mechanisms of risk and resilience. Here, we conduct a scoping review of the extant literature centered on the question, “Is variability in normative range parenting associated with variability in brain structure and function?” After removing duplicates and screening by title, abstract, and full-text, 23 records were included in a qualitative review. The most striking outcome of this review was not only how few studies have explored associations between brain development and normative range parenting, but also how little methodological consistency exists across published studies. In light of these limitations, we propose recommendations for future research on normative range parenting and brain development. In doing so, we hope to facilitate evidence-based research that will help inform policies and practices that yield optimal developmental trajectories and mental health.

Keywords: parenting, caregiving, brain development, MRI, fMRI

INTRODUCTION

There is widespread agreement that caregiving has a profound impact on development. A robust body of literature dating back to the early 20th century details how variation in caregiving across species impacts outcomes for physical and mental health¹⁻⁴. From these seminal studies arose a number of theoretical models of caregiving in humans. For example, Ainsworth proposed that caregiving is best conceptualized in terms of parent-child attachment, which she described along three broad styles of insecure-ambivalent, insecure-avoidant, and secure⁵. In another influential model, Baumrind proposed that caregiving is best indexed by parenting behavior, which he described along the three broad styles of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive⁶.

Following Baumrind, Maccoby and Martin developed a model that is best supported by empirical data and most widely adopted in contemporary research⁷. This model describes four styles of parenting: authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and uninvolved. These styles center on two continuous dimensions of parent behavior: *care* and *control*. *Care*, also commonly called warmth, sensitivity, or responsiveness, describes the extent to which parents are accepting of and sensitive to their child's emotional and developmental needs^{7,8}. *Control*, also commonly called demandingness, monitoring, or protection, refers to the extent to which parents control their children's behavior or demand maturity^{7,8}. These two dimensions interact both within and between caregivers and ultimately yield a range of patterns of parental values and practices as care and control are necessarily balanced within a family^{7,8}.

Robust evidence in the decades since the theoretical model of Maccoby & Martin was proposed portrays clear links between variability in normative range parenting style and clinical outcomes

across development. Parenting style marked by *low care* and *low control* (i.e., “uninvolved”) is generally associated with poorest developmental outcomes, such as increased rates of juvenile delinquency⁹, increased risk for anxiety and mood disorders, and poorer emotion regulation^{10,11}. Parenting characterized by *low control* but *high care* (i.e., “indulgent”) is associated with heightened risk for internalizing problems¹²; diminished self-control, self-esteem, and academic achievement^{13,14}; and greater aggression and substance use^{13,14}. Children of parents described as displaying *low care* and *high control* (i.e., “authoritarian”) are more susceptible to substance use and depressive disorders^{15–18}; tend to be less self-reliant and less socially accepted by peers^{13,19,20}; and on average have lower grades in school across ethnic groups^{21,22}. In contrast, the most positive developmental outcomes are generally observed among children of parents who exhibit *high care* and *high control* (i.e., “authoritative”). On average, these children show greater psychological well-being with regard to emotional stability, adaptive coping, and life satisfaction^{7,14}; exhibit lower rates of depressive symptoms, substance use, and externalizing problems^{7,12}; and show better school performance and overall academic achievement^{20,23,24}. These findings suggest that, although not an easy task, children benefit when parents balance safety concerns with fostering autonomy; balance support with overindulgence; and in doing so create an optimal child-rearing environment via high care and high control^{14,25}.

Given the impact of such variability in otherwise normative range parenting on socioemotional outcomes, there has been increased interest in investigating the parent-child relationship in relation to the development of brain circuits associated with these outcomes. These efforts may be particularly useful in identifying differences in brain development associated with variability in normative range parenting that emerge before behavioral problems and/or represent targets for

early intervention. The largest and most relevant extant body of literature describes the brain developmental correlates of extreme deviations in early caregiving (e.g., trauma, abuse, neglect, institutionalization). Across species, there are consistent and robust findings demonstrating a relationship between early caregiving extremes and the developing brain^{10,26–32}. In particular, many studies have focused on associations between caregiving extremes and the structural and functional development of a corticolimbic circuit supporting socioemotional development and stress responsivity^{31,33–36}. Within this circuit, the amygdala plays a critical role in establishing predictive associations between the environment and the experience of threat including the generation of adaptive behavioral and physiological responses, while the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) plays an equally critical role in effecting top-down integration and regulation of threat signaling from the amygdala. Numerous studies have reported links between early life stress and increased amygdala threat-related activity and gray matter volume as well as decreased structural and functional connectivity between the amygdala and mPFC^{35,37,38}. Of note, imbalance between the amygdala and mPFC can precipitate abnormal responsivity of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, dysregulation of which has been consistently associated with early adversity^{34,39–41}. Moreover, early adversity has also been linked with decreased gray matter volume of the hippocampus, which contributes to the contextually appropriate expression of threat.

Such studies of extreme early life stress highlight the importance of quality caregiving in the development of brain circuits supporting emotional behavior and mental health. However, the impact of less extreme variability in caregiving on such biobehavioral processes remains relatively poorly understood. Given the clear evidence that parenting impacts clinical and

behavioral outcomes, and that caregiving in its most extreme forms impacts brain development, explicitly examining brain development in relation to normative range parenting is essential for optimizing well-being in youth. The prevalence of clinically impairing psychopathology is increasing over time^{42–46}, and such high base rates cannot be explained by exposure to extreme early life adversity alone. Investigating how normative range parenting impacts brain development is one avenue for better delineating optimal caregiving environments for healthy social, emotional, and psychological functioning.

To address this question, we conducted a scoping review of the literature examining the functional and structural brain correlates of normative range variability in parenting style. Although still a relatively new technique for research synthesis, a scoping review is most appropriate for a broader exploration of a limited extant literature, while providing a more conservative and thorough investigation than a standard narrative review^{47–50}. Our primary objective was to build upon the work of research examining early caregiving extremes, which has shown *that* parenting matters, and directly examine and synthesize what the existing literature indicates regarding *how* parenting matters. For the purpose of this review, normative parenting was defined as upbringing in the absence of early caregiving extremes including trauma, physical abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, and prolonged family separation (e.g., institutionalization, foster care). Our review was further grounded in the theoretical framework developed by Maccoby & Martin by focusing on parenting along the dimensions of care and control⁷; however, we did not limit our search to include only these constructs. With regard to the brain, we focused on three functional MRI measures (activity during experimental tasks,

connectivity during experimental tasks, and intrinsic connectivity in the absence of experimental tasks) and two structural MRI measures (gray matter volume and cortical thickness).

METHODS

Data sources and search strategy

This scoping review centered on the research question, “Is variability in normative range parenting associated with neural function and structure in human offspring?” All review processes were conducted in accordance with the PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR)⁵⁰. The initial search was conducted February 5th, 2019 in 3 electronic databases: MEDLINE/PubMed, Scopus, and PsycInfo. The search was tailored to the specific requirements of each database. The search query consisted of three primary sets of terms: (1) *parenting*: parent*, caregiv*, maternal, paternal, family, familial; (2) *neuroimaging*: fMRI, MRI, dMRI, DTI; and (3) *psychological outcomes*: psycholog*, psychiatr*, psychopathology. The search query also consisted of terms preceded by the Boolean operator “NOT” in order to exclude large numbers of studies deemed irrelevant and/or outside the scope of the present study. A complete list of search terms and syntax is provided in the supplemental materials (Table S1). The search query included only peer-reviewed empirical articles, published in English, in samples of human subjects. Citations from all three databases were imported into bibliographic manager Zotero (version 5.0.60), wherein duplicate citations were manually removed and merged.

Data charting and screening

Data selection, screening, and synthesis were conducted by a single reviewer (MJF) who was not blind to record author or journal name throughout the reviewing process. The first level of

screening involved examination of articles for relevance and inclusion criteria by title and abstract only. Articles for which no abstracts were available were included for further screening in full-text review. During full-text review, each article was read in its entirety to (a) further screen for relevance and inclusion criteria, and (b) extract relevant data for subsequent qualitative analysis and synthesis.

Data characterization and synthesis

Citations were imported into Microsoft Excel (version 16.22) for citation management, data organization, and qualitative and descriptive statistical analyses. Extraction of data pertinent to the research question was conducted throughout full-text review and was recorded in Microsoft Excel.

RESULTS

Search and selection

The original search yielded 1,411 potentially relevant records. 814 records remained after removal of duplicates. Of these 814 records, 40 met inclusion criteria after screening by title and abstract. A large number of citations were excluded upon title and abstract screening as several terms used in the search algorithm also corresponded to other study parameters; a complete list of topics deemed irrelevant and/or beyond the scope of the present review during title and abstract screening can be found in the supplemental materials (S2). These 40 records were then procured for full-text review. After data characterization, 23 articles were included in the final analysis. The flow of records from identification through final inclusion is depicted in Figure 1.

Characteristics of included records

A summary of general characteristics, parenting assessment methodologies, and neuroimaging assessment methodologies of the 23 included records are reported in Supplemental Tables S3, S4, and S5, respectively. The 23 included records reported on 19 independent datasets in total. The timeline of data collection for each independent dataset is illustrated in Figure 2. Number of assessments, age of child at assessment, and age range of sample at assessment varied widely. Eleven included records also reported on child behavioral or clinical outcomes; these non-neuroimaging outcomes are not discussed in the present review. Further details of each individual study can be found in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Functional Activity (Table 1)

Ten included records examined parenting in relation to task-related functional activity as indexed by blood oxygen level-dependent (BOLD) signal change^{51–60}. Although varying in exact task design, these studies primarily investigated three constructs: (1) behavioral control/inhibition, (2) goal-directed behavior, and (3) threat responsivity. Inconsistent associations were observed between parenting and brain activity associated with responding to threat. For example, increased parental warmth or similar constructs were associated with relatively decreased⁵⁷ and relatively increased⁵⁹ amygdala activity. This could stem from differences in task, age range, and parenting construct assessed. Regardless, these studies suggest altered activity within a corticolimbic circuit including the amygdala and prefrontal cortex as well as the insula, which supports interoception. Studies exploring parenting style in relation to goal-directed behavior reported that increased familial obligation and positive parenting are associated with decreased activity in the ventral striatum (VS)^{53,54}, which plays a critical role in associative learning and the translation of motivation into action, while increased parental knowledge and decreased

household chaos are related to increased insula activity⁶⁰. Lastly, increased prefrontal activity associated with cognitive control and response inhibition was consistently associated with greater *control*-related parenting constructs (e.g., parental control, family obligation, household stability)^{53,56,58}. Collectively, these studies of task-based activation reveal mixed findings between normative range parenting and threat responsivity, relatively consistent findings with goal-directed behavior, and consistent findings with behavioral control/inhibition.

Functional Connectivity (Table 2)

Only one included record examined how functional connectivity between brain regions was modulated by an experimental task⁶¹, and three included records examined parenting in relation to intrinsic functional connectivity^{62–64}, which assesses the strength of correlated activity between brain regions when participants are “at rest” or otherwise not engaged by an experimental task. Although small in number, these studies converge to suggest positive associations between maternal touch frequency and within-network patterns of intrinsic connectivity⁶³ and negative associations between maternal caregiving quality and parental conflict and between-network patterns of intrinsic connectivity^{62,64}. It is possible that such associations are indicative of stronger communication between regions within networks supporting specific processes (e.g., cognitive control) but less efficient modulation in the ability of different networks to selectively engage or disengage as needed (e.g., salience detection and cognitive control). As with studies of functional activation, such possibilities are speculative given the vast range in study methodology. Moreover, the varied age ranges at the time of scanning further limit the ability to draw clear conclusions from these findings.

Brain Structure (Table 3)

Eight included records explored parenting in relation to volumetric estimates of brain structure^{65–72}, and four included records investigated parenting in relation to cortical thickness^{67,69,72,73}. With regard to volumetric measures, some studies reported positive associations between higher parental care and brain volume, while others reported negative or non-significant associations. As with the functional data, it is difficult to determine the extent to which these inconsistencies are due to the broad age range across records (3 mths-19 yrs) and/or different methods of indexing parenting style and brain volumes. The associations between parenting and CT appear similarly mixed. Some studies reported a positive association between higher parental care and CT, while others reported that care is associated with greater thinning of the cortex over time. Again, varied methodologies across a small number of studies obscures the nature of these inconsistencies.

DISCUSSION

Research on extreme deviations in early life caregiving has provided valuable insight into the effects of early adversity on brain development and risk for psychopathology. However, much has remained unknown about the impact of normative range variation in parenting on these same processes. The goal of this paper was to review available studies examining associations between normative variation in parenting style and both brain function and structure. We identified 23 studies, which varied widely in terms of research question, methodological approach, and findings. Likely because of this variability and the small number of studies, clear links between parenting style and the brain were not identified. Rather, the current state of research necessitates a discussion of possible limitations to progress and formulation of

recommendations for facilitating future research that may more clearly establish links between normative parenting and the brain.

Limitations of existing research

What is striking from this review is not only how few studies have explored associations between the brain and normative range parenting, but also how little methodological consistency exists across these studies. With regard to parenting style, studies varied in: (1) number of assessments, (2) age at assessment(s), (3) parent(s) assessed, (4) method of assessment, and (5) construct assessed. With regard to the brain, studies varied in: (1) number of assessments, (2) age at assessment(s), (3) type of neuroimaging acquired, and (4) approach to data analysis. Studies also varied in sample size and covariates. The absence of consistent findings is unsurprising given this vast variability. We next consider some specific limitations before outlining a potential path forward.

The first and perhaps most pressing barrier to a thorough investigation of this research question is feasibility, which we address in detail below in making recommendations for future research. Briefly, an ideal study design by which to assess the impact of normative range parenting on brain development would start with a population-representative birth cohort that is followed longitudinally over the lifespan with multiple data collection timepoints including neuroimaging data; structured clinical interviews of parent(s) and offspring; observed parent-child interactions; in-home interviews; child- and parent-reported parenting style data; and genetic data from all family members. Suffice it to say that such a dataset is not and will not be easy to come by. We

certainly do not fault any authors of the included records for their research designs, which already are resource intensive.

Second, publication bias may limit the available literature. It is theoretically possible that brain development is only impacted by caregiving at its most extremes, leading to the publication of only those studies examining the developing brain in relation to more severe variations in parenting such as trauma, abuse, or neglect. This would imply that the developing brain is robust to the influence of caregiving except in its most extreme forms, a possibility that seems unlikely given a vast literature on broader environmental influences on brain development^{10,74–76} and the notable influence of normative range parenting on socioemotional behavior and psychopathology^{1,5–7,14,25}.

Relatedly, neuroimaging standards of practice are constantly in motion. From a technological and methodological standpoint, the field has advanced even in the time since many of the included records were published. While neuroimaging studies of 10-30 subjects were once accepted as the norm, issues of low statistical power and high false positive rates have resulted in concerted efforts to increase sample sizes and attempt replication whenever possible^{77–79}. Better acquisition protocols (e.g., multiband) and preprocessing strategies (e.g., motion scrubbing) than those employed by many of the records included in this review are now available. Consistent findings across the available literature, albeit comprised of a small number of studies, may be lacking because of such methodological limitations.

Lastly, while we aimed to be comprehensive in our review of the literature, practical considerations required that we disregard a number of variables that could inform the research question of interest in meaningful ways. For example, we did not address the potential influence of genetics in the present review despite known genetic influences on both brain and behavior^{80,81}. Similarly, we did not explore the potentially bidirectional nature of parenting style and the possibility that child temperament and parent temperament interact to influence parent behavior, which then influences child brain development. We also did not examine interactions between parenting style and socioeconomic status, which is known to impact parenting⁸². Genetic predisposition, child temperament, socioeconomic status, and family structure may moderate the relationship between parenting style and the brain. Given the limited number of studies otherwise identified, however, we think it is premature to integrate such variables in examining links between normative parenting and the brain.

Implications

Despite these limitations, the relationship between normative range parenting and brain development remains a critically important area of study. It has long been demonstrated that the first two decades of life are vital in determining how the brain will develop to support behavior. Moreover, the extent of neural plasticity and associated capacity for change during these early years is unique to the lifespan; the brain is more susceptible to environmental factors—for better or for worse—during the first two decades of life than any other time period. Importantly, brain development is hierarchical and thus even small perturbations early in life can have broad effects later through a cascade of interrelated processes^{10,83,84}. Through better understanding of how normative range parenting is associated with changes in brain structure and function, we can

leverage this knowledge to promote positive changes during periods in which the developing brain is most open to environmental influence. That is, strengthening parenting in the first two decades of life holds the potential to create lifelong neural scaffolding for resilience.

The relationship between parenting and brain development has clinical implications. Mental illness across the lifespan is embedded within a broader family context. The salience of family context may be most readily apparent when treating child and adolescent patients, but the same is true of adult patients as well. A preschool-aged girl with anxiety requires active work with parents to extinguish learned fears and safety concerns. A high school-aged young man with anhedonic depression requires parent support to aid in successful behavioral activation outside of therapy. A middle-aged person with volatile romantic relationships requires exploration and understanding of how their upbringing contributed to their conceptualization of partnership. Regardless of a patient's age, clinical interventions nearly always involve examination of patterns learned in early life within the home environment and amongst caregivers. Thus, deepening our understanding of how various parenting styles impact biobehavioral outcomes is essential to optimizing mental health treatments.

The American Psychological Association (APA) last provided guidelines for parenting practices in 2012, encouraging parents to attend to and praise good behavior; ignore minor misbehavior and prevent misbehavior when possible; educate themselves on normative developmental milestones; implement consequences that are brief, calm, and immediate; teach children how to cope with demands; and take time for themselves⁸⁵. While most of these guidelines remain true, they can be further refined and advanced by identifying trajectories of brain development

associated with variability in normative range parenting that provide a foundation for understanding developmental biomarkers of risk and resilience, which can then be translated to work with patients and parents of patients across clinical contexts.

Such a foundation has implications at the policy level as well. An ongoing cultural narrative surrounds the notion of “helicopter parenting,” in which parents pay extremely close attention to their child's experiences and problems, often intervening before their child has an opportunity to handle the challenge independently. There is an increasing debate over the extent to which parental protection is beneficial to child development, and the point at which involvement veers into over-involvement. Indeed, some evidence suggests that overprotection can have negative consequences such as increased rates of depression and anxiety and decreased life satisfaction and general psychological well-being for children in certain circumstances^{86,87}. In a somewhat reflexive response to this style of parenting, others advocate for “free range parenting” (i.e., encouraging children to function independently and with limited parental supervision, in accordance with their age of development and with a reasonable acceptance of realistic personal risks) and “rewilding” (i.e., encouraging children to explore nature independently)^{88–90}. Of course, most parents will fall in-between these extremes and express caregiving more consistent with the above-mentioned APA guidelines. Nevertheless, this debate continues and even has been raised within law- and policy-making. In 2018, Utah became the first US state to protect free-range parenting by passing a state law changing the definition of neglect⁸⁸. In this and similar cases, law- and policy-makers are challenged with decisions requiring appropriate determination of whether parents were too harsh or appropriately protective; too permissive or effectively supporting of autonomy. There is similar ongoing debate regarding the effects of

family leave policy on child well-being^{91–93}. Such debates beg the question of whether the effects of parenting may be U-shaped in reality, such that extremely high *or* extremely low parental care or control have negative impact, while striking a balance yields optimal outcomes. The scientific community can leverage evidence-based research to inform and advocate for policies that will yield optimal developmental trajectories, and such advocacy will benefit from increasing our understanding of how normative parenting affects the brain.

Recommendations for future research

In light of these existing gaps in the literature and the clear need for improved understanding of the research question, we propose the following recommendations for the continued investigation of normative range parenting and brain development. First, we recommend a conservative approach to neuroimaging that emphasizes phenotypes readily collected in most studies and populations, such as high-resolution measures of brain structure (e.g., gray matter volume, cortical thickness, surface area, and fractional anisotropy) and intrinsic functional connectivity. Striving for such data harmonization will allow for attempts to replicate observed associations, which is critical for any clinically meaningful applications. Similarly, neuroimaging protocols should be administered to large samples providing adequate power to identify likely small effects and protect against false positives. Successfully translating research into the development of clinically meaningful biomarkers of risk or resilience is further dependent on establishing and employing measures with good test-retest reliability^{94–97}.

An equally conservative and thorough approach should be taken in measuring normative range parenting. In related research, a recent meta-analysis⁹⁸ found poor agreement between

prospective and retrospective measures of childhood maltreatment. Similar discrepancies may be characteristic of retrospective versus prospective reports of normative parenting as well. Acquiring observational or in-home data continues to be the gold standard for gathering objective data of any kind, and parenting is no exception. However, it is reasonable to expect that, for most researchers, acquiring observational data on parent-child dyads will not be feasible. Moreover, as the expected sample size for neuroimaging studies grows, obtaining observational parenting data on a full sample of participants becomes increasingly difficult. In the absence of more objective parenting data, we recommend that researchers collect questionnaire data from as many family members as well as others familiar with the family dynamics (e.g., close neighbors, grandparents) as possible. Researchers can then combine these multi-informant reports to identify shared variance that may provide better insight into parenting styles than child- or parent-report alone. As many studies have questionnaire data available as rated by only one observer (i.e., child-report or parent-report but not both), researchers should take great care in interpreting and framing observed associations with brain development. Studies examining child-report as opposed to parent-report, or retrospective versus prospective measures, may be addressing different research questions.

Lastly, a return to theoretical frameworks of parenting may be useful in building common ground from which researchers can investigate normative range parenting and the developing brain. Fifty years have passed since Baumrind⁶ originally proposed the three parenting style model that was later expanded upon by Maccoby & Martin⁷. Despite many decades of research, these remain the only parenting styles with a strong empirical basis¹⁴. Much of the challenge in synthesizing results across the records included in this review stemmed from the wide variety of

parental constructs assessed. We think an increased focus on the specific dimensions of parental *care* and *control* will facilitate convergence of research findings with meaningful implications for development and well-being.

Conclusions

Although the existing literature is limited and the path forward not without obstacles, the prospects for better understanding the associations between normative range parenting, brain development, and risk for psychopathology are promising. This review highlights studies that have attempted to delineate associations between normative parenting and brain development and finds encouragement in the existence of numerous datasets with the capacity to further explore these links. As importantly, there appears to be growing interest in doing so. Moreover, the shift toward large-scale, open-source developmental datasets such as the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD)⁹⁹ and the Lifespan Human Connectome Project-Development (HCP-D)¹⁰⁰ studies are poised to facilitate this research.

Our hope is that this review will not only illuminate the existing research examining this question, but also establish an agenda for advancing future research on how normative parenting shapes brain development. A foundation of developmental trajectories associated with caregiving extremes has been laid; we must now build a comparable body of work investigating trajectories associated with normative range parenting that is as comprehensive, systematic, and rigorous. In doing so, we have the opportunity to better understand how parenting can be leveraged to promote optimal brain development and ultimately mental health and well-being through clinical practice and policy.

Acknowledgements

We thank Gary G. Bennet and Timothy J. Strauman for their comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this manuscript. MJF received support from The Graduate School at Duke University. ARH received support from US-National Institutes of Health grant R01AG049789. DGG received support from National Institutes of Health grant DP5OD021370, a NARSAD Young Investigator Award from the Brain & Behavior Research Foundation, and a Jacobs Foundation Early Career Research Fellowship.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no competing financial or other interests.

REFERENCES

1. Bowlby, J. The nature of the child's tie to his mother. *Int. J. Psychoanal.* **39**, 350–373 (1958).
2. Harlow, H. F. The development of affectional patterns in infant monkeys. (1961).
3. Harlow, H. F. & Zimmermann, R. R. Affectional Responses in the Infant Monkey. *Science* **130**, 421–432 (1959).
4. Lorenz, K. Der kumpan in der umwelt des vogels. *J. Ornithol.* **83**, 289–413 (1935).
5. Ainsworth, M. D. S. Object relations, dependency, and attachment: A theoretical review of the infant-mother relationship. *Child Dev.* 969–1025 (1969).
6. Baumrind, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genet. Psychol. Monogr.* **75**, 43–88 (1967).
7. Maccoby, E. & Martin, J. Socialization in the context of the family: parent-child interaction. in *Handbook of Child Psychology Volume 4: Socialization, personality, and social development.*, 1–101 (Wiley, 1983).
8. Baumrind, D. The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Use. *J. Early Adolesc.* **11**, 56–95 (1991).
9. Steinberg, L. We Know Some Things: Parent–Adolescent Relationships in Retrospect and Prospect. *J. Res. Adolesc.* **11**, 1–19 (2001).
10. Tottenham, N. The Fundamental Role of Early Environments to Developing an Emotionally Healthy Brain. *Policy Insights Behav. Brain Sci.* **5**, 98–103 (2018).
11. Zeanah, C. H. *et al.* Institutional rearing and psychiatric disorders in Romanian preschool children. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **166**, 777–785 (2009).

12. Williams, L. R. *et al.* Impact of behavioral inhibition and parenting style on internalizing and externalizing problems from early childhood through adolescence. *J. Abnorm. Child Psychol.* **37**, 1063–1075 (2009).
13. Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L. & Dornbusch, S. M. Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Dev.* **62**, 1049–1065 (1991).
14. Power, T. G. Parenting Dimensions and Styles: A Brief History and Recommendations for Future Research. *Child. Obes.* **9**, S-14-S-21 (2013).
15. Calafat, A., García, F., Juan, M., Becoña, E. & Fernández-Hermida, J. R. Which parenting style is more protective against adolescent substance use? Evidence within the European context. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* **138**, 185–192 (2014).
16. Glozah, F. N. & Pevalin, D. J. Social support, stress, health, and academic success in Ghanaian adolescents: A path analysis. *J. Adolesc.* **37**, 451–460 (2014).
17. King, K. A., Vidourek, R. A. & Merianos, A. L. Authoritarian parenting and youth depression: Results from a national study. *J. Prev. Interv. Community* **44**, 130–139 (2016).
18. Rothrauff, T. C., Cooney, T. M. & An, J. S. Remembered parenting styles and adjustment in middle and late adulthood. *J. Gerontol. B. Psychol. Sci. Soc. Sci.* **64**, 137–146 (2009).
19. Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., Mounts, N. S. & Dornbusch, S. M. Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Dev.* **65**, 754–770 (1994).
20. Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M. & Darling, N. Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Dev.* **63**, 1266–1281 (1992).

21. Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F. & Fraleigh, M. J. The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *J. Res. Pers.* **21**, 1244–1257 (1987).
22. Steinberg, L., Elmen, J. D. & Mounts, N. S. Authoritative Parenting, Psychosocial Maturity, and Academic Success among Adolescents. *Child Dev.* **60**, 1424–1436 (1989).
23. Nyarko, K. The influence of authoritative parenting style on adolescents' academic achievement. *Am. J. Soc. Manag. Sci.* **2**, 278–282 (2011).
24. Spera, C. A review of the relationship among parenting practices, parenting styles, and adolescent school achievement. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* **17**, 125–146 (2005).
25. Darling, N. *Parenting Style and Its Correlates*. *ERIC Digest*. (1999).
26. Gee, D. G. Sensitive Periods of Emotion Regulation: Influences of Parental Care on Frontoamygdala Circuitry and Plasticity. *New Dir. Child Adolesc. Dev.* **2016**, 87–110 (2016).
27. Gee, D. G. & Casey, B. J. The Impact of Developmental Timing for Stress and Recovery. *Neurobiol. Stress* **1**, 184–194 (2015).
28. Green, J. G. *et al.* Childhood adversities and adult psychiatric disorders in the national comorbidity survey replication I: associations with first onset of DSM-IV disorders. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* **67**, 113–123 (2010).
29. McLaughlin, Conron, K. J., Koenen, K. C. & Gilman, S. E. Childhood adversity, adult stressful life events, and risk of past-year psychiatric disorder: a test of the stress sensitization hypothesis in a population-based sample of adults. *Psychol. Med.* **40**, 1647–1658 (2010).

30. McLaughlin, Peverill, M., Gold, A. L., Alves, S. & Sheridan, M. A. Child maltreatment and neural systems underlying emotion regulation. *J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* **54**, 753–762 (2015).
31. Tottenham, N. The importance of early experiences for neuro-affective development. in *The neurobiology of childhood* 109–129 (Springer, 2013).
32. Tottenham, N. & Gabard-Durnam, L. J. The developing amygdala: a student of the world and a teacher of the cortex. *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* **17**, 55–60 (2017).
33. Gabard-Durnam, L. J. *et al.* The development of human amygdala functional connectivity at rest from 4 to 23 years: a cross-sectional study. *Neuroimage* **95**, 193–207 (2014).
34. Gee, D. G. *et al.* Early developmental emergence of human amygdala-prefrontal connectivity after maternal deprivation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **110**, 15638–15643 (2013).
35. Hanson, J. L. *et al.* Behavioral problems after early life stress: contributions of the hippocampus and amygdala. *Biol. Psychiatry* **77**, 314–323 (2015).
36. Tottenham, N. *et al.* Prolonged institutional rearing is associated with atypically large amygdala volume and difficulties in emotion regulation. *Dev. Sci.* **13**, 46–61 (2010).
37. Eluvathingal, T. J. *et al.* Abnormal brain connectivity in children after early severe socioemotional deprivation: a diffusion tensor imaging study. *Pediatrics* **117**, 2093–2100 (2006).
38. Sheridan, M. A., Sarsour, K., Jutte, D., D’Esposito, M. & Boyce, W. T. The impact of social disparity on prefrontal function in childhood. *PloS One* **7**, e35744 (2012).
39. Gunnar, M. R., Frenn, K., Wewerka, S. S. & Van Ryzin, M. J. Moderate versus severe early life stress: Associations with stress reactivity and regulation in 10–12-year-old children. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **34**, 62–75 (2009).

40. Koss, K. J., Hostinar, C. E., Donzella, B. & Gunnar, M. R. Social deprivation and the HPA axis in early development. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **50**, 1–13 (2014).
41. Moriceau, S., Raineke, C., Holman, J. D., Holman, J. G. & Sullivan, R. M. Enduring neurobehavioral effects of early life trauma mediated through learning and corticosterone suppression. *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* **3**, 22 (2009).
42. Annual Statistical Report on the Social Security Disability Insurance Program, 2017.
Available at: https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/statcomps/di_asr/index.html. (Accessed: 30th March 2019)
43. Mental Health By the Numbers | NAMI: National Alliance on Mental Illness. Available at: <https://www.nami.org/learn-more/mental-health-by-the-numbers>. (Accessed: 30th March 2019)
44. Goldman, N., Gleib, D. A. & Weinstein, M. Declining mental health among disadvantaged Americans. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **115**, 7290–7295 (2018).
45. Merikangas, K. R. *et al.* Lifetime prevalence of mental disorders in U.S. adolescents: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication--Adolescent Supplement (NCS-A). *J. Am. Acad. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* **49**, 980–989 (2010).
46. Tucci, V. & Moukaddam, N. We are the hollow men: The worldwide epidemic of mental illness, psychiatric and behavioral emergencies, and its impact on patients and providers. *J. Emerg. Trauma Shock* **10**, 4–6 (2017).
47. Arksey, H. & O'Malley, L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int. J. Soc. Res. Methodol.* **8**, 19–32 (2005).

48. Daudt, H. M., van Mossel, C. & Scott, S. J. Enhancing the scoping study methodology: a large, inter-professional team's experience with Arksey and O'Malley's framework. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* **13**, 48 (2013).
49. Levac, D., Colquhoun, H. & O'Brien, K. K. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implement. Sci.* **5**, 69 (2010).
50. Tricco, A. C. *et al.* PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **169**, 467 (2018).
51. Taylor, S. E., Eisenberger, N. I., Saxbe, D., Lehman, B. J. & Lieberman, M. D. Neural responses to emotional stimuli are associated with childhood family stress. *Biol. Psychiatry* **60**, 296–301 (2006).
52. Coan, J. A., Beckes, L. & Allen, J. P. Childhood maternal support and social capital moderate the regulatory impact of social relationships in adulthood. *Int. J. Psychophysiol. Off. J. Int. Organ. Psychophysiol.* **88**, 224–231 (2013).
53. Telzer, E. H., Fuligni, A. J., Lieberman, M. D. & Galvan, A. Meaningful family relationships: neurocognitive buffers of adolescent risk taking. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **25**, 374–387 (2013).
54. Qu, Y., Fuligni, A. J., Galvan, A., Lieberman, M. D. & Telzer, E. H. Links between parental depression and longitudinal changes in youths' neural sensitivity to rewards. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* **11**, 1262–1271 (2016).
55. Gollier-Briant, F. *et al.* Neural correlates of three types of negative life events during angry face processing in adolescents. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* **11**, 1961–1969 (2016).
56. McCormick, E. M., Qu, Y. & Telzer, E. H. Adolescent neurodevelopment of cognitive control and risk-taking in negative family contexts. *NeuroImage* **124**, 989–996 (2016).

57. Romund, L. *et al.* Maternal parenting behavior and emotion processing in adolescents-An fMRI study. *Biol. Psychol.* **120**, 120–125 (2016).
58. Kim-Spoon, J., Maciejewski, D., Lee, J., Deater-Deckard, K. & King-Casas, B. Longitudinal associations among family environment, neural cognitive control, and social competence among adolescents. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* **26**, 69–76 (2017).
59. Farber, M. J. *et al.* Paradoxical associations between familial affective responsiveness, stress, and amygdala reactivity. *Emotion* No Pagination Specified-No Pagination Specified (2018). doi:10.1037/emo0000467
60. Lauharatanahirun, N. *et al.* Neural Correlates of Risk Processing Among Adolescents: Influences of Parental Monitoring and Household Chaos. *Child Dev.* **89**, 784–796 (2018).
61. Gee, D. G. *et al.* Maternal buffering of human amygdala-prefrontal circuitry during childhood but not during adolescence. *Psychol. Sci.* **25**, 2067–2078 (2014).
62. Graham, A. M., Pfeifer, J. H., Fisher, P. A., Carpenter, S. & Fair, D. A. Early life stress is associated with default system integrity and emotionality during infancy. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* **56**, 1212–1222 (2015).
63. Brauer, J., Xiao, Y., Poulain, T., Friederici, A. D. & Schirmer, A. Frequency of Maternal Touch Predicts Resting Activity and Connectivity of the Developing Social Brain. *Cereb. Cortex N. Y. N 1991* **26**, 3544–3552 (2016).
64. Degeilh, F., Bernier, A., Leblanc, E., Daneault, V. & Beauchamp, M. H. Quality of maternal behaviour during infancy predicts functional connectivity between default mode network and salience network 9 years later. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* **34**, 53–62 (2018).
65. Whittle, S. *et al.* Maternal responses to adolescent positive affect are associated with adolescents' reward neuroanatomy. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* **4**, 247–256 (2009).

66. Luby, J. L. *et al.* Maternal support in early childhood predicts larger hippocampal volumes at school age. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **109**, 2854–2859 (2012).
67. Whittle, S. *et al.* Positive parenting predicts the development of adolescent brain structure: a longitudinal study. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* **8**, 7–17 (2014).
68. Ganella, D. E. *et al.* Early life stress alters pituitary growth during adolescence-a longitudinal study. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **53**, 185–194 (2015).
69. Kok, R. *et al.* Socialization of prosocial behavior: Gender differences in the mediating role of child brain volume. *Child Neuropsychol.* **24**, 723–733 (2018).
70. Matsudaira, I. *et al.* Parental Praise Correlates with Posterior Insular Cortex Gray Matter Volume in Children and Adolescents. *PloS One* **11**, e0154220 (2016).
71. Sethna, V. *et al.* Mother-infant interactions and regional brain volumes in infancy: an MRI study. *Brain Struct. Funct.* **222**, 2379–2388 (2017).
72. Whittle, S. *et al.* Observed Measures of Negative Parenting Predict Brain Development during Adolescence. *PloS One* **11**, e0147774 (2016).
73. Avants, B. B. *et al.* Relation of Childhood Home Environment to Cortical Thickness in Late Adolescence: Specificity of Experience and Timing. *PloS One* **10**, e0138217 (2015).
74. Belsky, J. & Haan, M. de. Annual Research Review: Parenting and children’s brain development: the end of the beginning. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* **52**, 409–428 (2011).
75. Belsky, J. & Pluess, M. Beyond diathesis stress: Differential susceptibility to environmental influences. *Psychol. Bull.* **135**, 885–908 (2009).
76. Cicchetti, D. Neural plasticity, sensitive periods, and psychopathology. *Dev. Psychopathol.* **27**, 319–320 (2015).

77. Vul, E., Harris, C., Winkielman, P. & Pashler, H. Puzzlingly High Correlations in fMRI Studies of Emotion, Personality, and Social Cognition. *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* **4**, 274–290 (2009).
78. Lieberman, M. D. & Cunningham, W. A. Type I and Type II error concerns in fMRI research: re-balancing the scale. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* **4**, 423–428 (2009).
79. Yarkoni, T. Big Correlations in Little Studies: Inflated fMRI Correlations Reflect Low Statistical Power—Commentary on Vul et al. (2009). *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* **4**, 294–298 (2009).
80. Plomin, R., DeFries, J. C. & McClearn, G. E. *Behavioral Genetics*. (Macmillan, 2008).
81. Rakic, P. Specification of cerebral cortical areas. *Science* **241**, 170- (1988).
82. Roubinov, D. S. & Boyce, W. T. Parenting and SES: relative values or enduring principles? *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* **15**, 162–167 (2017).
83. Thelen, E. Dynamic systems theory and the complexity of change. *Psychoanal. Dialogues* **15**, 255–283 (2005).
84. Casey, B. J., Heller, A. S., Gee, D. G. & Cohen, A. O. Development of the emotional brain. *Neurosci. Lett.* **693**, 29–34 (2019).
85. Novotney, A. Parenting that works. <https://www.apa.org> **43**, 44 (2012).
86. LeMoyne, T. & Buchanan, T. Does “Hovering” Matter? Helicopter Parenting and Its Effect on Well-Being. *Sociol. Spectr.* **31**, 399–418 (2011).
87. Schiffrin, H. H. *et al.* Helping or Hovering? The Effects of Helicopter Parenting on College Students’ Well-Being. *J. Child Fam. Stud.* **23**, 548–557 (2014).
88. Flynn, M. Utah’s ‘free-range parenting’ law said to be first in the nation. *The Washington Post* (2018).

89. Pritchard, D. To Raise Confident, Independent Kids, Some Parents Are Trying To ‘Let Grow’. *National Public Radio* (2018).
90. Rewilding the American Child: How to restore kids’ freedom, fire up their imaginations, and let them loose to play. *Outside* (2018).
91. Bartel, A. P., Rossin-Slater, M., Ruhm, C. J., Stearns, J. & Waldfogel, J. Paid Family Leave, Fathers’ Leave-Taking, and Leave-Sharing in Dual-Earner Households. *J. Policy Anal. Manag. J. Assoc. Public Policy Anal. Manag.* **37**, 10–37 (2018).
92. Ferrante, M. B. In The Fight For Paid Parental Leave, 6 Months Should Be The Minimum. *Forbes* Available at: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/marybethferrante/2019/01/10/in-the-fight-for-paid-parental-leave-6-months-should-be-the-minimum/>. (Accessed: 22nd May 2019)
93. Burtel, A. & Bezruchka, S. Population Health and Paid Parental Leave: What the United States Can Learn from Two Decades of Research. *Healthcare* **4**, (2016).
94. Hedge, C., Powell, G. & Sumner, P. The reliability paradox: Why robust cognitive tasks do not produce reliable individual differences. *Behav. Res. Methods* **50**, 1166–1186 (2018).
95. Nord, C. L., Gray, A., Charpentier, C. J., Robinson, O. J. & Roiser, J. P. Unreliability of putative fMRI biomarkers during emotional face processing. *NeuroImage* **156**, 119–127 (2017).
96. Plichta, M. M. *et al.* Test-retest reliability of evoked BOLD signals from a cognitive-emotive fMRI test battery. *NeuroImage* **60**, 1746–1758 (2012).
97. Enkavi, A. Z. *et al.* Large-scale analysis of test-retest reliabilities of self-regulation measures. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **116**, 5472–5477 (2019).

98. Baldwin, J. R., Reuben, A., Newbury, J. B. & Danese, A. Agreement Between Prospective and Retrospective Measures of Childhood Maltreatment: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* (2019). doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.0097
99. Casey, B. J. *et al.* The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study: Imaging acquisition across 21 sites. *Dev. Cogn. Neurosci.* **32**, 43–54 (2018).
100. Somerville, L. H. *et al.* The Lifespan Human Connectome Project in Development: A large-scale study of brain connectivity development in 5-21 year olds. *NeuroImage* **183**, 456–468 (2018).

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. PRISMA-ScR flowchart of record identification and selection process for the scoping review.

Figure 2. Timelines of measurement and data collection for all independent datasets ($n = 19$).
The 23 included records reported on 19 independent datasets in total, as multiple studies utilized the same datasets.

Table 1. Characteristics and findings of records reporting associations between parenting and functional activity ($n = 10$). NR = Not Reported.

Table 2. Characteristics and findings of records reporting associations between parenting and functional connectivity ($n = 4$). NR = Not Reported.

Table 3. Characteristics and findings of records reporting associations between parenting and brain structure ($n = 9$). NR = Not Reported.

Study	<u>Study Characteristics</u>				Age(s)
	Cohort Type	N	% Male	Race/Ethnicity	
<i>Gee et al. (2014)</i>	Community	23, 30	40%	37.7% White, 32.1% Black, 15.1% Asian, 5.7% American Indian, 9.4% Other	4-10 yrs, 11-17 yrs
<i>Graham et al. (2015)</i>	Community - oversampled for conflict	23	65%	82.6% White, 21.7% Hispanic, 17.4% Mixed/Other	6-12 mths
<i>Brauer et al. (2017)</i>	Community	43	56%	NR	5 yrs
<i>Degeilh et al. (2018)</i>	Community	28	40%	77.1% White	13 mths; 15 mths

<u>Parenting Assessment</u>			<u>Neuroimaging</u>		Findings
Assessment Type	Assessment Focus	Temporal Window	Age(s)	Measure	
Task condition, Child-report	Maternal only	NR	4-10 yrs; 11-17 yrs	Task Connectivity	Viewing maternal stimuli : lower amygdala activity + more mature amygdala-mPFC connectivity in children
Parent-report, Observed interaction	Both parents, combined	Since birth	6-12 mths	Intrinsic Connectivity	Higher parental conflict : stronger positive PCC-amPFC and PCC-amygdala connectivity
Observed interaction	Maternal only	Concurrent	5 yrs	Intrinsic Connectivity	Higher maternal touch frequency : stronger positive STS-dmPFC connectivity
Observed interaction	Maternal only	Concurrent	10 yrs	Intrinsic Connectivity	Higher quality maternal behavior (i.e. greater mind-mindedness, greater autonomy support) : stronger negative DMN-SN connectivity

Study	Study Characteristics				Age(s)
	Cohort Type	N	% Male	Race/Ethnicity	
<i>Whittle et al. (2009)</i>	Community - oversampled for temperamental risk	113	51%	NR	11-15 yrs
<i>Luby et al. (2012)</i>	Case controlled - preschool MDD vs. healthy	92	53%	NR	4-7 yrs
<i>Whittle et al. (2014)</i>	Community - oversampled for temperamental risk	188	51%	NR	12 yrs
<i>Avants et al. (2015)</i>	Prenatal cocaine exposure, otherwise healthy	52	48%	100% Black	4 yrs; 8 yrs
<i>Ganella et al. (2015)</i>	Community - oversampled for temperamental risk	91	54%	NR	12 yrs; 15 yrs
<i>Kok et al. (2015)</i>	Community	191	50%	NR	1 yr; 3 yrs; 4 yrs
<i>Matsudaira et al. (2016)</i>	Community	225	52%	NR	5-18 yrs
<i>Sethna et al. (2016)</i>	Community	39	51%	82.1% White, 10.3% Asian, 2.6% Black, 5.1% Mixed race	3-6 mths
<i>Whittle et al. (2016)</i>	Community - oversampled for temperamental risk	166	51%	NR	12 yrs

<u>Parenting Assessment</u>			<u>Neuroimaging</u>	
Assessment Type	Assessment Focus	Temporal Window	Age(s)	Measure
Observed interaction	Maternal only	Concurrent	11-15 yrs	Volume
Observed interaction	Maternal only	Concurrent	7-13 yrs	Volume
Observed interaction	Maternal only	Concurrent	12 yrs; 16 yrs	Volume, Cortical thickness
In-home interview, Observational checklist	Broad home environment	Concurrent	18 yrs	Cortical thickness
Observed interaction; Child-report	Maternal only; Broad home environment	Concurrent; NR	16 yrs; 19 yrs	Volume
Observed interaction	Both parents, separately	Concurrent	8 yrs	Volume, Cortical thickness
Parent-report	Both parents, combined	Concurrent	10 yrs	Volume
Observed interaction	Maternal only	Concurrent	3-6 mths	Volume
Observed interaction	Maternal only	Concurrent	12 yrs; 16 yrs; 19 yrs	Volume, Cortical thickness

Findings

Higher maternal punishing response : larger OFC and left dACC volume (males and females) and larger right amygdala volume (males only)

Higher maternal support : larger hippocampal volume

Higher maternal warmth and support : reduced right amygdala volume growth over time; Higher maternal warmth and support : increased OFC thinning (males and females) and right ACC (males only) over time

Higher environmental stimulation : thinner fusiform cortex and lateral inferior temporal lobe

Higher maternal dysphoria : increased pituitary volume growth over time

Higher parental sensitivity : larger total brain volume; Higher parental sensitivity : increased precentral, postcentral, caudal middle frontal, and rostral middle frontal gyri thickness

Higher parental praise : larger left posterior insulate cortex volume

Lower maternal sensitivity : smaller subcortical volume (males and females), Higher positive communication and engagement : smaller cerebellar volume (males only)

Higher maternal aggression : decreased Nacc volume over time (males only); Higher maternal aggression : increased SFG, superior parietal lobe, and supramarginal gyrus thickness growth over time (males only)

Study	<u>Study Characteristics</u>				Age(s)
	Cohort Type	N	% Male	Race/Ethnicity	
<i>Taylor et al. (2006)</i>	Community	30	40%	NR	18-36 yrs
<i>Coan et al. (2013)</i>	Community	22	50%	64% White, 36% Black	13 yrs; 16-17 yrs
<i>Telzer et al. (2013)</i>	Community	48	43%	100% Hispanic	14-16.5 yrs
<i>Qu et al. (2015)</i>	Community	23	35%	NR	15-17 yrs; 16-18 yrs
<i>Gollier-Briant et al. (2016)</i>	Community	685	46%	NR	14 yrs
<i>McCormick et al. (2016)</i>	Community	20	65%	NR	14 yrs; 15 yrs
<i>Romund et al. (2016)</i>	Community	83	49%	NR	13-16 yrs
<i>Kim-Spoon et al. (2017)</i>	Community	167	53%	80% White, 13% Black, 7% Other	13-14 yrs
<i>Farber et al. (2018)</i>	Community - high or low risk for MDD	232	50%	58% White, 26% Hispanic, 5% Black	13-15 yrs
<i>Lauharatanahirun et al. (2018)</i>	Community	167	53%	80% White, 13% Black, 7% Other	13-15 yrs; 14-16 yrs

<u>Parenting Assessment</u>			<u>Neuroimaging</u>		
Assessment Type	Assessment Focus	Temporal Window	Age(s)	Measure	Task Construct
Child-report	Broad home environment	NR	18-36 yrs	Activity	Threat/valence
Parent-report; Observed interaction	Broad home environment; Maternal only	Concurrent	18-25 yrs	Activity	Threat/valence
Child-report	Broad home environment	NR	14-16.5 yrs	Activity	Control/inhibition, Risk/reward
Child-report	Both parents, combined	Past month	15-17 yrs; 16-18 yrs	Activity	Risk/reward
Child-report	Broad home environment	NR	13-15 yrs	Activity	Threat/valence
Child-report	Broad home environment	Past month; Concurrent	14 yrs; 15 yrs	Activity	Control/inhibition
Child-report	Maternal only	Concurrent	13-16 yrs	Activity	Threat/valence
Child-report	Both parents, combined, Broad home environment	Concurrent	13-14 yrs	Activity	Control/inhibition
Child-report	Broad home environment	NR	13-15 yrs	Activity	Threat/valence
Child-report	Broad home environment	Concurrent	13-15 yrs; 14-16 yrs	Activity	Risk/reward

Findings

Lower household chaos and conflict : lower amygdala reactivity to fearful and angry facial expressions + increased right vLPFC activity to emotion labelling

Higher maternal support : lower OFC, IFG, and left insula reactivity during exposure to threat with social support

Higher family obligation : higher dlPFC activity during behavioral inhibition; Higher family obligation : lower risk-related VS activity

Higher parental support and child disclosure + lower conflict : higher longitudinal decreases in VS reactivity to rewards

No significant association with family-related negative life events

Higher family conflict + lower family cohesion : higher longitudinal increases in left vLPFC activity during cognitive control

Higher maternal warmth and support : lower amygdala reactivity to fearful facial expressions

Higher parental control + lower household chaos: higher neural cognitive control (i.e. low BOLD interference-related signal)

Higher familial affective responsiveness + lower external life stress : lower amygdala reactivity to angry facial expressions

Higher parental knowledge + lower household chaos : higher insula activity during risk-processing