

Genetics and the geography of health, behaviour and attainment

Daniel W. Belsky^{1,2*}, Avshalom Caspi^{3,4,5,6}, Louise Arseneault⁶, David L. Corcoran⁵, Benjamin W. Domingue⁷, Kathleen Mullan Harris⁸, Renate M. Houts³, Jonathan S. Mill⁹, Terrie E. Moffitt^{3,4,5,6}, Joseph Prinz⁵, Karen Sugden³, Jasmin Wertz³, Benjamin Williams³ and Candice L. Odgers^{10,11*}

Young people's life chances can be predicted by characteristics of their neighbourhood¹. Children growing up in disadvantaged neighbourhoods exhibit worse physical and mental health and suffer poorer educational and economic outcomes than children growing up in advantaged neighbourhoods. Increasing recognition that aspects of social inequalities tend, in fact, to be geographical inequalities²⁻⁵ is stimulating research and focusing policy interest on the role of place in shaping health, behaviour and social outcomes. Where neighbourhood effects are causal, neighbourhood-level interventions can be effective. Where neighbourhood effects reflect selection of families with different characteristics into different neighbourhoods, interventions should instead target families or individuals directly. To test how selection may affect different neighbourhood-linked problems, we linked neighbourhood data with genetic, health and social outcome data for >7,000 European-descent UK and US young people in the E-Risk and Add Health studies. We tested selection/concentration of genetic risks for obesity, schizophrenia, teen pregnancy and poor educational outcomes in high-risk neighbourhoods, including genetic analysis of neighbourhood mobility. Findings argue against genetic selection/concentration as an explanation for neighbourhood gradients in obesity and mental health problems. By contrast, modest genetic selection/concentration was evident for teen pregnancy and poor educational outcomes, suggesting that neighbourhood effects for these outcomes should be interpreted with care.

A challenge in understanding how neighborhoods impact people's lives is distinguishing causal effects of neighbourhood features from processes of selection in which individuals with different characteristics come to live in different neighbourhoods^{6,7}. There is growing evidence that at least some neighbourhood effects are causal; in a natural experiment arising from immigration policy in Sweden and in a randomized trial of a housing voucher programme in the United States, people assigned to better-off neighbourhoods tended to have some better health outcomes^{8,9}. Economic benefits of neighbourhood interventions are less clear, but may be present for children whose neighbourhoods are changed relatively early

in life^{10,11}. But selection effects are also apparent. For example, in one study of hurricane survivors, those in poorer health before the disaster tended to relocate to higher-poverty communities in its aftermath¹². Selection and causation in neighbourhood effects are not mutually exclusive: both can occur¹³. Better understanding of how selection may contribute to apparent neighbourhood effects is needed to guide intervention design and policy. Where selection can be ruled out as an explanation of neighbourhood effects, neighbourhood-level interventions could be prioritized. In instances in which apparent neighbourhood effects reflect selection processes, interventions delivered to individuals or families directly might prove more effective.

To evaluate the size and scope of selection effects in neighbourhood research, methods are needed that quantify selection factors and that are not influenced by neighbourhood conditions. The ideal approach is to compare fixed characteristics between children growing up in high-risk neighbourhoods and peers growing up in better-off neighbourhoods. Because neighbourhoods may affect individuals as early as the very beginnings of their lives^{3,14}, traditional social science measurements are problematic. Recent discoveries from genome-wide association studies (GWAS) provide a new opportunity to quantify selection effects at the level of the individual: polygenic scores. DNA sequence is fixed at conception and is never altered by neighbourhood environments. Because children inherit their DNA sequence from their parents, measures of genetic risk form a conceptual link between familial characteristics, such as parental education, that may influence selection into neighbourhoods and children's health and social outcomes. In this article, we report proof-of-concept polygenic score analysis to quantify genetic selection into neighbourhoods.

We analysed polygenic scores and neighbourhood conditions in 1,999 young people from the Environmental Risk Longitudinal Study (E-Risk), a birth cohort ascertained from a birth registry in England and Wales and followed prospectively through 18 years of age. We studied phenotypes that represent substantial public health and economic burdens, have been linked with neighbourhood risk in previous studies, are prevalent among 18-year olds in England and Wales, and have been subject to large-scale GWAS meta-analyses:

¹Department of Epidemiology, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, New York, NY, USA. ²Robert N. Butler Columbia Aging Center, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA. ³Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA. ⁴Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA. ⁵Center for Genomic and Computational Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA. ⁶MRC Social, Genetic, and Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK. ⁷Stanford Graduate School of Education, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, USA. ⁸Carolina Population Center and Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA. ⁹Complex Disease Epigenetics Group, University of Exeter Medical School, Exeter, UK. ¹⁰Department of Psychological Science, University of California at Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA. ¹¹Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA. *e-mail: db3275@cumc.columbia.edu; codgers@uci.edu

obesity, mental health problems, teen pregnancy and poor educational outcomes. We measured children's genetic risk using four polygenic scores computed based on results from published GWAS of obesity, schizophrenia, age at first birth and educational attainment^{15–18}. We measured their neighbourhoods using administrative, survey and systematic social observation¹⁹ data collected during their childhoods. We tested for the expected associations of polygenic and neighbourhood risk with E-Risk children's development of obesity and mental health problems, teen pregnancy, earning poor educational qualifications and not being in education, employment or training (NEET), as measured during home visits at 18 years of age. To test for genetic selection effects, we tested for gene–environment correlations, in which young people who carried elevated burdens of polygenic risk tended to have grown up in more-disadvantaged neighbourhoods. To test whether gene–environment correlations reflected the passive inheritance of genetics and neighbourhood conditions from parents, we also analysed the genetics of the children's mothers. Finally, to test how genetics might become correlated with neighbourhood conditions, we tested genetic associations with neighbourhood mobility using data from 5,325 participants in the US-based National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), a nationally representative longitudinal study of American adolescents followed prospectively through their late 20s or early 30s.

As anticipated by the genetics literature, E-Risk children with higher genetic risk had more health and social problems by 18 years of age. We computed polygenic scores from published GWAS results for obesity, schizophrenia, age-at-first birth and educational attainment^{15–18} using the methods described by Dudbridge²⁰. This method proceeds as follows: first, single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in the E-Risk database were matched with SNPs reported in the GWAS publications. Second, for each matched SNP, a weight is calculated equal to the number of phenotype-associated alleles multiplied by the effect size estimated in the GWAS. Finally, the average weight across all SNPs in a study member's genome is calculated to compute their polygenic score. Scores were transformed to have a cohort-wide mean = 0 and standard deviation (s.d.) = 1 for analysis.

Eighteen-year olds with a higher polygenic risk for obesity were at increased risk for obesity (relative risk (RR) = 1.26, 95% CI: 1.14–1.38); those with a higher polygenic risk for schizophrenia were at increased risk for mental health problems (RR = 1.13, 95% CI: 1.02–1.26); those with a higher polygenic risk of young age at first birth were at increased risk for teen pregnancy (RR = 1.40, 95% CI: 1.19–1.63); and those with a higher polygenic risk for low educational attainment were at increased risk for poor educational qualifications (RR = 1.46, 95% CI: 1.34–1.59) and becoming NEET (RR = 1.32, 95% CI: 1.15–1.51) (Fig. 1, and Supplementary Table 1, panel A).

An advantage of using genetics to test for potential selection effects is that genotypes cannot be caused by the neighbourhoods where children live, ruling out reverse causation. A second advantage is that genetics may provide new information over and above what can be measured from children's families^{21–23}. To evaluate whether the polygenic scores that we studied provided new information over and above family history risk information, we repeated our polygenic score analysis, adding covariate adjustment for family history measures. After covariate adjustment for family history, associations of young people's polygenic scores with their health and social problems were modestly attenuated. Family history analysis is reported in Supplementary Table 1, panels B and C.

As anticipated from the neighbourhood-effects literature, children growing up in more-disadvantaged neighbourhoods were at increased risk for health and social problems by 18 years of age. Because there is no single standard to quantify neighbourhood risks^{6,24}, we used two different approaches to measure E-Risk children's exposure to neighbourhood disadvantage.

The first approach characterized the neighbourhoods as they are seen by businesses and the public sector, using a consumer classification system called ACORN ('A Classification of Residential Neighbourhoods'). We computed the average ACORN classification across children's home addresses when they were aged 5, 7, 10 and 12 years. According to ACORN, 22% of E-Risk cohort children grew up in 'wealthy achiever' neighbourhoods, 33% grew up in 'urban prosperity/comfortably off' neighbourhoods, 19% grew up in 'moderate means' neighbourhoods, and 26% grew up in 'hard pressed' neighbourhoods. This distribution matched the overall distributions for the United Kingdom. As an example, ACORN distributions for E-Risk families at the time of the age-12 assessment are compared to the national distribution in Fig. 2a.

The second approach characterized neighbourhoods as they are seen by social scientists and public health researchers. Ecological-risk measures were constructed from (1) geodemographic data from local governments, (2) official crime data accessed as part of an open data sharing effort about crime and policing in England and Wales, (3) a Google Street View Virtual systematic social observation¹⁹, and (4) data from surveys of neighbourhood residents (Fig. 2b). We used these data to score neighbourhoods on their economic deprivation, physical dilapidation, social disconnection and dangerousness. We standardized scores to have mean = 50 and s.d. = 10 (T scores). We summed these four ecological-risk measures to compute one composite ecological-risk index (mean = 198, s.d. = 33) (Supplementary Fig. 1). Ecological-risk measures were correlated with ACORN classifications (for the ecological-risk index $r = 0.65$; correlations for all measures are reported in Supplementary Table 2 and Supplementary Fig. 1).

Eighteen-year olds who grew up in neighbourhoods with more disadvantaged ACORN classifications or with higher scores on the ecological-risk index were at increased risk for obesity, mental health problems, teen pregnancy, poor educational qualifications and NEET status (obesity ACORN RR = 1.20 (95% CI: 1.10–1.31), ecological-risk index RR = 1.15 (95% CI: 1.03–1.29); mental health problems ACORN RR = 1.19 (95% CI: 1.08–1.31), ecological-risk index RR = 1.30 (95% CI: 1.14–1.47); teen pregnancy ACORN RR = 1.56 (95% CI: 1.34–1.83), ecological-risk index RR = 1.55 (95% CI: 1.30–1.85); poor educational qualifications ACORN RR = 1.53 (95% CI: 1.40–1.67), ecological-risk index RR = 1.47 (95% CI: 1.33–1.62); NEET ACORN RR = 1.52 (95% CI: 1.33–1.74), ecological-risk index RR = 1.59 (95% CI: 1.36–1.85)). Figure 3a plots the risk for each health and social problem by childhood neighbourhood disadvantage. Results for all neighbourhood measures are reported in Supplementary Table 3.

We found little evidence that genetic selection/concentration explained neighbourhood risk for obesity or mental health problems. Although children's genetic risk and their neighbourhood disadvantage separately predicted their increased risk of obesity and mental health problems, polygenic risks for obesity and schizophrenia were not consistently related to neighbourhood disadvantage. Figure 3 shows this result graphically. Whereas the blue slopes in Fig. 3a document positive associations between neighbourhood disadvantage and risk for obesity and mental health problems, the red slopes in Fig. 3b reveal null associations between neighbourhood disadvantage and polygenic risk for obesity and null or weak associations between neighbourhood disadvantage and polygenic risk for schizophrenia. In the E-Risk cohort, children raised in disadvantaged neighbourhoods more often became obese by 18 years of age; however, we found no evidence for concentration of children with high polygenic risk in disadvantaged neighbourhoods (ACORN $r = -0.01$ (95% CI: -0.07 to 0.04); ecological-risk index $r = -0.01$ (95% CI: -0.08 to 0.07)). Results were similar for analysis of genetic risk for schizophrenia, although the association between children's polygenic scores and their neighbourhood ecological-risk index was significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level (ACORN $r = 0.04$ (95% CI: -0.01




Fig. 1 | Children with a higher genetic risk had more health and social problems by 18 years of age. Graphs show the fitted probabilities of each health and social problem across the distribution of polygenic risk. Models were adjusted for sex. The grey line intersecting the y axis shows the frequency of the health or social problem in E-Risk. The shaded areas around the fitted slopes show 95% CIs. The probability of obesity is graphed against polygenic risk for obesity (RR=1.26, 95% CI: 1.14–1.38, $n=1,837$). The probability of mental health problems is graphed against polygenic risk for schizophrenia (RR=1.13, 95% CI: 1.02–1.26, $n=1,863$). The probability of teen pregnancy is graphed against polygenic risk for young age at first birth (RR=1.40, 95% CI: 1.19–1.64, $n=1,825$). The probabilities of poor educational qualification and NEET status are graphed against polygenic risk for low educational attainment (poor educational qualification RR=1.47, 95% CI: 1.34–1.60, $n=1,860$; NEET RR=1.32, 95% CI: 1.15–1.52, $n=1,863$) (Supplementary Table 1). Effect sizes are reported for a 1-s.d. increase in polygenic risk.

to 0.10); ecological-risk index $r=0.08$ (95% CI: 0.01–0.15)). Results for all neighbourhood measures are reported in Supplementary Table 4. These findings argue against neighbourhood selection/composition as a source of neighbourhood gradients in obesity and mental health problems and encourage more research to unravel the possible causal effects of neighbourhood conditions on physical and mental health.

We found evidence of genetic selection/concentration in disadvantaged neighbourhoods of children at high polygenic risk of teen pregnancy, poor educational attainment and NEET status. We tested whether children at higher polygenic risk for young age at first birth and poor educational attainment tended to grow up in more-disadvantaged neighbourhoods. They did, as measured by both ACORN classification and the composite ecological-risk index. Figure 3 shows this result graphically. The blue slopes in Fig. 3a document positive associations between neighbourhood disadvantage and risk for teen pregnancy, poor educational outcomes and NEET status. In parallel, the red slopes in Fig. 3b reveal positive associations between neighbourhood risk and polygenic risk for young age at first birth (reversed values of the age-at-first-birth polygenic score, y axis of the right graph; ACORN $r=0.12$ (95% CI: 0.06–0.17); ecological-risk index $r=0.12$ (95% CI: 0.04–0.19)) and low educational attainment (reversed values of the education polygenic score, y axis of the right graph; ACORN $r=0.18$ (95% CI: 0.12–0.23); ecological-risk index $r=0.17$ (95% CI: 0.09–0.25)). Results for all neighbourhood measures are reported in Supplementary Table 4. These findings suggest that neighbourhood selection/composition may be relevant to neighbourhood–teen pregnancy and neighbourhood–achievement gradients and encourage research to understand selection processes.

Children inherited genetic and neighbourhood risks from their parents. E-Risk children were 5–12 years of age during the period

when neighbourhood data were collected. It is unlikely that they actively selected themselves into different types of neighbourhoods. Instead, a hypothesis for why children's polygenic and neighbourhood risks are correlated is that both risks are inherited from their parents. According to this hypothesis, genetics influence parents' characteristics and behaviours, which in turn affect where they live. Children subsequently inherit their parents' genetics and their neighbourhoods. As an initial test of this hypothesis, we analysed genetic data that we collected in E-Risk from children's mothers ($n=858$ with children included in analysis). (E-Risk did not collect fathers' DNA.) As expected, polygenic scores were correlated between E-Risk participants and their mothers ($r=0.50$ – 0.52). We first tested whether mothers' polygenic scores were associated with neighbourhood disadvantage. Parallel to the results from analysis of children's genetics, we did not detect associations of mothers' obesity and schizophrenia polygenic scores with neighbourhood disadvantage ($r=0.00$ – 0.04). Also consistent with analysis of children, mother's age-at-first-birth and educational attainment polygenic scores were associated with neighbourhood disadvantage (effect sizes $r=0.14$ – 0.21 ; Supplementary Table 5). Next, we repeated the analysis of association between children's polygenic scores and neighbourhood disadvantage, this time including a covariate for the mother's polygenic score. Consistent with the hypothesis that children's polygenic and neighbourhood risks are correlated because both risks are inherited from their parents, covariate adjustment for mothers' polygenic scores reduced the magnitudes of associations between children's polygenic scores and their neighbourhood disadvantage by more than half (Supplementary Table 6 and Supplementary Fig. 2).

Polygenic risk for teen pregnancy and low educational attainment predicted downward neighbourhood mobility among participants in the US National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult




Fig. 2 | Quantification of E-Risk families' neighbourhood disadvantage using ACORN and a composite ecological-risk index. a, Distributions of ACORN classifications for E-Risk families at the time of the age-12 interview ($n = 1,008$ families with genetic data) and the corresponding distribution for the United Kingdom obtained from http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/6069/mrdoc/pdf/6069_acorn_userguide.pdf. **b**, The figure contains four cells (i-iv). (i) The four sources of data used for ecological-risk assessment: geodemographic data from local governments, resident surveys, Google Street View systematic social observation and official crime data. Image created by Motsavage Design/Bigstock.com. (ii) Images illustrating: a well-kept neighbourhood, visible play area for children, and roads and sidewalks in good condition (1); evidence of graffiti, poorly kept sidewalk and trash container, and sidewalks in fair condition (2); deprived residential area, vacant lot in poor condition, a heavy amount of litter and sidewalks in poor condition (3); and comfortably off residential area, roads and sidewalks in good conditions, and no signs of litter, graffiti or other signs of disorder (4). Images are from Google Street View. (iii) Distributions of four ecological-risk measures derived from these data: economic deprivation, physical dilapidation, social disconnectedness and danger. The values of the ecological-risk measures are expressed as T scores (mean = 50, s.d. = 10) ($n = 987$ families with genetic data). (iv) A matrix of the ecological-risk measures, illustrating their correlation with one another (see Supplementary Table 2). The matrix cells below and to the left of the measures show scatter plots of their association. The matrix cells above and to the right of the measures show their correlation expressed as Pearson's r ($n = 973$ families with genetic data and data on all four ecological-risk measures). The dashed red regression lines illustrate the slopes of associations between each pair of measures.




Fig. 3 | Neighbourhood gradients in obesity, mental health problems, teen pregnancy, poor educational qualifications, NEET status and in the genetic risk for these phenotypes. a, The neighbourhood risk gradient for each health and social problem. The y axis shows the probability of having a given problem at varying levels of neighbourhood risk. Left: probabilities by ACORN classification ($n=1,857$). Right: the predicted probabilities for a series of values of the composite ecological-risk index ($n=1,822$). Effect sizes associated with a one-category increase in disadvantage defined by the ecological-risk index, respectively, were: obesity (RR=1.20 (95% CI: 1.10–1.31); RR=1.15 (95% CI: 1.03–1.29)); mental health problems (RR=1.19 (95% CI: 1.08–1.31); RR=1.30 (95% CI: 1.14–1.47)); having a teen pregnancy (RR=1.56 (95% CI: 1.34–1.83); RR=1.55 (95% CI: 1.30–1.85)); poor educational qualifications (RR=1.53 (95% CI: 1.40–1.67); RR=1.47 (95% CI: 1.33–1.62)) and NEET (RR=1.52 (95% CI: 1.33–1.74); RR=1.59 (95% CI: 1.36–1.85)) (Supplementary Table 3). **b**, The neighbourhood risk gradient for each polygenic score. The y axis shows the polygenic risk on a z-score scale (mean = 0, s.d. = 1) at varying levels of neighbourhood risk; gray lines indicate a z-score value of 0. Left: polygenic risk by ACORN classification ($n=1,441$). Right: polygenic risk for a series of values of the composite ecological-risk index ($n=1,414$). Effect sizes with disadvantage defined by ACORN and by the ecological-risk index, respectively, were: body mass index (BMI) polygenic score ($r=-0.01$ (95% CI: -0.07 to 0.04); $r=-0.01$ (95% CI: -0.08 to 0.07)); schizophrenia polygenic score ($r=0.04$ (95% CI: -0.01 to 0.10); $r=0.08$ (95% CI: 0.01 – 0.15)); age-at-first-birth polygenic score ($r=0.12$ (95% CI: 0.06 – 0.17); $r=0.12$ (95% CI: 0.04 – 0.19)); and educational attainment polygenic score ($r=0.18$ (95% CI: 0.12 – 0.23); $r=0.17$ (95% CI: 0.09 – 0.25)) (Supplementary Table 4). Sample sizes in **b** are smaller than sample sizes in **a** because the polygenic score analysis shown in **b** included only one member of each monozygotic twin pair.

Health (Add Health). If children's genetic and neighbourhood risks are correlated because they inherit both risks from their parents, the next question is how parents' genetics come to be correlated with neighbourhood risks. A hypothesis is that parents' genetics influence their characteristics and behaviour in ways that affect where they are able to live. To test this hypothesis, data are needed that observe the neighbourhood mobility process in which people leave the homes where they grew up and selectively end up in new neighbourhoods. Because E-Risk began collecting information on children's mothers only after the children were born, data were not collected on the mothers' own childhood neighbourhoods. Thus, to test how polygenic risks might influence patterns of neighbourhood mobility, we turned to a second data set: Add Health. Add Health first surveyed participants when they were secondary school students living with their parents. Add Health has since followed participants into their late 20s and early 30s²⁵, when most were living in new neighbourhoods ($n=5,325$ with genetic and neighbourhood

data; 86% lived >1km from the address where they were first surveyed). We used the Add Health genetic database and neighbourhood measures derived from US Census data to test whether the polygenic risk for obesity, schizophrenia, teen pregnancy and low educational attainment predicted downward neighbourhood mobility, that is, young adults coming to live in more-disadvantaged neighbourhoods relative to the neighbourhood they lived in with their parents.

Add Health participants' polygenic risks for obesity and schizophrenia showed weak or null associations with neighbourhood disadvantage when they were first surveyed in their parents' homes as secondary school students (polygenic risk for obesity $r=0.03$ (95% CI: 0.00 – 0.06); polygenic risk for schizophrenia $r=-0.01$ (95% CI: -0.03 to 0.02)) and when they were followed-up in their 20s and 30s (polygenic risk for obesity $r=0.04$ (95% CI: 0.01 – 0.07); polygenic risk for schizophrenia $r=-0.03$ (95% CI: -0.05 to 0.00)). Findings were similar in the neighbourhood mobility analysis (polygenic risk for




Fig. 4 | Age-at-first-birth and education polygenic score association with neighbourhood mobility in the Add Health study. The figure plots polygenic risk associations with adult neighbourhood disadvantage at the census tract level for Add Health participants who grew up in low-disadvantage, average-disadvantage and high-disadvantage census tracts ($n = 5,325$). For the figure, low-disadvantage, average-disadvantage and high-disadvantage census tracts were defined as the bottom quartile, middle 50% and top quartile of the childhood tract disadvantage score distribution, respectively. The individual graphs show binned scatter plots in which each plotted point reflects the average x and y coordinates for a 'bin' of 50 Add Health participants. The regression lines are plotted from the raw data. The box-and-whisker plots at the bottom of the graphs show the distribution of polygenic risk for each childhood neighbourhood disadvantage category. The diamond in the middle of the box shows the median, the box shows the interquartile range, and the whiskers show the upper and lower bounds defined by the 25th percentile minus $1.5 \times$ the interquartile range and the 75th percentile plus $1.5 \times$ the interquartile range, respectively. The vertical line intersecting the x axis shows the cohort average polygenic risk. The figure illustrates three findings. First, adult participants tended to live in census tracts with similar levels of disadvantage to the census tracts where they grew up. Second, children's polygenic risks and their neighbourhood disadvantage were correlated; the box plots show that polygenic risk tended to be lower for participants who grew up in low-disadvantage tracts and higher for participants who grew up in high-disadvantage tracts. Third, across strata of childhood neighbourhood disadvantage, children at higher polygenic risk tended to move to more-disadvantaged census tracts no matter where they grew up.

obesity $r = 0.03$ (95% CI: 0.00–0.05); polygenic risk for schizophrenia $r = -0.02$ (95% CI: -0.05 to 0.00)). These findings bolster conclusions from the E-Risk analysis that genetic selection/concentration is likely to be a trivial factor in neighbourhood gradients in obesity and mental health problems, although the obesity polygenic score association with neighbourhood risk was significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level in Add Health and therefore did not fully replicate the findings in E-Risk.

By contrast, Add Health participants with a higher polygenic risk for teen pregnancy and low educational attainment tended to have grown up in more-disadvantaged neighbourhoods ($r = 0.07$ (95% CI: 0.05–0.10) for the age-at-first-birth polygenic score and $r = 0.17$ (95% CI: 0.14–0.19) for the educational attainment polygenic score) and to live in more-disadvantaged neighbourhoods when they were followed-up in their 20s and 30s (adult neighbourhood $r = 0.09$ (95% CI: 0.06–0.11) for the age-at-first-birth polygenic score and $r = 0.13$ (95% CI: 0.10–0.16) for the educational attainment polygenic score). In the neighbourhood mobility analysis, participants with a higher polygenic risk for teen pregnancy and low educational attainment tended to move to more-disadvantaged neighbourhoods relative to the neighbourhoods where they lived with their parents when they were first surveyed (downward mobility $r = 0.06$ (95% CI: 0.03–0.08) for the age-at-first-birth polygenic score and $r = 0.07$ (95% CI: 0.05–0.09) for the educational attainment polygenic score; Fig. 4). These findings bolster conclusions from the E-Risk analysis that genetic selection/concentration may contribute to neighbourhood gradients in teen pregnancy and poor educational outcomes, although this contribution may be small.

To put polygenic score–neighbourhood associations in context, we conducted a SNP heritability analysis to estimate the upper

bound of the information that polygenic scores could contain about participants' neighbourhoods. Traditional heritability analysis compares phenotypic similarity between more and less closely related relatives, for example, monozygotic twins who share 100% of their DNA and dizygotic twins who share 50% of their DNA. Analysis of how much more similar monozygotic twins are than dizygotic twins can be used as an estimate of how much of the variation in the phenotype can be attributed to genetic differences between people. This estimate is called heritability. SNP heritability analysis operates on the same principle, but instead of using known genetic similarities of relatives, SNP heritability analysis uses measured genetic similarity derived from the same genome-wide SNP data used to construct polygenic scores²⁶. An advantage of SNP heritability is that it can be estimated from samples of unrelated individuals. We estimated SNP heritability of neighbourhood disadvantage in Add Health using the GCTA software²⁷. We tested whether Add Health participants who were more genetically similar to one another also tended to live in neighbourhoods with more similar levels of disadvantage. We focused GCTA analysis on the neighbourhoods where Add Health participants had moved to by the time of the 2008 follow-up, when the participants were in their 20s and 30s. Analysis included unrelated (genetic-relatedness matrix (GRM) < 0.05) participants with available neighbourhood and genotype data ($n = 4,655$). (We did not conduct GCTA analysis in the E-Risk sample because power calculations suggested that plausible SNP heritabilities could not be distinguished from zero in that cohort; see Methods.) The result showed that neighbourhood disadvantage was heritable; about 16% of the variance in Add Health participants' adult neighbourhood disadvantage could be explained by their genetics (95% CI:

0.01–0.32). Neighbourhood mobility was somewhat less heritable; 9% of the variance in neighbourhood mobility could be explained by genetics, but the confidence interval for the estimate overlapped zero (95% CI: –0.06 to 0.24). Comparing the results of our polygenic score analysis with this analysis of SNP heritability suggests that, in Add Health, participants' age-at-first-birth polygenic scores explain about 5% of the SNP heritability in neighbourhood disadvantage and their education polygenic scores explain about 11% of the SNP heritability in neighbourhood disadvantage. For mobility, these fractions were 4% and 6% for age-at-first-birth and education polygenic scores, respectively.

In summary, sociogenomic analyses testing the concentration of polygenic risks for health, behaviour and social problems in children growing up in disadvantaged neighbourhoods yielded three findings: first, we found little consistent evidence for the concentration of polygenic risk for obesity or polygenic risk for mental health problems in children growing up in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Second, by contrast, we found consistent evidence for the concentration of polygenic risks for teen pregnancy and low achievement. The concentration of polygenic risks was mostly explained by children's inheritance of both neighbourhood and polygenic risks from their parents. Third, selective mobility may contribute to the concentrations of risks. In the neighbourhood mobility analysis that followed young people living with their parents during adolescence to where they lived as adults nearly two decades later, participants with a higher polygenic risk for teen pregnancy and low achievement exhibited downward neighbourhood mobility, moving to more-disadvantaged neighbourhoods across follow-up.

Large investments are being made in neighbourhood-level policies and programmes intended to improve the health and well-being of residents. These investments are based on exciting new findings demonstrating causal long-term effects of local neighbourhoods on health and possibly economic outcomes for children moving out of poverty^{9–11}. The promise of place-based intervention efforts is that they can improve, at scale, the lives of residents and, for children, break the intergenerational transmission of poverty and lack of opportunity. At the same time, GWAS are revealing genetic predictors of the health outcomes, behaviours and attainments that place-based interventions seek to modify. We carried out a study of genetic selection into neighbourhoods to test how genes and geography combine.

We did not find consistent evidence of genetic selection effects into neighbourhoods for obesity and mental health problems. A previous Swedish study detected evidence of a gene–neighbourhood correlation between the schizophrenia polygenic score and a commercial database measure of neighbourhood deprivation ($r=0.04$, $n\approx 7,000$)²⁸. The magnitude of the association was about the same as we observed for the E-Risk twins ($r=0.04$) using the commercial database ACORN measure. However, this association was not replicated in Add Health, in which the association was not significant and was in the opposite direction ($r=-0.01$ to -0.03). It is possible that selective non-participation in research related to genetic liability for schizophrenia could limit the ability to detect these associations in some data sets^{29,30}. Our results nevertheless document consistent evidence (across measures and samples) of a gene–neighbourhood correlation for GWAS discoveries for age at first birth and educational attainment, and less so for GWAS discoveries for obesity and schizophrenia.

We found consistent evidence of genetic selection effects into neighbourhoods for teen pregnancy, poor educational qualifications and NEET status. These findings are consistent with recent findings in sociology about how neighbourhood residents come to be both physically and economically 'stuck in place' across generations^{31,32}. Teen pregnancy and poor outcomes in education and the workplace can trap parents and their children in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, causing a clustering of individual-level and

neighbourhood-level risks. This has led to calls for multigenerational and multi-level intervention efforts to break the cycle of disadvantage. Although our findings show that selection is at work for these key outcomes, the effects documented are unlikely to be large enough to fully account for neighbourhood gradients. Consistent evidence for both selection (from us) and social causation (in the larger literature) means that policies and interventions will need to target resources at both people and place to be effective.

Our findings make three contributions. First, they make a methodological and conceptual contribution by integrating genetics and social science in the rapidly developing field of social geography. We know that the places where children grow up are associated with whether they thrive. The challenge in neighbourhood research is to sort out selection from causation. Here, we take a fresh look at this classic problem using new information from genomics research. DNA sequence differences between people index differences in liability to health and social outcomes, and DNA cannot be influenced by neighbourhoods. As the price of generating genetic data continues to fall, measurements of these DNA differences can provide tools to advance social science research into the effects of place.

Second, findings shed light on how genetics and environments combine to influence children's development. Genetics contribute to the effects of place by influencing where people choose to live, are forced to live or otherwise end up living. For young people from E-risk and Add Health, some genetic risks were patterned across neighbourhoods, presumably reflecting the children's inheritance of genetics that influenced where their parents were able to live. This patterning was apparent for genetics linked to teen pregnancy and poor education, but not with genetics linked to mental health problems or obesity. One interpretation is that teen pregnancy and poor education are more proximate causes of economic circumstances that determine where one can live than, for example, obesity. Consistent with this interpretation, young people from Add Health who carried higher levels of polygenic risk for teen pregnancy and poor educational outcomes showed patterns of downward neighbourhood mobility, tending to move to worse-off neighbourhoods in young adulthood relative to the neighbourhoods where they grew up. By contrast, Add Health participants' polygenic risk for obesity and schizophrenia showed trivial or null associations with their neighbourhood mobility. Findings document that, even though the risk for highly heritable health problems such as obesity and schizophrenia may be patterned across neighbourhoods, genetic risks for these conditions may not be. More broadly, findings highlight that a phenotype being heritable does not imply that social risk factors are necessarily genetically confounded.

Third, findings provide evidence that many children are growing up subject to correlated genetic and place-related risks, particularly for teen pregnancy and attainment failure. The polygenic score–neighbourhood correlations that we observed are too small to account entirely for neighbourhood effects, but genetic and neighbourhood risks may act in combination. Thus, neighbourhood interventions can be conceptualized, in part, as breaking up gene–environment correlations, lending urgency to the development of effective place-based interventions. To this end, genetically informed designs may offer opportunities to advance intervention research. For example, comparative studies could test whether correlations between genetic and neighbourhood risks vary across cities governed by different urban planning strategies. Intervention studies could also actively incorporate genetic information: trials of neighbourhood interventions can improve the precision of their treatment-effect estimates by including polygenic score measurements as control variables to account for unmeasured differences between participants³³.

We acknowledge the limitations of our study. Foremost, our measures of genetic risk are imprecise. They explain only a fraction of the genetic variance in risk estimated from family-based genetic

models: the polygenic score for educational attainment explains >10% of phenotypic variance, polygenic scores for body mass index and schizophrenia explain 6–7% of phenotypic variance, and the age-at-first-birth polygenic score explains 1% of phenotypic variance^{15–18}, whereas heritabilities of these traits and behaviours estimated in family-based studies tend to be much higher³⁴. As a consequence, our estimates of gene–neighbourhood correlations should be considered lower-bound estimates. Second, a related limitation is that the different polygenic scores had different amounts of power to detect associations with neighbourhood risk, with the education polygenic score having more power than the others. Nevertheless, we had more power for the body mass index and schizophrenia polygenic score analyses than we did for the age-at-first-birth polygenic score analysis, and yet genetic associations with neighbourhood risk were much larger for the age-at-first-birth polygenic score than for the body mass index and schizophrenia polygenic scores. This pattern of results held in both the E-Risk and Add Health studies. This pattern of results was also consistent with a previous analysis that used the linkage disequilibrium (LD) score regression method to test genetic correlations of an area-level measure of social deprivation with health and social outcomes³⁵. Third, the magnitudes of observed gene–neighbourhood correlations in our study were small. For example, the strongest gene–neighbourhood correlations that we observed were for the educational attainment polygenic score ($r \approx -0.17$). Based on our analysis, neighbourhood differences in this polygenic score between the highest-risk and lowest-risk neighbourhoods could account for, at most, only about 15% of the observed differences in poor educational qualifications and about 10% of the observed differences in NEET status between these neighbourhoods (Supplementary Methods). As GWAS sample sizes continue to grow, more precise measurements will become available³⁶. More predictive polygenic scores could potentially strengthen measured gene–neighbourhood correlations and explain increasing fractions of neighbourhood gradients in health and social outcomes.

An additional limitation is that E-Risk data come from a single birth cohort in a single country, and thus reflect a relatively specific geographical and historical context. Findings that polygenic risk of teen pregnancy and low educational attainment were correlated with neighbourhood disadvantage did replicate in the US-based Add Health Study. Add Health neighbourhood risk was measured from tract-level US Census data describing broad social and economic conditions and is thus less geographically precise than the small-area ACORN and ecological-risk assessment data analysed in E-Risk. Thus, the Add Health analysis is not a direct replication of our E-Risk findings. Instead, the consistent results across two studies of different populations measured using different methods argue for the overall robustness of our findings.

Our analysis in both the E-Risk and Add Health studies was limited to individuals of European descent. This restriction was necessary to match the ancestry of our analytic sample with the ancestry of the samples studied in the GWAS used to calculate polygenic scores, which is the recommended approach³⁷. As polygenic scores are developed for populations of non-European ancestry, replication in these populations should be a priority.

Finally and fundamentally, our results cannot establish causal relationships between genetics, neighbourhood risk and health, behaviour and attainment outcomes. It could be that genetics influence reproductive behaviour and educational attainment in ways that affect neighbourhood mobility. But there are alternative possibilities. For example, if neighbourhood risks cause teen pregnancy and school failure, GWAS of age at first birth and educational attainment could identify genetics that influence exposure to those causal neighbourhood risks. If and when large-scale GWAS of neighbourhood mobility are conducted, emerging statistical methods, such as two-sample Mendelian randomization^{38,39}, may be able to clarify this important causal question.

The observation of gene–neighbourhood correlations does not suggest that residents in disadvantaged neighbourhoods will not benefit from neighbourhood-level interventions. It simply means that policy-makers should not overinterpret neighbourhood effects in purely causal terms. For example, people observed to live in a friendly suburb, remote ranch, quaint village and luxury high-rise are not found in those neighbourhoods randomly by accident; people end up in such locations selectively. But regardless of the location, they all respond to incentives and opportunities. More precise quantifications of selection processes that influence where people live can help to inform policies and programmes to craft incentives and opportunities that promote healthy development for everyone.

Methods

E-Risk. Sample. Participants were members of the E-Risk twin study, which tracks the development of a birth cohort of 2,232 British children. The sample was drawn from a larger birth register of twins born in England and Wales in 1994–1995 (ref. 40). Full details about the sample are reported elsewhere⁴¹. Briefly, the E-Risk sample was constructed in 1999–2000, when 1,116 families (93% of those eligible) with same-sex 5-year-old twins participated in home visit assessments. The sample includes 56% monozygotic and 44% dizygotic twin pairs; sex is evenly distributed within zygosity (49% male). Families were recruited to represent the population of families with newborn babies in England and Wales in the 1990s, on the basis of residential location throughout England and Wales, and the mother's age. Teenaged mothers with twins were over-selected to replace high-risk families who were selectively lost to the register through non-response. Older mothers having twins via assisted reproduction were under-selected to avoid an excess of well-educated older mothers. These strategies ensured that the study sample represents the full range of socioeconomic conditions in Great Britain⁴⁹.

Follow-up home visits were conducted when the children were 7 years of age (98% participation), 10 years of age (96% participation), 12 years of age (96% participation) and, in 2012–2014, 18 years of age (93% participation). There were no differences between those who did and did not take part at 18 years of age in terms of socioeconomic status assessed when the cohort was initially defined ($\chi^2 = 0.86$, $P = 0.65$), age-5 IQ scores ($t = 0.98$, $P = 0.33$), or age-5 internalizing or externalizing behaviour problems ($t = 0.40$, $P = 0.69$ and $t = 0.41$, $P = 0.68$, respectively). Home visits at 5, 7, 10 and 12 years of age included assessments with participants as well as their mother; the home visit at 18 years of age included interviews only with the twin participants. All interviews at the age-18 assessment were conducted after each study participant's eighteenth birthday. Each twin participant was assessed by a different interviewer. The joint Research and Development Office of South London and Maudsley and the Institute of Psychiatry Research Ethics Committee approved each phase of the study. Parents gave informed consent and twins gave assent between 5 and 12 years of age; twins gave informed consent at 18 years of age.

Genetic data. We used Illumina HumanOmni Express 12 BeadChip arrays (version 1.1; Illumina) to assay common SNP variation in the genomes of cohort members. We imputed additional SNPs using the IMPUTE2 software (version 2.3.1; https://mathgen.stats.ox.ac.uk/impute/impute_v2.html)⁴² and the 1000 Genomes Phase 3 reference panel⁴³. Imputation was conducted on autosomal SNPs appearing in dbSNP (version 140; <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/SNP/>)⁴⁴ that were 'called' in more than 98% of the samples. Invariant SNPs were excluded. Pre-phasing and imputation were conducted using a 50 million-base pair sliding window. We analysed SNPs in Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium ($P > 0.01$). The resulting genotype databases included genotyped SNPs and SNPs imputed with 90% probability of a specific genotype among European-descent E-Risk members ($n = 1,999$ children in 1,011 families). The same procedure was used to construct the genetic database for study members' mothers. Genetic data were available for $n = 860$ mothers of the study members in our genetic analysis sample.

Polygenic scoring. We computed polygenic scores for obesity (body mass index), schizophrenia, age at first birth and educational attainment from published GWAS results^{15–18}. We computed these polygenic scores because the GWAS on which they are based are among the largest and most comprehensive available and their target phenotypes are established as having strong geographical gradients in risk. For example, in the case of schizophrenia, there is a long-running debate about hypotheses of social causation, in which ecological risks contribute to schizophrenia pathogenesis, and social drift, in which genetic liability to schizophrenia causes downward social mobility^{45,46}.

Polygenic scoring was conducted following the method described by Dudbridge²⁰ using the PRSice software⁴⁷. Briefly, SNPs reported in GWAS results were matched with SNPs in the E-Risk database. For each SNP, the count of phenotype-associated alleles (that is, alleles associated with a higher body mass index, increased risk of schizophrenia, younger age at first birth or less educational attainment, depending on the score being calculated) was weighted according to

the effect estimated in the GWAS. Weighted counts were averaged across SNPs to compute polygenic scores. We used all matched SNPs to compute polygenic scores irrespective of nominal significance in the GWAS.

Polygenic score analysis may be biased by population stratification, the non-random patterning of allele frequencies across ancestry groups^{37,48}. To address residual population stratification within the members of European descent of the E-Risk sample, we conducted principal component analysis¹⁹. We computed principal components from the genome-wide SNP data with the PLINK software⁵⁰ using the command 'pca'. One member of each twin pair was selected at random from each family for this analysis. SNP loadings for principal components were applied to co-twin genetic data to compute principal component values for the full sample. We residualized polygenic scores for the first ten principal components estimated from the genome-wide SNP data⁵¹ and standardized residuals to have mean = 0 and s.d. = 1 for analysis.

Neighbourhood disadvantage. We characterized the neighbourhoods where E-Risk study members grew up using two approaches. The first approach characterized the neighbourhoods as they are seen by businesses and the public sector, using a consumer classification system called ACORN. The second approach characterized neighbourhoods as they are seen by social scientists and public health researchers, using ecological-risk assessment methods.

Neighbourhood disadvantage measured by consumer classification. We used a geodemographic classification system, ACORN, developed as a tool for businesses interested in market segmentation by CACI (CACI, <http://www.caci.co.uk/>). This is a proprietary algorithm that is sold to businesses, but which CACI made available to our group for research purposes. ACORN classifications were derived from the analysis of census and consumer research databases. ACORN classifies neighbourhoods, in order of least disadvantaged to most disadvantaged, as 'wealthy achievers', 'urban prosperity', 'comfortably off', 'moderate means' or 'hard pressed'. For analysis, we combined neighbourhoods classified in the 'urban prosperity' and 'comfortably off' categories because very few children lived in 'urban prosperity' neighbourhoods. (Nationally, fewer children live in neighbourhoods characterized by 'urban prosperity'.) We obtained ACORN classifications for the output areas where E-Risk families lived⁴⁹. Output areas are the smallest unit at which UK Census data are provided and they reflect relatively small geospatial units of about 100–125 households. Households were classified based on street address at the time of the age-5, age-7, age-10 and age-12 in-home visits. We assigned children the average neighbourhood classification across these four measurements. ACORN classifications were available for $n = 1,993$ children in 1,008 families in the genetic sample.

Neighbourhood disadvantage measured by ecological-risk assessment. Ecological-risk assessment was conducted by combining information from four independent sources of data: geodemographic data from local governments, official crime data from the UK police, a Google Street View-based systematic social observation, and surveys of neighbourhood residents conducted by the E-Risk investigators when the E-Risk children were 13–14 years of age. These data sources are described in detail in the Supplementary Methods.

We used these four data sources to measure the neighbourhood ecological risk in four domains: deprivation, dilapidation, disconnection and danger. Deprivation was measured with the Department of Community and Local Government Index of Multiple Deprivation. Dilapidation was measured from resident ratings of problems in their neighbourhood (for example, litter, vandalized public spaces and vacant storefronts) and independent raters' assessments of these same problems based on the 'virtual walk-through' using Google Street View. Disconnection was measured from resident surveys assessing neighbourhood collective efficacy and social connectedness. Neighbourhood collective efficacy was assessed via the resident survey using a previously validated ten-item measure of social control and social cohesion⁵². Residents were asked about the likelihood that their neighbours could be counted on to intervene in various ways if, for example: 'children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner' or 'children were spray-painting graffiti on a local building'. They were also asked how strongly they agreed that, for example: 'people around here are willing to help their neighbours', or 'this is a close-knit neighbourhood' (item responses: 0–4). Social connectedness was assessed based on indicators of intergenerational closure ('if any of your neighbours' children did anything that upset you would you feel that you could speak to their parents about it?'), reciprocated exchange (for example, 'would you be happy to leave your keys with a neighbour if you went away on holiday?') and friendship ties (for example, 'do you have any close friends that live in your neighbourhood') among neighbours developed in previous research⁵³. Dangerousness was measured from police records of crime incidence, from neighbourhood residents' ratings of how much they feared for their safety and whether they had been victimized in their neighbourhood, and from independent raters' assessments of neighbourhood safety based on the 'virtual walk-through' using Google Street View (Fig. 2b).

For each of the four domains, we constructed a measure of ecological risk as follows. First, variables with skewed distribution were log transformed. Second, values were standardized to have mean = 50 and s.d. = 10. (For domains in which

multiple resident survey or systematic social observation measures were available, we combined values within the measurement method before standardizing.) Finally, scores were averaged across measurement method within each domain. The resulting scales of deprivation, dilapidation, disconnection and danger were approximately normally distributed (Fig. 2b). Neighbourhoods' ecological-risk levels on these four measures were correlated (Pearson's $r = 0.4$ – 0.7 ; Fig. 2b). We computed the composite ecological-risk index by summing values across the four risk domains. Values were pro-rated for families with data on at least three of the four domains. Ecological-risk index values were available for $n = 1,954$ children in 987 families in the genetic sample.

Phenotypes. We selected phenotypes for analysis that represented substantial public health and economic burden, had been linked with neighbourhood risk in previous studies, were prevalent among 18-year olds in the United Kingdom at the time data were collected and had been subject to large-scale GWAS meta-analyses: obesity, mental health problems, teen pregnancy and poor educational outcome.

Obesity. Trained research workers took anthropometric measurements of study members when they were 18 years of age. Body mass index was computed as weight in kilograms over squared height in metres. The waist/hip ratio was calculated by dividing waist circumference by hip circumference. We defined obesity using the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention threshold of body mass index > 30 and the World Health Organization recommendation of a waist/hip ratio of > 0.90 for men and > 0.85 for women⁵⁴. Of the analysis sample, 21% met at least one of these criteria, similar to the prevalence for 16–24-year olds in the United Kingdom⁵⁵.

Mental health problems. Our measure of mental health problems is a general factor of psychopathology, the 'p-factor', derived from confirmatory factor analysis of symptom-level psychopathology data collected at 18 years of age, when E-Risk participants were assessed in private interviews about alcohol dependence, tobacco dependence, cannabis dependence, conduct disorder, attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, depression, generalized anxiety disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, eating disorder and thought/psychotic disorders⁵⁶. The 'p-factor' indexes liability to develop a wide spectrum of mental health problems⁵⁷. We classified E-Risk study members reporting psychiatric symptoms 1 s.d. or more above the cohort norm as having mental health problems. Of the analysis sample, 17% met this criterion.

Teen pregnancy. Getting pregnant (for women) and getting someone pregnant (for men) was assessed as part of a computer-assisted interview about reproductive behaviour at the age-18 interview. Of the analysis sample, 8% (6% of men and 9% of women) reported a teen pregnancy.

Poor educational qualifications. Poor educational qualification was assessed by whether participants did not obtain or scored a low average grade (grade D–G) on their General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE). GCSEs are a standardized examination taken at the end of compulsory education at 16 years of age. Of the analysis sample, 23% met criteria for poor educational qualifications.

NEET. NEET status was assessed at in-person interviews⁵⁸. As of the age-18 interview, 12% of study members were NEET, similar to the UK population (as of 2010, about 14% of 19-year olds in the UK reported being NEET for at least 1 year⁵⁹).

Add Health. *Sample.* Add Health is an ongoing, nationally representative longitudinal study of the social, behavioural and biological linkages in health and developmental trajectories from early adolescence into adulthood. The cohort was drawn from a probability sample of 144 middle and high schools and is representative of American adolescents in grades 7–12 in 1994–1995. Since the start of the project, participants have been interviewed in-home at four data collection waves (numbered I–IV), most recently in 2007–2008, when 15,701 study members took part²⁵.

Genotyping. At the wave IV interview in 2007–2008, saliva and capillary whole blood were collected from respondents. Of the 15,701 individuals interviewed, 15,159 consented to genotyping and 12,254 agreed to genetic data archiving. DNA extraction and genotyping were conducted on this archive sample using two platforms (Illumina Omni1 and Omni2.5). After quality controls, genotype data were available for 9,975 individuals. We analysed data from $n = 5,690$ participants with genetically European ancestry. Imputation was conducted on SNPs called in more than 98% of the samples with a minor allele frequency of > 1% using the Michigan Imputation Server (<http://imputationserver.readthedocs.io/en/latest/pipeline/>) and the Haplotype Reference Consortium reference panel⁶⁰.

Polygenic scoring. We computed polygenic scores for body mass index, schizophrenia and age at first birth following the method described by Dudbridge²⁰ according to the procedure used in previous studies⁵¹. Briefly, SNPs in the genotype database were matched to published GWAS results^{16,17}. For each of these SNPs, a

loading was calculated as the number of phenotype-associated alleles multiplied by the effect size estimated in the original GWAS. Loadings were then averaged across the SNP set to calculate the polygenic score. The Add Health study was included in the most recent GWAS of educational attainment¹⁸. Thus, we obtained the polygenic score for educational attainment directly from the Social Science Genetic Association Consortium (SSGAC). The SSGAC computed the score according to the methods described in the GWAS article based on a GWAS that did not include any Add Health samples.

To account for any residual population stratification within the European-descent analysis sample, we residualized polygenic scores for the first 10 principal components estimated from the genome-wide SNP data³¹ and standardized residuals to have mean = 0 and s.d. = 1 to compute polygenic scores for analysis. Principal components for the Add Health European-descent sample were provided by the SSGAC.

Neighbourhood characteristics. We measured neighbourhood-level socioeconomic disadvantage using Census-tract-level data linked to Add Health participants' addresses when they were first interviewed in 1994–1995 and when they were most recently followed-up in 2007–2008. Participants' addresses in 1994–1995 were linked with tract-level data from the 1990 Decennial Census⁶². Participants' addresses in 2007–2008 were linked with tract-level data from the 2005–2009 panels of the American Community Survey⁶³. For each tract, we coded the proportions of female-headed households, individuals living below the poverty threshold, individuals receiving public assistance, adults with less than a high school education and adults who were unemployed using the following system: we computed tract deciles based on the full set of tracts from which Add Health participants were sampled at wave I. We then scored each tract on a scale of 1–10 corresponding to the wave I decile containing the tract's value on the variable. We calculated neighbourhood deprivation as the sum of decile scores across the 5 measures, resulting in a score ranging from 0 to 50. Values were Z-transformed to have mean = 0 and s.d. = 1 for analysis.

Add Health analysis included all European-descent Add Health participants with available genetic and neighbourhood data ($n = 5,325$).

Statistical analysis. We analysed continuous dependent variables using linear regression models. We analysed dichotomous dependent variables using Poisson regression models to estimate RRs. In models testing polygenic and neighbourhood risks for health and social problems, health and social problems were specified as the dependent variables and polygenic and neighbourhood risks were specified as predictor variables. We tested the statistical independence of polygenic risk information from family history risk information using multivariate regression with family history measures included as covariates alongside polygenic scores. In models testing for association between polygenic and neighbourhood risks, polygenic scores were specified as dependent variables and neighbourhood risks were specified as predictor variables. We tested whether associations between children's neighbourhood risks and polygenic risks were correlated because both were inherited from their parents using multivariate regression, with the mother's polygenic scores included as covariates alongside neighbourhood risk measures. We tested polygenic risk associations with neighbourhood mobility using the mobility model from previous work⁶⁴; participants' adulthood neighbourhood disadvantage scores were regressed on their polygenic scores, their childhood neighbourhood disadvantage scores and covariates. For all models, we accounted for the non-independence of observations of siblings within families by clustering standard errors at the family level. For models testing polygenic score associations with neighbourhood conditions in the E-Risk data, only one member of each monozygotic twin pair was included in analysis. (For these models, monozygotic twins would have identical values for predictors and outcomes.) All models were adjusted for sex. Add Health models were adjusted for year of birth. (Year of birth did not vary in the E-Risk cohort.)

We conducted post-hoc power analyses to provide context for interpretation of the associations that we observed. We conducted power analysis using the 'power' command in the Stata software⁶⁵. Both the E-Risk and Add Health samples had >80% power to detect associations with effect size $r = 0.1$ in all analyses. Power analysis for tests of polygenic score associations with neighbourhood risk is shown in Supplementary Fig. 3. We conducted power analysis for GCTA using the online power calculator provided by Hemani and Yang (<http://cns.genomics.com/shiny/gctaPower/>). In the Add Health sample, power was >80% to detect SNP heritability estimates of ≥ 0.2 . We did not conduct GCTA analysis in the E-Risk sample because power calculations suggested that only SNP heritabilities of >0.9 could be distinguished from 0 in that sample.

Reporting Summary. Further information on research design is available in the Nature Research Reporting Summary linked to this article.

Data availability

The E-Risk data set reported in the current article is not publicly available owing to a lack of informed consent and ethical approval, but is available on request by qualified scientists. Requests require a concept paper describing the purpose of data access, ethical approval at the applicant's institution and provision for secure data access. We

offer secure access on the Duke University and King's College London campuses. All data analysis scripts and results files are available for review. The Add Health data can be accessed through the Add Health study. Details are available through the Carolina Population Center as described here: <https://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/documentation>. Genotype data are available through dbGaP.

Code availability

All data analysis scripts and results files are available for review.

Received: 10 May 2018; Accepted: 19 February 2019;

Published online: 08 April 2019

References

- Woods, L. M. et al. Geographical variation in life expectancy at birth in England and Wales is largely explained by deprivation. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* **59**, 115–120 (2005).
- Chetty, R. et al. The association between income and life expectancy in the United States, 2001–2014. *JAMA* **315**, 1750–1766 (2016).
- Luo, Z.-C. et al. Disparities in birth outcomes by neighborhood income: temporal trends in rural and urban areas, British Columbia. *Epidemiology* **15**, 679–686 (2004).
- Sampson, R. J. Urban sustainability in an age of enduring inequalities: advancing theory and econometrics for the 21st-century city. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, 8957–8962 (2017).
- Newton, J. N. et al. Changes in health in England, with analysis by English regions and areas of deprivation, 1990–2013: a systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2013. *Lancet* **386**, 2257–2274 (2015).
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D. & Gannon-Rowley, T. Assessing 'neighborhood effects': social processes and new directions in research. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* **28**, 443–478 (2002).
- Oakes, J. M. The (mis)estimation of neighborhood effects: causal inference for a practicable social epidemiology. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **58**, 1929–1952 (2004).
- White, J. S. et al. Long-term effects of neighbourhood deprivation on diabetes risk: quasi-experimental evidence from a refugee dispersal policy in Sweden. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol.* **4**, 517–524 (2016).
- Ludwig, J. et al. Long-term neighborhood effects on low-income families: evidence from moving to opportunity. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **103**, 226–231 (2013).
- Chetty, R. & Hendren, N. *The Impacts of Neighborhoods on Intergenerational Mobility II: County-Level Estimates* <https://doi.org/10.3386/w23002> (National Bureau of Economic Research, 2016).
- Chetty, R., Hendren, N. & Katz, L. F. The effects of exposure to better neighborhoods on children: new evidence from the moving to opportunity experiment. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **106**, 855–902 (2016).
- Arcaya, M. C. et al. Role of health in predicting moves to poor neighborhoods among Hurricane Katrina survivors. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 16246–16253 (2014).
- Oakes, J. M., Andrade, K. E., Biyoow, I. M. & Cowan, L. T. Twenty years of neighborhood effect research: an assessment. *Curr. Epidemiol. Rep.* **2**, 80–87 (2015).
- Buka, S. L., Brennan, R. T., Rich-Edwards, J. W., Raudenbush, S. W. & Earls, F. Neighborhood support and the birth weight of urban infants. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **157**, 1–8 (2003).
- Locke, A. E. et al. Genetic studies of body mass index yield new insights for obesity biology. *Nature* **518**, 197–206 (2015).
- Schizophrenia Working Group of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium. Biological insights from 108 schizophrenia-associated genetic loci. *Nature* **511**, 421–427 (2014).
- Barban, N. et al. Genome-wide analysis identifies 12 loci influencing human reproductive behavior. *Nat. Genet.* **48**, 1462–1472 (2016).
- Lee, J. J. et al. Gene discovery and polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational attainment in 1.1 million individuals. *Nat. Genet.* **50**, 1112–1121 (2018).
- Odgers, C. L., Caspi, A., Bates, C. J., Sampson, R. J. & Moffitt, T. E. Systematic social observation of children's neighborhoods using Google Street View: a reliable and cost-effective method. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* **53**, 1009–1017 (2012).
- Dudbridge, F. Power and predictive accuracy of polygenic risk scores. *PLoS Genet.* **9**, e1003348 (2013).
- Belsky, D. W. et al. Polygenic risk, rapid childhood growth, and the development of obesity: evidence from a 4-decade longitudinal study. *Arch. Pediatr. Adolesc. Med.* **166**, 515–521 (2012).
- Belsky, D. W. et al. Polygenic risk and the developmental progression to heavy, persistent smoking and nicotine dependence: evidence from a 4-decade longitudinal study. *JAMA Psychiatry* **70**, 534–542 (2013).
- Agerbo, E. et al. Polygenic risk score, parental socioeconomic status, family history of psychiatric disorders, and the risk for schizophrenia: a Danish population-based study and meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* **72**, 635–641 (2015).

24. Mujahid, M. S., Diez Roux, A. V., Morenoff, J. D. & Raghunathan, T. Assessing the measurement properties of neighborhood scales: from psychometrics to econometrics. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **165**, 858–867 (2007).
25. Harris, K. M. et al. Social, behavioral, and genetic linkages from adolescence into adulthood. *Am. J. Public Health* **103**, S25–S32 (2013).
26. Yang, J. et al. Genome partitioning of genetic variation for complex traits using common SNPs. *Nat. Genet.* **43**, 519–525 (2011).
27. Yang, J., Lee, S. H., Goddard, M. E. & Visscher, P. M. GCTA: a tool for genome-wide complex trait analysis. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **88**, 76–82 (2011).
28. Sariaslan, A. et al. Schizophrenia and subsequent neighborhood deprivation: revisiting the social drift hypothesis using population, twin and molecular genetic data. *Transl Psychiatry* **6**, e796 (2016).
29. Martin, J. et al. Association of genetic risk for schizophrenia with nonparticipation over time in a population-based cohort study. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **183**, 1149–1158 (2016).
30. Gage, S. H., Smith, G. D. & Munafo, M. R. Schizophrenia and neighbourhood deprivation. *Transl Psychiatry* **6**, e979 (2016).
31. Sharkey, P. Neighborhoods, cities, and economic mobility. *RSF* **2**, 159–177 (2016).
32. Sharkey, P. *Stuck in Place: Urban Neighborhoods and the End of Progress Toward Racial Equality* (Univ. Chicago Press, 2013).
33. Okbay, A. et al. Genome-wide association study identifies 74 loci associated with educational attainment. *Nature* **533**, 539–542 (2016).
34. Polderman, T. J. C. et al. Meta-analysis of the heritability of human traits based on fifty years of twin studies. *Nat. Genet.* **47**, 702–709 (2015).
35. Hill, W. D. et al. Molecular genetic contributions to social deprivation and household income in UK Biobank. *Curr. Biol.* **26**, 3083–3089 (2016).
36. Visscher, P. M., Brown, M. A., McCarthy, M. I. & Yang, J. Five years of GWAS discovery. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **90**, 7–24 (2012).
37. Martin, A. R. et al. Human demographic history impacts genetic risk prediction across diverse populations. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **100**, 635–649 (2017).
38. Burgess, S., Butterworth, A. & Thompson, S. G. Mendelian randomization analysis with multiple genetic variants using summarized data. *Genet. Epidemiol.* **37**, 658–665 (2013).
39. Hartwig, F. P., Davies, N. M., Hemani, G. & Davey Smith, G. Two-sample Mendelian randomization: avoiding the downsides of a powerful, widely applicable but potentially fallible technique. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **45**, 1717–1726 (2016).
40. Trouton, A., Spinath, F. M. & Plomin, R. Twins Early Development Study (TEDS): a multivariate, longitudinal genetic investigation of language, cognition and behavior problems in childhood. *Twin Res. Hum. Genet.* **5**, 444–448 (2002).
41. Moffitt, T. E. & E-Risk Team Teen-aged mothers in contemporary Britain. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* **43**, 727–742 (2002).
42. Howie, B. N., Donnelly, P. & Marchini, J. A flexible and accurate genotype imputation method for the next generation of genome-wide association studies. *PLoS Genet.* **5**, e1000529 (2009).
43. 1000 Genomes Project Consortium et al. An integrated map of genetic variation from 1,092 human genomes. *Nature* **491**, 56–65 (2012).
44. Sherry, S. T. et al. dbSNP: the NCBI database of genetic variation. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **29**, 308–311 (2001).
45. Lapouse, R., Monk, M. A. & Terris, M. The drift hypothesis and socioeconomic differentials in schizophrenia. *Am. J. Public Health Nations Health* **46**, 978–986 (1956).
46. Murray, R. M., Jones, P. B., Susser, E., Os, J. V. & Cannon, M. *The Epidemiology of Schizophrenia* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002).
47. Euesden, J., Lewis, C. M. & O'Reilly, P. F. PRSice: polygenic risk score software. *Bioinformatics* **31**, 1466–1468 (2015).
48. Hamer, D. & Sirota, L. Beware the chopsticks gene. *Mol. Psychiatry* **5**, 11–13 (2000).
49. Price, A. L., Zaitlen, N. A., Reich, D. & Patterson, N. New approaches to population stratification in genome-wide association studies. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **11**, 459–463 (2010).
50. Chang, C. C. et al. Second-generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. *Gigascience* **4**, 7 (2015).
51. Conley, D. et al. Assortative mating and differential fertility by phenotype and genotype across the 20th century. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 6647–6652 (2016).
52. Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W. & Earls, F. Neighborhoods and violent crime: a multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science* **277**, 918–924 (1997).
53. Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D. & Earls, F. Beyond social capital: spatial dynamics of collective efficacy for children. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **64**, 633–660 (1999).
54. *Waist Circumference and Waist–Hip Ratio: Report of a WHO Expert Consultation* http://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/obesity/WHO_report_waistcircumference_and_waisthip_ratio/en/ (WHO, 2008).
55. Scantlebury, R. & Moody, A. in *Health Survey for England, 2014* (eds. Craig, R., Fuller, E. & Mindell, J.) Vol. 1 Ch. 9 (The Health and Social Care Information Centre, 2014).
56. Schaefer, J. D. et al. Adolescent victimization and early-adult psychopathology: approaching causal inference using a longitudinal twin study to rule out noncausal explanations. *Clin. Psychol. Sci.* **6**, 352–371 (2018).
57. Caspi, A. & Moffitt, T. E. All for one and one for all: mental disorders in one dimension. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **175**, 831–844 (2018).
58. Goldman-Mellor, S. et al. Committed to work but vulnerable: self-perceptions and mental health in NEET 18-year olds from a contemporary British cohort. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* **57**, 196–203 (2016).
59. Brown, J. *NEET: Young people Not in Education, Employment Or Training* (House of Commons, 2016).
60. The Haplotype Reference Consortium. A reference panel of 64,976 haplotypes for genotype imputation. *Nat. Genet.* **48**, 1279–1283 (2016).
61. Domingue, B. W. et al. The social genome of friends and schoolmates in the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **115**, 702–707 (2018).
62. Billy, J. O., Wenzlow, A. T. & Grady, W. R. *User Documentation for the Add Health Contextual Database* (Seattle Battelle Center Public Health Research, 1998).
63. Morales, L. & Monbureau, T. *Add Health Wave IV Contextual Data* (Add Health, 2013).
64. Belsky, D. W. et al. The genetics of success: how single-nucleotide polymorphisms associated with educational attainment relate to life-course development. *Psychol. Sci.* **27**, 957–972 (2016).
65. *Power and Sample Size* <https://www.stata.com/features/power-and-sample-size/> (Stata, 2017).

Acknowledgements

The E-Risk Study is funded by the Medical Research Council (UKMRC grant G1002190). Additional support was provided by NICHD grant HD077482, Google and by the Jacobs Foundation. The Add Health study is supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development grants P01HD31921, R01HD073342 and R01HD060726, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. D.W.B. and C.L.O. were supported by fellowships from the Jacobs Foundation. C.L.O. is supported by the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research. B.W.D. is supported by the Russell Sage Foundation award 961704. We are grateful to the E-Risk study mothers and fathers, the twins and the twins' teachers, and the Add Health study participants and their parents for their participation. Our thanks to CACI, Google Street View and to members of the E-Risk team for their dedication, hard work and insights. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish or preparation of the manuscript.

Author contributions

D.W.B., A.C., T.E.M. and C.L.O. designed the research. A.C., T.E.M., L.A., C.L.O. and K.M.H. collected the data. Data were analysed by D.W.B., B.W.D., R.M.H., D.L.C. and J.P. All authors reviewed drafts and provided critical feedback and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

Supplementary information is available for this paper at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0562-1>.

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to D.W.B. or C.L.O.

Publisher's note: Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Limited 2019

In the format provided by the authors and unedited.

Genetics and the geography of health, behaviour and attainment

Daniel W. Belsky ^{1,2*}, **Avshalom Caspi**^{3,4,5,6}, **Louise Arseneault**⁶, **David L. Corcoran**⁵,
Benjamin W. Domingue ⁷, **Kathleen Mullan Harris**⁸, **Renate M. Houts**³, **Jonathan S. Mill**⁹,
Terrie E. Moffitt ^{3,4,5,6}, **Joseph Prinz**⁵, **Karen Sugden**³, **Jasmin Wertz**³, **Benjamin Williams**³
and **Candice L. Odgers** ^{10,11*}

¹Department of Epidemiology, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, New York, NY, USA. ²Robert N. Butler Columbia Aging Center, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA. ³Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA. ⁴Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA. ⁵Center for Genomic and Computational Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA. ⁶MRC Social, Genetic, and Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK. ⁷Stanford Graduate School of Education, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, USA. ⁸Carolina Population Center and Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA. ⁹Complex Disease Epigenetics Group, University of Exeter Medical School, Exeter, UK. ¹⁰Department of Psychological Science, University of California at Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA. ¹¹Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA. *e-mail: db3275@cumc.columbia.edu; codgers@uci.edu

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Supplementary Methods	2
Ecological-Risk Assessment Measures of Neighborhood Disadvantage.....	2
Calculations to Evaluate How Much of the Neighborhood Gradient in Risk for Poor Educational Attainment and NEET Status Might Be Explained by Gene-Neighborhood Correlation Between the Education Polygenic Score and ACORN and Ecological-Risk Score Measures of Neighborhood Risk.	3
Supplementary Tables	5
Supplementary Table 1. Polygenic score and family history associations with E-Risk children’s health and social problems	5
Supplementary Table 2. Means and standard deviations of neighborhood measures and their correlations with one another	8
Supplementary Table 3. Associations between neighborhood disadvantage measures and children’s health and social problems	9
Supplementary Table 4. Associations between neighborhood disadvantage and children’s polygenic risk for obesity, schizophrenia, young age at first birth, and low educational attainment	10
Supplementary Table 5. Association between neighborhood disadvantage and mother’s polygenic risk for obesity, schizophrenia, young age at first birth, and low educational attainment	11
Supplementary Table 6. Effect-sizes for associations between children’s neighborhood and polygenic risks before and after covariate adjustment for their mothers’ polygenic risk	12
Supplementary Figures	13
Supplementary Figure 1. Distributions of ecological-risk assessments within ACORN neighborhood classifications	13
Supplementary Figure 2. Effect-sizes for associations between children’s neighborhood and polygenic risks before and after covariate adjustment for their mothers’ polygenic risk.....	14
Supplementary Figure 3. Power for testing genetic associations with neighborhood risk.	15

Supplementary Methods

Ecological-Risk Assessment Measures of Neighborhood Disadvantage. Ecological risk assessment was conducted by combining information from four independent sources of data: Geodemographic data from local governments, official crime data from the UK police, Google Streetview-based Systematic Social Observation (SSO), and surveys of neighborhood residents.

1. Geodemographic Data from Local Governments. We obtained information about the Index of Multiple Deprivation from the Department for Communities and Local Government. The Index is the official measure of relative deprivation for neighborhoods in England. Every small area in England is ranked from 1 (most deprived area) to 32,844 (least deprived area), these rankings are then converted into deciles. The Index of Multiple Deprivation is created based on 37 separate indicators, that are organized in seven domains of deprivation (Employment Deprivation; Health Deprivation and Disability; Education, Skills and Training Deprivation; Crime; Barriers to Housing and Services; and Living Environment Deprivation), and combined with appropriate weights to calculate the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). Households were assigned a neighborhood IMD based on street address at the time of the age-5, age-7, age-10, and age-12 in-home visits. We analyzed the average IMD value across these four measurements.
2. Official Crime Data. We measured local area crime by mapping a 1-mile radius around each E-Risk Study family's home and tallying the total number of crimes that occurred in the area each month. Street-level crime data, including information on the type of crime, date of occurrence, and approximate location, were accessed online as part of an open data sharing effort about crime and policing in England and Wales (<https://data.police.uk/>) and geocoded to the home address of the study members. An Application Program Interface was used to extract street-level crime data for each of the geospatial coordinates marking the family's home. For a full description see: <https://data.police.uk/about/#location-anonymisation>.
3. Google Street View Virtual Systematic Social Observation (SSO). The Google Streetview-SSO consisted of trained raters taking a "virtual walk" through the neighborhoods of the E-Risk families. Raters then coded neighborhoods based on what they saw on that virtual walk. Street View is a freely available tool that generates panoramic street-level views using high definition images taken from camera-equipped cars. Signals from global positioning devices are used to accurately position images in the online maps. To avoid gaps in the imagery, adjacent cameras on the car take overlapping pictures and the images are then stitched together to create a continuous 360-degree image of the street. Images are then smoothed and re-projected onto a sphere to create the image displayed in Street View (see **Figure 2**). To protect the privacy of individuals, face- and license-blurring technology is applied to ensure that people on the street and cars in the photographs cannot be identified. Google Street View came online in the United Kingdom in March 2009 and by March 2010, 94% of the E-risk children's neighborhoods were available for viewing. The Google Street View Systematic Social Observation (SSO) was completed by adapting SSO instruments for the virtual context and training raters to reliably code neighborhood features while taking a virtual walk down the street. We have reported full details of the Google Street View SSO

method, inter-rater reliability and predictive validity of the measures elsewhere¹⁹. We analyzed Google Street View SSO measures of environmental decay and disorder and perceived dangerousness.

4. Resident Surveys. A survey of residents living alongside E-Risk families was conducted when the children were 13-14 years of age to capture neighborhood-level social processes that cannot easily be captured via official records or direct observation. The sampling frame for the Neighborhood Survey was drawn using UK-Info Pro V13 <http://www.192.com/products/>. The survey responses were anonymous; no identifying information was collected. In Britain, a postcode area typically contains 15 households, with at most 100 households (e.g., a large apartment block). Therefore, survey respondents were typically living on the same street or within the same apartment block as the children in our study. Surveys were mailed to every household in the postcode registered to the electoral role, with the exception of the E-Risk family, resulting in 20,529 surveys being mailed to households to capture information on E-Risk families. On average, we received 5 (SD=3) completed surveys per neighborhood (range= 0-18 respondents). We achieved at least 3 responses for 80% of target neighborhood and at least 2 responses for 95% (resulting in a total of 5601 completed questionnaires). Survey responses were received for N=1,077 of the 1,116 families in the study. We analyzed survey measures of the following neighborhood-level social processes: fear of crime, direct victimization, neighborhood problems, and social disconnectedness.

Calculations to Evaluate How Much of the Neighborhood Gradient in Risk for Poor Educational Attainment and NEET Status Might Be Explained by Gene-Neighborhood Correlation Between the Education Polygenic Score and ACORN and Ecological-Risk Score Measures of Neighborhood Risk. We evaluated the extent to which gene-neighborhood correlations between GWAS discoveries for educational attainment and measures of neighborhood risk might account for the neighborhood gradient in risk for poor educational outcomes and NEET status.

First, we computed the average polygenic risk for E-Risk participants living in very low- and very high-risk neighborhoods (ACORN scores of 1 and 4; Ecological Risk Scores of 150 and 275) based on the regressions reported in **Supplementary Table S4** (see also **Figure 3** of the main text). For the very low- and very high-risk neighborhoods, the predicted values of the education polygenic score were -0.30 and 0.23 for ACORN and -0.21 and 0.31 for the Ecological-Risk Score, differences of about 0.5 standard deviations. (The education polygenic score is reversed in our analysis relative to the original GWAS, so high values correspond to a genetic prediction of low educational attainment.)

Next, we computed predicted values of the phenotypes for participants with those polygenic scores based on the regression reported in **Supplementary Table S1, Panel A** (see also **Figure 1** of the main text). The predicted proportions of individuals with poor educational qualifications corresponding to the low and high polygenic risk values were 19% and 24% based on the ACORN predictions and 20% and 24% based on the Ecological Risk Score predictions, differences of 4-5%. The predicted proportions of individuals who were NEET corresponding to the low and high polygenic risk values were 11% and 12% based on the ACORN predictions and 11% and 13% based on the Ecological Risk Score predictions, differences of 1-2%.

Finally, we computed predicted values of the phenotypes for participants who grew up in very low- and very high-risk neighborhoods based on the regressions reported in **Supplementary Table S3** (see also **Figure 3** of the main text). The predicted proportions of individuals with poor educational qualifications corresponding to the very low- and very high-risk neighborhoods were 8% and 38% based on the ACORN predictions and 14% and 46% based on the Ecological Risk Score predictions, differences of 30-32%. The predicted proportions of individuals who were NEET corresponding to the very low- and very high-risk neighborhoods were 7% and 20% based on the ACORN predictions and 6% and 27% based on the Ecological Risk Score predictions, differences of 13-21%.

To summarize, we observed a difference in polygenic risk for low educational attainment between very low-risk and very high-risk neighborhoods of roughly one half of one standard deviation. Based on our analysis, this difference in genetic risk could account for a difference in the prevalence of poor educational qualifications between very low-risk and very high-risk neighborhoods of 4-5%. The observed difference in the prevalence of poor educational qualifications between very low-risk and very high-risk neighborhoods was 30-32%, 6-7 times larger. The pattern of results was similar for NEET status. Based on our analysis, genetic risk could account for a neighborhood difference of 1-2% in prevalence. The observed difference in prevalence was 13-21%, an order of magnitude larger.

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1. Polygenic score and family history associations with E-Risk children's health and social problems.

Panel A shows effect-sizes for polygenic risk associations with children's health and social problems. Effect-sizes are relative risks (RR) estimated from Poisson regression models for a 1 SD increase in polygenic risk. Models included all E-Risk Study members with available genotype and phenotype data (N=1,837 for obesity; N=1,863 for mental health problems; N=1,825 for teen pregnancy; N=1,860 for poor educational qualifications; N=1,863 for NEET status). All models were adjusted for sex. Nesting of twins within families was accounted for by clustering standard errors at the family level.

Phenotype	Polygenic Score	RR	95% CI	p-value
Obesity	Body-mass Index	1.26	[1.14-1.38]	1.99E-06
Mental Health Problems	Schizophrenia	1.13	[1.02-1.26]	0.022
Teen Pregnancy	Age-at-first-birth (reversed)	1.40	[1.19-1.63]	3.24E-05
Poor Educational Qualification	Educational	1.46	[1.34-1.59]	8.96E-18
NEET	Attainment (reversed)	1.32	[1.15-1.51]	7.42E-05

Associations of polygenic scores with continuous measurements of selected phenotypes. Analysis of age-at-first-birth and NEET status are omitted because these phenotypes do not have continuous operationalizations.

Phenotype	Polygenic Score	r	95% CI	p-value
Body-mass Index	Body-mass Index	0.26	[0.21-0.31]	1.04E-21
Mental Health Problems	Schizophrenia	0.06	[0.01-0.11]	0.023
Educational Attainment	Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.28	[0.23-0.33]	1.04E-25

Panel B shows correlations between measures of polygenic and family history risk. Maternal body-mass-index (BMI) was measured from mother’s self-reported height and weight when E-Risk participants were aged 12 years (N=900 mothers of 1,780 participants; M=26, SD=6); family history of psychiatric hospitalization was measured based on family histories collected during interviews with children’s mothers as the proportion of relatives with a hospitalization (N=970 mothers of 1,920 participants; M=0.07, SD=0.13); mother’s age at first birth was collected as part of screening for enrollment in the study (N=1,011 mothers of 1,999 participants; M=24 years, SD=6); the highest education of either parent was collected during interviews when participants were aged 5 years (N=1,011 families of 1,999 participants; 12% held no educational credentials, 12% held GCSE Level-1 credentials; 35% held GCSE Level-2 credentials; 41% held GCSE Level-3 or higher credentials).

Polygenic Risk Measure	Family History Measure	Pearson r
BMI Polygenic Score	Maternal BMI	0.14
Schizophrenia Polygenic Score	Family History of Psychiatric Hospitalization	0.01
Age-at-first-birth Polygenic Score	Mother's age at first birth	0.16
Educational Attainment Polygenic Score	Parents' Education	0.23

Panel C shows effect-sizes for polygenic risk and family-history associations with children's health and social problems. Samples are restricted to children with available phenotype, genotype, and family-history information (N=1,666 for obesity; N=1,812 for mental health problems; N=1,825 for teen pregnancy; N=1,860 for poor educational qualifications; and N=1,863 for NEET status). The first column (M1) reports the effect-size for polygenic risk. The second column (M2) reports the effect-size for family-history risk. The third column (M3) reports the multivariate-adjusted effect-sizes for polygenic risk and family-history risk from a model that includes both risk factors. All models were adjusted for sex. Nesting of twins within families was accounted for by clustering standard errors at the family level.

	M1	M2 <u>RR [95% CI]</u>	M3
Obesity			
BMI Polygenic Score	1.19 [1.08-1.32]		1.16 [1.04-1.29]
Family History (maternal BMI)		1.23 [1.14-1.34]	1.22 [1.12-1.32]
Mental Health Problems			
Schizophrenia Polygenic Score	1.13 [1.01-1.26]		1.13 [1.01-1.26]
Family History (maternal family history of psychiatric hospitalization)		1.19 [1.08-1.30]	1.19 [1.08-1.30]
Teenaged Pregnancy			
Age-at-first-birth Polygenic Score (reversed)	1.40 [1.19-1.63]		1.25 [1.07-1.47]
Family History (mother's age at first birth)		2.35 [1.81-3.05]	2.24 [1.71-2.92]
Poor Educational Qualifications			
Educational Attainment Polygenic Score (reversed)	1.46 [1.34-1.59]		1.30 [1.19-1.41]
Family History (parents' education)		1.69 [1.57-1.82]	1.61 [1.48-1.74]
NEET			
Educational Attainment Polygenic Score (reversed)	1.32 [1.15-1.51]		1.16 [1.01-1.32]
Family History (parents' education)		1.72 [1.53-1.94]	1.67 [1.48-1.90]

Supplementary Table 2. Means and standard deviations of neighborhood measures and their correlations with one another.

	M	SD	Pearson Correlation					
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
(1) ACORN	2.49	1.10						
(2) Composite Ecological-Risk Index	198.46	32.77	0.65					
(3) Deprived	49.54	9.85	0.53	0.76				
(4) Dilapidated	49.73	9.79	0.52	0.85	0.50			
(5) Disconnected	49.72	9.94	0.50	0.81	0.44	0.58		
(6) Dangerous	49.39	9.88	0.61	0.89	0.58	0.72	0.64	

Supplementary Table 3. Associations between neighborhood disadvantage measures and children’s health and social problems. Table shows relative risks (RR) estimated from Poisson regression models. Nesting of twins within families was accounted for by clustering standard errors at the family level. Panel A shows results for ACORN (N=1,857) and the composite Ecological-Risk Index (N=1,822). Effect-sizes for ACORN classification are reported for a 1-category increase in social disadvantage. Effect-sizes for composite Ecological-Risk Index are reported for a 1-SD increase in ecological risk. Panel B shows results for individual ecological-risk measures. Effect-sizes are reported for a 1-SD increase in ecological risk.

Panel A

	RR	95% CI	p-value
ACORN Classification			
Obesity	1.20	[1.10-1.31]	5.52E-05
Mental Health Problems	1.19	[1.08-1.31]	6.35E-04
Teen Pregnancy	1.56	[1.34-1.83]	1.69E-08
Poor Educational Qualification	1.53	[1.40-1.67]	1.26E-20
NEET	1.52	[1.33-1.74]	1.22E-09
Composite Ecological-Risk Index			
Obesity	1.15	[1.03-1.29]	0.011
Mental Health Problems	1.30	[1.14-1.47]	5.58E-05
Teen Pregnancy	1.55	[1.30-1.85]	1.06E-06
Poor Educational Qualification	1.47	[1.33-1.62]	9.61E-14
NEET	1.59	[1.36-1.85]	5.38E-09

Panel B

	RR	95% CI	p-value
Economic Deprivation			
Obesity	1.13	[1.03-1.24]	0.010
Mental Health Problems	1.11	[1.01-1.23]	0.037
Teen Pregnancy	1.26	[1.11-1.43]	4.60E-04
Poor Educational Qualification	1.20	[1.10-1.31]	3.54E-05
NEET	1.34	[1.19-1.51]	1.18E-06
Physical Dilapidation			
Obesity	1.09	[1.00-1.19]	0.053
Mental Health Problems	1.25	[1.12-1.40]	5.05E-05
Teen Pregnancy	1.40	[1.22-1.61]	2.47E-06
Poor Educational Qualification	1.34	[1.24-1.46]	5.02E-12
NEET	1.46	[1.30-1.64]	5.21E-10
Social Disconnection			
Obesity	1.11	[1.01-1.22]	0.037
Mental Health Problems	1.18	[1.06-1.31]	0.003
Teen Pregnancy	1.35	[1.15-1.59]	2.52E-04
Poor Educational Qualification	1.31	[1.20-1.43]	2.75E-09
NEET	1.28	[1.12-1.47]	4.47E-04
Danger			
Obesity	1.08	[0.98-1.19]	0.110
Mental Health Problems	1.26	[1.11-1.42]	2.88E-04
Teen Pregnancy	1.42	[1.18-1.72]	2.40E-04
Poor Educational Qualification	1.43	[1.30-1.58]	1.02E-12
NEET	1.49	[1.27-1.75]	1.34E-06

Supplementary Table 4. Associations between neighborhood disadvantage and children’s polygenic risk for obesity, schizophrenia, young age at first birth, and low educational attainment. Table shows unstandardized coefficients from linear regression models. Nesting of twins within families was accounted for by clustering standard errors at the family level. Only one monozygotic twin from each pair was included in analysis because monozygotic twins share identical neighborhood disadvantage and polygenic score values. Panel A shows results for ACORN (N=1,441) and the composite Ecological-Risk Index (N=1,414). Coefficients can be interpreted as expected SD increase in polygenic risk per unit increase in ACORN disadvantage classification and SD increase in polygenic score per SD increase in composite Ecological-Risk Index. Panel B shows results for individual ecological-risk measures. Coefficients can be interpreted as expected SD increase in polygenic risk per SD increase in ecological-risk.

Panel A

	B	95% CI	p-value
<u>Polygenic Score</u>	ACORN Classification		
Body-mass Index	-0.01	[-0.07 , 0.04]	0.686
Schizophrenia	0.04	[-0.01 , 0.10]	0.094
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.12	[0.06 , 0.17]	2.63E-05
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.18	[0.12 , 0.23]	3.46E-10
	Composite Ecological-Risk Index		
Body-mass Index	-0.01	[-0.08 , 0.07]	0.863
Schizophrenia	0.08	[0.01 , 0.15]	0.033
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.12	[0.04 , 0.19]	0.003
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.17	[0.09 , 0.25]	3.48E-05

Panel B

	B	95% CI	p-value
<u>Polygenic Score</u>	Economic Deprivation		
Body-mass Index	0.03	[-0.03 , 0.10]	0.278
Schizophrenia	0.10	[0.04 , 0.16]	0.001
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.09	[0.03 , 0.16]	0.004
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.11	[0.04 , 0.17]	0.002
	Physical Dilapidation		
Body-mass Index	-0.02	[-0.09 , 0.05]	0.582
Schizophrenia	0.06	[0.00 , 0.12]	0.054
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.07	[0.01 , 0.13]	0.025
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.10	[0.03 , 0.16]	0.002
	Social Disconnection		
Body-mass Index	-0.02	[-0.08 , 0.04]	0.539
Schizophrenia	0.02	[-0.04 , 0.07]	0.585
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.04	[-0.02 , 0.10]	0.159
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.10	[0.04 , 0.17]	0.002
	Danger		
Body-mass Index	-0.02	[-0.09 , 0.05]	0.564
Schizophrenia	0.04	[-0.02 , 0.10]	0.197
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.10	[0.04 , 0.17]	0.002
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.15	[0.08 , 0.21]	1.60E-05

Supplementary Table 5. Association between neighborhood disadvantage and mother’s polygenic risk for obesity, schizophrenia, young age at first birth, and low educational attainment. Table shows unstandardized coefficients from linear regression models. Panel A shows results for ACORN (N=858) and the composite Ecological-Risk Index (N=841). Coefficients can be interpreted as expected SD increase in polygenic risk per unit increase in ACORN disadvantage classification and SD increase in polygenic score per SD increase in composite Ecological-Risk Index. Panel B shows results for individual ecological-risk measures. Coefficients can be interpreted as expected SD increase in polygenic risk per SD increase in ecological-risk.

Panel A

	B	95% CI	p-value
<u>Polygenic Score</u>	ACORN Classification		
Body-mass Index	0.00	[-0.07 , 0.06]	0.957
Schizophrenia	0.02	[-0.04 , 0.08]	0.508
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.14	[0.08 , 0.20]	8.45E-06
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.19	[0.13 , 0.26]	3.99E-10
	Composite Ecological-Risk Index		
Body-mass Index	0.04	[-0.05 , 0.12]	0.388
Schizophrenia	0.01	[-0.08 , 0.09]	0.834
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.21	[0.13 , 0.29]	6.89E-07
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.20	[0.12 , 0.28]	2.86E-06

Panel B


	B	95% CI	p-value
<u>Polygenic Score</u>	Economic Deprivation		
Body-mass Index	0.04	[-0.03 , 0.10]	0.262
Schizophrenia	0.03	[-0.05 , 0.10]	0.484
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.13	[0.06 , 0.19]	1.55E-04
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.15	[0.08 , 0.21]	9.82E-06
	Physical Dilapidation		
Body-mass Index	0.02	[-0.05 , 0.09]	0.562
Schizophrenia	0.00	[-0.07 , 0.08]	0.899
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.15	[0.09 , 0.22]	4.76E-06
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.10	[0.03 , 0.17]	0.005
	Social Disconnection		
Body-mass Index	0.02	[-0.04 , 0.09]	0.507
Schizophrenia	-0.03	[-0.09 , 0.04]	0.463
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.12	[0.05 , 0.19]	0.001
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.14	[0.07 , 0.21]	1.21E-04
	Danger		
Body-mass Index	0.03	[-0.05 , 0.10]	0.488
Schizophrenia	0.01	[-0.06 , 0.08]	0.721
Age at first birth (reversed)	0.16	[0.09 , 0.23]	1.04E-05
Educational Attainment (reversed)	0.15	[0.08 , 0.22]	3.04E-05

Supplementary Table 6. Effect-sizes for associations between children’s neighborhood and polygenic risks before and after covariate adjustment for their mothers’ polygenic risk. Table shows unstandardized coefficients from linear regression model of associations between neighborhood disadvantage and polygenic risk (rGE). Unadjusted associations are parallel to results reported in Supplementary Table 4 with a sample restricted to the subset of E-Risk participants for whom maternal polygenic score values were available (N=1,235 participants in 858 families for ACORN analysis and N=1,213 participants in 841 families for Ecological-Risk Index analysis). Standard errors were clustered at the family level to account for non-independence of data. Only one monozygotic twin from each pair was included in analysis because monozygotic twins share identical neighborhood disadvantage and polygenic score values.


	ACORN		Ecological-Risk Index	
	B	[95% CI]	B	[95% CI]
BMI Polygenic Score				
Unadjusted rGE	-0.01	[-0.07-0.05]	0.00	[-0.09-0.08]
Maternal PGS-adjusted	-0.01	[-0.06-0.04]	-0.02	[-0.09-0.05]
Schizophrenia Polygenic Score				
Unadjusted rGE	0.04	[-0.02-0.09]	0.05	[-0.03-0.12]
Maternal PGS-adjusted	0.04	[-0.01-0.09]	0.05	[-0.01-0.12]
Age-at-first-birth Polygenic Score (reversed)				
Unadjusted rGE	0.11	[0.05-0.17]	0.13	[0.04-0.21]
Maternal PGS-adjusted	0.04	[-0.01-0.09]	0.02	[-0.05-0.08]
Educational Attainment Polygenic Score (reversed)				
Unadjusted rGE	0.17	[0.11-0.23]	0.16	[0.08-0.25]
Maternal PGS-adjusted	0.06	[0.01-0.11]	0.05	[-0.02-0.12]

Supplementary Figures


Panel A.



Panel B.




Supplementary Figure 1. Distributions of ecological-risk assessments within ACORN neighborhood classifications. We used two different methods to measure neighborhood disadvantage: A geodemographic index (ACORN) and an Ecological Risk Index based on surveys of neighborhood residents, electronic record data, and Systematic Social Observation using Google Streetview. Neighborhoods with more socially disadvantaged ACORN classification were also more disadvantaged as measured by ecological-risk assessment. **Panel A** graphs distributions of each ecological-risk measure within each ACORN classification for N=985 families for which both ACORN and ecological-risk assessment measurements were available. For each ecological-risk measure, average risk trended upwards from the least disadvantaged ACORN classification (Wealthy Achievers) to the most disadvantaged ACORN classification (Hard Pressed). **Panel B** graphs the distribution of the composite Ecological Risk Index.



Supplementary Figure 2. Effect-sizes for associations between children’s neighborhood and polygenic risks before and after covariate adjustment for their mothers’ polygenic risk. The figure shows effect-sizes for associations between children’s polygenic and neighborhood risks in the full E-Risk sample (gray bars, N=1,441 for ACORN, 1,414 for Ecological-Risk Index, see also Supplementary Table 4), in the mother-child sub-sample which included families with genetic data on mothers and children (dark blue bars, N=1,235 for ACORN, 1,213 for the Ecological-Risk Index), and in the mother-child sub-sample after covariate adjustment for mother’s polygenic score (light blue bars). Nesting of twins within families was accounted for by clustering standard errors at the family level. The top panel shows results for ACORN neighborhood disadvantage classification. Coefficients can be interpreted as expected SD increase in polygenic risk per unit increase in ACORN disadvantage classification. The bottom panel shows results for the composite Ecological-Risk Index. Coefficients can be interpreted as expected SD increase in polygenic risk per SD increase in ecological-risk. Only one monozygotic twin from each pair was included in analysis because monozygotic twins share identical neighborhood disadvantage and polygenic score values.

Power for testing polygenic score association with neighborhood risk at effect-size $r=0.1$



Supplementary Figure 3. Power for testing genetic associations with neighborhood risk. The figure plots statistical power on the y-axis against sample-size on the x-axis for testing effect-sizes of $r=0.1$ against a null hypothesis of $r=0$. Power is plotted for the conventional alpha threshold of 0.05 as well as an alpha threshold corrected for testing 4 polygenic scores ($0.05/4=0.0125$). The sample-sizes for E-Risk and Add Health tests of genetic association with neighborhood risk are denoted by vertical blue lines. The threshold of 80% power is denoted with a horizontal red line. The graph shows that both samples have $>80\%$ power to test associations with effect-size of $r=0.1$.