Age and Sex Differences in the Genetic Architecture of Measures of Subjective Health: Relationships with Physical Health, Depressive Symptoms, and Episodic Memory

Finkel, D., Gatz, M., Franz, C. E., Catts, V. S., Christensen, K., Kremen, W., Nygaard, M., Plassman, B. L., Perminder, S., Whitfield, K., Pedersen, N. L.

CESR-SCHAEFFER
WORKING PAPER SERIES

cesr.usc.edu   **healthpolicy.usc.edu**

Age and sex differences in the genetic architecture of measures of subjective health:

Relationships with physical health, depressive symptoms, and episodic memory

Deborah Finkel, PhD[1,2], Margaret Gatz, PhD[1], Carol E. Franz, PhD[3,4], Vibeke S. Catts, PhD[5],

Kaare Christensen, MD, PhD[6], William Kremen, PhD[3,4], Marianne Nygaard, PhD[7], Brenda L.

Plassman, PhD[8], Perminder S. Sachdev, PhD[5], Keith Whitfield, PhD[9], and Nancy L. Pedersen,

PhD[10]

1. Center for Economic and Social Research, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.
2. Institute for Gerontology, College of Health and Welfare, Jönköping University, Jönköping, Sweden
3. Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA
4. Center for Behavior Genetics of Aging, University of California, San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA
5. Centre for Healthy Brain Ageing (CHeBA), Discipline of Psychiatry and Mental Health, School of Clinical Medicine, UNSW, Sydney, Australia
6. Danish Aging Research Center, Department of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark
7. The Danish Twin Registry, University of Southern Denmark, Odense C, Denmark
8. Departments of Psychiatry and Neurology, Duke University School of Medicine
9. Department of Psychology and Brain and Health, University of Nevada Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV, USA
10. Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

Corresponding Author: Deborah Finkel, dgfinkel@usc.edu

Word count main text: 5411
References: 57
Data elements: 5

ABSTRACT

Objectives. Subjective health (SH) is not just an indicator of physical health, but also reflects active cognitive processing of information about one's own health and has been associated with emotional health measures, such as neuroticism and depression. Behavior genetic approaches investigate the genetic architecture of SH, i.e., genetic and environmental influences on individual differences in SH and associations with potential components such as physical, cognitive, and emotional health. Previous twin analyses have been limited by sex, sample size, age range, and focus on single covariates.

Methods. The current analysis used data from 24,173 adults ranging in age from 40-90 years from the international Interplay of Genes and Environment Across Multiple Studies (IGEMS) consortium to investigate the genetic architecture of three measures of SH: self-rated health, health compared to others, and impact of health on activities. Independent pathways model of SH included physical health, depressive symptoms, and episodic memory, with age, sex, and country included as covariates.

Results. Most or all of the genetic variance for SH measures was shared with physical health, depressive symptoms, and episodic memory. Genetic architecture of SH differed across measures, age groups (40-65, 66-90), and sexes. Age comparisons indicated stronger correlations with all 3 covariates in older adults, often resulting from greater shared genetic variance.

Discussion. The predictive value of SH has been amply demonstrated. The higher genetic contributions to associations between SH and its components in older adults support the increasing conceptualization with age of SH as an intuitive summation of one's vital reserve.

Subjective health is typically measured with a single item. The fact that this item can predict mortality and other health outcomes independent of objective health measures (Idler & Benyamini, 1997; Latham & Peek, 2013; McFadden et al., 2009) suggests that it taps more than just perceptions of physical health. Subjective health likely also reflects active cognitive processing of explicit information about one's own health and intuitive knowledge of symptoms and physical sensations (Jylhä, 2009). Some researchers emphasize that culturally-influenced concepts of health in general play a role in subjective health (Jylhä, 2009). Subjective health has also been associated with emotional health measures, such as neuroticism and depression, that may influence response tendencies or may correlate with objective physical health measures (Östberg & Nordin, 2022; Svedberg, Bardage, Sandin, & Pedersen, 2006). In addition, individual differences in subjective health have been shown to be highly valid (predicting health outcomes) and reliable (Lundberg & Manderbacka, 1996). Therefore, it is of interest to investigate the mechanisms that drive these individual differences.

Behavior genetic methods are a powerful tool for understanding what shapes individual differences in subjective health. Previous studies suggest that between 20% and 46% of individual differences in subjective health is explained by genetic factors, and most if not all of the remaining variance is explained by unique environmental factors (Franz et al., 2017). Multivariate behavior genetic analyses can provide insight into genetic architecture of subjective health, i.e., the genetic and environmental influences on individual differences in SH and its association with potential components such as physical health and emotional health. Because subjective health arises from a combination of component variables, it is likely that the genetic variance is not specific for subjective health but rather mediated through factors related to underlying perceptions of health. Shared genetic variance among SH and covariates would

indicate that a common set of genes contributes to individual differences in these variables, impacting our understanding of subjective health and what it measures. In addition, common environmental variance among SH and the covariates may arise from the effects of environmental resources to support multiple components of health.

Myriad potential components of subjective health have been investigated, and they tend to fall into three major domains: physical health, cognitive functioning, and emotional health (Benyamini, 2016; Huisman & Deeg, 2010; Jylhä, 2009; Layes, Asada, & Kephart, 2012). Moreover, measures in all three domains have been shown to have significant genetic variance (Finkel, Gerritsen, Reynolds, Dahl, & Pedersen, 2014; Pahlen et al., 2018; Petkus et al., 2017) and thus may contribute to the genetic architecture of subjective health. In Swedish twin data, the relationship between life satisfaction and subjective health arose from both genetic and unique environmental factors after age 65; whereas, before age 65 the correlation resulted from shared and unique environmental factors (J. R. Harris, Pedersen, Stacey, McClearn, & Nesselroade, 1992). A co-twin control approach found genetic factors contributed to the relationship between subjective health and physical symptoms (Svedberg et al., 2006). Correlations between cognitive measures and subjective health were modest but significant (r's ~ .10), and they arose primarily from shared genetic variance (Svedberg, Gatz, & Pedersen, 2009). In a sample of Dutch twins, the correlation between subjective health and exercise participation was completely explained by shared genetic variance (De Moor, Stubbe, Boomsma, & De Geus, 2007). In Australian and Swedish samples, the relationship between optimism and subjective health resulted largely from shared genetic factors (Mosing, Pedersen, Martin, & Wright, 2010; Mosing, Zietsch, Shekar, Wright, & Martin, 2009). In one of the few investigations to examine the genetic architecture of subjective health incorporating multiple covariates, Leinonen and colleagues (2005) found that

there was no genetic variance specific to subjective health in a sample of Danish female twins; instead, genetic variance associated with disease severity, walking speed, and depressive symptoms explained all of the genetic variance in subjective health.

The studies reviewed here are limited by at least one of several factors: utilized a single domain of subjective health covariate, limited sample size to detect age or sex differences (Mosing, Pedersen, et al., 2010; Mosing et al., 2009), reduced age range (De Moor et al., 2007; Leinonen et al., 2005), or samples that included only one sex (De Moor et al., 2007; Leinonen et al., 2005). The experience of aging differs at midlife and later, and for men and women (Sainio et al., 2006); thus, the role of individual components of subjective health, and the genetic and environmental contributions to their inter-relationships, may vary across age and sex. The meaning of "good health" is unlikely to be the same for middle-aged and older adults; thus, genes associated with subjective health may vary between age groups. In fact, studies have suggested age differences in genetic influences on subjective health (Franz et al., 2017), as well as the genetic architecture of subjective health (J. R. Harris, Pedersen, Stacey, et al., 1992; Svedberg et al., 2009). Identification of age differences would highlight the developmental processes involved from mid- to late-life in personal conceptions of health

Sex differences in genetic influences on subjective health have also been identified (Franz et al., 2017), while attempts to identify sex differences in genetic architecture of subjective health were suggestive but limited by sample size (Mosing, Pedersen, et al., 2010; Mosing et al., 2009). Men tend to have earlier and more compressed histories of major illnesses and disability before death; whereas women live longer and have high prevalence of chronic but not fatal diseases in later life (Sainio et al., 2006). Identifying sex differences in the genetic contribution to the relationship between objective health measures and subjective health may

contribute to our understanding of the differences in the experience of aging for men and women (Deeg, Portrait, & Lindeboom, 2002). Most investigations of subjective health use a single item asking participants to rate their overall health. In previous investigations, we have found that the phrasing of the subjective health item influences the frame of reference used to respond to the item and can significantly impact results (Finkel et al., 2022; Franz et al., 2017). Both sex and age may impact frames of reference.

The goal of the current study is to investigate the genetic architecture of subjective health in a twin sample large enough to support examination of possible age and sex differences, incorporating a large age range, covariates in three domains (physical, cognitive, and emotional health), and multiple measures of subjective health. In these analyses we use data from 24,173 twins ranging in age from 40 to 90 from 10 studies from the Interplay of Genes and Environment across Multiple Studies (IGEMS) consortium (Pedersen et al., 2013; Pedersen et al., 2019). Our aims are to investigate the extent to which measures of physical health, episodic memory, and depressive symptoms contribute to the genetic architecture of subjective health, and whether the relationships among the variables differ across age, sex, or measure of subjective health.

METHOD

Participants

IGEMS is an international consortium of 18 twin studies covering the adult lifespan (Pedersen et al., 2013; Pedersen et al., 2019). The sample sizes and age ranges of the 10 IGEMS studies that collected the variables included in the current analyses are presented in Table 1. Data come from Australia, Denmark, Sweden, and the U.S. Because sample sizes were quite small before age 40 and after age 90, only data from adults aged 40 to 90 were included in the current analyses (98.6% of the full sample). Mean age in the full sample was 62.58 (sd = 11.37).

Because two studies of veterans include only male twins (NAS/NRC and VETSA), the sample was 44.67% female. Only 3 of the studies included people of color: CAATSA (100% Black), MIDUS (10.74% non-White), and VETSA (9.2% non-White). As a result, people of color made up 3.3% of the total sample for the current analyses.

Measures

Subjective Health. Three self-reported variables are used to measure subjective health, based on which items were included in the 10 IGEMS studies. All 10 studies included the most common question used to assess subjective health: "How would you rate your overall health?" (SRH). Nine of the studies asked participants to compare their health to others (COMP). Seven of the studies included a single question about how their health affected their daily activities (ACT): "Is your health condition preventing you from doing things you like to do?" As part of SF-36 (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992) administered by VETSA and MIDUS, individuals indicated whether their health affected their participation in a list of activities: responses were averaged to create a single ACT score. Across studies, response scales varied from dichotomous options to 7-point Likert scales. Previous analysis of harmonization methods (Gatz, Reynolds, et al., 2015) indicated that the most parsimonious approach was standardizing the variables within study, transforming to a T-score, and then combining data across studies. Higher scores indicated worse subjective health.

Physical Health. The Cumulative Illness Rating Scale (CIRS) was developed to provide a brief assessment of physical impairment (Linn, Linn, & Gurel, 1968). Harmonization of an IGEMS version of the CIRS is derived from the Parmelee et al. (1995) modification geared toward geriatric patients. The IGEMS CIRS reflects self-reported illnesses and medical conditions in 13 domains: cardiac, hypertension, vascular, respiratory, otolaryngological,

gastrointestinal, hepatic, renal, musculo-skeletal, neurological, endocrine-metabolic, cancer, and stroke (Gatz, Petkus, Franz, Kaprio, & Christensen, 2015). The total score is prorated for up to three missing domains. Higher scores indicated illnesses in more domains.

Depressive Symptoms. IGEMS studies administered various inventories to assess depressive symptoms (DEPR), including the including the Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression (CES-D) scale (Radloff, 1977), the Cambridge Mental Disorders of the Elderly Examination (CAMDEX) (Roth et al., 1986), General Health Questionnaire (Goldberg, 1972), and the Geriatric Depression Scale (Yesavage & Sheikh, 1986). A crosswalk between all measures of depression was developed utilizing an independent sample administered each of the scales of interest (Gatz, Reynolds, et al., 2015). Rasch IRT modeling was used to obtain latent trait score estimates representing an underlying depressive symptoms continuum. Each scale was transformed to CAMDEX units. Higher scores indicated more depressive symptoms.

Episodic Memory. The harmonized Word List variable (WORD) is a test of verbal recall that asked participants to listen to or read aloud 10 to 16 words (number varied across study), and then immediately repeat back as many words as possible. From the raw score, a percent correct score was created and then translated to a T-score within study, based on mean and standard deviation in the 65-70 age range (Luczak et al., 2023). Higher scores indicated better memory performance; however, for the current analyses WORD scores were reversed so that higher scores indicated worse functioning on all variables.

Statistical Methods

The standard twin method incorporates monozygotic (MZ) twins and dizygotic (DZ) twins to decompose the variance of any trait into the proportion attributed to additive genetic influences (A), shared environmental influences that contribute to similarity within families (C),

and unique environmental influences that contribute to differences within families (E). MZ twins share all their genetic material (A) and DZ twins share on average half of their segregating genes. In standard analysis of twin data, effects attributable to measurement error are included with E. Data from both complete and incomplete pairs can be included, with incomplete pairs contributing to estimation of means.

The independent pathways model (Martin & Eaves, 1977) was used to estimate the extent of shared genetic and environmental variance among SH measures and physical health, depressive symptoms, and word recall, as shown in Figure 1. Variance shared among the variables is decomposed into three latent common factors: Ag, Cg, and Eg. The residual variance that is not shared among the 4 variables but specific to an individual variable is also decomposed into specific factors for each variable: As, Cs, and Es. Reduced versions of the model were tested to identify the most parsimonious model to fit the data and, especially, to examine whether genetic and environment variance specific to subjective health (gray circles in Figure 1) remained significant when physical health, depressive symptoms, and word recall were included in the model. All statistical models were tested using the structural equation-modeling package Open Mx 2.20.6 (Boker et al., 2021). Analyses were cross-sectional, using first wave at which study variables were collected for each study. Evaluation of relative fit of statistical models was performed using the likelihood-ratio-test (LRT). Given the number of models compared, significance level was set at $p < .01$.

To examine possible sex differences in the genetic architecture of subjective health, equality of model parameters across sex was tested by setting parameters equal across sexes and using LRT to examine reduction in model fit. The models were corrected for age and country. The same method was used to examine possible age differences in the genetic architecture of

subjective health, with the sample divided at the median age of 66 to create middle-aged and older groups. The models were corrected for age (within groups), sex, and country.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Mean and standard deviations for all measures within each of the 10 studies are reported in Supplemental Table 1. Overall, the sample reported illnesses in 1.77 domains on average (SD = 1.63) and the mean ranged from 0.86 in MIDUS (the youngest sample) to 3.34 in OATS (one of the oldest samples). Overall mean on depressive symptoms was 20.60 (SD = 4.24), with study means ranging from 19.26 (MADT) to 23.74 (SATSA). Mean word recall was lowest in LSADT, the oldest sample, and highest in MIDT, one of the youngest samples. Means of the three subjective health variables did not vary greatly across studies.

Phenotypic correlations between the three subjective health variables and the covariates (physical health, depressive symptoms, and word recall) in the total sample and separately for men and women, middle-aged and older are reported in Supplemental Table 2. All correlations were significant at p < .01; however, correlations with SRH and ACT tended to be higher than correlations with COMP. Correlations between the three subjective health variables and word recall (ranging from .06 to .13) were lower than between the subjective health variables and physical health or depressive symptoms (ranging from .21 to .42). The correlations between the three subjective health and depressive symptoms were weaker for middle-aged participants (ranging from .21 to .34) than for older participants (ranging from .29 to .42).

Components of Variance

Independent pathways models support two approaches to understanding the genetic architecture of subjective health: components of variance and bivariate relationships. Examining

components of variance provides a test of the presence of any variance unique to subjective

health (As_s, Cs_s, and Es_s) in the context of variance associated with all three covariates combined

(Ag, Cg, and Eg; see bold paths in Figure 1). Supplemental Table 3 provides the model fit

statistics for the full and reduced models, indicating which parameters were dropped without

significantly reducing model fit. The full list of parameter estimates (and standard errors) from

best-fitting models is provided in Supplemental Tables 4 - 6. These parameter estimates were

used to calculate the A, C, and E variance for each subjective health variable shared with

depressive symptoms, physical health, and memory (general variance) and specific to the

subjective health variable (specific variance) reported in Table 2. Heritability estimates for the

three subjective health measures were 38% (SRH), 33% (ACT), and 24% (COMP). Little or no

C variance was identified in the models. However, for all three subjective health variables, all or

nearly all the genetic variance (A) was shared with the covariates and there was little or no

genetic variance specific to a subjective health variable. The only real source of variance specific

to subjective health was nonshared environmental variance (E): estimates were .07 (SRH), .11

(ACT), and .25 (COMP). Overall, 92% of total variance in SRH was shared with depressive

symptoms, physical health, and memory, 84% of ACT, and 62% of COMP.

Models were then tested for sex and age differences; Supplemental Table 3 provides the

model fit statistics for the full and reduced models, indicating which parameters were dropped

and which parameters were equated across groups without significantly reducing model fit. The

full list of parameter estimates (and standard errors) from best-fitting models are provided in

Supplemental Tables 4 - 6. These parameter estimates were used to calculate the general and

specific A, C, and E reported in Table 3, separately for men and women and middle-aged and

older adults. Variances specific to COMP were either dropped (As_s and Cs_s) or identical across

both sex and age groups (Es$_s$) in best-fitting models; therefore, the results for COMP are not included in Table 3. Again, no genetic variance specific to SRH and ACT was indicated, and little or no shared environmental variance. Total variances in SRH and ACT was greater for older than middle-aged adults, but the impact on heritability estimates was modest.

Two primary sex differences were identified in variance components. For SRH, higher total variance in men was explained by greater nonshared environment specific to SRH in men than women (.14 vs .03). As a result, both heritability (43% vs 37%) and proportion of total variance in SRH shared with the covariates (95% vs 84%) was higher for women than men. For ACT, the genetic variance was greater in women than men, again resulting in higher heritability for women than men (46% vs 37%) and greater proportion of total variance in ACT shared with the covariates for women than men (84% vs 80%).

Bivariate Relationships

The second approach to understanding genetic architecture supported by the independent pathways model focuses on the nature of the bivariate relationships between subjective health and each covariate, individually. Using the Ag, Cg, and Eg pathways in the model, it is possible the calculate the A, C, and E contributions to the phenotypic correlations between measures of subjective health and the three covariates (see Figure 2). Physical health has the highest correlation with SRH and similar correlations with ACT and COMP. Contributions to all 3 correlations were equally divided between A and E. Correlations with depressive symptoms were similar for both SRH and ACT and lower for COMP, and correlations were equally divided between A and E. Although correlations with word list were modest and similar across measures of subjective health, in this case they arose primarily or entirely from shared genetic variance.

Comparisons of correlations across age and sex are also presented in Figure 2. With one exception (COMP x CIRS) correlations are stronger in older adults than middle-aged adults. For SRH and ACT, the age differences in correlations are primarily driven by higher E contributions. For ACT x CIRS, all 3 components of the correlation are higher in older adults. The decomposition of the correlation with subjective health measures is markedly different for word list. In this case, the correlation is primarily or entirely driven by shared genetic variance in older adults, while in middle aged adults the correlation is divided between genetic variance and shared and/or nonshared environmental variance. Sex differences in correlations are more mixed. In three instances, the total correlation and the genetic and environmental contributions to the correlations are identical for men and women (SRH x DEPR, COMP x DEPR, and COMP x WORD). In three instances (SRH x CIRS, COMP x CIRS, ACT x WORD) the total correlation is the same for men and women, but the A contribution is greater in men than women. In two instances, a greater correlation in women arises from more nonshared environmental variance common to the two variables (ACT x CIRS and ACT x DEPR). Finally, the A contribution for SRH x WORD is the same for men and women, but a contribution of C in men results in a higher total correlation in men than women.

Additional Analyses

Combining across three U.S. studies (CAATSA, VETSA, and MIDUS) resulted in a sample of 612 Black twins from 89 complete MZ pairs, 141 complete DZ, and individuals from incomplete pairs. Analyses were repeated in this sample to examine possible racial/ethnic differences in the genetic architecture of SRH and COMP (CAATSA did not include ACT). Power to detect small effects was reduced in the smaller sample; however, the best-fitting models for SRH and COMP in the full sample also resulted in sufficient fit to the data in the Black twin

sample. Comparison of results between the full sample and the Black sample (Supplemental figures S1 and S2) indicated modest differences in parameter estimates but no differences in overall pattern of results.

DISCUSSION

The current analyses represent the largest twin sample, by far, used to investigate the genetic architecture of different subjective health measures and possible age, sex, and measure differences in that architecture. Generally, results indicated that most or all of the genetic influences on measures of subjective health were mediated through genetic influences on physical health, depressive symptoms, and episodic memory, leaving little or no genetic variance unaccounted for, or specific to subjective health. Overall, 92% of total variance in SRH was shared with depressive symptoms, physical health, and memory, 84% of ACT, and 62% of COMP. That associations among physical health, depressive symptoms, and subjective health measures are explained by genetic influences in common makes intuitive sense since these measures all involve observations and experiences of one's physical and mental health as well as similar methodology (self-report). The primarily genetic nature of the relationship between episodic memory and, in particular SRH and ACT also suggests a set of genes influencing both cognitive processing of information about one's own health and perceptions of health (Bailis, Segall, & Chipperfield, 2003; Benyamini, 2011; Jylhä, 2009). This is of particular interest since the episodic memory measure is not self-report unlike the depressive symptoms and physical health measures. It is also possible that subtle changes in episodic memory are detected by aging adults and incorporated into perceptions of health (Svedberg et al., 2009). Measures of subjective health are very commonly used in large epidemiological surveys, clinical trials, and in clinical practice, yet few studies examine multiple measures of subjective health, in particular their

genetic architecture and/or relationship with other outcomes. In addition, most twin studies have been underpowered to examine the influence of sex and wide age ranges. Finally, little attention is paid to sources of differences in associations with outcomes, for instance due to different forms of the subjective health questions or the effects of age and sex.

Correlations between the subjective health measures and the covariates were fairly equally divided between genetic and unique environmental sources, with the exception of episodic memory where the correlations between subjective health measures and word list were primarily mediated genetically. Previous investigations of genetic architecture of subjective health measures have reported similar findings for individual covariates of subjective health (J. R. Harris, Pedersen, Stacey, et al., 1992; Leinonen et al., 2005; Mosing, Pedersen, et al., 2010; Svedberg et al., 2006; Svedberg et al., 2009). Moreover, GWAS analyses have identified a variety of SNPs that may contribute to subjective health, including SNPs associated with various health conditions, major depression, and measures of intelligence (S. E. Harris et al., 2017; Mosing, Verweij, et al., 2010). Although modest (r's ~ .10), correlations between subjective health and memory were consistent with the literature (e.g., (Svedberg et al., 2009) and mediated primarily by genetic factors, particularly in late adulthood. Several studies indicate that subjective health can predict subsequent cognitive decline (Bendayan, Piccinin, Hofer, & Muniz, 2017; Bond et al., 2006; Carmelli, Swan, LaRue, & Eslinger, 1997; Sargent-Cox, Cherbuin, Sachdev, & Anstey, 2011), suggesting the possibility that genetic variance contributes to important facets of cognition that underly perceptions of (physical and cognitive) health and are vulnerable to changes with age.

The variance component specific to subjective health measures identified in these analyses was unique environmental variance. Unique environmental variance specific to

subjective health could arise from measurement error, which is included in the estimate of E. Although studies suggest high reliability for the most common measure of subjective health (SRH) (Lundberg & Manderbacka, 1996), ACT and COMP are less frequently measured, and reliability data are not as available. These measures may be more subject to measurement error, or they may be more sensitive than SRH to true environmental differences within families.

Different subjective health items tap different frames of reference for "good health," which can change the weighting of the factors that constitute self-perception of health (Franz et al., 2017; Sargent-Cox, Anstey, & Luszcz, 2008, 2010). Changing the frame of reference of a subjective health item from self (SRH) to activities (ACT) or "others" (COMP) appears to affect the genetic architecture of subjective health, such that more unique environmental variance specific to the measure are tapped by ACT and COMP than by SRH. Unique environmental sources of variance could include changes in physical health not captured by CIRS (e.g., changes in walking pace, balance, or sleep) or changes in the environment including loss of friends, widowhood, reduced social activity, lifestyle changes, living situations, or changes in health or abilities of members of one's social circle (J. R. Harris, Pedersen, Stacey, et al., 1992; Svedberg et al., 2009). The change in frame of reference could even tap different individual conceptions of the meaning of "good health" for self vs. peers vs. abilities (Jylhä, 2009). Studies that rely on a single subjective health item (e.g., SRH) may obscure interesting distinctions in the etiology and implications of diverse subjective health measures.

Age Differences

In addition to differences between subjective health measures, age differences in genetic architecture of subjective health were also identified for SRH and ACT, but not for COMP, with greater total variance for older than for middle-aged. Other analyses have also found that results

for SRH and ACT tend to be more similar than results for COMP (Finkel et al., 2022; Franz et al., 2017). Increasing total variance for SRH and ACT is not surprising. People age at different rates, so individual differences in physical health increase with age, as well as individual differences in perceptions of health (Finkel et al., 2014; J. R. Harris, Pedersen, McClearn, Nesselroade, & Plomin, 1992). The genetic architecture underlying these increases in variance indicated increases in unique environmental variance for both SRH and ACT and increases in genetic variance for ACT. Correlations between all three measures of subjective health and the three covariates were higher in older than in middle-aged adults, especially correlations with word list. Previous studies have reported similar age differences (J. R. Harris, Pedersen, Stacey, et al., 1992).

These differences in genetic architecture suggest that subjective health measures may not be equivalent for middle-aged and older adults and may reflect different subjective conceptions of health. In particular, the role of memory in shaping subjective health is greater in older than in middle-aged adults. Evidence suggests that the discordance between objective health measures and subjective health increases in late adulthood (French, Sargent-Cox, & Luszcz, 2012; Zikic et al., 2009), possibly as a result of greater emphasis on psychological components of subjective health assessments by older adults (Araújo, Teixeira, Ribeiro, & Paúl, 2018; Pinquart, 2001). Older adults may normalize their current health status by shifting their expectations of health (Puvill et al., 2016). Increased attention with age to perceived memory difficulties, in particular, may play a larger role in judgments of one's own health in later adulthood (Svedberg et al., 2009). In fact, awareness of cognitive change is associated with measures of subjective health (Sabatini et al., 2021). The higher genetic contributions to associations between subjective health and its components found in older adults in the current analyses may reflect an increasingly

holistic self-assessment of health across domains in later ages that relies on a common set of genes associated with self-evaluation of functioning. Healthy aging is typically easier with sufficient resources, so the increasing genetic covariance may also arise from an underlying ability to amass and leverage resources in support of health (Mirowsky & Ross, 2003; Ross & Wu, 1996).

Sex Differences

Current analyses generally supported the sex differences in subjective health reported by previous studies (Mosing, Pedersen, et al., 2010; Mosing et al., 2009). Heritability of both SRH and ACT was higher for women than men, although the underlying genetic architecture differed. Sex differences in the etiology of the correlations between subjective health and the covariates differed across measures of subjective health. Sex differences in genetic influences on measures physical health tend to be mixed (Finkel et al., 2014), although any sex differences in heritabilities may reflect the higher prevalence of genetically influenced chronic disabling diseases in women compared to men's more compressed history of disability prior to death (Sainio et al., 2006). In the current analyses, overlapping genetic factors contributed more to the associations between physical health and SRH and COMP in men, but to the associations between physical health and ACT in women, where in women ACT seems to be a key component of subjective health. It is possible, then, that higher rates of chronic disabling conditions in women are captured more by the perceived impact of health on one's activities than by general ratings of health and comparison to peers.

Research suggests that mean levels of depressive symptoms tend to be higher in women than men, as does heritability for depression (Petkus et al., 2017). Investigation of the genetic architecture of depressive symptoms indicated that the association between depressive symptoms

and physical health resulted more from common genetic factors in men than in women (Petkus et al., 2017). In contrast, little or no sex differences in the genetic architecture of the association between subjective health and depression were identified in the current analyses, again highlighting the differences between physical health and subjective health.

Limitations

Pooling data across samples provided the sample size and thus statistical power to detect subtle age, sex, and measure differences in the genetic architecture of subjective health. However, pooling relies on harmonization of measures across multiple studies, which can be a source of measurement error. The measures of subjective health and depressive symptoms used in the current analyses were included in crosswalk samples to identify the optimal methods for harmonization (Gatz, Reynolds, et al., 2015). Harmonization of the measures of physical health and episodic memory were the result of extensive work by members of the IGEMS team (Gatz, Petkus, et al., 2015; Luczak et al., 2023). Pooling variables across countries could introduce error if there are significant country effects on measurement or recruiting procedures. For example, culturally-influenced concepts of health may differ across countries (Jylhä, 2009). To address this possibility, the models were corrected for country effects. Finally, while the sample drawn from twin studies in four countries (Australia, Denmark, Sweden, and USA) was large and diverse in the variables of interest for this analysis, ethnic and racial compositions of the IGEMS samples were fairly homogenous.

Conclusions

In the largest investigation of the genetic architecture of subjective health to date, results indicate that, although these subjective measures all showed significant genetic influences, there was little or no genetic variance <u>specific</u> to measures of subjective health. Instead, genes

contributing to perceptions of health are completely explained by genes associated with physical health, depressive symptoms, and episodic memory combined. All three covariates were necessary to explain the genetic variance in subjective health. The etiology of the relationship between subjective health and episodic memory was largely genetic while both genetic and environmental factors contributed to the associations between physical health and depressive symptoms and subjective health. The genetic architecture of subjective health differed across measures of subjective health (self-rated, compared to others, impact on activities) and between age group and sexes.

The predictive value of subjective health has been amply demonstrated; the current analyses identified significant nuances in the etiology of subjective health that contribute to understanding the value of subjective health for maintaining and improving quality of life of older adults. The higher genetic contributions to associations between SH and the three covariates (depressive symptoms, illnesses, memory) in older adults reported here support the conceptualization that, with increasing age, perceptions of health constitute intuitive summations of one's vital reserve in multiple domains (Jylhä, 2009). GWAS analyses of subjective health (S. E. Harris et al., 2017; Mosing, Verweij, et al., 2010) also support a multidimensional approach. Like any analysis, however, GWAS may be susceptible to age specific effects, either through changes in relative weight of the multi-dimensional components of subjective health or changes in probability of "risk" alleles through population mortality (Escott-Price & Schmidt, 2023). For optimal utility, investigations of subjective health should take into account age, sex, and the multidimensionality of the construct of subjective health.

REFERENCES

Araújo, L., Teixeira, L., Ribeiro, O., & Paúl, C. (2018). Objective vs. subjective health in very advanced ages: looking for discordance in centenarians. *Frontiers in Medicine, 5*, 189. doi:10.3389/fmed.2018.00189

Bailis, D. S., Segall, A., & Chipperfield, J. G. (2003). Two views of self-rated general health status. *Social science & medicine, 56*(2), 203-217. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(02)00020-5

Bendayan, R., Piccinin, A. M., Hofer, S. M., & Muniz, G. (2017). Are changes in self-rated health associated with memory decline in older adults? *Journal of aging and health, 29*(8), 1410-1423.

Benyamini, Y. (2011). Why does self-rated health predict mortality? An update on current knowledge and a research agenda for psychologists. *Psychology & health, 26*(11), 1407-1413. doi:10.1080/08870446.2011.621703

Benyamini, Y. (2016). Self-rated health. *Assessment in health psychology*, 175-188. doi:10.1027/00452-000

Boker, S., Neale, M., Maes, H., Wilde, M., Spiegel, M., Brick, T., . . . Kirkpatrick, R. (2021). OpenMx user guide release 2.19.1-1. In.

Bond, J., Dickinson, H. O., Matthews, F., Jagger, C., Brayne, C., & CFAS, M. (2006). Self-rated health status as a predictor of death, functional and cognitive impairment: a longitudinal cohort study. *European Journal of Ageing, 3*, 193-206.

Carmelli, D., Swan, G. E., LaRue, A., & Eslinger, P. J. (1997). Correlates of change in cognitive function in survivors from the Western Collaborative Group Study. *Neuroepidemiology, 16*(6), 285-295.

De Moor, M., Stubbe, J., Boomsma, D., & De Geus, E. (2007). Exercise participation and self-rated health: do common genes explain the association? *European Journal of Epidemiology, 22*, 27-32. doi:10.1007/s10654-006-9088-8

Deeg, D. J. H., Portrait, F., & Lindeboom, M. (2002). Health profiles and profile-specific health expectancies of older women and men: The Netherlands. *Journal of Women and Aging, 14*, 27-46.

Escott-Price, V., & Schmidt, K. M. (2023). Pitfalls of predicting age-related traits by polygenic risk scores. *Annals of Human Genetics, 87*(5), 203-209.

Finkel, D., Gerritsen, L., Reynolds, C. A., Dahl, A. K., & Pedersen, N. L. (2014). Etiology of individual differences in human health and longevity. In R. L. Sprott (Ed.), *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics – Genetics* (pp. 189-227). New York: Springer.

Finkel, D., Zavala, C., Franz, C. E., Pahlen, S., Gatz, M., Pedersen, N. L., . . . Ericsson, M. (2022). Financial strain moderates genetic influences on self-rated health: support for diathesis–stress model of gene–environment interplay. *Biodemography and Social Biology, 67*(1), 58-70. doi:10.1080/19485565.2022.2037069

Franz, C. E., Finkel, D., Panizzon, M. S., Spoon, K., Christensen, K., Gatz, M., . . . Reynolds, C. (2017). Facets of subjective health from early adulthood to old age. *Journal of aging and health, 29*(1), 149-171. doi:10.1177/0898264315625488

French, D. J., Sargent-Cox, K., & Luszcz, M. A. (2012). Correlates of subjective health across the aging lifespan: Understanding self-rated health in the oldest old. *Journal of aging and health, 24*(8), 1449-1469.

Gatz, M., Petkus, A. J., Franz, C., Kaprio, J., & Christensen, K. (2015). *Age moderation of individual differences in chronic medical illness burden*. Paper presented at the Behavior Genetics Association, San Diego, CA.

Gatz, M., Reynolds, C. A., Finkel, D., Hahn, C. J., Zhou, Y., & Zavala, C. (2015). Data harmonization in aging research: Not so fast. *Experimental aging research, 41*(5), 475-495. doi:10.1080/0361073X.2015.1085748

Goldberg, P. (1972). The detection of psychiatric illness by questionnaire. *Maudsley monograph*.

Harris, J. R., Pedersen, N. L., McClearn, G. E., Nesselroade, J. R., & Plomin, R. (1992). Age differences in genetic and environmental influences for health from the Swedish Adoption/Twin Study of Aging. *Journal of Gerontology, 47*(3), P213-P220. doi:10.1093/geronj/47.3.P213

Harris, J. R., Pedersen, N. L., Stacey, C., McClearn, G., & Nesselroade, J. R. (1992). Age differences in the etiology of the relationship between life satisfaction and self-rated health. *Journal of aging and health, 4*(3), 349-368. doi:10.1177/089826439200400302

Harris, S. E., Hagenaars, S. P., Davies, G., David Hill, W., Liewald, D. C., Ritchie, S. J., . . . Group, L. (2017). Molecular genetic contributions to self-rated health. *International journal of epidemiology, 46*(3), 994-1009.

Huisman, M., & Deeg, D. J. (2010). A commentary on Marja Jylhä's "What is self-rated health and why does it predict mortality? Towards a unified conceptual model"(69: 3, 2009, 307–316). *Social science & medicine, 70*(5), 652-654. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.11.003

Idler, E. L., & Benyamini, Y. (1997). Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. *J Health Soc Behav, 38*(9097506), 21-37. Retrieved from http://www.hubmed.org/display.cgi?uids=9097506

Jylhä, M. (2009). What is self-rated health and why does it predict mortality? Towards a unified conceptual model. *Social science & medicine, 69*(3), 307-316. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.05.013

Latham, K., & Peek, C. W. (2013). Self-rated health and morbidity onset among late midlife US adults. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 68*(1), 107-116. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbs104

Layes, A., Asada, Y., & Kephart, G. (2012). Whiners and deniers–What does self-rated health measure? *Social science & medicine, 75*(1), 1-9. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.10.030

Leinonen, R., Kaprio, J., Jylhä, M., Tolvanen, A., Koskenvuo, M., Heikkinen, E., & Rantanen, T. (2005). Genetic influences underlying self-rated health in older female twins. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 53*(6), 1002-1007. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53319.x

Linn, B. S., Linn, M. W., & Gurel, L. (1968). Cumulative illness rating scale. *Journal of the American Geriatric Society, 16*, 622-626.

Luczak, S. E., Beam, C. R., Pahlen, S., Lynch, M., Pilgrim, M., Reynolds, C. A., . . . Finkel, D. (2023). Remember this: Age moderation of genetic and environmental contributions to verbal episodic memory from midlife through late adulthood. *Intelligence, 99*, 101759. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2023.101759

Lundberg, O., & Manderbacka, K. (1996). Assessing reliability of a measure of self-rated health. *Scandinavian journal of social medicine, 24*(3), 218-224. doi:10.1177/140349489602400314

Martin, N. G., & Eaves, L. J. (1977). The genetical analysis of covariance structure. *Heredity, 138*, 79-95. doi:10.1038/hdy.1977.9

McFadden, E., Luben, R., Bingham, S., Wareham, N., Kinmonth, A.-L., & Khaw, K.-T. (2009). Does the association between self-rated health and mortality vary by social class? . *Social Science & Medicine, 68*, p275-280.

Mirowsky, J., & Ross, C. E. (2003). *Education, social class, and health*. New York, New York: Aldine deGruyter.

Mosing, M. A., Pedersen, N. L., Martin, N. G., & Wright, M. J. (2010). Sex differences in the genetic architecture of optimism and health and their interrelation: A study of Australian and Swedish twins *Twin Research and Human Genetics, 13*(4), 322-329. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.10.012

Mosing, M. A., Verweij, K. J. H., Medland, S. E., Painter, J., Gordon, S. D., Heath, A. C., . . . Martin, N. G. (2010). A genome-wide association study of self-rated health. *Twin Research and Human Genetics, 13*(4), 398-403. doi:10.1375/twin.13.4.398

Mosing, M. A., Zietsch, B. P., Shekar, S. N., Wright, M. J., & Martin, N. G. (2009). Genetic and environmental influences on optimism and its relationship to mental and self-rated health: A study of aging twins. *Behavior Genetics, 39*, 597-604. doi:10.1007/s10519-009-9287-7

Östberg, D., & Nordin, S. (2022). Three-year prediction of depression and anxiety with a single self-rated health item. *Journal of Mental Health, 31*(3), 402-409. doi:10.1080/09638237.2021.2022610

Pahlen, S., Hamdi, N. R., Dahl Aslan, A. K., Horwitz, B. N., Panizzon, M. S., Petersen, I., . . .
McGue, M. (2018). Age-moderation of genetic and environmental contributions to
cognitive functioning in mid-and late-life for specific cognitive abilities. *Intelligence, 68*,
70-81. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2017.12.004

Parmelee, P. A., Thuras, P. D., Katz, I. R., & Lawton, M. P. (1995). Validation of the Cumulative
Illness Rating Scale in a geriatric residential population. *Journal of the American
Geriatrics Society, 43*(2), 130-137. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.1995.tb06377.x

Pedersen, N. L., Christensen, K., Dahl, A., Finkel, D., Franz, C. E., Gatz, M., . . . Reynolds, C. A.
(2013). IGEMS: The Consortium on Interplay of Genes and Environment across Multiple
Studies. *Twin Research and Human Genetics, 16*, 481-489. doi:10.1017/thg.2012.110

Pedersen, N. L., Gatz, M., Finch, B. K., Finkel, D., Butler, D. A., Aslan, A. D., . . . McGue, M.
(2019). IGEMS: the Consortium on interplay of genes and environment across multiple
studies—an update. *Twin Research and Human Genetics, 22*(6), 809-816.
doi:10.1017/thg.2019.76

Petkus, A. J., Beam, C. R., Johnson, W., Kaprio, J., Korhonen, T., McGue, M., . . . Gatz, M.
(2017). Gene–environment interplay in depressive symptoms: moderation by age, sex,
and physical illness. *Psychological medicine, 47*(10), 1836-1847.
doi:10.1017/S0033291717000290

Pinquart, M. (2001). Correlates of subjective health in older adults: a meta-analysis. *Psychology
and aging, 16*(3), 414.

Puvill, T., Lindenberg, J., Gussekloo, J., de Craen, A. J., Slaets, J. P., & Westendorp, R. G.
(2016). Associations of various health-ratings with geriatric giants, mortality and life

satisfaction in older people. *PLoS One, 11*(9), e0163499.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0163499

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depressive mood scale for research in the

general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 3*(1), 385-401.

doi:10.1177/014662167700100306

Ross, C. E., & Wu, C. L. (1996). Education, age, and the cumulative advantage in health.

Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 37, 104-120. doi:10.2307/2137234

Roth, M., Tym, E., Mountjoy, C. Q., Huppert, F. A., Hendrie, H., Verma, S., & Goddard, R.

(1986). CAMDEX: a standardised instrument for the diagnosis of mental disorder in the

elderly with special reference to the early detection of dementia. *The British journal of

psychiatry, 149*(6), 698-709. doi:10.1192/bjp.149.6.698

Sabatini, S., Ukoumunne, O. C., Ballard, C., Collins, R., Anstey, K. J., Diehl, M., . . . Hampshire,

A. (2021). Cross-sectional association between objective cognitive performance and

perceived age-related gains and losses in cognition. *International psychogeriatrics, 33*(7),

727-741. doi:10.1017/S1041610221000375

Sainio, P., Koskinen, S., Heliovaara, M., Martelin, T., Harkanen, T., Hurri, H., & Aromaa, A.

(2006). Self-reported and test-based mobility limitations in a representative sample of

Finns aged 30. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 34*, 378-286.

doi:10.1080/14034940500489859

Sargent-Cox, K. A., Anstey, K. J., & Luszcz, M. A. (2008). Determinants of self-rated health

items with different points of reference: implications for health measurement of older

adults. *Journal of aging and health, 20*(6), 739-761.

Sargent-Cox, K. A., Anstey, K. J., & Luszcz, M. A. (2010). Patterns of longitudinal change in older adults' self-rated health: The effect of the point of reference. *Health psychology, 29*(2), 143.

Sargent-Cox, K. A., Cherbuin, N., Sachdev, P., & Anstey, K. J. (2011). Subjective health and memory predictors of mild cognitive disorders and cognitive decline in ageing: the Personality and Total Health (PATH) through Life Study. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 31*(1), 45-52.

Svedberg, P., Bardage, C., Sandin, S., & Pedersen, N. L. (2006). A prospective study of health, life-style and psychosocial predictors of self-rated health. *European Journal of Epidemiology, 21*, 767-776. doi:10.1007/s10654-006-9064-3

Svedberg, P., Gatz, M., & Pedersen, N. L. (2009). Genetic and environmental mediation of the associations between self-rated health and cognitive abilities. *Experimental aging research, 35*(2), 178-201. doi:10.1080/03610730902720372

Ware, J. E., & Sherbourne, C. D. (1992). The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36): I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical care*, 473-483. doi:10.1097/00005650-199206000-00002

Yesavage, J. A., & Sheikh, J. I. (1986). 9/Geriatric depression scale (GDS) recent evidence and development of a shorter version. *Clinical gerontologist, 5*(1-2), 165-173.

Zikic, L., Jankelic, S., Milosevic, D., Despotovic, N., Erceg, P., & Davidovic, M. (2009). Self-perception of health (SPH) in the oldest-old subjects. *Archives of gerontology and geriatrics, 49*, 245-249.

FUNDING

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

IGEMS Data Availability

IGEMS data are not publicly available given the variety of data agreements and regulations governing the different studies and countries. However, many of the individual studies participating in IGEMS do have ways to access their data, some by direct request to the participating study, and many of the datasets may be accessed through National Archive of Computerized Data on Aging (NACDA). See https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR03843.v2 (SATSA), https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR25963.v2 (Study of Dementia in Swedish Twins), https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR02760.v19 (MIDUS), and https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/NACDA/studies/36234/versions/V6 (National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Twin Registry). Two studies may be requested through Maelstrom: OCTO-Twin https://www.maelstrom-research.org/study/octo-twin and GENDER https://www.maelstrom-research.org/study/gender. For access to data from the Danish Twin Registry, see

https://www.sdu.dk/en/om_sdu/institutter_centre/ist_sundhedstjenesteforsk/centre/dtr/researcher.

To request OATS data please contact the CHeBA Research Bank via email on

CHeBAData@unsw.edu.au for a current application form. For VETSA data, see instructions to

researchers:

https://medschool.ucsd.edu/som/psychiatry/research/VETSA/Researchers/Pages/default.aspx

Table 1. Sample description.

Study	N individuals	MZ/DZ pairs	% Female	Age Range	Mean Age (SD)	Subjective health variables
Australia						
OATS	496	119/96	65.72	65 - 90	71.18 (5.40)	SRH, ACT, COMP
Denmark						
LSADT	4091	410/604	57.88	70 - 90	76.35 (4.90)	SRH, ACT, COMP
MADT	4256	666/1195	48.87	45 - 68	56.38 (6.34)	SRH, ACT, COMP
MIDT	9924	704/2143	53.12	40 - 80	56.59 (9.40)	SRH, ACT, COMP
Sweden						
GENDER	425	0/211	48.47	69 - 79	72.89 (2.58)	SRH, ACT, COMP
SATSA	314	38/72	61.46	48 - 86	65.78 (8.27)	SRH, ACT, COMP
USA						
CAATSA	404	57/63	59.41	40 - 89	55.79 (11.18)	SRH, COMP
MIDUS	188	48/20	59.57	40 - 72	51.98 (8.84)	SRH, ACT, COMP
NAS/NRC	2850	742/629	0.00	70 - 82	74.12 (2.76)	SRH, ACT
VETSA	1225	340/260	0.00	51 - 61	55.89 (2.48)	SRH, ACT, COMP
Total	24,173	3124/5293	44.67	40 - 90	62.58 (11.37)	

Note: MZ = Monozygotic twins, DZ = Dizygotic twins
Studies: OATS = Older Australian Twin Study, LSADT = Longitudinal Study of Aging Danish Twins, MADT = Middle-Aged Danish Twins, MIDT = Mid-aged Danish Twins, GENDER = Ageing in Men and Women, SATSA = Swedish Adoption/Twin Study of Aging, CAATSA = Carolina African- American Twin Study of Aging, MIDUS = Midlife in the United States, NAS/NRC = National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, VETSA = Vietnam Era Twin Study of Aging
Variables: SRH = self-rated health, ACT = health impacts activities, COMP = health compared to others

Table 2. Variance components for three measures of subjective health

Component	SRH	ACT	COMP
A variance			
General	.30	.23	.16
Specific	.00	.00	.01
Total	.30	.23	.17
C variance			
General	.00	.00	.00
Specific	.00	.01	.00
Total	.00	.01	.00
E variance			
General	.42	.35	.27
Specific	.07	.11	.25
Total	.49	.46	.52
Total variance			
General	.72	.58	.43
Specific	.07	.12	.26
Total	.79	.70	.69

Variables: SRH = self-rated health, ACT = health impacts activities, COMP = health compared to others, A = additive genetic effects, C = shared environment, E = unique environment

Table 3. Age and sex differences in variance components for SRH and ACT.

Variance	SRH		SRH		ACT		ACT	
component	MA	Older	Men	Women	MA	Older	Men	Women
A variance								
General	.27	.27	.32	.32	.21	.34	.28	.40
Specific	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.01	.00
Total	.27	.27	.32	.32	.21	.34	.29	.40
C variance								
General	.03	.00	.01	.00	.03	.03	.00	.00
Specific	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Total	.03	.00	.01	.00	.03	.03	.00	.00
E variance								
General	.40	.48	.40	.40	.19	.45	.33	.33
Specific	.06	.06	.14	.03	.10	.14	.14	.14
Total	.46	.54	.54	.43	.29	.59	.47	.47
Total variance								
General	.70	.75	.73	.73	.42	.83	.61	.73
Specific	.06	.06	.14	.03	.10	.14	.15	.14
Total	.76	.81	.87	.76	.52	.97	.76	.87

Variables: SRH = self-rated health, ACT = health impacts activities, MA = middle-aged, A = additive genetic effects, C = shared environment, E = unique environment

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Independent pathways model. Ag, Cg, and Eg indicate additive genetic, shared environmental, and unique environmental variance common to the 4 variables. As, Cs, and Es indicate additive genetic, shared environmental, and unique environmental variance specific to the individual variables. Subscripts indicate individual variables (c = physical health, d = depressive symptoms, w = word list, s = subjective health).

Figure 2: Decomposition of bivariate correlations between subjective health measures and covariates. A, C, and E indicate additive genetic, shared environmental, and unique environmental components of the correlations. SRH = self-rated health, ACT = health impact activities, COMP = health compared to others, CIRS = physical health, DEPR = depressive symptoms, WORD = word list.