
Table S.1. Correlation matrix with means and SDs for 14 cytokines used to create the inflammatory index

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | 10 | | 11 | | 12 | | 13 | | 14 | |
| 1. IL‑1β ([Interleukin 1 beta](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interleukin_1_beta)) | ── | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 2. IL‑4 (Interleukin 4) | .301 | \*\* | ── | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 3. IL‑5 (Interleukin 5) | -.096 | † | .081 |  | ── | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 4. IL‑6 (Interleukin 6) | .113 | \* | .073 |  | .106 | \* | ── | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 5. IL‑7 (Interleukin 7) | .045 |  | .004 |  | .065 |  | .136 | \*\* | ── | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 6. IL‑8 (Interleukin 8) | .043 |  | .026 |  | -.006 |  | .089 | † | .184 | \*\* | ── | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 7. IL‑10 (Interleukin 10) | .070 |  | .061 |  | .266 | \*\* | .228 | \*\* | .073 |  | .064 |  | ── | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 8. IL‑12 (Interleukin 12) | .196 | \*\* | .163 | \*\* | .101 | \* | .422 | \*\* | .196 | \*\* | .125 | \* | .460 | \*\* | ── | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 9. IL‑13 (Interleukin 13) | .355 | \*\* | .170 | \*\* | .084 | † | .223 | \*\* | .214 | \*\* | .008 |  | .310 | \*\* | .456 | \*\* | ── | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 10. IL‑17 (Interleukin 17) | .143 | \*\* | .240 | \*\* | .099 | \* | .192 | \*\* | .125 | \* | .148 | \*\* | .224 | \*\* | .494 | \*\* | .349 | \*\* | ── | |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 11. G‑CSF | .078 |  | .161 | \*\* | .198 | \*\* | .185 | \*\* | .200 | \*\* | .148 | \*\* | .146 | \*\* | .320 | \*\* | .285 | \*\* | .462 | \*\* | ── | |  |  |  | |  |  |
| 12. IFN‑γ (Interferon gamma) | .277 | \*\* | .182 | \*\* | .060 |  | .296 | \*\* | .141 | \*\* | .053 |  | .078 |  | .212 | \*\* | .263 | \*\* | .078 |  | .185 | \*\* | ── | |  | |  |  |
| 13. MIP‑1β | .064 |  | .005 |  | .064 |  | .057 |  | .092 | † | .233 | \*\* | .174 | \*\* | .103 | \* | .110 | \* | .111 | \* | .140 | \*\* | .002 |  | ── | |  |  |
| 14. TNF‑α | .200 | \*\* | .141 | \*\* | .093 | † | .294 | \*\* | .118 | \* | -.001 |  | .401 | \*\* | .348 | \*\* | .317 | \*\* | .276 | \*\* | .227 | \*\* | .298 | \*\* | .001 |  | ── | |
| Mean | 1.525 | | 1.090 | | 1.245 | | 1.213 | | 1.990 | | 2.136 | | 2.017 | | 1.354 | | 1.656 | | 1.162 | | 1.380 | | 1.102 | | 2.235 | | 1.823 | |
| SD | .677 | | .340 | | .527 | | .501 | | .638 | | .550 | | .629 | | .608 | | .702 | | .446 | | .618 | | .361 | | .452 | | .686 | |

\*\**p* ≤ .01; \**p* ≤.05; †*p*<.10 (two-tailed tests); *N* = 413. G‑CSF: Granulocyte-colony stimulating factor; [MIP‑1β : Macrophage inflammatory protein 1 beta;](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interleukin_1_beta) TNF‑α: Tumor necrosis factor alpha

Figure S.1. Effect of the Parent-child relationship through Romantic Partner Support Alone




Chi-square = .000, *df* = 0, *p* = .000; CFI = 1.000. Values are standardized parameter estimates and standard errors are in parentheses. Gender, insurance, diet, exercise, binge drinking, cigarette use, high school, and married or cohabited are controlled in these analyses. *N* = 413.

Using bootstrap methods with 1,000 replications, the test of the indirect effect of early parenting on INF through supportive romantic partner relationship is significant [indirect effect = .024, 95%CI (.006, .059), 19.512% of the total variance], *p* < .05].

Using bootstrap methods with 1,000 replications, the test of the indirect effect of parent-child relationship on depression through supportive romantic partner relationship is not significant [indirect effect = .011, 95%CI (-.004, .030)].

\*\**p* ≤ .01; \**p* ≤.05; †*p*<.10 (two-tailed tests).

Figure S.2. Effect of Parent-child relationship through Romantic Partner Hostility Alone



Chi-square = .000, *df* = 0, *p* = .000; CFI = 1.000. Values are standardized parameter estimates and standard errors are in parentheses. Gender, insurance, diet, exercise, binge drinking, cigarette use, high school, and married or cohabited are controlled in these analyses. *N* = 413.

Using bootstrap methods with 1,000 replications, the test of the indirect effect of parent-child relationship on INF through hostile romantic partner relationship is significant [indirect effect = .018, 95%CI (.003, .062), 14.634% of the total variance], *p* < .05].

Using bootstrap methods with 1,000 replications, the test of the indirect effect of parent-child relationship on depression through hostile romantic partner relationship is not significant [indirect effect = .014, 95%CI (.000, .041)].

\*\**p* ≤ .01; \**p* ≤.05; †*p*<.10 (two-tailed tests).