Full paper for the session "99 Family, Work, and Education: Complex Interrelations and Consequences" (Wednesday, July 16 at 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM in Meeting Room P4) for the 2025 IUSSP conference (IPC), Brisbane, Australia, July 2025

Family-Work Trajectories and Inequalities in Later-Life Cognition in China: Evidence from CHARLS

Jiawei Wu [a], Guillaume Marois [a,b]

[a] Asian Demographic Research Institute, School of Sociology and Political Science, Shanghai University, Shanghai, China

[b] International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Wittgenstein Centre for Demography and Global Human Capital (IIASA, OeAW, University of Vienna), Laxenburg, Austria

presenting author: Jiawei Wu

email: wujiawei191@126.com, jiaweiwu@shu.edu.cn

Abstract

Prior work showed that an individual's history of partnership, fertility, or employment was separately linked to old-age cognition, but little is known about how family-work history influences later-life cognition, especially in low- and middle-income countries. Our sample comprised respondents aged 50 and above in 2014 interviewed in regular (2011, 2013, 2015, 2018, and 2020) and life-history (2014) waves of the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS, n = 8,535). After conducting sequence analysis and identifying six statistically justifiable and context-attuned family-work trajectories, we investigated how Chinese older adults' family-work history (age 18-50) related to their cognition measured by immediate word recall (0-10) and mental status scores (0-11) cross-sectionally (pairwise comparison) and longitudinally (linear mixed-effects models). We found that older adults in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory had lowest baseline immediate recall and mental status scores compared with whom slower declines in immediate recall rather than mental status were found for those in "late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (b = 0.02, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.00, 0.03)", "married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (mainly early retirees, b = 0.04, 95% CI: 0.01, 0.06)", and "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (b = 0.04, 95% CI: 0.03, 0.06)" trajectories. Our findings imply that inequalities in China's pre-1964 birth cohorts' cognition were affected by marriage timing and, to a greater extent, driven by midlife employment sectors which determined substantial inequalities in access to social welfare.

1. Introduction

In ageing societies across the globe, older adults' cognitive decline and its progression to mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementias (ADRD) pile growing pressure on healthcare and social care systems. Apart from contemporaneous behavioural, dietary and neuropathological factors, a life-course perspective is critical to understanding early-life and midlife risk factors for later-life cognitive decline (Kuh et al., 2003; Livingston et al., 2024). For example, individuals' educational attainment in young adulthood directly relates to building cognitive reserve (Stern et al., 2020) and it also indirectly affects old-age cognition by exposing individuals to varying levels of cognitive stimulations in family life (marriage, childbearing, and childrearing) and jobs in adulthood (Baldivia et al., 2008). The education-cognition link is often observed: a recent gerontological study using the Harmonised Cognitive Assessment Protocols (HCAPs) showed that across the United States, England, China, India, and Mexico, more education was consistently associated with better general cognitive function (Zhang et al., 2024).

Empirical research on midlife determinants of old-age cognition, mainly conducted in Western countries, often separately scrutinised individuals' histories of partnership (e.g., Håkansson et al., 2009), fertility (e.g., Read & Grundy, 2016; Zhang, 2022), and employment (e.g., Kobayashi & Feldman, 2019). This body of research repeatedly found beneficial effects of stable marriage as well as sustained employment and high-skilled occupations in midlife on old-age cognition, but the evidence regarding fertility history was mixed. As individuals' family life and employment are intertwined (e.g., taking care of children may prevent mothers from returning to the labour force), many studies sought to unveil the association of family-work history across individuals' partnership, fertility, and employment domains with later-life health outcomes (Machů et al., 2022). Although a recent systematic review of 48 studies (Machů et al., 2022) concluded that family-work history characterised by an early transition to parenthood, single parenthood, and weak ties to employment were associated with worse old-age health, cognition was rarely tested, especially in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

The lack of evidence on family-work history and old-age cognition in LMICs warrants further investigation. Given that the numbers of older adults with dementia are greater and rising faster in LMICs than in high-income countries (HICs) (Livingston et al., 2020), there is a pressing need to understand modifiable early-life and midlife risk factors for later-life cognition in LMICs to facilitate preventions and interventions so as to improve the cognitive function of future older generations. However, prior work from LMICs either only examined

fertility history in South Africa (Phillips et al., 2023) and China (Du et al., 2023; Heys et al., 2011; Li et al., 2016; Weng & Yang, 2023; Yang et al., 2022) or only explored employment history in South Africa (Yu et al., 2024) and China (Wang et al., 2024). To the best of our knowledge, only Zhao and Gao (2023) investigated the joint history of fertility and employment in China but the measure of cognition was not refined and employment sectors were not distinguished. In this study, we focus on China who has a large and rapidly ageing population with a high prevalence of dementia (6%, about 15 million older adults) and MCI (15.5%, about 39 million older adults) among citizens aged 60+ (Jia et al., 2020). Using data from the life-history wave (2014) and regular waves (2011, 2013, 2015, 2018, 2020) of the nationally representative China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS), we aim to assess how respondents' family-work history across partnership, fertility, and employment domains relates to inequality in later-life cognition cross-sectionally and longitudinally.

2. Background

2.1 Family-work history and old-age cognition: biological and psychosocial pathways

Due to the sparse research on the associations between family-work history and old-age cognition (Ice et al., 2020; Mayeda et al., 2020; Zhao & Gao, 2023), we first reviewed literature that investigated only one domain (partnership, fertility, or employment) of individuals' family-work history. In regards to partnership history, a protective effect of staying in marriage against cognitive decline was found: lifelong singlehood (being never married) (Sironi, 2023; Skirbekk et al., 2023; Sommerlad et al., 2018), being persistently widowed or divorced in midlife (Håkansson et al., 2009), and being intermittently divorced from age 44 to 68 (Skirbekk et al., 2023) were associated with worse cognition. Among previously married individuals, older age at first marriage or shorter duration spent unmarried was separately linked to better initial memory performance (Zaheed et al., 2021). Couples may enjoy health benefits from shared economic resources, mutual psychological support and greater social engagement. Besides, history of marital disruptions and loss was linked to impaired immune system and compromised cardiovascular and metabolic functioning (Rote, 2017), which may be correlated with worse cognition.

A voluminous body of research used various indicators for fertility history: parenthood status, age at first birth (i.e., the timing of parenthood), age at last birth, parity, age at menopause, and reproductive span (i.e., years between menarche and menopause), but the definitions of low and high parity, as well as early or late parenthood, varied across studies.

Researchers have long speculated that becoming a parent at the desirable time of one's life and having an "optimal" number of children would discourage health-damaging behaviour, build wider social network, and expose parents to more cognitively stimulating activities. In comparison, off-time early transition to parenthood, high parity, and other non-standard family profile may hinder human capital accumulation and labour force participation, dilute socio-economic resources, increase childrearing stress and marital strain, and incur social sanctions (Arpino et al., 2023; Zhang, 2022), with long-term implications for later-life cognition. Specifically for women whose longer estrogen exposure is beneficial for old-age cognition which is reduced during pregnancy, lower parity is supposedly linked to better cognitive performance in later life (Li et al., 2016).

Empirical work, however, produced mixed findings. On the one hand, prior work had repeatedly found the associations of worse cognition with low parity (including childlessness) (Bae et al., 2020; Bordone & Weber, 2012; Heys et al., 2011; Mekonnen et al., 2025; Read & Grundy, 2016; Saenz et al., 2019; Sironi, 2023; Zhang, 2022), high parity (Bae et al., 2020; Bonsang & Skirbekk, 2022; Bordone & Weber, 2012; Du et al., 2023; Fu et al., 2023; Gemmill & Weiss, 2021; Li et al., 2016; Mekonnen et al., 2025; Read & Grundy, 2016; Saenz et al., 2019; Weng & Yang, 2023; Yang et al., 2022; Zhang, 2022), early parenthood (Fu et al., 2023; Gemmill & Weiss, 2021; Read & Grundy, 2016; Thomeer et al., 2024; Zhang, 2022), late parenthood (Yang et al., 2022; Zhang, 2022), very early/late age at last birth (Yang et al., 2022; Zhang, 2022), and premature/early or late menopause (Guo et al., 2025). Nevertheless, some associations disappeared when socio-economic status and health were adjusted for (Gemmill & Weiss, 2021; Read & Grundy, 2016; Sironi, 2023). On the other hand, some contradictory findings were also reported: better cognition was associated with high parity (Phillips et al., 2023; Zhang & Fletcher, 2024), late parenthood (Read & Grundy, 2016; Weng & Yang, 2023), and longer reproductive period (Heys et al., 2011; Li et al., 2016). Having at least one child (Bordone & Weber, 2012; Phillips et al., 2023; Zhang & Fletcher, 2021) was linked to better cognition, but using UK biobank data, Zhang et al. (2023) found that mothers had worse cognitive function in some domains than childless women. This was also observed in a recent US study that having any child was associated with worse self-reported memory for women (Thomeer et al., 2024).

In contrast, the evidence on how employment history affects old-age cognition is more conclusive. Consistently undertaking high-skilled professional jobs was associated with higher numerical reasoning scores in the US (Kobayashi & Feldman, 2019), higher general cognitive function for older Americans and Mexicans and for older Indian women (Kobayashi et al.,

2023), better cognition for European men (Greenberg & Burgard, 2021), and higher memory scores in South Africa (Yu et al., 2024). Other studies showed that sustained mid-life employment was associated with higher memory scores in South Africa (Yu et al., 2024) and Europe (Greenberg & Burgard, 2021) and lower dementia risks in the United States (Pacca et al., 2025), while part-time employment was beneficial for women's cognitive functioning in Europe (Bertogg & Leist, 2023). In China, Wang et al. (2024) found that compared with older adults in lifelong agricultural work, those in lifelong non-agricultural work had better global cognitive function and mental intactness and those who shifted from agricultural to non-agricultural work around age 30 also had better global cognitive function. These studies suggested that persistently being employed may constitute a source of financial stability and enhance social network, while high-skilled occupation may provide more cognitive stimulations, which may lead to better cognitive performance in later life.

In spite of the increasing recognition that an individual's multiple roles in midlife as a partner, a parent, and an employee, or the lack of these, are interacted in complex ways (Machů et al., 2022), to date there are only a few studies examining the effects of family-work history on later-life cognition. Ice et al. (2020) found that in Europe, compared with full-time working mothers, partnered mothers who mainly worked part-time had better cognitive function, while partnered mothers who were mainly unpaid caregivers or who did other unpaid activities had worse cognitive function. Mayeda et al. (2020) reported that American women who worked for pay in early adulthood and midlife experienced slower rates of later-life memory decline regardless of marital and parenthood status. Zhao and Gao (2023) showed that compared with urban working mothers with one child, urban multiparous or nulliparous women in China had worse cognition irrespective of employment status, and early exit from workforce was detrimental to both men's and women's cognition. Ice et al. (2020) and Mayeda et al. (2020) only focused on older women and did not examine parity. Zhao and Gao (2023) focused on urban men and women in China whose midlife employment sector was not differentiated. Moreover, Zhao and Gao (2023) only examined inequalities in cognition cross-sectionally and did not explain how older adults' cognition score ranging from 0 to 12 was operationalised (cognition was one of the health outcomes they tested). In view of this, more research is needed to shed light on the effects of a more holistic and comprehensive family-work history on older adults' cognition, especially in non-Western settings.

2.2 The Chinese context

Although trends of later and less marriage and childbearing were observed in recent decades in China (Raymo et al., 2015), a recent study analysing data from the China Family Panel Studies (CFPS) showed that the family life course for China's 1930-39, 1940-49, and 1950-59 birth cohorts was marked by continuity despite change (Van Winkle & Wen, 2023). These birth cohorts were characterised by persistent high marriage rates (> 95%), low divorce rates (< 2%), low childless rates (< 3%), and young ages at first marriage (< 23.25 years old) and first childbirth (< 25 years old), albeit with declining average number of children (3.58 for 1930-39 birth cohort, 2.72 for 1940-49 birth cohort, and 2.01 for 1950-59 birth cohort) resulting from the one-child policy introduced in 1979 (Van Winkle & Wen, 2023).

The employment conditions of older birth cohorts in China were rigidly regulated by a few interrelated social institutions such as the household registration (*hukou*) system and urban work unit (*danwei*) system (Wu, 2019). Introduced in the 1950s, *hukou* system divided Chinese population into having agricultural (rural) or non-agricultural (urban) *hukou* status and imposed stringent restrictions on converting from rural to urban *hukou*, creating marked inequalities in terms of education opportunities, income, housing, childcare and healthcare services between rural and urban populations (Wu & Treiman, 2004). Rural citizens undertook agricultural jobs, while urbanites were affiliated with work units (e.g., government or public institutions, state-owned enterprises, collectively owned enterprises) with varying welfare benefits in the redistributive hierarchy, contributing to decades-long high labour force participation rates among men and women in China. The market-oriented economic reforms since the late 1970s gave rise to a large number of rural-to-urban migrants whose conversion to urban *hukou* holders became less insurmountable, the reshuffling of state-owned enterprises (e.g., massive layoffs from 1990s to mid-2000s), the development of private enterprises, and declining labour force participation among women (Song et al., 2025; Wu, 2019). Although researchers uncovered *hukou*-based health inequalities (e.g., depressive symptoms) in China (Song & Smith, 2021) and *hukou* status was strongly associated with employment sector in the pre-1978 period, there is a lack of evidence explicitly examining how older adults' major employment sector in midlife relates to later-life cognition in China.

In this study, our objective is to investigate how family-work history across partnership, fertility, and employment domains relates to inequality in later-life cognition cross-sectionally and longitudinally in China. We did not know *a priori* the number and nature of family-work trajectories that would be identified by sequence analysis using CHARLS data. However, informed by prior empirical work (Du et al., 2023; Heys et al., 2011; Ice et al., 2020; Li et al.,

2016; Mayeda et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2024; Weng & Yang, 2023; Yang et al., 2022; Zhao & Gao, 2023) and the Chinese context (Song et al., 2025; Wu, 2019), we hypothesise that family-work history characterised by early marriage (presumably early transition to parenthood and high parity) and longer time spent in agricultural employment would be associated with poorer cognitive function in China.

3. Methods

3.1 Data and sample

Data were drawn from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS), a nationally representative survey of community-dwelling adults aged 45 and above (Phillips et al., 2021; Wahrendorf et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2014). Through multistage probability-proportional-to-size (PPS) sampling, the baseline wave of CHARLS fielded in 2011 had a response rate of 81%, collecting demographic, socio-economic and health data from 17,708 participants who were regularly followed every two years (Zhao et al., 2013) with a special life-history wave conducted in 2014. At regular follow-up waves (2013, 2015, 2018, 2020), the response rates for longitudinal sample were above 86% (Zhao et al., 2023). We used data from regular waves (2011, 2013, 2015, 2018, 2020) and the life history wave (2014) of CHARLS.

We selected respondents aged 50 to 85 in 2014 and interviewed in 2011, 2013, 2015, 2018, and 2020 (n = 8,913) who had complete information on partnership, fertility, and employment states from age 18 to 50 (n =8,535). The cut-off point of age 50 was informed by previous studies (Ice et al., 2020; Mayeda et al., 2020; Zhao & Gao, 2023) and China's decades-long pension system (only applicable to urban workers: 60 for men, 55 for white-collar women, and 50 for blue-collar women) (Giles et al., 2023). We did not exclude rural respondents because agricultural employment (some agriculturally employed individuals potentially transitioned to non-agricultural employees in private sector following China's economic reforms in late 1970s) constituted a major employment sector in the Chinese context (Wang et al., 2024).

3.2 Variable

3.2.1 Dependent variable

Although the Harmonised Cognitive Assessment Protocols available only in CHARLS 2018 facilitated cross-cultural comparative studies (Zhang et al., 2024), in this study we relied on measures of cognition (immediate/delayed word recall and mental status) available in all

waves of CHARLS that had been assessed by prior work (Cadar et al., 2023; Lei et al., 2014). Respondents' episodic memory score was usually constructed as the mean of their immediate and delayed word recall scores. However, immediate word recall tests were administered three times in 2018 and 2020 (Table S1 compares word recall questions across waves) so that respondents may score spuriously high in delayed recall test and thus in episodic memory due to practice effects (Weuve et al., 2015). In light of this, we included delayed word recall and episodic memory scores in our cross-sectional analysis, but for longitudinal analysis using data from CHARLS 2011 to 2020, we only used immediate word recall score in respondents' first attempt (range: 0-10, higher scores indicate better cognition) as our first measure of cognition.

Our second measure of cognition is based on some components of the mental status questions of the Telephone Interview of Cognitive Status (TICS) battery established to capture intactness of individuals (Lei et al., 2014). Across all CHARLS regular waves, mental status questions consistently contained the following items: serial 7 subtraction from 100 (up to five times), naming today's date (month, day, year, and season), the day of the week, and the ability to redraw a picture shown to him/her. Answers to these questions were summed up into a mental status score ranging from 0 to 11 with higher scores indicating better cognition.

3.2.2 Family-work trajectories and covariates

The classification of respondents' family-work trajectories is our key independent variable. We explained how we identified these trajectories in section 3.3. In longitudinal analysis, we adjusted for time-invariant or time-varying covariates (Read & Grundy, 2016) capturing respondents' demographics, socio-economic status, health behaviour and physical or mental health (Agrigoroaei & Lachman, 2011). Our first time-invariant covariate was baseline age centred at 59 (the mean age of our sample, see Table 1) (Cadar et al., 2023; Thoma et al., 2025). As Thoma et al. (2025) noted, "in the cognitive aging literature, specifying time-since-baseline as the timescale while controlling for age at baseline is generally preferred because it separates cohort and period effects--estimated by between-person differences in baseline age--from aging effects, estimated by within-person change". Other time-invariant covariates included gender (women = ref), educational attainment (lower secondary or below, upper secondary, and tertiary), and respondents' Communist party membership reported in 2013 (no = ref). Party membership was related to career advancement and still conferred advantage in terms of income and occupational attainment after China's market transition (Wu, 2019). Quintile of household per capita wealth (lowest quintile = ref) and smoking status (no = ref) were taken

from baseline wave because of substantial missing values in selected follow-up waves (Cho et al., 2023; Phillips et al., 2021) which may produce biased estimates in regression models in complete case analysis. Time-varying covariates were *hukou* (household registration) status (urban = ref), marital status (divorced/separated/widowed/single or married), drinking alcohol (no = ref), depressive symptomatology (no = ref, determined if respondents' depressive symptoms score ≥ 10 within a range of 0 to 30) (Wu et al., 2023), and the number of limitations in instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs which include doing housework, preparing meals, shopping, managing money, and taking medications, ranging from 0 to 5).

3.3 Analytical strategy

First, we conducted sequence analysis (Abbott & Tsay, 2000) to map each respondent's unique family-work history from age 18 to 50. We kept the number of family-work states parsimonious by specifying two categories for partnership (married or non-married with the latter category corresponding to single, divorced, or widowed), three categories for fertility (no child, 1 child, and ≥ 2 children), and four categories for employment ("agriculturally employed" which included self-employed and family business, "non-agriculturally employed in public sector" such as government or public institutions or state- or collectively controlled firms, "non-agriculturally employed in private sector" which incorporated self-employed and others, and "not in labour force" which included education, army service, home, unemployed, retired, and others). We did not break down non-married to single, divorced, and widowed because 96% of our study sample stayed in marriage by age 50 (Figure S1). Our choice of differentiating no child, 1 child, and ≥ 2 children was informed by Van Winkle and Wen (2023) as 64% of our study sample were born between 1950 and 1964 whose birth cohorts on average had no more than 2 children. Alternatively we tested the classification of no child, 1-2 children, and ≥ 3 children but this approach did not yield substantively meaningful cluster solutions (results not shown). Respondents' any work episode lasting no less than 6 months was recorded. When synthesizing information from these three domains, we opted for the extended/expanded alphabet approach (Arpino et al., 2023; Emery & Berchtold, 2023) and constructed 24 (2 × 3 × 4) possible combinations/elements for each respondent's family-work state at each age. In this way, there was one family-work sequence per each respondent running from age 18 to 50 which contained the timing, duration, and transitions between family-work states. We did not use the multi-channel approach whose strong assumption (the state observed at a given position in a given domain is independent from the states occurring at the same position in other domains) may not hold (Ritschard et al., 2023) given the intersectionality of family and work.

Because gendered family-work history (Uccheddu et al., 2022) and gender differences in old-age cognition are not the major objective of our study, we did not use gender-stratified sample for sequence and subsequent analyses. Three operations (insertion, deletion, and substitution) are generally adopted when determining the effort/costs needed to transform one sequence into another (i.e., to calculate the pairwise distance/dissimilarity between two sequences). Our respondents' sequences were of equal length (32 years, i.e., 33 yearly records) and the timing of transitions mattered (e.g., the timing of parenthood) so we followed Lesnard (2014) and calculated dynamic Hamming distance (Lesnard, 2010), a variant of Optimal Matching which only used substitution for operation, to map inter-sequence dissimilarity and derived a symmetric matrix. When classifying respondents with similar sequences into a finite number of clusters, we conducted hierarchical cluster analysis using Ward's linkage and turned to Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F statistics (higher is better, i.e., larger between-cluster variation and smaller within-cluster variation) (Halpin, 2016), dendrograms, chronograms, and index plots (Halpin, 2017) to aid in determining the optimal number of clusters. The Calinski-Harabasz cluster-stopping index examined the sum of squared distances within the partitions (i.e., n + 1 clusters) and compared it to that in the unpartitioned data (i.e., n clusters), taking into account the number of clusters and number of cases (Halpin, 2016). Sequence analysis and hierarchical cluster analysis were conducted using the Stata package *sadi* (Halpin, 2017).

Then, we described our sample's characteristics (cognition and socio-demographics) by various family-work trajectories in 2011 and tested differences in characteristics across all family-work trajectories using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) or Pearson χ^2 tests depending on the nature of variables (continuous or categorical). Next, for cross-sectional analysis we specifically tested whether means in episodic memory, immediate word recall, delayed word recall, and mental status scores in 2011 differed between each pair of family-work trajectories using Bonferroni correction to address the increased risk of Type I error when conducting multiple testing.

Last, for longitudinal analysis we built linear mixed-effects models using maximum likelihood estimation to explore the effects of family-work trajectories on immediate recall and mental status from 2011 to 2020. We added random intercepts for family-work trajectories (random slopes were tested but dropped due to no improvement in model fit), specified unstructured covariance, and interacted time with family-work trajectories. We used time as our choice of timescale (Thoma et al., 2025) which was defined as years since baseline wave (i.e., CHARLS 2011). We also interacted time with all covariates but only kept the significant interactions (Yu et al., 2024) which varied across models depending on which outcome was

tested and illustrated the effects of family-work trajectories using margins plots. Longitudinal weight for our study sample consecutively interviewed in all six waves of CHARLS (five regular waves plus a special life-history wave) was not available from the CHARLS team. All analyses were conducted using Stata 18.

4. Results

4.1 Family-work history

We explained how we conducted sequence analysis and hierarchical cluster analysis in section 3.3. When determining the optimal number of clusters (i.e., family-work trajectories), Table S1 shows that a six-cluster solution yielded the highest Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F statistics so fit our data best. We used dendrograms (Figure S2a) and chronograms (Figure 1 and Figures S2b-S2f where time 1 indicates age 18) to compare five-, six-, seven-, eight-, nine-, and ten-cluster solutions. In tandem with statistical justification, we believed the six-cluster solution was also substantively meaningful in the Chinese context, distinguishing older adults whose midlife was spent in various employment sectors (agricultural employment, non-agricultural employment in private sector, non-agricultural employment in public sector, and not in the labour force) and differentiating rural older adults who married earlier or later. To capture the distinct characteristics of older adults belonging to each family-work trajectory, we named these six trajectories as follows: "Group 1 (n = 1,332): married, 1 child, various employment states", "Group 2 (n = 488): married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector", "Group 3 (n = 505): married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force", "Group 4 (n = 763): married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector", "Group 5 (n = 4,027): late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed", and "Group 6 (n = 1,420): early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed". It shall be noted that being assigned to a specific trajectory did not necessarily mean respondents kept that family-work state until age 50 (e.g., some respondents in Group 5 who were mainly agriculturally employed in midlife switched to non-agricultural employment in private sector in their late 40s). In other words, this six-cluster classification underlined the advantage of using sequence analysis to document individuals' decades-long employment profile rather than simply taking their employment status at age 45 or 50. We also drew index plots (Figure S2g) to illustrate individuals' full-length sequences in each family-work trajectory because chronograms (Figure 1) emphasised the composition of various family-work states in each year in each family-work trajectory.

4.2 Sample characteristics by family-work trajectories

Table 1 shows our sample's characteristics in 2011 by six distinct family-work trajectories. The average age of respondents was about 59 years old and the gender composition was balanced (48% men). About 90% of respondents were married with lower secondary or below education and 84% of them had rural *hukou*. There are differences in all characteristics across these six family-work trajectories. For example, those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector" trajectory were oldest, having the highest proportions of tertiary degree holders, urban *hukou* holders, and Communist party members and more likely to be the wealthiest. They also had highest scores on episodic memory, immediate recall, delayed recall, and mental status, while those in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory had lowest scores on any of these four cognition measures.

4.3 Family-work history and cognition

We examined how family-work history affected CHARLS respondents' cognition cross-sectionally (Table 2) and longitudinally (Table 3). Table 2 presents results from pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction of means in episodic memory, immediate word recall, delayed word recall, and mental status in 2011 among six clusters of family-work trajectories. We found that those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector" trajectory had higher episodic memory score (diff = 0.28, $p < 0.01$) than those in the "married, 1 child, various types of employment" trajectory, 0.33 point higher ($p < 0.01$) than those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector" trajectory, 0.70 point higher ($p < 0.001$) than those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force" trajectory, 0.77 point higher ($p < 0.001$) than those in the "late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory, and 0.92 point higher ($p < 0.001$) than those in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory). In contrast, those in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory had lower episodic memory scores than those in the "married, 1 child, various types of employment" trajectory (diff = 0.64, $p < 0.001$) and those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector" trajectory (diff = 0.59, $p < 0.001$). Respondents in this trajectory also scored lower than those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force" trajectory and the "late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory, although the differences were not significant. Similarly, the cognitive advantage for those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector" trajectory and the cognitive disadvantage for those in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children,

agriculturally employed" trajectory were also found in immediate word recall, delayed word recall, and mental status scores.

Across other four trajectories of family-work trajectories in Table 2, those in the "late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" underperformed in episodic memory than those in the "married, 1 child, various employment states" trajectory (diff = 0.50, $p < 0.001$) and those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector" (diff = 0.45, $p < 0.001$)". Meanwhile, those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force" trajectory scored lower in episodic memory than those in the "married, 1 child, various employment states" trajectory (diff = 0.42, $p < 0.001$) and those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector" (diff = 0.37, $p < 0.05$). We found similar gradients in immediate word recall, delayed word recall, and mental status scores.

Table 3 shows selected results from fully adjusted linear mixed-effects models examining how family-work trajectories affected immediate word recall and mental status longitudinally from 2011 to 2020 (full results are shown in Table S2b). Margins plots for these effects are shown in Figure 2. Chronologically, there was an annual decline in immediate recall score (b = -0.15, 95% confidence interval (CI): -0.16 to -0.13, $p < 0.001$) for the reference group (those aged 59 in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory who did not have depressive symptomatology) over this nine-year period. We tried only keeping one interaction term (family-work trajectories × time) in regression models and the coefficient for time became -0.141 (results not shown), very similar to that in Table 3 (-0.146 if we kept three decimal places). Compared with respondents in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory, several trajectories started off with higher baseline immediate word recall scores (for the "married, 1 child, various types of employment" trajectory: b = 0.22, 95% CI: 0.11 to 0.34, $p < 0.001$; for the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector" trajectory: b = 0.17, 95% CI: 0.01 to 0.33, $p < 0.05$; for the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector" trajectory: b = 0.40, 95% CI: 0.25 to 0.54, $p < 0.001$). In the meantime, compared with respondents in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory, protective effects against the decline in immediate word recall were found for the "married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force" trajectory (b = 0.04, 95% CI: 0.01 to 0.06, $p < 0.01$), the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector" trajectory (b = 0.04, 95% CI: 0.03 to 0.06, $p < 0.001$), and the "late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory (b = 0.02, 95% CI: 0.00 to 0.03, $p < 0.05$).

Table 3 shows that there was also an annual decline in mental status score (b = -0.13, 95% CI: -0.15 to -0.11, $p < 0.001$) for the reference group (women in the "early marriage, ≥ 2

children, agriculturally employed" trajectory with no depressive symptomatology) over this nine-year period. We tried only keeping one interaction term (family-work trajectories × time) in regression models and the coefficient for time became -0.128 (results not shown), very similar to that in Table 3 (-0.131 if we kept three decimal places). Compared with respondents in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory, respondents in all other five family-work trajectories had higher baseline mental status scores. All interaction terms between family-work trajectories and time were insignificant, suggesting that the rate of decline in respondents' mental status was similar across various family-work trajectories. Table S2c and Figure S2h show results for respondents' delayed recall and episodic memory from linear mixed-effects models with significant interaction terms between time and covariates (gender and baseline age). Models only keeping one interaction term (family-work trajectories × time) gave very similar coefficients for time (for delayed recall: b = 0.12, 95% CI: 0.10 to 0.13, $p < 0.001$; for episodic memory: b = -0.00, 95% CI: -0.01 to 0.01, $p > 0.05$) compared with results in Table S2c. These annual changes (increases in delayed recall and stability in episodic memory) for the reference group (respondents in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory) may be biased because of practice effects when immediate recall tests were administered three times in CHARLS 2018 and 2020.

4.4 Sensitivity analyses

We conducted a series of sensitivity analyses to check the robustness of our findings in Table 2 and Table 3. In the main analysis, we included as many respondents as possible aged 50 and above in CHARLS 2014 who had complete family-work information from age 18 to 50 (n = 8,535). In the first sensitivity analysis, we changed sample to respondents aged 50+ in 2011 (n = 7,432) and repeated all analyses (sequence, cluster, and cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis). We found that a six-cluster solution remained optimal (Table S3a) and it yielded the same classification of family-work trajectories (Figure S3a and Figure S3b). Results from pairwise comparisons (Table S3b) and linear mixed-effects models (Table S3c, Figure S3c, Table S3d, and Figure S3d) were similar to those in Table 2 and Table 3.

Second, we excluded CHARLS 2020 data (fielded in July and August in 2020) to reduce potential bias caused by COVID-19 related measures such as social distancing that may affect older adults' cognition. We obtained a less selective study sample comprising respondents interviewed in 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2018 (n = 9,329) and repeated all analyses (sequence, cluster, cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis). A six-cluster solution still remained optimal (Table S4a) and it yielded the same classification of family-work trajectories

(Figure S4a and Figure S4b). Results from pairwise comparisons (Table S4b) and linear mixed-effects models (Table S4c, Figure S4c, Table S4d, and Figure S4d) were similar to those in Table 2 and Table 3. We found protective effects against the decline in immediate recall for all other five trajectories (all interaction terms were significant in Table S4c), implying that disadvantage in immediate recall for those in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory became more pronounced over time in a less selective sample.

Third, instead of changing our study sample and redoing sequence analysis, we summed up immediate recall and mental status scores to a total cognition score (range: 0-21) and repeated the cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis (Table S5a, Table S5b, and Figure S5). The results were similar to those in Table 2 and Table 3.

Fourth, missing values on the dependent variables and covariates (there was no missing value on family-work history) led to respondents being dropped from models because of listwise deletion, which may bias our estimates. In our long format data, among various other missing patterns, 86% of records had no missing values, 4% of records only had missing values in immediate recall, and 4% of records only had missing values in immediate recall, mental status, and depressive symptomatology. Assuming missing at random (MAR), we imputed our data 10 times using multiple imputation by chained equations (MICE), re-estimated linear mixed-effects models, and obtained marginal effects using the Stata command *mimrgns* (Klein, 2022). The results (Table S6 and Figure S6) were similar to those in Table 3 and Figure 2.

Then, time-varying covariates we adjusted for (marital status, *hukou* status, IADLs, drinking alcohol, and depressive symptomatology) may be mediators rather than confounders. We did another sensitivity analysis by estimating models without these time-varying covariates. The results (Table S7 and Figure S7) were similar to those in Table 3 and Figure 2.

Next, to gain more insights into cohort effects, we replaced baseline age with respondents' birth cohort classified into 4 groups: "1960-1964 (ref)", "1955-1959", "1950-1954", and "1949 or before" and re-estimated linear mixed-effects models. We found that earlier birth cohorts were associated with lower immediate recall and mental status scores, but faster decline was only found in immediate recall (Table S8 and Figure S8).

Last, although multiple observation points per individual are needed for estimating linear mixed-effects models, we acknowledge the selective nature of our sample due to attrition across waves and our other choices (age 50+ in 2014 and having complete information in family-work states from age 18 to 50). In the second sensitivity analysis, we chose a less selective sample by not using CHARLS 2020 data. Here, we also necessarily compared respondents' characteristics in CHARLS 2011 between excluded respondents and our study

sample (Table S9). We found that those excluded respondents were slightly younger, more likely to have urban *hukou* status, more educated, wealthier, less likely to be in marriage, and had more limitations in instrumental activities of daily living. These differences shall be noted when interpreting the key findings of our study.

5. Discussion

In this study using CHARLS data, we conducted sequence analysis and identified six statistically justifiable and context-attuned family-work trajectories running from age 18 to 50 for Chinese older adults born in or before 1964. Building on this, we examined inequalities in cognition among older adults in various trajectories cross-sectionally and longitudinally.

Regardless of cognition outcomes tested (immediate recall, delayed recall, episodic memory, or mental status), older adults in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" family-work trajectory had lowest cognitive function in CHARLS 2011, supporting our hypothesis. Given the short gap between marriage and first childbirth in China illustrated in Figure 1, this result is consistent with prior studies that early parenthood was associated with poorer cognition in later life (Fu et al., 2023; Gemmill & Weiss, 2021; Read & Grundy, 2016; Thomeer et al., 2024; Weng & Yang, 2023; Zhang, 2022). Moreover, older adults agriculturally employed throughout their midlife undertook low-skilled jobs according to the International Standard Classification of Occupations 2008 (ISCO-08). At baseline they underperformed than those in the "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector" trajectory who probably held managerial or professional positions, echoing findings that high-skilled professional occupation in midlife was beneficial for later-life cognition (Greenberg & Burgard, 2021; Kobayashi & Feldman, 2019; Kobayashi et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2024). These inequalities were also found in longitudinal analysis. Compared with older adults in the "early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed" trajectory, slower declines in immediate recall were found for those in the "late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed", "married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force", and "married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector" trajectories, once again supporting our hypothesis.

There are a number of reasons behind these inequalities in cognition. Among pre-1964 birth cohorts in China, agriculturally employed rural older adults' early transition to parenthood impeded their educational attainment (Weng & Yang, 2023) which is critical for old-age cognition (Zhang et al., 2024) and their high parity depleted socio-economic resources (rural residents were less affected by China's one-child policy introduced in late 1970s) (Yang et al.,

2022; Zhao & Gao, 2023). China's *hukou* system (Wu & Treiman, 2004) created decades-long segregated internal labour market with rural residents having lower income, fewer social welfare in terms of health insurance and pension benefits, more exposure to higher levels of pesticides/herbicides and ultraviolet radiation, and less support from adult children emigrating to urban areas for better economic opportunities (Song & Smith, 2019; Wang et al., 2024), all of which contributed to their poorer cognition in old age (Kezios et al., 2022; Peng et al., 2023).

Compared with those agriculturally employed and those in private sector, urban residents employed in public sector topped the redistributive hierarchy with more job stability, higher income, broader social network, and generous entitlements to social welfare (Wu, 2019) so they may reap cognitive gains. Moreover, they may benefit from greater workplace cognitive stimulations in relation to data (high to low: synthesising, coordinating, analysing, compiling, computing, copying, comparing), people (high to low: mentoring, negotiating, instructing, supervising, diverting, persuading, speaking, serving, and taking instructions), and things (high to low: setting up, prevision work, operating, driving, manipulating, tending, feeding, and handling) (Andel et al., 2014). Additionally, although weak ties to employment in midlife were often associated with poorer old-age cognition (Ice et al., 2020; Machů et al., 2022; Mayeda et al., 2020; Zhao & Gao, 2023), our analysis not using gender-stratified sample revealed an exception in China where older adults primarily not in the labour force in their midlife had better old-age cognition than those agriculturally employed. The majority of respondents belonging to the "married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force" trajectory reported retired as early as in their late 30s (results not shown) who were likely to be laid-off employees from state-owned enterprises in the 1990s and 2000s (Song et al., 2025) whose sustained limited access to social welfare may have still bestowed cognitive advantage on them over rural residents.

Our findings lend support to cumulative dis/advantage (CAD) (Dannefer, 2003, 2020) and cumulative inequality (CI) (Ferraro & Shippee, 2009) theories. We illustrated how institutional factors embedded in China's unique historical context (e.g., *hukou* system and the rigid duality of urban/rural labour market) shaped individuals' demographic processes and occupational developments (i.e., family-work trajectories) over their life course which related to later-life cognition. In particular, we showed that the intersection of early marriage, early parenthood (presumably high parity) and sustained agricultural employment in midlife predicted lower initial immediate recall and mental status scores and a faster decline in immediate recall. Exposures in these intertwined domains (partnership, fertility, and employment) may act concertedly to influence old-age cognition via risk factors such as education, depression, chronic conditions, health behaviour, air pollution, and social network.

Since retrospective family-work trajectories in midlife could not be altered in old age, a question that surfaces is whether there are some remedies to support persistently agriculturally employed older adults with cognitive disadvantage. One option may be promoting leisure and physical activities as well as social engagement which may compensate for long-term cognitive disadvantage conferred by working in less cognitively stimulating occupations (Andel et al., 2014; Stern et al., 2020). Moreover, China's New Cooperative Medical Scheme (NCMS) and New Rural Pension Scheme (NRPS) implemented just before 2010 improved rural older adults' cognitive function (Cheng et al., 2015; Cheng et al., 2018), which underscored the importance of refining social welfare to support cognitively vulnerable populations.

In this study, we only traced respondents' employment history from age 18 to 50 but the urban-rural differences in employment/retirement may extend well beyond age 50. Giles et al. (2023) found that the rates of retirement (defined as no longer engaged in any wage or self-employed activities, including both agricultural and non-agricultural work) were higher among urban *hukou* older adults than among rural *hukou* residents in China and the gap widened with age (in the 50-54 age group: 30% vs 16%; in the 55-59 age group: 44% vs 22%; in the 60-64 age group: 71% vs 26%). The fact that rural residents continued to work until advanced ages because of limited access to generous pensions and poor economic resources (usually undertaking low-skilled jobs in unfavourable working conditions) calls for improvement in retirement policy and broader social welfare to promote equity in later life.

The main limitation of our observational study is that causality could not be claimed. One of the endogeneity issues is that early-life (childhood or adolescence) cognitive abilities or socioeconomic status, observed or non-observed, may influence both family-work history and later-life cognition so more robust causal inference methods are needed (Cheng et al., 2025; Schwartz & Glymour, 2023). That said, to some extent early-life disadvantages may have been proxied by respondents' timing of marriage and parenthood as well as labour force participation and their first job's employment sector that had been captured in our sequence analysis so not considering early-life factors may not alter our substantive findings.

Despite the limitation noted above, the contribution of our study is threefold. First, we addressed the research gap by unmasking the link between family-work history and later-life cognition in China, a nation among LMICs underrepresented in prior work. Second, we extended the literature by explicitly considering employment sector, identifying six statistically justifiable and context-attuned family-work trajectories in China, and probing inequalities in cognition cross-sectionally and longitudinally. Third, we cautioned that how immediate word recall questions were administered in CHARLS 2018 and 2020 was prone to practice effects

so researchers operationalising cognition as delayed word recall and episodic memory scores in these two waves may obtain biased results. Another issue is that the word lists used were identical in CHARLS 2011, 2013, and 2015 but they changed in CHARLS 2018 and were modified again in 2020 (Table S1). A weighted equipercentile equating method could be used to adjust for this inconsistency (Guo et al., 2025; Wu et al., 2024) but its assumption that respondents' percentile ranks in cognitive performance did not change over time may not hold. Overall, our research revealed that China's pre-1964 birth cohorts' midlife employment sector played a major role in contributing to later-life disparities in cognitive function. Future work may peruse gendered family-work history and its effects on gender differences in old-age cognition in the Chinese context.



Figure 1. Chronograms for family-work trajectories by six-cluster solution for study sample aged 50 and above in CHARLS 2014 (n = 8,535).

Table 1. Sample characteristics in CHARLS 2011 by six clusters of family-work trajectories (non-weighted)

	Married, 1 child, various types of employment (n = 1,332) Mean (SD) / Freq. (%)	Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 488) Mean (SD) / Freq. (%)	Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 505) Mean (SD) / Freq. (%)	Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 763) Mean (SD) / Freq. (%)	Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 4,027) Mean (SD) / Freq. (%)	Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 1,420) Mean (SD) / Freq. (%)	Total	p-value
Episodic memory	3.82 (1.76)	3.78 (1.63)	3.40 (1.66)	4.10 (1.64)	3.33 (1.61)	3.18 (1.55)	3.48 (1.66)	<0.001
Immediate word recall	4.31 (1.77)	4.25 (1.66)	3.90 (1.72)	4.61 (1.59)	3.80 (1.65)	3.65 (1.58)	3.96 (1.68)	<0.001
Delayed word recall	3.33 (2.06)	3.31 (1.87)	2.89 (1.89)	3.59 (1.97)	2.85 (1.87)	2.70 (1.83)	3.00 (1.92)	<0.001
Mental status	7.70 (3.00)	8.46 (2.52)	7.21 (2.99)	9.03 (2.26)	6.77 (3.12)	5.82 (3.16)	7.07 (3.14)	<0.001
Age	56.75 (7.67)	55.84 (7.45)	58.62 (7.79)	61.94 (7.95)	59.14 (7.64)	59.91 (7.06)	58.93 (7.73)	<0.001
Men	0.52 (0.50)	0.76 (0.43)	0.38 (0.49)	0.72 (0.45)	0.49 (0.50)	0.22 (0.41)	0.48 (0.50)	<0.001
Married	0.87 (0.34)	0.95 (0.21)	0.89 (0.32)	0.93 (0.26)	0.90 (0.30)	0.91 (0.28)	0.90 (0.30)	<0.001
Education								<0.001
Lower secondary or below	1,086 (81.53%)	395 (80.94%)	456 (90.30%)	513 (67.23%)	3,799 (94.34%)	1,398 (98.45%)	7,647 (89.60%)	
Upper secondary	220 (16.52%)	89 (18.24%)	48 (9.50%)	211 (27.65%)	224 (5.56%)	20 (1.41%)	812 (9.51%)	
Tertiary	26 (1.95%)	4 (0.82%)	1 (0.20%)	39 (5.11%)	4 (0.10%)	2 (0.14%)	76 (0.89%)	
Rural hukou	0.69 (0.46)	0.77 (0.42)	0.78 (0.42)	0.27 (0.44)	0.96 (0.20)	0.98 (0.13)	0.84 (0.37)	<0.001
Communist party member	0.14 (0.35)	0.13 (0.34)	0.10 (0.29)	0.34 (0.47)	0.08 (0.27)	0.04 (0.19)	0.11 (0.31)	<0.001
Household per capita wealth quintile								<0.001
Lowest	195 (15.22%)	69 (14.47%)	84 (17.18%)	102 (14.01%)	842 (21.44%)	368 (26.34%)	1,660 (20%)	
2nd	191 (14.91%)	76 (15.93%)	81 (16.56%)	77 (10.58%)	873 (22.23%)	362 (25.91%)	1,660 (20%)	

3rd	222 (17.33%)	88 (18.45%)	111 (22.70%)	100 (13.74%)	847 (21.56%)	293 (20.97%)	1,661 (20.01%)	
4th	246 (19.20%)	115 (24.11%)	108 (22.09%)	164 (22.53%)	809 (20.60%)	217 (15.53%)	1,659 (19.99%)	
Highest	427 (33.33%)	129 (27.04%)	105 (21.47%)	285 (39.15%)	557 (14.18%)	157 (11.24%)	1,660 (20%)	
Smoking	0.33 (0.47)	0.43 (0.50)	0.25 (0.43)	0.35 (0.48)	0.32 (0.47)	0.19 (0.39)	0.30 (0.46)	<0.001
Drinking alcohol	0.39 (0.49)	0.47 (0.50)	0.28 (0.45)	0.40 (0.49)	0.33 (0.47)	0.23 (0.42)	0.34 (0.47)	<0.001
Number of IADL limitations	0.31 (0.85)	0.17 (0.68)	0.43 (0.99)	0.17 (0.59)	0.40 (0.95)	0.54 (1.07)	0.38 (0.92)	<0.001

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011 and 2014. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. SD = standard deviation. IADL = instrumental activities of daily living. Respondents' Communist party membership is taken from CHARLS 2013 because it was not asked in 2011.

Table 2. Pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction of means in episodic memory, immediate word recall, delayed word recall, and mental status between six clusters of family-work trajectories in CHARLS 2011 (n = 8,535)

Differences in means between row cluster and column cluster	Married, 1 child, various types of employment (n = 1,332)	Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 488)	Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 505)	Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 763)	Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 4,027)
	Episodic memory				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 488)	-0.05 (0.09)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 505)	-0.42*** (0.09)	-0.37* (0.11)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 763)	0.28** (0.08)	0.33** (0.10)	0.70*** (0.10)		
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 4,027)	-0.50*** (0.06)	-0.45*** (0.09)	-0.08 (0.08)	-0.77*** (0.07)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 1,420)	-0.64*** (0.07)	-0.59*** (0.09)	-0.22 (0.09)	-0.92*** (0.08)	-0.15 (0.05)
	Immediate recall				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 488)	-0.07 (0.10)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 505)	-0.41*** (0.10)	-0.34* (0.11)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 763)	0.29** (0.08)	0.36** (0.10)	0.70*** (0.10)		

Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 4,027)	-0.51*** (0.06)	-0.45*** (0.09)	-0.10 (0.08)	-0.81*** (0.07)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 1,420)	-0.66*** (0.07)	-0.59*** (0.09)	-0.25 (0.09)	-0.95*** (0.08)	-0.15 (0.06)
	Delayed recall				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 488)	-0.02 (0.11)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 505)	-0.44*** (0.11)	-0.42* (0.13)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 763)	0.26 (0.09)	0.28 (0.12)	0.70*** (0.12)		
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 4,027)	-0.47*** (0.06)	-0.46*** (0.10)	-0.04 (0.10)	-0.73*** (0.08)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 1,420)	-0.63*** (0.08)	-0.61*** (0.11)	-0.19 (0.11)	-0.89*** (0.09)	-0.15 (0.06)
	Mental status				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 488)	0.76*** (0.17)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 505)	-0.49* (0.16)	-1.25*** (0.20)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 763)	1.33*** (0.14)	0.57* (0.18)	1.82*** (0.18)		

Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 4,027)	-0.93*** (0.10)	-1.69*** (0.15)	-0.44* (0.15)	-2.26*** (0.12)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 1,420)	-1.88*** (0.12)	-2.64*** (0.16)	-1.39*** (0.16)	-3.21*** (0.14)	-0.95*** (0.09)

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. Numbers in cells are the differences in means followed by standard errors in parentheses. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Table 3. **Selected results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate word recall and mental status scores** from 2011 to 2020 (n = 8,535).

	Immediate recall		Mental status	
	coef.	95% CI	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effects portion				
Family-work trajectories				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.22***	[0.11,0.34]	0.63***	[0.43,0.83]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	0.17*	[0.01,0.33]	0.93***	[0.66,1.21]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	0.04	[-0.11,0.19]	0.74***	[0.48,1.00]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	0.40***	[0.25,0.54]	1.45***	[1.20,1.71]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	0.05	[-0.04,0.14]	0.39***	[0.23,0.55]
Time	-0.15***	[-0.16,-0.13]	-0.13***	[-0.15,-0.11]
Family-work trajectories × Time				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.01	[-0.00,0.03]	0.02	[-0.00,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	0.01	[-0.01,0.03]	-0.01	[-0.04,0.02]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.04**	[0.01,0.06]	0.01	[-0.02,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.04***	[0.03,0.06]	-0.00	[-0.03,0.02]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.02*	[0.00,0.03]	-0.00	[-0.02,0.01]
Random-effects portion				
Variance (constant)	0.83	[0.79,0.87]	3.99	[3.85,4.14]
Variance (residual)	1.99	[1.96,2.02]	3.64	[3.58,3.70]
Observations	36,669		38,494	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. For immediate call, the models adjusted for gender, baseline age centred at 59, baseline age centred at 59 × time, *hukou* status, marital status, educational attainment, Communist party membership, quintile of household per capita wealth, smoking, drinking alcohol, depressive symptomatology, depressive symptomatology × time, and number of limitations in instrumental activities of daily living. For mental status, the models adjusted for gender, gender × time, baseline age centred at 59, *hukou* status, marital status, educational attainment, Communist party membership, quintile of household per capita wealth, smoking, drinking alcohol, depressive symptomatology, depressive symptomatology × time, and number of limitations in instrumental activities of daily living. $^{*}p<0.05$, $^{**}p<0.01$, $^{***}p<0.001$



Figure 2. Margins plots for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' immediate recall and mental status from 2011 to 2020.

References

Abbott, A., & Tsay, A. (2000). Sequence Analysis and Optimal Matching Methods in Sociology:Review and Prospect. *Sociological Methods & Research, 29*(1), 3-33. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124100029001001

Agrigoroaei, S., & Lachman, M. E. (2011). Cognitive Functioning in Midlife and Old Age: Combined Effects of Psychosocial and Behavioral Factors. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 66B*(suppl_1), i130-i140. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbr017

Andel, R., Silverstein, M., & Kåreholt, I. (2014). The Role of Midlife Occupational Complexity and Leisure Activity in Late-Life Cognition. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 70*(2), 314-321. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbu110

Arpino, B., Gumà, J., & Julià, A. (2023). Non-standard family histories and wellbeing at older ages. *Social Science & Medicine, 338*, 116350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.116350

Bae, J. B., Lipnicki, D. M., Han, J. W., Sachdev, P. S., Kim, T. H., Kwak, K. P., Kim, B. J., Kim, S. G., Kim, J. L., Moon, S. W., Park, J. H., Ryu, S.-H., Youn, J. C., Lee, D. Y., Lee, D. W., Lee, S. B., Lee, J. J., Jhoo, J. H., Llibre-Rodriguez, J. J., Llibre-Guerra, J. J., Valhuerdi-Cepero, A. J., Ritchie, K., Ancelin, M.-L., Carriere, I., Skoog, I., Najar, J., Sterner, T. R., Scarmeas, N., Yannakoulia, M., Dardiotis, E., Meguro, K., Kasai, M., Nakamura, K., Riedel-Heller, S., Roehr, S., Pabst, A., van Boxtel, M., Köhler, S., Ding, D., Zhao, Q., Liang, X., Scazufca, M., Lobo, A., De-la-Cámara, C., Lobo, E., Kim, K. W., Sachdev, P. S., Lipnicki, D. M., Makkar, S. R., Crawford, J. D., Thalamuthu, A., Kochan, N. A., Leung, Y., Lo, J. W., Turana, Y., Castro-Costa, E., Larijani, B., Nabipour, I., Rockwood, K., Shifu, X., Lipton, R. B., Katz, M. J., Preux, P.-M., Guerchet, M., Lam, L., Skoog, I., Ninimiya, T., Walker, R., Hendrie, H., Guaita, A., Chen, L.-K., Shahar, S., Dominguez, J., Krishna, M., Ganguli, M., Anstey, K. J., Crowe, M., Haan, M. N., Kumagai, S., Ng, T. P., Brodaty, H., Meguro, K., Mayeux, R., Schupf, N., Sachdev, P., Ganguli, M., Petersen, R., Lipton, R., Lowe, E. S., Ritchie, K., Kim, K.-W., Jorm, L., Brodaty, H., & for Cohort Studies of Memory in an International, C. (2020). Does parity matter in women's risk of dementia? A COSMIC collaboration cohort study. *BMC Medicine, 18*(1), 210. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-01671-1

Baldivia, B., Andrade, V. M., & Bueno, O. F. A. (2008). Contribution of education, occupation and cognitively stimulating activities to the formation of cognitive reserve. *Dementia & Neuropsychologia, 2*.

Bertogg, A., & Leist, A. K. (2023). Gendered life courses and cognitive functioning in later life: the role of context-specific gender norms and lifetime employment. *European journal of ageing, 20*(1), 7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-023-00751-4

Bonsang, E., & Skirbekk, V. (2022). Does Childbearing Affect Cognitive Health in Later Life? Evidence From an Instrumental Variable Approach. *Demography, 59*(3), 975-994. https://doi.org/10.1215/00703370-9930490

Bordone, V., & Weber, D. (2012). Number of children and cognitive abilities in later life. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research 2012, 2012*, 95-126. https://doi.org/10.1553/populationyearbook2012s95

Cadar, D., Brocklebank, L., Yan, L., Zhao, Y., & Steptoe, A. (2023). Socioeconomic and Contextual Differentials in Memory Decline: A Cross-Country Investigation Between England and China. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 78*(3), 544-555. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbac163

Cheng, L., Liu, H., Zhang, Y., Shen, K., & Zeng, Y. (2015). The Impact of Health Insurance on Health Outcomes and Spending of the Elderly: Evidence from China's New Cooperative Medical Scheme. *Health Economics, 24*(6), 672-691. https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3053

Cheng, L., Liu, H., Zhang, Y., & Zhao, Z. (2018). The health implications of social pensions: Evidence from China's new rural pension scheme. *Journal of Comparative Economics, 46*(1), 53-77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jce.2016.12.002

Cheng, M., Van Herreweghe, L., Gireesh, A., Sieber, S., Ferraro, K. F., & Cullati, S. (2025). Life Course Socioeconomic Position and Cognitive Aging in Later Life: A Scoping Review. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 100670. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2025.100670

Cho, T.-C., Yu, X., Gross, A. L., Zhang, Y. S., Lee, J., Langa, K. M., & Kobayashi, L. C. (2023). Negative wealth shocks in later life and subsequent cognitive function in older adults in China, England, Mexico, and the USA, 2012–18: a population-based, cross-nationally harmonised, longitudinal study. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity, 4*(9), e461-e469. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-7568(23)00113-7

Dannefer, D. (2003). Cumulative Advantage/Disadvantage and the Life Course: Cross-Fertilizing Age and Social Science Theory. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 58*(6), S327-S337. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/58.6.S327

Dannefer, D. (2020). Systemic and Reflexive: Foundations of Cumulative Dis/Advantage and Life-Course Processes. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 75*(6), 1249-1263. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gby118

Du, Y., Luo, Y., Zheng, X., & Liu, J. (2023). Number of children and cognitive function among Chinese menopausal women: The mediating role of depressive symptoms and social participation. *Journal of affective disorders, 340*, 758-765. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2023.08.084

Emery, K., & Berchtold, A. (2023). Comparison of two approaches in multichannel sequence analysis using the Swiss Household Panel. *Longitudinal and life course studies, 14*(4), 592-623. https://doi.org/10.1332/175795921x16698302233894

Ferraro, K. F., & Shippee, T. P. (2009). Aging and Cumulative Inequality: How Does Inequality Get Under the Skin? *The Gerontologist, 49*(3), 333-343. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnp034

Fu, C., Hao, W., Ma, Y., Shrestha, N., Virani, S. S., Mishra, S. R., & Zhu, D. (2023). Number of Live Births, Age at the Time of Having a Child, Span of Births and Risk of Dementia: A Population-Based Cohort Study of 253,611 U.K. Women. *Journal of Women's Health, 32*(6), 680-692. https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2022.0396

Gemmill, A., & Weiss, J. (2021). The Relationship Between Fertility History and Incident Dementia in the U.S. Health and Retirement Study. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 77*(6), 1118-1131. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbab183

Giles, J., Lei, X., Wang, G., Wang, Y., & Zhao, Y. (2023). One country, two systems: evidence on retirement patterns in China. *Journal of Pension Economics and Finance, 22*(2), 188-210. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474747221000391

Greenberg, K., & Burgard, S. (2021). Cumulative employment intensity and complexity across the life course and cognitive function in later life among European women and men. *Annals of Epidemiology, 58*, 83-93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2021.01.006

Guo, M., Wu, Y., Gross, A. L., Karvonen-Gutierrez, C., & Kobayashi, L. C. (2025). Age at menopause and cognitive function and decline among middle-aged and older women in the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study, 2011–2018. *Alzheimer's & Dementia, 21*(2), e14580. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.14580

Håkansson, K., Rovio, S., Helkala, E.-L., Vilska, A.-R., Winblad, B., Soininen, H., Nissinen, A., Mohammed, A. H., & Kivipelto, M. (2009). Association between mid-life marital status and cognitive function in later life: population based cohort study. *BMJ, 339*, b2462. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2462

Halpin, B. (2016). *Cluster Analysis Stopping Rules in Stata*. http://ulsites.ul.ie/sociology/sites/default/files/wp2016-01.pdf

Halpin, B. (2017). SADI: Sequence Analysis Tools for Stata. *The Stata Journal, 17*(3), 546-572. https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867x1701700302

Heys, M., Jiang, C., Cheng, K. K., Zhang, W., Yeung, S. L. A., Lam, T. H., Leung, G. M., & Schooling, C. M. (2011). Life long endogenous estrogen exposure and later adulthood cognitive function in a population of naturally postmenopausal women from Southern China: The Guangzhou Biobank Cohort Study. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 36*(6), 864-873. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2010.11.009

Ice, E., Ang, S., Greenberg, K., & Burgard, S. (2020). Women's Work-Family Histories and Cognitive Performance in Later Life. *American journal of epidemiology, 189*(9), 922-930. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwaa042

Jia, L., Du, Y., Chu, L., Zhang, Z., Li, F., Lyu, D., Li, Y., Li, Y., Zhu, M., Jiao, H., Song, Y., Shi, Y., Zhang, H., Gong, M., Wei, C., Tang, Y., Fang, B., Guo, D., Wang, F., Zhou, A., Chu, C., Zuo, X., Yu, Y., Yuan, Q., Wang, W., Li, F., Shi, S., Yang, H., Zhou, C., Liao, Z., Lv, Y., Li, Y., Kan, M., Zhao, H., Wang, S., Yang, S., Li, H., Liu, Z., Wang, Q., Qin, W., Jia, J., Quan, M., Wang, Y., Li, W., Cao, S., Xu, L., Han, Y., Liang, J., Qiao, Y., Qin, Q., & Qiu, Q. (2020). Prevalence, risk factors, and management of

dementia and mild cognitive impairment in adults aged 60 years or older in China: a cross-sectional study. *The Lancet Public Health, 5*(12), e661-e671. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30185-7

Kezios, K. L., Zhang, A., Kim, S., Lu, P., Glymour, M. M., Elfassy, T., & Al Hazzouri, A. Z. (2022). Association of Low Hourly Wages in Middle Age With Faster Memory Decline in Older Age: Evidence From the Health and Retirement Study. *American journal of epidemiology, 191*(12), 2051-2062. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwac166

Klein, D. (2022). *MIMRGNS: Stata module to run margins after mi estimate.* In https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:boc:bocode:s457795

Kobayashi, L. C., & Feldman, J. M. (2019). Employment trajectories in midlife and cognitive performance in later life: longitudinal study of older American men and women. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 73*(3), 232-238. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2018-211153

Kobayashi, L. C., O'Shea, B. Q., Wixom, C., Jones, R. N., Langa, K. M., Weir, D., Lee, J., Wong, R., & Gross, A. L. (2023). Lifetime occupational skill and later-life cognitive function among older adults in the United States, Mexico, India, and South Africa. *Alzheimer's & Dementia, 20*(3), 1933-1943. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.13665

Kuh, D., Ben-Shlomo, Y., Lynch, J., Hallqvist, J., & Power, C. (2003). Life course epidemiology. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 57*, 778-783. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.57.10.778

Lei, X., Smith, J. P., Sun, X., & Zhao, Y. (2014). Gender Differences in Cognition in China and Reasons for Change over Time: Evidence from CHARLS. *J Econ Ageing, 4*, 46-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeoa.2013.11.001

Lesnard, L. (2010). Setting Cost in Optimal Matching to Uncover Contemporaneous Socio-Temporal Patterns. *Sociological Methods & Research, 38*(3), 389-419. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124110362526

Lesnard, L. (2014). Using Optimal Matching Analysis in Sociology: Cost Setting and Sociology of Time. In P. Blanchard, F. Bühlmann, & J.-A. Gauthier (Eds.), *Advances in Sequence Analysis: Theory, Method, Applications* (pp. 39-50). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04969-4_3

Li, F.-D., He, F., Chen, T.-R., Xiao, Y.-Y., Lin, S.-T., Shen, W., Wang, X.-Y., Zhai, Y.-J., Shang, X.-P., & Lin, J.-F. (2016). Reproductive History and Risk of Cognitive Impairment in Elderly Women: A Cross-Sectional Study in Eastern China. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease, 49*(1), 139-147. https://doi.org/10.3233/jad-150444

Livingston, G., Huntley, J., Liu, K. Y., Costafreda, S. G., Selbæk, G., Alladi, S., Ames, D., Banerjee, S., Burns, A., Brayne, C., Fox, N. C., Ferri, C. P., Gitlin, L. N., Howard, R., Kales, H. C., Kivimäki, M., Larson, E. B., Nakasujja, N., Rockwood, K., Samus, Q., Shirai, K., Singh-Manoux, A., Schneider, L. S., Walsh, S., Yao, Y., Sommerlad, A., & Mukadam, N. (2024). Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2024 report of the

Lancet standing Commission. *The Lancet, 404*(10452), 572-628. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(24)01296-0

Livingston, G., Huntley, J., Sommerlad, A., Ames, D., Ballard, C., Banerjee, S., Brayne, C., Burns, A., Cohen-Mansfield, J., Cooper, C., Costafreda, S. G., Dias, A., Fox, N., Gitlin, L. N., Howard, R., Kales, H. C., Kivimäki, M., Larson, E. B., Ogunniyi, A., Orgeta, V., Ritchie, K., Rockwood, K., Sampson, E. L., Samus, Q., Schneider, L. S., Selbæk, G., Teri, L., & Mukadam, N. (2020). Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2020 report of the Lancet Commission. *The Lancet, 396*(10248), 413-446. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30367-6

Machů, V., Arends, I., Veldman, K., & Bültmann, U. (2022). Work-family trajectories and health: A systematic review. *Advances in Life Course Research, 52*, 100466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2022.100466

Mayeda, E. R., Mobley, T. M., Weiss, R. E., Murchland, A. R., Berkman, L. F., & Sabbath, E. L. (2020). Association of work-family experience with mid- and late-life memory decline in US women. *Neurology, 95*(23), e3072-e3080. https://doi.org/doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000010989

Mekonnen, T., Skirbekk, V., Zotcheva, E., Engdahl, B., Bratsberg, B., Jugessur, A., Bowen, C., Selbæk, G., Kohler, H.-P., Harris, J. R., Tom, S. E., Krokstad, S., Edwin, T. H., Wedatilake, Y., Wolfova, K., Kristjansson, D., Stern, Y., Håberg, A. K., & Strand, B. H. (2025). Number of children and dementia risk: a causal mediation analysis using data from the HUNT study linked with national registries in Norway. *BMC Neurology, 25*(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12883-025-04044-4

Pacca, L., Gaye, S. A., Brenowitz, W. D., Fujishiro, K., Glymour, M. M., Harrati, A., & Vable, A. M. (2025). Do type, timing and duration of life course non-employment differentially predict dementia risk? An application of sequence analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*, 117976. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2025.117976

Peng, C., Burr, J. A., & Han, S. H. (2023). Cognitive function and cognitive decline among older rural Chinese adults: the roles of social support, pension benefits, and medical insurance. *Aging & Mental Health, 27*(4), 771-779. https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2022.2088693

Phillips, D., Green, H., Petrosyan, S., Shao, K., Wilkens, J., & Lee, J. (2021). *Harmonized CHARLS Documentation Version D (2011-2018)*. https://charls.charlsdata.com/Public/ashelf/public/uploads/document/harmonized_charls/application/Harmonized_CHARLS_D.pdf

Phillips, M. L., Kobayashi, L. C., Chakraborty, R., Wagner, R., Mahlalela, N., Harezlak, J., Brown, J. W., Ludema, C., & Rosenberg, M. (2023). Number of children and mid- to later-life cognitive function and cognitive impairment in rural South Africa: Evidence from "Health and Aging in Africa: A Longitudinal Study of an INDEPTH Community in South Africa" (HAALSI). *medRxiv*, 2023.2009.2025.23296101. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.09.25.23296101

Raymo, J. M., Park, H., Xie, Y., & Yeung, W.-j. J. (2015). Marriage and Family in East Asia: Continuity and Change. *Annual Review of Sociology, 41*(1), 471-492. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112428

Read, S. L., & Grundy, E. M. D. (2016). Fertility History and Cognition in Later Life. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 72*(6), 1021-1031. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbw013

Ritschard, G., Liao, T. F., & Struffolino, E. (2023). Strategies for Multidomain Sequence Analysis in Social Research. *Sociological Methodology, 53*(2), 288-322. https://doi.org/10.1177/00811750231163833

Rote, S. (2017). Marital Disruption and Allostatic Load in Late Life. *Journal of Aging and Health, 29*(4), 688-707. https://doi.org/10.1177/0898264316641084

Saenz, J. L., Díaz-Venegas, C., & Crimmins, E. M. (2019). Fertility History and Cognitive Function in Late Life: The Case of Mexico. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 76*(4), e140-e152. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbz129

Schwartz, G. L., & Glymour, M. M. (2023). Bridging the Divide: Tackling Tensions Between Life-Course Epidemiology and Causal Inference. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology, 5*, 355-374. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-devpsych-120221-033623

Sironi, M. (2023). The Role of Fertility and Partnership History in Later-life Cognition. *Ageing International, 48*(3), 794-815. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12126-022-09500-x

Skirbekk, V., Bowen, C. E., Håberg, A., Jugessur, A., Engdahl, B., Bratsberg, B., Zotcheva, E., Selbæk, G., Kohler, H. P., Weiss, J., Harris, J. R., Tom, S. E., Krokstad, S., Stern, Y., & Strand, B. H. (2023). Marital Histories and Associations With Later-Life Dementia and Mild Cognitive Impairment Risk in the HUNT4 70+ Study in Norway. *J Aging Health, 35*(7-8), 543-555. https://doi.org/10.1177/08982643221131926

Sommerlad, A., Ruegger, J., Singh-Manoux, A., Lewis, G., & Livingston, G. (2018). Marriage and risk of dementia: systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry, 89*(3), 231-238. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2017-316274

Song, Q., Lim, E., Friedman, E., & Smith, J. P. (2025). Impact of layoffs on mortality and physical health in transitional China 1989–2015. *Social Science Research, 125*, 103110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2024.103110

Song, Q., & Smith, J. P. (2019). Hukou system, mechanisms, and health stratification across the life course in rural and urban China. *Health & Place, 58*, 102150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2019.102150

Song, Q., & Smith, J. P. (2021). The Citizenship Advantage in Psychological Well-being: An Examination of the Hukou System in China. *Demography, 58*(1), 165-189. https://doi.org/10.1215/00703370-8913024

Stern, Y., Arenaza-Urquijo, E. M., Bartrés-Faz, D., Belleville, S., Cantilon, M., Chetelat, G., Ewers, M., Franzmeier, N., Kempermann, G., Kremen, W. S., Okonkwo, O., Scarmeas, N., Soldan, A., Udeh-Momoh, C., Valenzuela, M., Vemuri, P., Vuoksimaa, E., & the Reserve, Resilience Protective Factors PIA Empirical Definitions Conceptual Frameworks Workgroup. (2020). Whitepaper: Defining and investigating cognitive reserve, brain reserve, and brain maintenance. *Alzheimer's & Dementia, 16*(9), 1305-1311. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2018.07.219

Thoma, M. C., Wang, J., Mayeda, E. R., McCulloch, C. E., Hayes-Larson, E., Torres, J. M., & Glymour, M. M. (2025). Are we there yet? Estimating the waves of follow-up required for stable effect estimates in cognitive aging research. *American journal of epidemiology*. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwaf049

Thomeer, M. B., Wolfe, J. D., Ferguson, D., Reczek, R., & Cao, R. (2024). Childbearing Histories and Midlife Cognition: Accounting for Early Life Factors. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 79*(12). https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbae177

Uccheddu, D., Emery, T., Gauthier, A. H., & Steverink, N. (2022). Gendered work-family life courses and late-life physical functioning: A comparative analysis from 28 European countries. *Advances in Life Course Research, 53*, 100495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2022.100495

Van Winkle, Z., & Wen, F. (2023). A Holistic Approach to Family Life Course Change across 1930–1978 Chinese Birth Cohorts. *Population and Development Review, 49*(2), 279-317. https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12553

Wahrendorf, M., Deindl, C., Phillips, D., & Lee, J. (2022). *Harmonized CHARLS Life History Documentation version A*. https://charls.charlsdata.com/Public/ashelf/public/uploads/document/harmonized_charls/application/Harmonized_CHARLS_Life_History_A.pdf

Wang, Y., Wang, X., Fu, P., Jiang, H., Wang, X., & Zhou, C. (2024). Life Course Patterns of Work History and Cognitive Trajectories Among Community-Dwelling Older Adults. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 80*(2). https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbae195

Weng, Y., & Yang, X. (2023). Fertility behaviors and mid-late-life health status in China: From a life-course perspective. *Social Science & Medicine, 338*, 116314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.116314

Weuve, J., Proust-Lima, C., Power, M. C., Gross, A. L., Hofer, S. M., Thiébaut, R., Chêne, G., Glymour, M. M., & Dufouil, C. (2015). Guidelines for reporting methodological challenges and evaluating potential bias in dementia research. *Alzheimer's & Dementia, 11*(9), 1098-1109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2015.06.1885

Wu, J., Glaser, K., & Avendano, M. (2023). Does the transition to grandparenthood influence the health and well-being of older people? Evidence from the CHARLS study in China. *SSM - Population Health, 21*, 101328. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2022.101328

Wu, X. (2019). Inequality and Social Stratification in Postsocialist China. *Annual Review of Sociology, 45*(1), 363-382. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073018-022516

Wu, X., & Treiman, D. J. (2004). The household registration system and social stratification in China: 1955–1996. *Demography, 41*(2), 363-384. https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.2004.0010

Wu, Y., Zhang, Y. S., Kobayashi, L. C., Mayeda, E. R., & Gross, A. L. (2024). How to assess cognitive decline when test administration changes across study waves? Harmonizing cognitive scores across waves in the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease Reports, 8*(1), 1661-1669. https://doi.org/10.1177/25424823241302759

Yang, H.-L., Zhang, S.-Q., Zhang, S., Wu, Y.-Y., & Luo, R.-D. (2022). Fertility experiences and later-life cognitive function among older adults in China. *American Journal of Human Biology, 34*(10), e23786. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23786

Yu, X., Kabudula, C. W., Wagner, R. G., Bassil, D. T., Farrell, M. T., Tollman, S. M., Kahn, K., Berkman, L. F., Rosenberg, M. S., & Kobayashi, L. C. (2024). Mid-life employment trajectories and subsequent memory function and rate of decline in rural South Africa, 2000–22. *International journal of epidemiology, 53*(2). https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyae022

Zaheed, A. B., Sharifian, N., Morris, E. P., Kraal, A. Z., & Zahodne, L. B. (2021). Associations between life course marital biography and late-life memory decline. *Psychol Aging, 36*(5), 557-571. https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000617

Zhang, Y. (2022). Fertility History and Risk of Cognitive Impairment Among Older Parents in the United States. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 77*(12), 2326-2337. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbac091

Zhang, Y., & Fletcher, J. (2021). Parental status in later life and parents' risk of cognitive impairment. *SSM - Population Health, 16*, 100968. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.100968

Zhang, Y., Fletcher, J., Lu, Q., & Song, J. (2023). Gender differences in the association between parity and cognitive function: Evidence from the UK biobank. *Social Science & Medicine, 320*, 115649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115649

Zhang, Y., & Fletcher, J. M. (2024). Research Note: The Association Between Parity and Odds of Alzheimer's Disease and Dementias Status. *Demography, 61*(5), 1339-1350. https://doi.org/10.1215/00703370-11585876

Zhang, Y. S., O'Shea, B., Yu, X., Cho, T.-C., Zhang, K. P., Kler, J., Langa, K. M., Weir, D. R., Gross, A. L., & Kobayashi, L. C. (2024). Educational Attainment and Later-life Cognitive Function in High- and Middle-income Countries: Evidence from the Harmonized Cognitive Assessment Protocol. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 79*(5). https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbae005

Zhao, M., & Gao, W. (2023). Ta bi ta geng jiankang? Shengyu-jiuye shengming licheng dui zhongguo zhonglaonianren jiankang de yingxiang [He is healthier? The effects of the parity-employment life course trajectory on the health and mid-aged and older adults in China]. *Renkou yanjiu, 47*(5), 18-30.

Zhao, Y., Chen, X., Wang, Y., Meng, Q., Bo, H., Chen, C., Chen, Y., Gong, J., Jia, Y., Wang, G., Wu, X., Yan, L., Yang, P., & Zhou, H. (2023). *China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study Wave 5 (2020) User Guide*. https://charls.charlsdata.com/Public/ashelf/public/uploads/document/2020-charls-wave5/application/CHARLS_2020_User_Guide_English.pdf

Zhao, Y., Hu, Y., Smith, J. P., Strauss, J., & Yang, G. (2014). Cohort Profile: The China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS). *International journal of epidemiology, 43*(1), 61-68. https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dys203

Zhao, Y., Strauss, J., Yang, G., Giles, J., Hu, P. P., Hu, Y., Lei, X., Liu, M., Park, A., Smith, J. P., & Wang, Y. (2013). *China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study: 2011-2012 National Baseline User's Guide*. https://charls.charlsdata.com/Public/ashelf/public/uploads/document/2011-charls-wave1/application/CHARLS_nationalbaseline_users_guide.pdf

Supplementary Materials for manuscript "Family-work history and inequalities in old-age cognition in China"

Figure S4a. **Chronograms** for family-work trajectories by six-cluster solution
Figure S4b**. Index plots** for family-work trajectories by six-cluster solution
Table S4b. **Pairwise comparisons** with Bonferroni correction of means in episodic memory, immediate word recall, delayed word recall, and mental status between six clusters of family-work trajectories in CHARLS 2011
Table S4c. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate word recall and mental status scores** from **2011 to 2018**
Figure S4c. **Margins plots** for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate recall and mental status scores** from **2011 to 2018**
Table S4d. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **delayed word recall and episodic memory scores** from **2011 to 2018**
Figure S4d**. Margins plots** for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **delayed recall and episodic memory scores** from **2011 to 2018**

[Sensitivity analysis C, immediate recall and mental status scores summed up to a total cognition score ranging from 0 to 21, n = 8,535]

Table S5a. **Pairwise comparisons** with Bonferroni correction of means in total cognition score in CHARLS 2011 between six clusters of family-work trajectories
Table S5b. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **total cognition score** from 2011 to 2020
Figure S5. **Margins plot** for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **total cognition score** from 2011 to 2020

[Sensitivity analysis D, data multiply imputed 10 times, n = 8,535]

Table S6. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' immediate word recall and mental status scores from 2011 to 2020.
Figure S6. **Margins plot** for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate recall and mental status scores**

[Sensitivity analysis E, time-varying covariates dropped from linear mixed-effects models, n = 8,535]

Table S7. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' immediate word recall and mental status scores from 2011 to 2020.
Figure S7. **Margins plot** for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate recall and mental status scores**

[Sensitivity analysis F, time-invariant baseline age replaced by time-invariant birth cohorts, n = 8,535]

Table S8. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' immediate word recall and mental status scores from 2011 to 2020.

Figure S8. **Margins plot** for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate recall and mental status scores**

[Sensitivity analysis G, comparison of excluded respondents with our study sample]

Table S9. Comparisons of characteristics in baseline wave (CHARLS 2011) between excluded respondents (n = 9,713) and our study sample (n = 8,535)

Table S1. Questions and variables related to immediate word recall assessment in CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2015, 2018, and 2020.

Wave	Questions and variables	List of words used
2011	The interviewed read the words. If the respondent did not recall any word in their first attempt, the interviewer would read the same list of words to them for a second time and asked the respondent to recall the words immediately. If the respondent did not recall any word again, the interviewer would repeat the same procedure for a third time. There were 10 variables recording respondents' performance on immediate word recall (It would be from their last attempt if applicable).	One list randomly chosen from four lists. List A: rice, river, doctor, clothes, egg, cat, bowl, child, hand, book; List B: stool, foot, sky, money, pillow, dog, house, wood, school, tea; List C: mountain, stone, blood, mother, shoes, eye, girl, house, road, sun; List D: water, hospital, tree, father, fire, tooth, moon, village, boy, table
2013	Questions were the same as in CHARLS 2011, but there were 30 variables recording respondents' performance on immediate word recall (10 for each attempt (if applicable)).	The same as in CHARLS 2011.
2015	The interviewer read the words. If the respondent did not recall any word in their first attempt, the procedure was not repeated. There were 10 variables recording respondents' performance on immediate word recall	The same as in CHARLS 2011.
2018	The respondents were asked to read 10 words displayed on the screen and then to recall them. If respondents had visual impairments so could not read, the interviewer would read the words to	Only one list of 10 words in different orders. First time: butter, arm, shore, letter, queen, cabin, pole, ticket, grass, engine;

	respondents. Regardless of respondents' performance in their first attempt to recall, the procedure was repeated twice with changing orders in words. There were 30 variables recording respondents' performance on immediate word recall (10 for each attempt).	Second time: pole, letter, butter, queen, arm, shore, grass, cabin, ticket, engine; Third time: shore, letter, arm, cabin, pole, ticket, engine, grass, butter, queen.
2020	The interviewer read the words. If the respondent had hearing problems, the words were shown on the screen. Regardless of respondents' performance in their first attempt to recall, the procedure was repeated twice with changing orders in words. There were 30 variables recording respondents' performance on immediate word recall (10 for each attempt).	One list randomly chosen from two lists used for all three attempts, with different orders in words. First list: river, book, eyes, cottage, pole, stamp, motorcycle, grass, egg, president; Second list: sky, paper, arm, building, stick, ticket, automobile, flower, milk, prime minister.

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2015, 2018, and 2020.



Figure S1. Chronogram for our study sample's partnership history from age 18 to 50 (n = 8,535)

Table S2a. Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F statistics by various cluster solutions to family-work trajectories among CHARLS respondents (n = 8,535)

Number of clusters	Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F statistics
2	111.37
3	161.55
4	273.19
5	292.08
6	**544.80**
7	473.00
8	406.57
9	367.02
10	421.71
11	382.77
12	388.73
13	358.50
14	362.71
15	359.24

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2014



Figure S2a Dendrograms for various cluster solutions to family-work trajectories among CHARLS respondents (n = 8,535)



Figure S2b Chronograms for family-work trajectories by five-cluster solution for study sample aged 50 and above in CHARLS 2014 (n = 8,535).



Figure S2c Chronograms for family-work trajectories by seven-cluster solution for study sample aged 50 and above in CHARLS 2014 (n = 8,535).



Figure S2d Chronograms for family-work trajectories by eight-cluster solution for study sample aged 50 and above in CHARLS 2014 (n = 8,535).



Figure S2e. Chronograms for family-work trajectories by nine-cluster solution for study sample aged 50 and above in CHARLS 2014 (n = 8,535).



Figure S2f. Chronograms for family-work trajectories by ten-cluster solution for study sample aged 50 and above in CHARLS 2014 (n = 8,535).



Figure S2g. Index plots for family-work trajectories by six-cluster solution for study sample aged 50 and above in CHARLS 2014 (n = 8,535).

Table S2b. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate word recall and mental status scores** from 2011 to 2020 (corresponding to Table 3, n =8,535).

	Immediate recall		Mental status	
	coef.	95% CI	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effects portion				
Family-work trajectories				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.22***	[0.11,0.34]	0.63***	[0.43,0.83]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	0.17*	[0.01,0.33]	0.93***	[0.66,1.21]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	0.04	[-0.11,0.19]	0.74***	[0.48,1.00]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	0.40***	[0.25,0.54]	1.45***	[1.20,1.71]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	0.05	[-0.04,0.14]	0.39***	[0.23,0.55]
Time	-0.15***	[-0.16,-0.13]	-0.13***	[-0.15,-0.11]
Family-work trajectories × Time				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.01	[-0.00,0.03]	0.02	[-0.00,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	0.01	[-0.01,0.03]	-0.01	[-0.04,0.02]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.04**	[0.01,0.06]	0.01	[-0.02,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.04***	[0.03,0.06]	-0.00	[-0.03,0.02]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.02*	[0.00,0.03]	-0.00	[-0.02,0.01]
Men	0.08*	[0.01,0.14]	1.56***	[1.42,1.70]
Men × Time			-0.02***	[-0.04,-0.01]
Baseline age centred at 59	-0.04***	[-0.05,-0.04]	-0.06***	[-0.07,-0.05]
Baseline age centred at 59 × Time	-0.00***	[-0.00,-0.00]		
Educational attainment				
Lower secondary or below	ref	ref	ref	ref
Upper secondary	0.76***	[0.67,0.85]	1.22***	[1.05,1.40]
Tertiary	0.94***	[0.67,1.21]	1.10***	[0.57,1.62]
Married	0.20***	[0.14,0.27]	0.33***	[0.23,0.43]
Rural *hukou*	-0.32***	[-0.39,-0.25]	-0.50***	[-0.62,-0.39]
Communist party member	0.25***	[0.17,0.34]	0.42***	[0.25,0.58]
Quintile of household per capita wealth				

Lowest quintile	ref	ref	ref	ref
2nd quintile	0.02	[-0.06,0.10]	0.07	[-0.08,0.22]
3rd quintile	0.09*	[0.01,0.17]	0.38***	[0.23,0.53]
4th quintile	0.17***	[0.09,0.25]	0.71***	[0.55,0.86]
Highest quintile	0.27***	[0.19,0.35]	1.06***	[0.90,1.21]
Smoking	-0.12***	[-0.18,-0.05]	-0.26***	[-0.39,-0.14]
Drinking alcohol	0.09***	[0.05,0.13]	0.07*	[0.01,0.14]
Number of limitations in instrumental activities in daily living	-0.10***	[-0.12,-0.08]	-0.24***	[-0.27,-0.22]
Depressive symptomatology	-0.27***	[-0.33,-0.21]	-0.31***	[-0.39,-0.23]
Depressive symptomatology × Time	0.01**	[0.00,0.02]	0.02*	[0.00,0.03]
Constant	3.86***	[3.72,3.99]	5.67***	[5.45,5.90]
Random-effects portion				
Variance (constant)	0.83	[0.79,0.87]	3.99	[3.85,4.14]
Variance (residual)	1.99	[1.96,2.02]	3.64	[3.58,3.70]
Observations	36,669		38,494	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. Baseline age centred at 59 × Time was significant only when the outcome was immediate recall. Men × Time was significant only when the outcome was mental status. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Table S2c. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **delayed word recall and episodic memory** from 2011 to 2020 (n = 8,535).

	Delayed recall		Episodic memory	
	coef.	95% CI	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effect portion				
Family-work trajectories				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.14	[-0.01,0.29]	0.20**	[0.08,0.32]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	0.19	[-0.01,0.40]	0.20*	[0.03,0.36]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	-0.04	[-0.23,0.16]	0.02	[-0.14,0.18]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	0.24*	[0.05,0.42]	0.37***	[0.22,0.52]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	0.10	[-0.02,0.21]	0.08	[-0.01,0.18]
Time	0.11***	[0.10,0.13]	-0.01	[-0.02,0.00]
Family-work trajectories × Time				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.04***	[0.02,0.06]	0.02**	[0.01,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	0.05***	[0.02,0.08]	0.03*	[0.01,0.05]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.06***	[0.04,0.09]	0.05***	[0.03,0.07]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.09***	[0.06,0.11]	0.06***	[0.04,0.07]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.01	[-0.01,0.03]	0.01	[-0.00,0.02]
Men	-0.10*	[-0.20,-0.00]	-0.02	[-0.10,0.06]
Men × Time	0.03***	[0.02,0.04]	0.02***	[0.01,0.03]
Baseline age centred at 59	-0.04***	[-0.05,-0.04]	-0.04***	[-0.05,-0.04]
Baseline age centred at 59 × Time	-0.01***	[-0.01,-0.01]	-0.00***	[-0.01,-0.00]
Educational attainment				
Lower secondary or below	ref	ref	ref	ref
Upper secondary	0.85***	[0.74,0.97]	0.80***	[0.70,0.89]
Tertiary	0.98***	[0.64,1.31]	0.96***	[0.68,1.25]
Married	0.17***	[0.09,0.26]	0.17***	[0.10,0.24]
Rural *hukou*	-0.35***	[-0.44,-0.26]	-0.30***	[-0.37,-0.22]
Communist party member	0.36***	[0.25,0.47]	0.30***	[0.21,0.39]
Quintile of household per capita wealth				

Lowest quintile	ref	ref	ref	ref
2nd quintile	-0.01	[-0.11,0.09]	0.00	[-0.08,0.09]
3rd quintile	0.06	[-0.04,0.16]	0.07	[-0.01,0.16]
4th quintile	0.23***	[0.13,0.33]	0.21***	[0.12,0.29]
Highest quintile	0.33***	[0.23,0.44]	0.31***	[0.23,0.40]
Smoking	-0.08	[-0.16,0.01]	-0.09**	[-0.16,-0.02]
Drinking alcohol	0.11***	[0.06,0.17]	0.10***	[0.05,0.14]
Number of limitations in instrumental activities in daily living	-0.12***	[-0.14,-0.09]	-0.10***	[-0.12,-0.08]
Depressive symptomatology	-0.26***	[-0.31,-0.21]	-0.23***	[-0.26,-0.19]
Constant	2.59***	[2.43,2.76]	3.17***	[3.04,3.31]
Random-effects portion				
Variance(constant)	1.28	[1.22,1.35]	1.00	[0.96,1.05]
Variance(residual)	3.20	[3.15,3.25]	1.86	[1.82,1.89]
Observations	35,730		35,641	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001



Figure S2h. Margins plots for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **delayed recall and episodic memory scores** from 2011 to 2020 (n = 8,535).

Table S3a. Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F statistics by various cluster solutions to family-work trajectories among CHARLS respondents (n = 7,432) (study sample aged 50 and above in 2011)

Number of clusters	Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F statistics
2	94.40
3	125.51
4	204.54
5	569.06
6	**689.26**
7	581.91
8	521.66
9	470.31
10	454.58
11	450.03
12	414.61
13	396.84
14	380.85
15	357.95

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study.



Figure S3a. Chronograms for family-work trajectories by six-cluster solution for study sample aged 50 and above in CHARLS 2011 (n = 7,432).



Figure S3b. Index plots for family-work trajectories by six-cluster solution for study sample aged 50 and above in CHARLS 2011 (n = 7,432).

Table S3b. Pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction of means in episodic memory, immediate word recall, delayed word recall, and mental status in CHARLS 2011 between six clusters of family-work trajectories (**study sample aged 50 and above in 2011, n = 7,432**)

Differences in means between row cluster and column cluster	Married, 1 child, various types of employment (n = 875)	Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n =1,159)	Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 479)	Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 682)	Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,181)
	Episodic memory				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 1,159)	-0.27** (0.08)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 479)	-0.39*** (0.10)	-0.12 (0.09)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 682)	0.30** (0.09)	0.58*** (0.08)	0.70*** (0.10)		
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,181)	-0.42*** (0.07)	-0.15 (0.06)	-0.03 (0.09)	-0.73*** (0.08)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,056)	-0.65*** (0.07)	-0.37*** (0.06)	-0.25 (0.09)	-0.95*** (0.08)	-0.23*** (0.05)
	Immediate recall				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 1,159)	-0.30** (0.08)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 479)	-0.39** (0.10)	-0.09 (0.10)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 682)	0.30* (0.09)	0.60*** (0.08)	0.70*** (0.10)		

Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,181)	-0.45*** (0.07)	-0.15 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.09)	-0.75*** (0.08)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,056)	-0.69*** (0.07)	-0.39*** (0.07)	-0.29* (0.09)	-0.99*** (0.08)	-0.24*** (0.05)
	Delayed recall				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 1,159)	-0.26 (0.09)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 479)	-0.41** (0.11)	-0.15*** (0.11)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 682)	0.30 (0.10)	0.55*** (0.10)	0.71*** (0.12)		
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,181)	-0.40*** (0.08)	-0.15 (0.07)	0.01 (0.10)	-0.70*** (0.09)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,056)	-0.61*** (0.08)	-0.36*** (0.08)	-0.21*** (0.10)	-0.91*** (0.09)	-0.21*** (0.06)
	Mental status				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 1,159)	0.19 (0.14)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 479)	-0.28 (0.18)	-0.47 (0.17)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 682)	1.44*** (0.16)	1.24*** (0.15)	1.72*** (0.19)		

Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,181)	-0.79*** (0.12)	-0.98*** (0.11)	-0.51* (0.16)	-2.23*** (0.14)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,056)	-1.67*** (0.13)	-1.87*** (0.12)	-1.40*** (0.16)	-3.11*** (0.14)	-0.89*** (0.10)

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table S3c. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate word recall and mental status scores** from 2011 to 2020 (**sample aged 50+ in 2011, n = 7,432**).

	Immediate recall		Mental status	
	coef.	95% CI	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effects portion				
Family-work trajectories				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.20**	[0.07,0.33]	0.36***	[0.15,0.58]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	0.17**	[0.06,0.28]	0.85***	[0.66,1.05]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	0.07	[-0.08,0.22]	0.84***	[0.59,1.10]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	0.38***	[0.23,0.54]	1.35***	[1.09,1.61]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	0.13**	[0.04,0.22]	0.30***	[0.14,0.45]
Time	-0.16***	[-0.18,-0.14]	-0.13***	[-0.15,-0.12]
Family-work trajectories × Time				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.01	[-0.00,0.03]	0.03*	[0.00,0.05]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	0.01	[-0.00,0.03]	-0.01	[-0.03,0.01]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.03**	[0.01,0.05]	-0.00	[-0.03,0.02]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.05***	[0.03,0.07]	0.00	[-0.02,0.03]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.00	[-0.01,0.01]	-0.01	[-0.03,0.01]
Men	0.07	[-0.00,0.14]	1.62***	[1.48,1.77]
Men × Time			-0.02**	[-0.04,-0.01]
Baseline age centred at 61	-0.04***	[-0.05,-0.04]	-0.06***	[-0.07,-0.05]
Baseline age centred at 61 × Time	-0.00***	[-0.00,-0.00]		
Educational attainment				
Lower secondary or below	ref	ref	ref	ref
Upper secondary	0.73***	[0.63,0.84]	1.20***	[1.01,1.40]
Tertiary	0.89***	[0.60,1.17]	1.21***	[0.65,1.77]
Married	0.20***	[0.13,0.27]	0.34***	[0.23,0.45]
Rural *hukou*	-0.39***	[-0.50,-0.28]	-0.49***	[-0.61,-0.37]
Rural *hukou* × Time	0.02*	[0.00,0.03]		
Communist party member	0.26***	[0.17,0.35]	0.41***	[0.23,0.58]

Quintile of household per capita wealth				
Lowest quintile	ref	ref	ref	ref
2nd quintile	0.06	[-0.03,0.14]	0.10	[-0.07,0.26]
3rd quintile	0.09*	[0.01,0.18]	0.37***	[0.21,0.53]
4th quintile	0.17***	[0.08,0.25]	0.75***	[0.58,0.91]
Highest quintile	0.30***	[0.21,0.39]	1.14***	[0.97,1.31]
Smoking	-0.11**	[-0.18,-0.04]	-0.24***	[-0.37,-0.10]
Drinking alcohol	0.10***	[0.05,0.15]	0.05	[-0.02,0.12]
Number of limitations in instrumental activities in daily living	-0.10***	[-0.12,-0.08]	-0.24***	[-0.26,-0.21]
Depressive symptomatology	-0.26***	[-0.32,-0.20]	-0.30***	[-0.39,-0.22]
Depressive symptomatology × Time	0.01*	[0.00,0.02]	0.02**	[0.00,0.03]
Constant	3.79***	[3.64,3.94]	5.53***	[5.31,5.75]
Random-effects portion				
Variance(constant)	0.83	[0.79, 0.88]	4.10	[3.94, 4.26]
Variance(residual)	2.00	[1.96, 2.03]	3.66	[3.59, 3.72]
Observations	31,797		33,497	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. Baseline age was centred at age 61 in light of new analytical sample's mean age at baseline wave. Baseline age centred at 61 × Time was significant only when the outcome was immediate recall. Men × Time was significant only when the outcome was mental status. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001



Figure S3c. Margins plots for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate recall and mental status scores** from 2011 to 2020 (**sample aged 50+ in 2011, n =7,432**).

Table S3d. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **delayed word recall and episodic memory scores** from 2011 to 2020 (**sample aged 50+ in 2011, n = 7,432**).

	Delayed recall		Episodic memory	
	coef.	95% CI	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effects portion				
Family-work trajectories				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.08	[-0.08,0.24]	0.18**	[0.05,0.30]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	0.11	[-0.03,0.25]	0.17**	[0.05,0.28]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	-0.05	[-0.24,0.14]	0.03	[-0.12,0.19]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	0.23*	[0.04,0.42]	0.39***	[0.24,0.55]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	0.08	[-0.03,0.20]	0.12*	[0.02,0.21]
Time	0.10***	[0.09,0.11]	-0.01**	[-0.02,-0.01]
Family-work trajectories × Time				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.04***	[0.02,0.06]	0.02*	[0.00,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	0.04***	[0.02,0.06]	0.02**	[0.01,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.06***	[0.04,0.09]	0.04***	[0.02,0.06]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.09***	[0.06,0.11]	0.05***	[0.03,0.07]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.01	[-0.01,0.02]	0.00	[-0.01,0.01]
Men	-0.11*	[-0.22,-0.01]	-0.04	[-0.13,0.04]
Men × Time	0.03***	[0.02,0.05]	0.02***	[0.01,0.03]
Baseline age centred at 61	-0.04***	[-0.05,-0.03]	-0.04***	[-0.05,-0.04]
Baseline age centred at 61 × Time	-0.01***	[-0.01,-0.00]	-0.00***	[-0.00,-0.00]
Educational attainment				
Lower secondary or below	ref	ref	ref	ref
Upper secondary	0.84***	[0.72,0.97]	0.78***	[0.67,0.88]
Tertiary	0.91***	[0.55,1.27]	0.91***	[0.60,1.21]
Married	0.18***	[0.09,0.27]	0.17***	[0.10,0.24]
Rural *hukou*	-0.32***	[-0.42,-0.22]	-0.27***	[-0.35,-0.20]
Communist party member	0.37***	[0.26,0.48]	0.31***	[0.22,0.41]
Quintile of household per capita wealth				

Lowest quintile	ref	ref	ref	ref
2nd quintile	0.02	[-0.08,0.13]	0.04	[-0.05,0.13]
3rd quintile	0.05	[-0.06,0.15]	0.07	[-0.02,0.16]
4th quintile	0.22***	[0.11,0.32]	0.20***	[0.11,0.29]
Highest quintile	0.36***	[0.25,0.47]	0.34***	[0.25,0.43]
Smoking	-0.06	[-0.15,0.03]	-0.09*	[-0.16,-0.01]
Drinking alcohol	0.13***	[0.07,0.19]	0.11***	[0.06,0.16]
Number of limitations in instrumental activities in daily living	-0.11***	[-0.14,-0.09]	-0.09***	[-0.11,-0.07]
Depressive symptomatology	-0.25***	[-0.31,-0.20]	-0.22***	[-0.26,-0.18]
Constant	2.48***	[2.32,2.65]	3.05***	[2.92,3.19]
Random-effects portion				
Variance(constant)	1.28	[1.22, 1.35]	1.01	[0.96, 1.06]
Variance(Residual)	3.21	[3.16, 3.27]	1.86	[1.83, 1.90]
Observations	30,918		30,835	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001



Figure S3d. Margins plots for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **delayed recall and episodic memory scores** from 2011 to 2020 (**sample aged 50+ in 2011, n = 7,432**).

Table S4a. Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F statistics by various cluster solutions to family-work trajectories among CHARLS respondents (n = 9,329) (**CHARLS 2020 data excluded**)

Number of clusters	Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F statistics
2	162.76
3	197.18
4	345.87
5	484.38
6	**736.80**
7	639.78
8	553.61
9	520.65
10	541.62
11	510.50
12	482.88
13	454.87
14	421.30
15	419.39

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2018. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study.



Figure S4a. Chronograms for family-work trajectories by six-cluster solution (CHARLS 2020 data excluded, i.e., respondents were interviewed in 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2018, n = 9,329).



Figure S4b. Index plots for family-work trajectories by six-cluster solution (CHARLS 2020 data excluded, i.e., respondents were interviewed in 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2018, n = 9,329)

Table S4b. Pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction of means in episodic memory, immediate word recall, delayed word recall, and mental status between six clusters of family-work trajectories in CHARLS 2011 (**CHARLS 2020 data excluded, n = 9,329**)

Differences in means between row cluster and column cluster	Married, 1 child, various types of employment (n = 1,228)	Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n =836)	Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 614)	Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 854)	Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 4,039)
	Episodic memory				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 836)	-0.05 (0.08)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 614)	-0.34** (0.09)	-0.29* (0.09)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 854)	0.29** (0.08)	0.34*** (0.09)	0.63*** (0.09)		
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 4,039)	-0.52*** (0.06)	-0.48*** (0.07)	-0.19 (0.08)	-0.81*** (0.07)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 1,758)	-0.60*** (0.07)	-0.55*** (0.07)	-0.26* (0.08)	-0.89*** (0.07)	-0.07 (0.05)
	Immediate recall				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 1,159)	-0.11 (0.08)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 479)	-0.37*** (0.09)	-0.26 (0.10)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 682)	0.30** (0.08)	0.41*** (0.09)	0.67*** (0.09)		

Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,181)	-0.56*** (0.06)	-0.44*** (0.07)	-0.19 (0.08)	-0.85*** (0.07)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,056)	-0.63*** (0.07)	-0.52*** (0.08)	-0.26* (0.08)	-0.93*** (0.07)	-0.08 (0.05)
	Delayed recall				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 1,159)	0.01 (0.09)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 479)	-0.31* (0.10)	-0.33* (0.11)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 682)	0.28* (0.09)	0.26 (0.10)	0.59*** (0.11)		
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,181)	-0.49*** (0.07)	-0.50*** (0.08)	-0.18 (0.09)	-0.77*** (0.08)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,056)	-0.57*** (0.08)	-0.58*** (0.09)	-0.26 (0.10)	-0.85*** (0.09)	-0.08 (0.06)
	Mental status				
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 1,159)	0.67*** (0.14)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 479)	-0.24 (0.15)	-0.92*** (0.17)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 682)	1.35*** (0.14)	0.67*** (0.15)	1.59*** (0.16)		

Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,181)	-0.93*** (0.10)	-1.60*** (0.12)	-0.68*** (0.13)	-2.27*** (0.12)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 2,056)	-1.70*** (0.11)	-2.38*** (0.13)	-1.46*** (0.14)	-3.05*** (0.13)	-0.77*** (0.09)

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2018. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table S4c. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate word recall and mental status scores** from **2011 to 2018** (**CHARLS 2020 data excluded, n = 9,329**).

	Immediate recall		Mental status	
	coef.	95% CI	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effects portion				
Family-work trajectories				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.06	[-0.06,0.18]	0.34***	[0.14,0.54]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	0.10	[-0.03,0.24]	0.93***	[0.70,1.16]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	-0.04	[-0.19,0.10]	0.80***	[0.55,1.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	0.25***	[0.11,0.40]	1.14***	[0.89,1.39]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	-0.01	[-0.10,0.07]	0.33***	[0.18,0.48]
Time	-0.26***	[-0.28,-0.23]	-0.17***	[-0.20,-0.14]
Family-work trajectories × Time				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.05***	[0.02,0.07]	0.03*	[0.00,0.06]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	0.04**	[0.01,0.07]	-0.02	[-0.05,0.02]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.05***	[0.03,0.08]	-0.01	[-0.05,0.03]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.06***	[0.04,0.09]	0.01	[-0.02,0.05]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.03***	[0.01,0.05]	-0.00	[-0.02,0.02]
Men	0.07*	[0.00,0.14]	1.54***	[1.41,1.68]
Men × Time			-0.03***	[-0.05,-0.02]
Baseline age centred at 59	-0.04***	[-0.05,-0.04]	-0.06***	[-0.07,-0.06]
Baseline age centred at 59 × Time	-0.00***	[-0.00,-0.00]		
Educational attainment				
Lower secondary or below	ref	ref	ref	ref
Upper secondary	0.74***	[0.65,0.83]	1.16***	[0.99,1.33]
Tertiary	0.83***	[0.58,1.09]	1.05***	[0.56,1.53]
Married	-0.02	[-0.12,0.09]	0.21**	[0.06,0.36]
Married × Time	0.06***	[0.04,0.08]	0.04**	[0.01,0.06]
Rural *hukou*	-0.49***	[-0.57,-0.41]	-0.80***	[-0.93,-0.67]
Communist party member	0.24***	[0.15,0.32]	0.44***	[0.28,0.60]

Quintile of household per capita wealth				
Lowest quintile	ref	ref	ref	ref
2nd quintile	0.04	[-0.04,0.12]	0.09	[-0.06,0.24]
3rd quintile	0.08	[-0.00,0.15]	0.38***	[0.23,0.53]
4th quintile	0.17***	[0.09,0.25]	0.65***	[0.50,0.80]
Highest quintile	0.29***	[0.21,0.37]	1.01***	[0.85,1.16]
Smoking	-0.03	[-0.11,0.04]	-0.24***	[-0.36,-0.11]
Smoking × Time	-0.03***	[-0.04,-0.01]		
Drinking alcohol	0.06*	[0.01,0.11]	0.08*	[0.00,0.15]
Number of limitations in instrumental activities in daily living	-0.11***	[-0.13,-0.09]	-0.27***	[-0.30,-0.24]
Depressive symptomatology	-0.24***	[-0.28,-0.20]	-0.26***	[-0.32,-0.20]
Constant	4.38***	[4.23,4.53]	6.16***	[5.92,6.41]
Random-effects portion				
Variance(constant)	0.83	[0.79,0.87]	3.96	[3.81, 4.11]
Variance(Residual)	1.96	[1.93,2.00]	3.71	[3.65, 3.78]
Observations	31,660		33,711	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2018. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001



Figure S4c. Margins plots for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate recall and mental status scores** from **2011 to 2018 (CHARLS 2020 data excluded, n = 9,329**).

Table S4d. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **delayed word recall and episodic memory scores** from **2011 to 2018** (**CHARLS 2020 data excluded, n = 9,329**).

	Delayed recall		Episodic memory	
	coef.	95% CI	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effects portion				
Family-work trajectories				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.02	[-0.12,0.17]	0.05	[-0.08,0.17]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	0.21*	[0.04,0.37]	0.15*	[0.02,0.29]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	-0.07	[-0.25,0.10]	-0.05	[-0.20,0.09]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	0.19*	[0.01,0.38]	0.24**	[0.09,0.39]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	0.05	[-0.06,0.15]	0.01	[-0.07,0.10]
Time	0.05**	[0.02,0.09]	-0.10***	[-0.13,-0.07]
Family-work trajectories × Time				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.05**	[0.02,0.08]	0.05***	[0.02,0.07]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	0.05**	[0.02,0.08]	0.05***	[0.02,0.07]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.08***	[0.04,0.11]	0.06***	[0.04,0.09]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.08***	[0.04,0.11]	0.07***	[0.04,0.09]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.01	[-0.01,0.03]	0.02*	[0.00,0.04]
Men	-0.07	[-0.16,0.03]	0.04	[-0.03,0.11]
Men × Time	0.03**	[0.01,0.04]		
Baseline age centred at 59	-0.04***	[-0.04,-0.03]	-0.04***	[-0.04,-0.03]
Baseline age centred at 59 × Time	-0.01***	[-0.01,-0.01]	-0.01***	[-0.01,-0.01]
Educational attainment				
Lower secondary or below	ref	ref	ref	ref
Upper secondary	0.82***	[0.72,0.93]	0.77***	[0.68,0.87]
Tertiary	0.87***	[0.56,1.17]	0.86***	[0.59,1.12]
Married	0.07	[-0.06,0.20]	0.02	[-0.08,0.12]
Married × Time	0.03**	[0.01,0.06]	0.05***	[0.03,0.07]
Rural *hukou*	-0.32***	[-0.44,-0.20]	-0.38***	[-0.48,-0.28]
Rural *hukou* × Time	-0.06***	[-0.09,-0.04]	-0.03***	[-0.05,-0.01]

Communist party member	0.17**	[0.04,0.30]	0.19***	[0.08,0.30]
Communist party member × Time	0.05***	[0.02,0.07]	0.03**	[0.01,0.05]
Quintile of household per capita wealth				
Lowest quintile	ref	ref	ref	ref
2nd quintile	-0.02	[-0.12,0.07]	0.01	[-0.08,0.09]
3rd quintile	0.02	[-0.07,0.12]	0.05	[-0.03,0.13]
4th quintile	0.18***	[0.08,0.27]	0.18***	[0.10,0.26]
Highest quintile	0.29***	[0.19,0.39]	0.30***	[0.21,0.38]
Smoking	-0.09*	[-0.17,-0.01]	-0.10**	[-0.17,-0.04]
Drinking alcohol	0.08**	[0.02,0.14]	0.07**	[0.02,0.12]
Number of limitations in instrumental activities in daily living	-0.08***	[-0.12,-0.04]	-0.11***	[-0.13,-0.09]
Number of limitations in instrumental activities in daily living × Time	-0.01**	[-0.02,-0.00]		
Depressive symptomatology	-0.27***	[-0.32,-0.22]	-0.25***	[-0.29,-0.21]
Constant	2.92***	[2.72,3.12]	3.62***	[3.46,3.79]
Random-effects portion				
Variance(constant)	1.13	[1.07,1.19]	0.95	[0.90,0.99]
Variance(Residual)	2.97	[2.92,3.03]	1.79	[1.76,1.83]
Observations	31,097		31,002	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2018. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. When the outcome was episodic memory, the structure of the covariance matrix for the random effects was changed from unstructured to independent to simplify model. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.



Figure S4d. Margins plots for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **delayed recall and episodic memory scores** from **2011 to 2018 (CHARLS 2020 data excluded, n = 9,329**).

The lines for all six trajectories trended up in delayed recall and trended down in episodic memory (right panel). These findings suggested that, when potential biased delayed recall and episodic memory scores in CHARLS 2020 were removed (these scores were still biased in CHARLS 2018), these respondents' immediate recall score decreased more than their delayed recall score increased so the coefficients for the slopes for episodic memories became negative.

Table S5a. Pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni correction of means in **total cognition score (immediate recall + mental status score, range: 0-21)** in CHARLS 2011 between six clusters of family-work trajectories (**n = 8,535**)

Differences in means between row cluster and column cluster	Married, 1 child, various types of employment (n = 1,332)	Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n =488)	Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 505)	Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 763)	Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 4,027)
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector (n = 488)	0.57 (0.22)				
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force (n = 505)	-0.99*** (0.21)	-1.56*** (0.26)			
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector (n = 763)	1.50*** (0.18)	0.93** (0.24)	2.49*** (0.23)		
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 4,027)	-1.47*** (0.13)	-2.05*** (0.20)	-0.48 (0.19)	-2.98*** (0.16)	
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed (n = 1,420)	-2.54*** (0.16)	-3.11*** (0.22)	-1.55*** (0.21)	-4.04*** (0.18)	-1.07*** (0.13)

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. Standard errors in parentheses.

Table S5b. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **total cognition score (immediate recall + mental status, range: 0-21)** from 2011 to 2020 (**n = 8,535**).

	Total cognition score	
	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effects portion		
Family-work trajectories		
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.92***	[0.65,1.19]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	1.16***	[0.79,1.53]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	0.78***	[0.43,1.14]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	1.97***	[1.63,2.31]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	0.46***	[0.24,0.67]
Time	-0.32***	[-0.35,-0.28]
Family-work trajectories × Time		
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.03	[-0.00,0.05]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	-0.01	[-0.04,0.03]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.05*	[0.01,0.09]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.04*	[0.00,0.07]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.01	[-0.01,0.03]
Men	1.54***	[1.37,1.71]
Baseline age centred at 59	-0.10***	[-0.11,-0.09]
Baseline age centred at 59 × Time	-0.00***	[-0.01,-0.00]
Educational attainment		
Lower secondary or below	ref	ref
Upper secondary	1.99***	[1.75,2.23]
Tertiary	2.06***	[1.35,2.76]
Married	0.31**	[0.10,0.51]
Married × Time	0.03*	[0.01,0.06]
Rural *hukou*	-0.64***	[-0.79,-0.49]
Communist party member	0.66***	[0.44,0.88]
Quintile of household per capita wealth		
Lowest quintile	ref	ref
2nd quintile	0.10	[-0.10,0.31]
3rd quintile	0.47***	[0.26,0.67]
4th quintile	0.88***	[0.68,1.09]
Highest quintile	1.34***	[1.13,1.55]
Smoking	-0.28**	[-0.47,-0.09]
Smoking × Time	-0.02*	[-0.04,-0.01]
Drinking alcohol	0.16***	[0.07,0.25]
Number of limitations in instrumental activities in daily living	-0.32***	[-0.36,-0.29]
Depressive symptomatology	-0.58***	[-0.69,-0.47]
Depressive symptomatology × Time	0.03***	[0.02,0.05]
Constant	9.63***	[9.30,9.95]
Random-effects portion		

Variance(constant)	7.33	[7.06, 7.61]
Variance(Residual)	6.15	[6.05, 6.26]
Observations	36,662	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. We interacted time with all covariates but only kept those significant interaction terms in the final model. $^{*}p<0.05$, $^{**}p<0.01$, $^{***}p<0.001$.



Figure S5. Margins plot for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **total cognition score (immediate recall + mental status)** from 2011 to 2020 (n = 8,535).

Table S6. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' immediate word recall and mental status scores from 2011 to 2020 (**data multiply imputed 10 times, n = 8,535**).

	Immediate recall		Mental status	
	coef.	95% CI	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effects portion				
Family-work trajectories				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.21***	[0.09,0.33]	0.62***	[0.42,0.82]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	0.14	[-0.02,0.31]	0.87***	[0.60,1.14]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	0.04	[-0.11,0.19]	0.68***	[0.42,0.94]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	0.39***	[0.25,0.54]	1.40***	[1.15,1.65]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	0.04	[-0.05,0.13]	0.35***	[0.20,0.51]
Time	-0.15***	[-0.16,-0.14]	-0.13***	[-0.15,-0.12]
Family-work trajectories × Time				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.01	[-0.00,0.03]	0.02	[-0.00,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	0.02	[-0.01,0.04]	-0.00	[-0.03,0.03]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.04***	[0.02,0.06]	0.01	[-0.01,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.04***	[0.03,0.06]	-0.00	[-0.03,0.02]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.02*	[0.00,0.03]	-0.00	[-0.02,0.01]
Men	0.10**	[0.03,0.16]	1.54***	[1.41,1.67]
Men × Time			-0.02***	[-0.04,-0.01]
Baseline age centred at 59	-0.04***	[-0.05,-0.04]	-0.06***	[-0.07,-0.05]
Baseline age centred at 59 × Time	-0.00***	[-0.00,-0.00]		
Educational attainment				
Lower secondary or below	ref	ref	ref	ref
Upper secondary	0.75***	[0.66,0.84]	1.21***	[1.04,1.38]
Tertiary	0.92***	[0.65,1.18]	1.04***	[0.53,1.55]
Married	0.20***	[0.14,0.27]	0.32***	[0.22,0.42]
Rural *hukou*	-0.31***	[-0.37,-0.24]	-0.50***	[-0.61,-0.39]
Communist party member	0.26***	[0.17,0.34]	0.43***	[0.27,0.59]
Quintile of household per capita wealth				

Lowest quintile	ref	ref	ref	ref
2nd quintile	0.02	[-0.05,0.10]	0.08	[-0.07,0.23]
3rd quintile	0.11**	[0.03,0.19]	0.39***	[0.24,0.54]
4th quintile	0.20***	[0.12,0.28]	0.73***	[0.58,0.88]
Highest quintile	0.29***	[0.21,0.38]	1.08***	[0.92,1.23]
Smoking	-0.13***	[-0.19,-0.06]	-0.24***	[-0.36,-0.11]
Drinking alcohol	0.09***	[0.05,0.13]	0.09**	[0.03,0.16]
Number of limitations in instrumental activities in daily living	-0.09***	[-0.10,-0.06]	-0.21***	[-0.23,-0.19]
Depressive symptomatology	-0.27***	[-0.33,-0.22]	0.31***	[-0.39,-0.23]
Depressive symptomatology × Time	0.01*	[0.00,0.02]	0.02*	[0.00,0.03]
Constant	3.82***	[3.69,3.96]	5.66***	[5.44,5.88]
Random-effects portion				
sd(constant)	0.93	[0.91,0.95]	2.00	[1.97,2.04]
sd(Residual)	1.41	[1.40, 1.42]	1.91	[1.90, 1.93]
Observations	42,575		42,575	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2018. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. Men × Time was not significant when the outcome was mental status (It was significant in Table 3). *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.



Figure S6. Margins plots for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' immediate recall and mental status from 2011 to 2020 **using multiply imputed data**

Table S7. **Full results** from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate word recall and mental status scores** from 2011 to 2020 (**all time-varying covariates dropped,** n =8,535).

	Immediate recall		Mental status	
	coef.	95% CI	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effects portion				
Family-work trajectories				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.31***	[0.20,0.43]	0.78***	[0.58,0.99]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	0.27**	[0.11,0.43]	1.08***	[0.80,1.36]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	0.10	[-0.05,0.25]	0.84***	[0.58,1.11]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	0.65***	[0.51,0.80]	1.88***	[1.63,2.12]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	0.06	[-0.03,0.16]	0.41***	[0.25,0.57]
Time	-0.15***	[-0.16,-0.14]	-0.14***	[-0.15,-0.12]
Family-work trajectories × Time				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.01	[-0.01,0.03]	0.01	[-0.01,0.03]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	0.01	[-0.01,0.03]	-0.02	[-0.05,0.01]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.03**	[0.01,0.05]	0.00	[-0.02,0.03]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.04***	[0.02,0.06]	-0.02	[-0.04,0.01]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.02*	[0.00,0.03]	-0.00	[-0.02,0.01]
Men	0.17***	[0.11,0.24]	1.67***	[1.53,1.81]
Men × Time			-0.02**	[-0.03,-0.01]
Baseline age centred at 59	-0.05***	[-0.05,-0.04]	-0.07***	[-0.08,-0.06]
Baseline age centred at 59 × Time	-0.00***	[-0.00,-0.00]		
Educational attainment				
Lower secondary or below	ref	ref	ref	ref
Upper secondary	0.83***	[0.74,0.93]	1.33***	[1.16,1.51]
Tertiary	1.08***	[0.81,1.36]	1.32***	[0.78,1.86]
Communist party member	0.28***	[0.20,0.37]	0.47***	[0.30,0.64]
Quintile of household per capita wealth				
Lowest quintile	ref	ref	ref	ref
2nd quintile	0.05	[-0.03,0.13]	0.12	[-0.04,0.27]

3rd quintile	0.13**	[0.05,0.21]	0.44***	[0.29,0.60]
4th quintile	0.23***	[0.15,0.31]	0.81***	[0.65,0.97]
Highest quintile	0.38***	[0.30,0.46]	1.23***	[1.07,1.39]
Smoking	-0.13***	[-0.20,-0.06]	-0.28***	[-0.41,-0.15]
Constant	3.53***	[3.44,3.62]	5.16***	[4.99,5.32]
Random-effects portion				
Variance (constant)	0.90	[0.86,0.94]	4.29	[4.13,4.45]
Variance (residual)	1.99	[1.96,2.02]	3.67	[3.61,3.73]
Observations	36,789		38,681	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. Baseline age centred at 59 × Time was significant only when the outcome was immediate recall. Men × Time was significant only when the outcome was mental status. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.



Figure S7. Margins plots for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' immediate recall and mental status from 2011 to 2020 **(all time-varying covariates dropped from linear mixed-effects models)**

Table S8. Full results from linear mixed-effects models exploring the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' **immediate word recall and mental status scores** from 2011 to 2020 (**time-invariant baseline age replaced by time-invariant birth cohorts**, n =8,535)

	Immediate recall		Mental status	
	coef.	95% CI	coef.	95% CI
Fixed-effects portion				
Family-work trajectories				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment	0.25***	[0.13,0.37]	0.67***	[0.47,0.87]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector	0.19*	[0.03,0.36]	0.97***	[0.69,1.24]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force	0.04	[-0.12,0.19]	0.74***	[0.48,1.01]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector	0.37***	[0.22,0.51]	1.39***	[1.13,1.64]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed	0.05	[-0.04,0.14]	0.39***	[0.23,0.55]
Time	-0.10***	[-0.12,-0.09]	-0.13***	[-0.15,-0.11]
Family-work trajectories × Time				
Early marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	ref	ref	ref	ref
Married, 1 child, various types of employment × Time	0.01	[-0.00,0.03]	0.02	[-0.01,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in private sector × Time	0.01	[-0.01,0.03]	-0.01	[-0.04,0.02]
Married, ≥ 2 children, not in labour force × Time	0.03**	[0.01,0.06]	0.01	[-0.02,0.04]
Married, ≥ 2 children, non-agriculturally employed in public sector × Time	0.04***	[0.02,0.06]	-0.00	[-0.03,0.02]
Late marriage, ≥ 2 children, agriculturally employed × Time	0.01*	[0.00,0.03]	-0.01	[-0.02,0.01]
Men	0.06	[-0.00,0.13]	1.55***	[1.41,1.68]
Men × Time			-0.02***	[-0.04,-0.01]
Birth cohort				
1960-1964	ref	ref	ref	ref
1955-1959	-0.25***	[-0.35,-0.15]	-0.43***	[-0.58,-0.28]
1950-1954	-0.24***	[-0.34,-0.14]	-0.46***	[-0.61,-0.31]
1949 and before	-0.69***	[-0.79,-0.60]	-0.92***	[-1.07,-0.78]
Birth cohort × Time				
1960-1964 × Time	ref	ref		
1955-1959 × Time	-0.04***	[-0.05,-0.02]		
1950-1954 × Time	-0.05***	[-0.07,-0.04]		
1949 and before × Time	-0.06***	[-0.07,-0.05]		

Educational attainment				
Lower secondary or below	ref	ref	ref	ref
Upper secondary	0.81***	[0.72,0.90]	1.31***	[1.13,1.49]
Tertiary	0.94***	[0.66,1.21]	1.09***	[0.56,1.62]
Married	0.29***	[0.22,0.36]	0.40***	[0.30,0.51]
Rural *hukou*	-0.31***	[-0.38,-0.23]	-0.49***	[-0.60,-0.37]
Communist party member	0.22***	[0.14,0.31]	0.37***	[0.21,0.54]
Quintile of household per capita wealth				
Lowest quintile	ref	ref	ref	ref
2nd quintile	0.04	[-0.04,0.12]	0.09	[-0.06,0.24]
3rd quintile	0.11**	[0.03,0.19]	0.41***	[0.26,0.56]
4th quintile	0.21***	[0.12,0.29]	0.76***	[0.60,0.91]
Highest quintile	0.30***	[0.22,0.38]	1.10***	[0.94,1.26]
Smoking	-0.11**	[-0.18,-0.04]	-0.25***	[-0.38,-0.12]
Drinking alcohol	0.10***	[0.06,0.15]	0.08*	[0.02,0.15]
Number of limitations in instrumental activities in daily living	-0.11***	[-0.13,-0.09]	-0.25***	[-0.28,-0.22]
Depressive symptomatology	-0.26***	[-0.32,-0.21]	-0.31***	[-0.38,-0.23]
Depressive symptomatology × Time	0.01**	[0.00,0.02]	0.02**	[0.00,0.03]
Constant	4.10***	[3.95,4.26]	6.09***	[5.83,6.34]
Random-effects portion				
Variance (constant)	0.87	[0.83,0.91]	4.07	[3.92,4.22]
Variance (residual)	1.99	[1.96,2.02]	3.64	[3.58,3.70]
Observations	36,669		38,494	

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. CI = confidence interval. Birth cohort × Time was significant only when the outcome was immediate recall. Men × Time was significant only when the outcome was mental status. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.



Figure S8. Margins plots for the effects of family-work history on CHARLS respondents' immediate recall and mental status from 2011 to 2020 **(time-invariant baseline age replaced by time-invariant birth cohort).**

Table S9. Comparisons of characteristics in baseline wave (CHARLS 2011) between excluded respondents (n = 9,170) and our study sample (n = 8,535)

	Excluded respondents (n = 9,170)	Study sample (n = 8,535)	Total (n = 17,708)	p-value
Age	58.70 (11.94)	59.43 (7.79)	59.05 (10.15)	<0.001
Men	0.48 (0.50)	0.48 (0.50)	0.48 (0.50)	0.51
Rural *hukou* status	0.73 (0.44)	0.84 (0.37)	0.78 (0.41)	<0.001
Married	0.84 (0.36)	0.90 (0.30)	0.87 (0.33)	<0.001
Education				<0.001
Lower secondary or below	7,898 (86.25%)	7,647 (89.60%)	15,545 (87.86%)	
Upper secondary	981 (10.71%)	812 (9.51%)	1,793 (10.13%)	
Tertiary	278 (3.04%)	76.00 (0.89%)	354 (2.00%)	
Quintile of household per capita wealth				<0.001
Lowest quintile	1,758.00 (20.05%)	1,656.00 (19.95%)	3,414.00 (20.00%)	
2nd quintile	1,662.00 (18.96%)	1,752.00 (21.11%)	3,414.00 (20.00%)	
3rd quintile	1,617.00 (18.44%)	1,797.00 (21.65%)	3,414.00 (20.00%)	
4th quintile	1,734.00 (19.78%)	1,678.00 (20.22%)	3,412.00 (19.99%)	
Highest quintile	1,996.00 (22.77%)	1,417.00 (17.07%)	3,413.00 (20.00%)	
Smoking	0.27 (0.44)	0.30 (0.46)	0.29 (0.45)	<0.001
Drinking alcohol	0.32 (0.47)	0.34 (0.47)	0.33 (0.47)	<0.05
Number of IADL limitations	0.57 (1.26)	0.38 (0.92)	0.48 (1.11)	<0.001
Depressive symptomatology	0.37 (0.48)	0.37 (0.48)	0.37 (0.48)	0.50

Notes: Data source: CHARLS 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2020. CHARLS = China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. IADL = instrumental activities in daily living。