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Abstract

Understanding health requires more than knowledge of the genome. Environmental factors regulate gene function through epigenetics. Collectively, environmental exposures have been called the “exposome”. Caregivers are instrumental in shaping exposures in a child’s initial years. Maternal dietary patterns, physical activity, degree of weight gain, and body composition while pregnant, will influence not only fetal growth, but also the infant’s metabolic response to nutrients and energy. Maternal over- or under-weight, excess caloric intake, nutrient imbalances, glucose dysregulation, and presence of chronic inflammatory states, have been shown to establish risk for many later chronic diseases. During the period from birth to age 3 years, when the infant’s metabolic rate is high, and synaptogenesis and myelination of the brain are occurring extremely rapidly, the infant is especially prone to damaging effects from nutrient imbalances. During this same period, the infant transitions from a purely milk-based diet to include a wide variety of foods. The process, timing, quality, and ultimate dietary pattern acquired is a direct outcome of the caregiver-infant feeding relationship, with potentially life long consequences. More research on how meal time interactions shape food acceptance is needed to avoid eating patterns that augment existing disease risk. Traditional clinical trials in nutrition, meant to isolate single factors for study, are inadequate to study the highly-interconnected realm of environment-gene interactions in early life. Novel technologies are being used to gather broad exposure data on disparate populations, employing pioneering statistical approaches and correlations applied specifically to the individual, based on their genetic make-up and unique environmental experiences.
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Introduction

Exposures during early life shape health behaviors, but these exposures can also be responsible for influence at a much deeper level. The contemporary view of nutrition in health is one that encompasses environment-gene interconnections. In this concept each nutrient, through its wide variety actions at the molecular level, contributes to the total system, keeping it poised to adapt to perturbations and return the body to a state of homeostasis. This casts nutrition in personal terms. It is not whether a dietary pattern or an individual nutrient, such as sodium or sugar, is broadly recommended for all humans, but rather whether it is optimal for helping an individual reach their health goals at this moment in their life. Based on mounting clinical evidence, more recent versions of the Dietary Guidelines for Americans have embraced the broad health benefits of a nutritious dietary pattern. The role of nutrition is to ensure that cellular networks are fully supplied with sufficient energy and nutrients to optimize their flexibility. Nutritional sufficiency, then, is defined by whether the collective physiological response to the nutrient flow can meet an individual’s ever-changing physical and psychological demands. In order to capture an individual’s genetic-environmental response to health risk there is a need to overcome the challenges found in molecular nutrition research as well as a need to take assessments on a system-wide basis instead of individual cause and effect trials (1).

Around 50 years after the discovery of DNA structure the human genome sequence was fully characterized. Yet, for all its promise, knowledge of the genetic code has afforded only limited ability to predict risk of complex disease. Environmental factors that influence gene function have been shown to be a powerful force, but one even more challenging to study. Environmental exposures, ranging from prenatal to geriatric phases of the life course can alter gene expression and through it, human health(2). Understanding disease requires identification of the mechanisms through which environmental influences alter cellular responses contributing to pathology (3). Environmental influences occur in several
overlapping domains: the broad external environment (community, climate, social, financial), more specific environmental hazards (sun exposure, environmental toxicants, alcohol, tobacco, nutrient deficiencies, lifestyle), and the internal physiologic environment (cardiometabolic activity, stress response, immune and inflammatory systems, hormonal communication, the commensal microbiota).

Collectively, these environmental exposures have been termed “the Exposome”, representing the non-genetic counterpart to the genome(2-4). Describing the “exposome” is only the first step in characterizing the system. The fact that life-long exposome-genome interactions accumulate means that we are faced with the principle of “unique disease”(3, 5). This principle states that any disease or disorder will manifest uniquely in everyone, because of their personal genetic make-up coupled with their history of exposures during critical periods. Although delineating the specific way in which each discrete disease will act in different individuals may seem like a daunting task, it is a line of research already well underway. Studies on the epigenome, transcriptome, proteome, metabolome, microbiome, and interactome, hold promise for understanding the range of potential reactions that a disease can engender within a population. With these data, disease can be characterized in relation to the external macro-environment alongside the cellular microenvironment.

The dichotomy between genes and environment is now recognized to be an ever-changing complex interplay of nature via nurture. The developing fetus, neonate, and infant are especially susceptible to environmental influences and it is here where the gene x environment interaction is in full display. The physical and emotional environments that surround and engage the mother directly mold her child’s lifelong potential. The pre-conception period within the human life course is the first to manifest environmental-gene interactions, which affect the molecular on-off switches that control DNA expression. Non-genetic factors that control gene expression in a stable manner are termed “epigenetic”. Epigenetic mechanisms are fundamental to expressing phenotypically different states from a single genetic blueprint, as typified by lineage commitment and differentiation from pluripotent stem cells.
Epigenetic mechanisms also serve as an interface between environmental/exogenous stimuli and cellular responses, and eventually phenotypes they confer. Epigenetic forces may involve alterations in the DNA methylation patterns at cytosine, post-transcriptional modifications of histones, around which the DNA is wrapped and via regulation of non-coding RNA. These chemical changes alter the type, timing, and extent of protein production by genes. Maternal diet and health condition as well as the quality and balance of the child’s diet during the first years after birth contribute not only to the child’s physical habitus and well-being, but also fuels a unique neurocognitive expansion on which their future academic, social, and behavioral success will be based(6). Given these important outcomes, research has sought specific ways to ensure optimal environments and experiences for the developing child. In this paper, we will examine examples of what is known and unknown in terms of the biologic and environmental nutritional forces that shape the fetus, neonate, infant, and child in the early years (Table 1)(7, 8).

Illustrations of the way that early experiences affect life-long health risk will be presented in four areas: in-utero and developmental programming of metabolism, neurodevelopment and cognition, postnatal behaviors around food choice, and finally a “Future Vision of the Exposome”.

**Effects of Maternal Nutrition and Weight on Fetal Development**

The co-occurring incidence of obesity, hunger, and malnutrition comingle around the world, complicating public health policy. Worldwide, the overweight population now exceeds the underweight population(9). Cardiometabolic diseases, such as heart disease, dyslipidemia, Type II diabetes, metabolic syndrome, and fatty liver are diagnosed not only in adults and seniors, but also in children and adolescents. Unraveling the intersecting circumstances that result in obesity will require a better understanding of how an individual’s environmental exposures create or mitigate risk. Increasingly, a systems perspective has been invoked, one that examines layered exposures to food quality, to agricultural practices, to community and social factors, as well as to personal and family lifestyle(10). Due to the identification of “epigenetic”
forces -- environmentally triggered DNA modulations that adapt gene expression to the environment -- the role of genes in the development of obesity and its complications has been expanded to include a more complex perspective(11).

The first awareness of the role of maternal nutritional status on adult health began with studies on the effects of malnutrition during pregnancy. In the late 20th century, the developmental origins of health & disease hypothesis was advanced based on the finding that under-nutrition during critical periods in utero permanently altered the development of the fetus, including structure, function, weight and metabolism(12-14). Since those initial studies, a wide variety of environmental factors occurring during pregnancy have been identified, ranging from toxins and chemicals to diseases and depressive symptoms, all of which raised the risk for health and mental health disorders in adulthood.

Among the most keenly studied and reproducible outcomes have been the mechanisms that link maternal body composition to the child’s risk for future obesity(15-17). In utero exposure to maternal obesity and high-fat diets in rodent models has illuminated the extent to which preconception maternal body habitus, excess gestational weight gain, and dietary imbalances, can lead to a “hyper-responsive infant”; that is, an infant prone to accumulate excess body fat, fatty liver, and metabolic derangement when exposed to postnatal high calorie or high fat feeding (18, 19). This risk is associated with alterations in a multitude of metabolic processes, including impaired glucose homeostasis and insulin sensitivity(20, 21), lower skeletal muscle mass(22), altered appetite and food preferences(23), and epigenetic changes in DNA methylation patterns that favor adipogenesis(24). In experimental models, accumulation of ectopic lipids in the liver(25, 26), increased lipogenesis in white adipose tissue(24), and a greater tendency for stem cells to differentiate into adipocytes(24) all have been noted. Similarly, alterations in pathways regulating lipid oxidation and basal energy expenditure (such as, PPAR-α, AMPK and insulin signaling) in
metabolically important tissues such as liver, muscle, and adipose tissue, creates a milieu that favors storage over oxidation(27-29).

Human studies, similarly, have showed that babies born to obese mothers, even in the absence of glycemic disturbance, have greater adiposity and a higher risk of insulin resistance(30, 31). With over 60% of women in the United States overweight at the time of conception(32) and steadily rising rates of weight gain and gestational diabetes during pregnancy, poor nutrition puts both the fetus and the mother at risk. In the face of excess energy, fetal composition changes quickly, developing a higher fat mass, insulin resistance, and excess growth(33). Meta-analysis has confirmed the association between maternal body mass index and the risk for large for gestation weight babies(34), which in turn, is associated with higher C-section rates and complications during delivery. As early as 2-4 years of age, obesity risk is doubled, which tracks into adolescence and young adulthood, as shown in several studies(30, 35, 36). Likewise, cardiometabolic risk markers for dyslipidemia, glucose-insulin dysregulation, and diminished hunger-satiety control, also are closely associated with maternal obesity and gestational diabetes.

In the Beginnings Study—a USDA funded prospective observational study tracking the growth and development of children 2 months to 6 years of age—325 infants born to normal weight, overweight, or obese mothers were followed longitudinally(37). By school age, significantly higher body mass index z-scores and percent body fat were seen in children of obese mothers. Differences became apparent after age 2-3 years, with males showing a more striking response than females. Another study showed the relationship between maternal adiposity and child obesity in children born to morbidly obese women before and after they had undergone bariatric surgery. Those infants before the intervention had significantly higher risk for later obesity than did their siblings born after surgery-induced maternal weight loss(38, 39).
What are the mechanisms underlying fetal programming of obesity? Maternal obesity, diet, and the resulting metabolic milieu, including the lipids and nutrients delivered to the developing fetus, can alter gene expression. During critical windows of development, external events directly shape every cell, tissue, and organ under development. In total, these adjustments reset fetal -- and later child and adult -- metabolic response. Gene expression responds to environment cues very quickly. Shifting the maternal diet toward one high in fat intake upregulates fetal inflammatory markers as early as the oocyte and the embryo stages in animal models (40). The placenta, which senses nutrient flow, adjusts to the needs of the fetus(41). The placenta also has shown a capacity not only to monitor nutrients, but also to produce inflammatory compounds and lipotoxic mediators in response to the type and quantity of circulating nutrients, which further modifies the uterine environment(42-44). It is possible that a pro-inflammatory environment, and pathways sensitive to excess nutrition in the peri-conception and post-conception environment, serve to regulate systems that promote adiposity in the offspring. The specific molecular factors involved remain to be fully elucidated.

Mother’s specific dietary choices may influence epigenetic mechanisms. Most of the available evidence comes from rodent and non-human primate studies on the effects of a few dietary components, including folic acid, fructose, long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids, and protein content. The mechanisms that underpin cardiometabolic risk are being targeted in several human studies, as well. The Healthy Start Study has shown a strong association between maternal insulin resistance and late term circulating glucose levels with the development of the neonatal fat mass, independent of maternal preconception body mass index(45, 46). The ongoing USDA-funded Glowing Study has been designed to follow 320 human maternal-infant pairs from early pregnancy through age 2 years, specifically examining the inter-
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connected nature of maternal weight, body composition, dietary intake, and energy expenditure on adiposity, weight gain trajectory, and fat oxidation in the child.

Despite steady progress in understanding pivotal links between maternal and offspring health, several knowledge gaps need to be addressed in this area. These include a better understanding of the influence of maternal dietary patterns, diet quality and individual micronutrients and/or macronutrients during critical windows in pregnancy on offspring health outcomes. How does obesity in the preconception phase differ from excess gestational weight gain in terms of impact on glucose-insulin axis perturbations? Is fat distribution a key factor? After birth, are there postnatal factors that could be manipulated to lower risk, such as the effect of the microbiome on metabolic and physiologic processes, or the social-emotional-behavioral conditions that comprise the maternal-infant feeding relationship? What is the combined effect of diet quality, nutrient components, physical activity, and fitness? To what extent is the inflammatory response central to programming cardio-metabolic risks?

*Early Nutrition, Brain Structure, and Cognitive Development*

Early life and in utero factors also program and impact systems beyond adiposity, including brain and neurocognitive development. Health and mental health risks resulting from gene-epigene interactions accumulate over time. As in pregnancy, postnatal early life exposures and experiences are a foundation on which rests a child’s future social, emotional, cognitive, and motor skills(47). Like other major organs of the body, neurodevelopment and the brain are highly affected by maternal nutrition during pregnancy(48, 49). Neural tube formation, neurogenesis, neuron migration, programmed cell death, the expansion of the nervous system, and the structural coordination between regions of the brain, occur sequentially over the 40 weeks of gestation(50, 51). By parturition, the neonate has developed more than 85 billion neurons which, with the exception of two areas (the hippocampus and the cerebellum), amount to the infant’s total
for life(52-54). Brain imaging studies have shown that maternal obesity is associated with decreases in the white matter content of the central nervous system in several different regions of the neonatal brain(55). Besides obesity, nutrient deficiencies from an unbalanced maternal diet, a persistent high-risk metabolic and inflammatory state, alongside many other deleterious exposures that occur during sensitive periods, can negatively influence fetal brain structure and function. For instance, not only diet quality(56, 57), regular physical activity(58), and body composition(59) affect the fetal brain, but also psychological stresses(60), social interactions(61), daily routines(62, 63), sleep(64, 65), chemical toxins(66), emotional and sensory stimulation(61, 67), financial status(68), family structure(69), and the child’s experiences with acute and chronic diseases(70-72).

Sensitive periods exist between birth and 3 years of age that greatly expand, coordinate, and refine brain structure and function(57, 73). From birth, the brain doubles in size by year one and triples in size by year three, nearly to complete adult size, as a result of increasing myelination and synaptic connections, spurred on by the infant’s sensory-motor experiences(74, 75). Play, non-verbal expression, acquisition of verbal language, and routine problem-solving stimulate the formation of synaptic linkages. These form the basis for all future cognitive, social, and behavioral performance. Synaptic connections are formed at 700 per second during this crucial period. Arborization reaches a life time maximum around age 3, after which weak or unused synapses are “pruned back”, leaving only 50% by young adulthood(75). For the child in a stimulating, nurturing, and healthful environment, this results in a well-structured, highly responsive brain built on early exploration and expanded through the child’s experiences. However, for those children who are not raised in such a stimulating and supportive environment, those who lack the kind of constant verbal and emotional exchange that anchors basic language and literacy skills, or who face persistent or severe adverse events in early life, the brain displays a very different, attenuated capacity that can potentially leave the child at a cognitive disadvantage for life(73, 76).
Scientists have utilized two primary methods for studying brain structure and function noninvasively. Brain imaging procedures are used, to quantify brain structural integrity and connectivity [magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)], and functional MRI for observing brain activation during the performance of specific tasks(77). Imaging procedures require the absence of movement to obtain acceptable data, making such procedures difficult to use successfully in active infants and young children. Consequently, EEG measures—which are more tolerant to movement—have been the primary source of information describing brain-behavior relationships in early life. During the infancy-early childhood period there is rapid development of processes involving attention, arousal, sensory-motor skills, emotion, working memory, social orientation and language acquisition. Optimal operation, maintenance, and repair of the growing brain require a steady stream of nutrients and energy.

Nutrition continues to be a central environmental factor throughout childhood. Infants and children have a metabolic rate more than 2.5 times higher than in the adult(78, 79). Their metabolic demands make them sensitive to variations in energy or nutrient flow during even short periods of fasting. Recognition of this vulnerability has emphasized the importance of breakfast, since this meal follows the longest naturally occurring fast that occurs daily. Academic performance among school age children is better in those who regularly eat breakfast(80,81), but there have been few studies using measures of brain activity—and none using imaging procedures—to describe the neural correlates associated with eating or skipping breakfast in young children. EEG studies have shown changes in brain activity, indicating increased attention and memory processes, resulting in faster decision-making and more efficient mental math in children fed compared with those who skipped breakfast(82,83). Decision-making and mental arithmetic rely on processes known as “executive functions”. These functions, which are largely controlled by the
frontal lobe(84-86), involve processes contributing to self-regulation and mental flexibility such as attention, emotional control, and memory(87).

Sensitivity of executive functions to even transient variations in morning nutrition suggest that the cognitive deficits resulting from meal-skipping or chronic poor diet are likely to be far worse for the obese child(88). Imaging studies have shown both gray and white matter are diminished among obese children(89) and that frontal brain activation is reduced when the obese child is given tasks involving memory, attention, verbal and motor skills that challenge the pre-frontal cortex(90,91). The obese population also shows impaired outcomes on a variety of tests measuring executive function(92). Physical exercise, similar to breakfast consumption, has been shown to be capable of improving these executive skills(93-95), even in obese children(90,91). Such studies illustrate how one’s prior “programmed” risks associated with obesity may interact with more proximate environmental exposures to alter the immediate cardio-metabolic state and affect cognitive function.

More research on the environment-gene relationships that result from nutritional status and body composition is needed. The individual and collective components of diet, along with the benefits of regular physical activity, may present ways to alleviate the detrimental effects of weight, adiposity, or other programmed risk. Studies on diet quality and cognitive development in infants and toddlers are just beginning. Identification of the epigenetic mechanisms by which acute changes in dietary behavior affect cognitive function in children and teens is needed. An integrated approach that combines studies of brain structure, function, environmental exposures, and personal variables will be necessary to identify which key factors may protect the developing child and turn early cognitive “potential” into life-long social, emotional, and academic skills.
Early Life Environmental Exposures and Eating Behavior

Diet quality in early childhood also is an important epigenetic force, given the intense increases in height and weight, ongoing organic development, and the extreme expansion of the brain. Just as the maternal diet and obesity can affect the offspring’s weight and brain development, it can also start to shape food preferences and dietary habits, influencing the child’s health and development well into the future.

Establishing nutrient rich dietary habits has proved challenging considering the complexity of human behavior, which often is resistant to change, despite proven benefits. Research has shown the importance of initial experiences with food on later food preferences and dietary habits (96,97). Typically, non-milk foods offered during the second 6 months of life represent the child’s most intensive period of exposure to the many tastes, textures, and colors of foods and beverages. But it is not the first exposure. Studies show that both the fetus and neonate can experience flavors through swallowed amniotic fluid and through breastmilk, both of which reflect components of the mother’s diet, which are hypothesized to influence the infant food acceptance and preference (96,98). However, given that most adults in the U.S. fail to achieve recommended fruit and vegetable intake, particularly low income pregnant and lactating women, the potential for maternal diets to positively influence infant diet quality is not maximized (99,100).

Parental diet quality becomes an even more crucial factor in the second year of a child’s life, as the transition from breastmilk- or formula-based feeding to family foods occurs.

Food preferences established in the first 3 years of life tend to persist (97,101). Although children are more open to new food experiences during the first years, the daily parent-child negotiation around meals and snacks often prevent the opportunity to promote varied dietary preferences. After instilling an acceptance of fruit and vegetable intake using infant food during the first year, intake of both falls quickly in the second year, not only total consumption, but also variety (102). Nearly 1/3 of toddlers and preschoolers eat no vegetables regularly (103). Irrespective of race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status,
intake in the U.S. consistently fails to achieve the recommendations of the Dietary Guidelines for Americans for vegetables and fruits(104). Snacks often introduce high-calorie, low-nutrient products that become strongly preferred by children already primed to like sweet, salty, and fatty items -- a preference honed throughout human evolution(104,105). Conversely, bitter and sour, the attributes of vegetables, are more likely to be resisted(98,106). These less nutritious dietary patterns that do not meet dietary recommendations, especially for the food groups that are encouraged (fruits, vegetables, whole wheat, and dairy), put our population at an increased risk for consuming sub-optimal amounts of essential nutrients which in turn increases the risk for developing diet-related health concerns.

What is the pathway to broad food acceptance that establishes a life-long high-quality dietary pattern? There are several factors in play, some individual to the child, such as neophobia (i.e. the extent to which children display resistance to trying new foods)(107), temperament(108), and intensity of response to bitter(109), and others related to the environment, such as education, income, food insecurity, and family norms(110). Children prefer what they know; that is, they tend to accept what is familiar and routine(111). Taste can be “trained” through familiarity or “mere exposure”(112-116). This seemingly simple principle requires that caregivers show patience and persistence in their efforts to shape food preferences and in their willingness to continue to offer and model consumption of previously rejected foods. The number of exposures to induce acceptance varies in the literature, with reports ranging from 8 to more than 15 times(117). Recent studies have shown a greater likelihood of establishing food acceptance through repeated exposure in children less than 24 months old than in older children, emphasizing the early lifecourse as a pivotal period(118). Pairing preferred flavors with new flavors can encourage acceptance, but the evidence for the effectiveness of this strategy is inconsistent(115, 116, 119,120). Current resources have not been successful at guiding parental understanding of appropriate portion sizes, ways to meet recommended servings per day, or use of nutrient-rich options from each of the 5 food groups to improve children’s intake at both meals and snacks. Repeated exposure takes
patience, something that may arise from the parent’s level of understanding of the developmental norms matching the child’s age and a trust in children’s ability to eat to energy needs for appropriate growth.

Parents who label their child a “picky eater” report halting presentation of rejected foods after only 3-5 tries which may be insufficient to give the child enough experience to overcome their initial neophobic response(121,122). They also tend to attribute children’s limited food acceptance to inheritance rather than to malleable behavior (123). Bribing or pressuring the child to eat, along with a permissive feeding style of catering to the child, foster rejection, as does failure to create a supportive emotional milieu around meal times(124). Conversely, successful behavioral strategies include encouragement, task-centered praise, and monitoring of eating progress(125-128). Setting high expectations, establishing clear structure, the presence of family rules, and modeling by family members, have reinforcing benefits(129, 130).

The emotional environment surrounding the parent-child feeding relationship may be important in shaping feeding behavior, but remains largely unstudied (130, 131). Breastfeeding, promotes a close physical-emotional attachment that transcends simply the supplying of food(132, 133). This feeding principle, termed “responsive feeding” embodies a reciprocal relationship between the child and caregiver in which children’s cues are promptly met with contingent caregiver responses that support children’s development of healthy eating behaviors(133, 134).

In the Totality of Early Environmental Exposures: The Body’s Other Biome

A recent corollary to the epigenetic manipulation of gene expression in the animal and human has been the expanding literature on the ways that our diet, diseases, and exposures act as inputs to alter the gut
microbiome. Our microbiome serves as another epigenetic influence on a child’s genetic make-up. In the first years of life, the human gut is colonized by over 1000 bacterial species, which encode as many as 5-10 million genes, compared with our own 20,000 genes. The microbiome illustrates a classic symbiotic relationship, one that closely intertwines the collective physiology of the bacterial population with our own. The presence of the microbiome greatly amplifies the complexity of a systems -- or exposome-wide --, approach to human health. The adaptive flexibility of the microbiome to rebound from environmental perturbations mirrors many of our own body’s adaptations. Consider the sum of the body’s response to a single invading enteric pathogen, which triggers reactions across the highly-interconnected processes that control inflammation, immunity, nervous system function, and epithelial absorptive capacity in the gut. The resulting vomiting, diarrhea, loss of appetite, and dehydration, dramatically diminish gut bacteria. Prolonged illness or complications might impede homeostasis, particularly if antibiotics are prescribed. Adaptations within the microbial system might be detrimental, chronically altering the gut milieu. Opportunistic overgrowth of other pathogens, such as Clostridia difficile, may further compromise the stability of the microbiome, as well as the integrity of the gastrointestinal tract itself, causing a cascade of adaptations across physiologic and metabolic systems.

Can both systems, ours and the microbiome’s, be strengthened through diet to enhance our health, as defined as our ability to resist stresses and maintain homeostasis? To approach this question, we need to use novel 21st Century technologies and innovations that can characterize and model the highly-complicated relationships that involve humans within the many environments in which we live and grow. Complete characterizations of the human genome and the gut microbial genome have been undertaken successfully. Characterization of the exposome, although complex, is a pressing research endeavor(2).
The Search for Novel Methods to Study the Exposome-Genome Interaction

Scientists are designing projects to lay the groundwork. Among the most established are those examining environmental chemicals, occupational hazards, and their effect on health. Multiple agencies acting in concert are pooling large data sets and building platforms for analysis in such projects as Exposure21, Health and Environment-Wide Associations based on Large-Scale Population Surveys, and the Exposomics Consortium. A forward-looking report on exposure science was published by the National Academies of Sciences and funded by the National Institute for Environmental Health Services and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, entitled “Exposure Science in the 21st Century: A Vision and A Strategy”(8). The report called for multi-agency cooperation to gather pooled toxicity testing data, build platforms to handle massive data waves, develop novel statistical approaches, and design analysis paradigms that are publicly available to encourage information sharing. Many emerging research technologies have been cited as building blocks for such an undertaking, including microfluidics, nanotechnologies, mass spectrometry, capillary lab-on-a-chip technology for chemical analysis, liquid chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry to measure protein adducts (chemicals bonded to protein structures), as well as high-tech sensor technology, global positioning systems, genomic techniques, and informatics. Many will provide the biomarkers needed to quantify chemical exposures. The report from the National Academy of Sciences also urged that the diverse information gleaned from these large-scale toxicology studies be applied not only to health care, but also to environmental regulation, urban and ecosystem planning, and disaster management.

Among the several nascent studies being launched on the exposome, early life exposures and their resulting health outcomes are being taken up in the Human Early-Life Exposome (HELIX) project, centered in Barcelona, but comprised of six birth cohort studies in Europe(135). HELIX will follow more than 32,000 mother-child pairs to examine chemical and physical environmental factors. A subset of
1,200 dyads will have repeated biomarkers assessed, using smart phones to quantify mobility, physical activity, and personal exposures, coupled with -omics technologies to provide molecular profiles of each subject. Advanced statistical methods will correlate fetal and child growth, exercise, obesity, neurodevelopment, health and respiratory outcomes (e.g., asthma) to begin to characterize exposure-response relationships.

The intensity or persistence of certain stress events can impose permanent changes in the body, which can change the way that our body subsequently reacts to adversity. Significant environmental challenges have the capacity to alter not only gene expression, but also metabolic, neuronal, immunologic and hormonal responses, which can alter the trajectory of an individual’s life. That is clear from the findings on the maternal-child relationship in gestation. Life-changing exposures are also well documented in studies on the effects of severe adverse childhood events in early childhood, permanently altering the capabilities of the rapidly growing infant brain (136). Adult outcomes as disparate as emotional behavior, responsiveness to stress, resilience, academic success, and peer social interactions, have been associated with adverse childhood events accumulated during the critical window of early life.

If the concept of health is represented by the flexibility, robustness and durability of the body and mind, then a fundamental research question can now be stated: can we enhance a system’s adaptability to environmental exposures by challenging it (137)? That is, are there ways of “exercising” the body’s homeostatic networks to increase their resilience to perturbations of all kinds? Mounting evidence suggests that many different types of stimuli (antigen, pathogen, metabolite, chemical) can serve to stimulate and benefit existing physiologic processes (138, 139). It is conceivable that adjustments in the child’s socio-ecological connectedness, their diet quality, hygiene, and physical activity might be
manipulated to improve their system’s “flexibility”, with significant practical consequences for the growing fetus and child.

*Complex Diseases in the Light of G × E*

The Human Genome Project was an investment of billions, but it in turn has reaped strong economic benefits. So too, the Exposome Project offers enormous economic and societal return on investment, but will require a similar financial and scientific commitment(7). Researchers already are compiling longitudinal and extensive data from individuals via the expanding electronic health records system, which has the capacity to outline the variations of “normal” during times of health and disease. Creating a screening tool derived from these data that compares one’s personal biomarkers as well as those of the microbiome against that of the healthy population, for instance, offers an opportunity to identify deviations and potentially to adjust them. Consider assaying an individual’s microbiome, comparing it with population norms and, by undertaking specific adjustments to the dietary pattern, augmenting the symbiotic relationship with the human organism. A similar example might be a tool that quantifies the responsiveness of one’s inflammatory system to a variety of stimuli. Such challenges might illuminate ways to modulate inflammatory function for prevention of disease or its rapid mitigation, allowing faster healing.

*A Vision of Future Nutrition and Health*

Rather than a one-size-fits-all dietary recommendation such as those of the past, a comprehensive health model, complete with challenges and biomarker-based assays, holds promise for creating individualized dietary recommendations that help consumers develop an ideal dietary pattern to promote their personal health. New initiatives have begun to recruit consumers into “health data cooperatives” that are legal
entities pooling system-wide health data from dozens of disparate sources, ranging from doctors and insurance files to government, school, and health service provider records. What makes this type of amalgamated data repository unique is that the individual citizen/consumers own their own data. These are the first seeds of truly personalized health care. When a child is born later in the 21st century, each parent may be handed a personal Bio-passport which, unlike the traditional infant book or electronic health supervision visit handout, not only gathers all the child’s health information in one place, but also guides parental decisions, based on their child’s gene-environment responsiveness and current health trajectory, proposing specific ways to use nutrition and other variables to “nourish” their child’s optimal health for life.
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