Preventing Adverse Childhood Experiences: Leveraging the Best Available Evidence for Psychological Practice

A Continuing Education Reading Manual for Licensed Psychologists and Graduate-Level Clinicians

---

Continuing Education Credit: 6 Hours

Source Material: *Preventing Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs): Leveraging the Best Available Evidence*, developed by the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2024).

Prepared for: Licensed psychologists, clinical social workers, mental health counselors, and graduate-level clinicians engaged in trauma-informed practice, prevention science, and integrated behavioral health care.

Abstract

Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) represent a constellation of potentially traumatic events occurring in childhood that exert profound, durable, and intergenerational consequences for mental health, physical health, and social functioning. Drawing on the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) synthesis of the best available evidence, *Preventing Adverse Childhood Experiences: Leveraging the Best Available Evidence* (CDC, 2024), this continuing education manual integrates the conceptual, empirical, and applied dimensions of ACEs research into a single cohesive resource for psychologists and allied mental health professionals. The manuscript situates ACEs within their historical and theoretical foundations, articulates the developmental and neurobiological mechanisms that link early adversity to lifelong outcomes, and elaborates the shared risk and protective factors that connect ACEs, suicide, and overdose across the life course and across generations.

Particular attention is given to psychological pathways and stress responses, the spectrum of mental health outcomes, and system-level effects on families, communities, and service delivery. The manual concludes with clinical implications, including assessment, prevention, intervention, and advocacy roles for psychologists, and identifies future directions and research gaps. Throughout, the emphasis remains on translating evidence into practice in ways that are scientifically grounded, ethically sound, and clinically meaningful.

---

1. Introduction

Few constructs in contemporary behavioral health have transformed clinical thinking as decisively as the construct of adverse childhood experiences. Over the past quarter century, the term has migrated from a circumscribed epidemiological literature into mainstream pediatrics, psychiatry, psychology, public health, education, and policy. The CDC's resource *Preventing Adverse Childhood Experiences: Leveraging the Best Available Evidence* (CDC, 2024) reflects this maturation. It represents a deliberate effort to consolidate decades of research into an actionable framework that links what is known about childhood adversity to what can be done to prevent it. For psychologists, the document offers more than a public health roadmap; it provides a conceptual scaffold for reframing case formulation, treatment planning, and prevention work in light of an expanding science of early-life stress.

The CDC (2024) characterizes ACEs as potentially traumatic events that occur in childhood, including but not limited to experiencing violence, abuse, or neglect; witnessing violence in the home or community; and growing up in a household with substance use, mental health problems, or instability resulting from parental separation or incarceration. The CDC further emphasizes that ACEs, suicide, and drug overdose are interconnected phenomena that share common risk and protective factors and that cluster across the life course and across generations. This conceptualization is foundational because it dissolves the artificial boundaries between previously siloed problems—child maltreatment, intimate partner violence, suicide, substance use disorder—and invites a unified preventive and clinical response.

This manual is intended to support psychologists in integrating the CDC's synthesis into their professional work. It is written with the assumption that the reader is already familiar with

foundational concepts in developmental psychopathology, trauma-focused intervention, and ethical practice, but may benefit from a structured, scholarly treatment of how the ACEs framework articulates with these domains. The narrative emphasizes mechanisms and meaning rather than enumeration of statistics, and it foregrounds the interpretive judgment that psychologists must exercise when applying population-level evidence to individual clinical encounters.

---

2. Historical and Theoretical Foundations

The contemporary ACEs paradigm emerged from the convergence of several historical streams in psychology and public health. Clinically, the recognition that childhood maltreatment exerts lasting psychological consequences can be traced to early psychoanalytic accounts of trauma, to the developmental psychopathology tradition that examined risk and resilience across the life span, and to the attachment theory literature that linked early caregiving environments to later socioemotional functioning. Epidemiologically, the ACEs construct crystallized in the late 1990s through collaborations between the CDC and large health care systems, which demonstrated that retrospective reports of childhood adversity were strongly associated with adult health outcomes in dose-response fashion. The CDC (2024) builds directly upon this lineage, treating the original ACEs investigations as the empirical foundation upon which subsequent prevention science has been constructed.

Theoretically, the ACEs framework rests upon a biopsychosocial and ecological model of human development. It assumes that children develop in nested contexts—family, school, neighborhood, community, and society—and that adversity at any level can perturb development. This ecological orientation, consistent with Bronfenbrenner's broader developmental tradition as reflected in the CDC's (2024) emphasis on multi-level prevention, leads naturally to the conclusion that prevention cannot be located solely within the individual or even the family. Rather, prevention strategies must address the social, economic, and policy contexts that shape the probability of adversity occurring in the first place.

The framework also draws on the life course perspective, which conceptualizes health and behavior as products of cumulative exposures and developmental timing. The CDC (2024) underscores that ACEs are linked across the life course, meaning that childhood exposures

shape adolescent risk behaviors, which in turn shape adult morbidity and mortality, which in turn shape the next generation's exposure to adversity. Embedded within this life course logic is the concept of intergenerational transmission: parents who experienced ACEs are at elevated risk of parenting under conditions that increase the likelihood of their children experiencing ACEs. This intergenerational dynamic is critical for psychologists because it reframes parental psychopathology not as a discrete clinical entity but as a node in a multigenerational cycle that can be interrupted.

A third theoretical pillar is the toxic stress framework. The CDC's (2024) emphasis on the biological embedding of early adversity reflects the now-extensive literature demonstrating that prolonged, severe activation of the stress response in the absence of buffering relationships can alter the architecture of the developing brain, dysregulate the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis, and shape immune and metabolic functioning in ways that elevate lifelong disease risk. Psychologists familiar with this literature will recognize the toxic stress concept as the physiological bridge that links psychosocial adversity to the broad array of health outcomes documented in ACEs research.

Finally, the CDC's framework is grounded in a public health prevention orientation. Whereas clinical psychology has historically been organized around tertiary prevention—treating disorder after it emerges—the CDC (2024) explicitly elevates primary and secondary prevention. This shift has significant implications for how psychologists conceive of their professional role, encouraging engagement with community-level interventions, policy advocacy, and population-level screening alongside individual treatment.

---

3. Conceptual Models and Mechanisms

The conceptual architecture of the CDC's (2024) resource rests on three interlocking propositions. First, ACEs are common. Second, ACEs are consequential. Third, ACEs are preventable. Each proposition carries mechanistic implications that warrant careful psychological analysis.

The proposition that ACEs are common has reshaped clinical epidemiology. Rather than treating childhood adversity as a marker of unusual pathology, the ACEs literature reframes it

as a normatively distributed exposure that varies in type, intensity, chronicity, and constellation. The clinical implication is that psychologists should expect adversity histories among their clients and should incorporate developmentally informed inquiry into routine assessment. The methodological implication is that prevalence estimates depend heavily on how adversity is defined and measured, a point the CDC (2024) acknowledges in its careful delineation of categories.

The proposition that ACEs are consequential is supported by a robust dose-response relationship between cumulative adversity and a wide range of outcomes. Conceptually, this dose-response pattern is consistent with allostatic load theory, which holds that repeated activation of stress-response systems produces wear and tear on regulatory architecture over time. As the number of adversities accumulates, the probability of dysregulation across multiple systems—neuroendocrine, immune, autonomic, and behavioral—rises correspondingly. The CDC (2024) frames this as the empirical basis for cross-cutting prevention: because the same set of adversities elevates risk for outcomes as varied as depression, suicide, substance use, cardiovascular disease, and interpersonal violence, interventions that reduce adversity will produce returns across many downstream domains.

The proposition that ACEs are preventable rests on the identification of modifiable risk and protective factors. The CDC (2024) organizes prevention strategies around a set of evidence-informed pillars, including strengthening economic supports for families, promoting social norms that protect against violence, ensuring a strong start for children, teaching skills, connecting youth to caring adults and activities, and intervening to lessen immediate and long-term harms. The mechanistic claim underlying these strategies is that adversity arises not from immutable individual characteristics but from a confluence of structural, relational, and individual factors, each of which constitutes a potential point of intervention.

A conceptual model derived from the CDC's (2024) synthesis can be described as follows. Distal structural conditions—poverty, housing instability, neighborhood disadvantage, and limited access to health care—shape the proximal family environment, which in turn shapes the caregiving relationships and stress exposures experienced by the child. These proximal conditions influence the child's developing stress-regulation systems, attachment representations, and cognitive-emotional schemas. These internal systems then mediate the relationship between early adversity and later behavioral, psychological, and physical outcomes. Protective factors—including stable caregiving relationships, community connectedness, and access to supportive services—operate at multiple levels to buffer the

impact of adversity and to interrupt the cascade. Figure 1, conceptually rendered, would depict this layered model with arrows representing causal pathways and feedback loops, illustrating how interventions at structural, relational, or individual levels each propagate effects across the system.

This integrated model is consistent with what developmental psychopathologists have long argued: outcomes are multifinal and equifinal. The same adversity can produce divergent outcomes depending on moderating factors, and similar outcomes can arise from distinct adversity profiles. For psychologists, this principle reinforces the importance of individualized case formulation even as the population-level evidence supports broad prevention strategies.

---

4. Empirical Findings Across Studies

The CDC's (2024) synthesis draws together findings from epidemiological, clinical, and intervention research conducted over more than two decades. While a full enumeration of studies is beyond the scope of this manual, the conceptual contours of the empirical literature warrant integrative discussion.

A consistent finding across studies is the high prevalence of ACEs in the general population, with a substantial minority of adults reporting multiple adversities. This prevalence is not evenly distributed; rather, ACEs are concentrated in populations facing structural disadvantage, including those experiencing poverty, racial and ethnic minoritization, and geographic marginalization. The CDC (2024) emphasizes that these disparities are not incidental but reflect the systemic conditions that elevate the probability of adversity. From a psychological standpoint, this finding underscores that ACEs cannot be understood apart from the social determinants of health and that prevention efforts which ignore structural inequities are likely to fall short.

A second consistent finding is the dose-response relationship between cumulative ACEs and adult outcomes. As the number of adversities accumulates, the probability of adverse outcomes—including depression, anxiety, posttraumatic stress, suicide attempts, substance use disorders, chronic disease, and premature mortality—rises in graded fashion. This dose-response relationship has been replicated across diverse populations and represents

one of the more robust findings in contemporary epidemiology. Importantly, however, the CDC (2024) cautions that a cumulative count, while useful for population surveillance, does not capture the qualitative differences among adversity types, the developmental timing of exposure, or the presence of buffering relationships. Psychologists should therefore interpret ACE scores as one informative but limited summary, not as a deterministic predictor.

A third body of evidence concerns the interconnections among ACEs, suicide, and overdose. The CDC (2024) explicitly frames these three phenomena as linked, sharing common risk and protective factors and clustering across the life course and across generations. This integrative framing reflects a growing recognition that the historical separation of these issues into distinct silos has impeded both research and prevention. Empirically, individuals who die by suicide or overdose disproportionately have histories of childhood adversity, and the same family and community conditions that elevate risk for one outcome tend to elevate risk for the others.

A fourth empirical thread concerns the effectiveness of prevention strategies. The CDC's (2024) synthesis identifies several categories of intervention with evidence of effectiveness, ranging from policy-level changes that strengthen economic supports for families, to community-level programs that build social cohesion and reduce violence, to relational interventions such as home visiting and parenting programs that strengthen caregiving capacity, to individual-level skill-building programs for children and adolescents. The strength of evidence varies across these categories, and the CDC's framework is candid about the methodological challenges of evaluating multi-component, multi-level interventions.

A final empirical observation concerns resilience. Across studies, a meaningful proportion of individuals exposed to substantial adversity demonstrate adaptive functioning across the life course. Resilience is not a fixed trait but a dynamic process shaped by ongoing transactions between the individual and the environment. The CDC (2024) treats resilience-relevant factors—stable caregiving, social connectedness, opportunity—as legitimate targets of intervention, reinforcing the position that prevention is not merely about reducing exposure but about strengthening the conditions under which children can thrive.

Critical analysis of the empirical literature must acknowledge several methodological limitations. Much of the foundational ACEs research relies on retrospective adult reports of childhood experiences, which are subject to recall bias and underreporting, particularly for stigmatized exposures. The original ACE scale was developed in a specific population and

does not capture the full range of relevant adversities, particularly those linked to community violence, racism, and structural marginalization. Many studies are correlational and cannot establish causal pathways with the rigor that intervention research can provide. The CDC (2024) implicitly acknowledges these limitations by framing its document as a synthesis of the *best available* evidence, signaling that the evidence base, while substantial, continues to evolve.

---

5. Psychological Pathways and Stress Responses

To translate epidemiological findings into clinically meaningful understanding, psychologists must engage with the mechanisms by which childhood adversity shapes psychological functioning. The CDC (2024) implicates several interrelated pathways that warrant elaboration.

The neurobiological pathway begins with the chronic activation of stress-response systems under conditions of adversity. When a child is repeatedly exposed to threat, unpredictability, or deprivation in the absence of consistent buffering by caregivers, the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis, autonomic nervous system, and associated neural circuits adapt to a high-threat environment. Adaptations that may be functional in the short term—heightened vigilance, rapid threat detection, blunted exploration—can become maladaptive when the developmental context shifts. Over time, these adaptations may manifest as difficulties with emotion regulation, attentional control, executive functioning, and interpersonal trust. For the clinician, this neurobiological framing reframes "symptoms" not as expressions of pathology in the abstract but as developmentally understandable adaptations to early environments.

The attachment pathway concerns the internal working models of self and other that are shaped by early caregiving. When caregivers are themselves the source of threat or are unavailable due to mental illness, substance use, incarceration, or chronic stress, children may develop insecure or disorganized attachment representations that influence later relational functioning. These representations operate as cognitive-affective schemas that filter subsequent interpersonal experiences, predisposing the individual to interpret ambiguous social cues in threat-consistent ways and to reenact familiar relational patterns. The clinical

implication is that interventions for ACE-exposed clients must often attend to the relational and representational dimensions of distress, not only to symptom reduction.

The behavioral pathway concerns the development of coping strategies that may carry short-term adaptive value but long-term cost. Substance use, for example, can function as a means of regulating overwhelming affect, and disordered eating, self-injury, and avoidance can serve similar functions. The CDC's (2024) explicit linkage of ACEs to overdose and suicide reflects this behavioral pathway, in which strategies for managing unbearable internal states can themselves become sources of harm. Psychologists working with clients with histories of adversity will recognize that addressing these behaviors requires understanding their function, not merely targeting them as discrete symptoms.

The cognitive pathway involves the development of beliefs about self, others, and the world that are shaped by early experience. Adversity often instills beliefs in personal unworthiness, the dangerousness of others, and the unpredictability of outcomes. These beliefs can be remarkably stable across the life course and may underlie depressive, anxious, and posttraumatic presentations. They also influence help-seeking and treatment engagement, with implications for how psychologists structure therapeutic relationships.

The social pathway concerns the cumulative effects of adversity on educational attainment, employment, social network composition, and access to resources. These cascading effects can constrain opportunities for recovery and growth, embedding adversity in the structural conditions of adult life. Psychologists who attend only to intrapsychic processes without recognizing these social cascades may miss critical targets for intervention and advocacy.

Importantly, these pathways are not independent. They interact recursively, such that neurobiological adaptations shape behavior, behavior shapes social context, and social context feeds back into stress exposure. The CDC's (2024) integrative framing invites psychologists to hold this complexity in mind, recognizing that effective intervention often requires action at multiple points in the system.

---

6. Mental Health Outcomes and Severity Spectrum

The mental health outcomes associated with ACEs span a wide severity spectrum, from subclinical distress to severe and persistent psychiatric disorders. The CDC's (2024) synthesis reinforces what clinicians have long observed: adversity is implicated in nearly every category of psychopathology, though the strength and specificity of these associations vary.

Depressive disorders represent one of the most consistently documented outcomes. Adults with histories of ACEs show elevated rates of major depressive disorder, persistent depressive disorder, and subthreshold depressive symptoms. The mechanisms likely involve a combination of neurobiological dysregulation, negative self-schemas, interpersonal difficulties, and chronic stress exposure. Anxiety disorders similarly show robust associations, with generalized anxiety, panic, and social anxiety all elevated among ACE-exposed populations.

Posttraumatic stress disorder occupies a central position in the ACEs-related psychopathology literature. Many of the experiences captured by ACEs—abuse, neglect, witnessing violence—meet diagnostic criteria for traumatic events, and the development of PTSD is a direct sequela. However, the clinical presentations of individuals with developmental and complex trauma often extend beyond the classic PTSD criteria to include disturbances in self-organization, affect dysregulation, and interpersonal difficulties, consistent with the construct of complex posttraumatic stress disorder.

Substance use disorders are strongly linked to ACEs, both as functional responses to dysregulated affect and as products of the family and community conditions that constitute adversity. The CDC's (2024) framing of overdose as part of the interconnected web of outcomes underscores the public health gravity of this association. Suicide and suicidal behavior similarly show robust associations with cumulative adversity, with risk rising in dose-response fashion. For psychologists, this means that thorough assessment of adversity history is integral to suicide risk assessment, particularly for clients presenting with depression, substance use, or histories of self-harm.

Other outcomes documented in the broader literature and reflected in the CDC's (2024) synthesis include eating disorders, dissociative disorders, personality disorders, and a range of somatic symptom presentations. The breadth of associations does not imply that ACEs cause any specific disorder, but rather that early adversity functions as a transdiagnostic risk factor that shapes the developmental trajectories from which various forms of

psychopathology may emerge.

It is essential to situate these outcomes on a severity spectrum. Many individuals with ACE histories experience subclinical distress that does not reach diagnostic thresholds but that nonetheless impairs functioning and quality of life. Others experience episodic difficulties that wax and wane across the life course. Still others develop severe and persistent conditions that require intensive treatment. This heterogeneity reinforces the importance of individualized assessment and treatment planning. It also has implications for prevention, suggesting that universal prevention strategies aimed at the general population, selective strategies targeted to higher-risk groups, and indicated strategies for symptomatic individuals are all warranted.

The CDC (2024) is careful to avoid deterministic framing. ACEs elevate probability; they do not dictate outcome. A substantial proportion of individuals with high ACE exposure achieve good adult functioning, and the factors that support this resilience—stable relationships, opportunity, meaning, and skills—are themselves modifiable. For psychologists, this nondeterministic framing aligns with the ethical imperative to maintain hope and to communicate it credibly to clients.

---

7. System-Level and Contextual Psychological Effects

Beyond individual outcomes, ACEs exert effects at the level of families, organizations, communities, and systems. The CDC (2024) emphasizes these system-level dimensions, recognizing that prevention requires action beyond the individual encounter.

At the family level, parental ACE histories influence parenting capacity through multiple pathways. Parents with their own histories of adversity may experience difficulties with emotion regulation, may struggle to provide the consistent, attuned caregiving that buffers stress in their children, and may face the cumulative burden of unaddressed trauma alongside the demands of parenting. This is not a matter of blame; it is a matter of recognizing that the intergenerational transmission of adversity operates through identifiable mechanisms that can be addressed through support. Family-level interventions that strengthen parenting capacity, build skills, and connect families to resources represent a critical leverage point.

At the community level, neighborhoods characterized by concentrated disadvantage, exposure to violence, and limited institutional resources elevate the probability of ACEs and constrain the protective factors that could buffer them. Community-level prevention strategies—including efforts to reduce neighborhood violence, strengthen social cohesion, and build the institutional infrastructure that supports families—are integral to the CDC's (2024) prevention framework. For psychologists, engagement at the community level may involve consultation, program development, training, or advocacy.

At the organizational level, the systems that serve children and families—schools, health care, child welfare, juvenile justice—can either mitigate or compound the effects of adversity. Trauma-informed organizational practices, as advanced in the broader trauma-informed care literature reflected in the CDC's (2024) framing, aim to ensure that service systems do not inadvertently retraumatize the populations they serve and that they actively support recovery and resilience. Psychologists frequently occupy roles as trainers, consultants, and leaders within these systems, with corresponding opportunities to shape organizational culture.

At the policy level, the structural conditions that shape the probability of ACEs—including economic supports for families, access to health care, housing stability, and educational opportunity—are amenable to policy intervention. The CDC's (2024) inclusion of policy-level strategies among its prevention pillars reflects the recognition that downstream clinical work, however skilled, cannot fully compensate for upstream conditions that generate adversity. Psychologists have a legitimate role in policy advocacy informed by science, and professional organizations increasingly recognize this role as integral to the discipline.

These system-level effects also generate what might be termed contextual psychological consequences. Communities with high cumulative adversity experience collective trauma, diminished trust in institutions, and erosion of social capital. These collective phenomena are not merely backdrop to individual psychology; they shape the meaning-making frameworks, identities, and aspirations of the people who live within them. Psychologists working with populations affected by community-level adversity must attend to these contextual dimensions, recognizing that individual treatment occurs within a larger psychosocial ecology.

---

8. Clinical Implications for Psychologists

The translation of the CDC's (2024) synthesis into clinical practice has multiple dimensions. The following discussion organizes these implications around assessment, intervention, prevention, system engagement, and ethical practice.

Assessment. Psychologists should incorporate developmentally informed inquiry into childhood adversity as a routine component of assessment, while exercising clinical judgment about timing, framing, and depth. Standardized ACE measures can be useful for screening and risk stratification, but they should be supplemented by clinical interviewing that captures the qualitative dimensions of experience, including developmental timing, chronicity, the presence of buffering relationships, and the meaning the client makes of these experiences. Psychologists should also assess current functioning across multiple domains—affective, cognitive, behavioral, relational, somatic, and social—recognizing that ACE-related sequelae are typically transdiagnostic.

Importantly, the act of inquiry must itself be conducted in a trauma-informed manner. Clients should be informed about the purpose of inquiry, offered choice about disclosure, and supported in regulating any distress that arises. Psychologists should be prepared to respond to disclosures with empathy, validation, and connection to appropriate resources, recognizing that the relational quality of the assessment interaction may itself be therapeutic.

Intervention. Treatment of ACE-related sequelae draws on the extensive evidence base for trauma-focused interventions, including cognitive-behavioral approaches with trauma-specific components, attachment-based interventions, mindfulness-based approaches, and integrative frameworks that address dysregulation across multiple systems. The CDC's (2024) emphasis on lessening immediate and long-term harms aligns with the clinical work of treating established psychopathology, while its emphasis on prevention extends the psychologist's purview to selective and indicated prevention activities.

Treatment planning should be guided by careful case formulation that integrates the individual's adversity history, current symptoms, strengths, and context. Psychologists should be cautious about applying any single intervention protocol mechanically to all ACE-exposed clients, recognizing that the heterogeneity of presentations requires individualized planning. Treatment should attend to safety, stabilization, and regulation before processing of traumatic material, consistent with established phase-based approaches to complex trauma.

Prevention. The CDC's (2024) framework invites psychologists to engage in prevention activities that extend beyond traditional clinical practice. This may include developing and delivering parenting programs, providing consultation to schools and early childhood programs, participating in home visiting initiatives, designing skill-building curricula for children and adolescents, and contributing to community-based programs that strengthen social cohesion and reduce violence. Psychologists with expertise in evaluation can contribute to the rigorous assessment of prevention programs, addressing the methodological challenges that the CDC's synthesis acknowledges.

System engagement. Psychologists frequently occupy positions of influence within service systems, and the CDC's (2024) framework supports active engagement in shaping organizational culture and policy. This may include training colleagues in trauma-informed practice, advising on organizational policies that reduce retraumatization, consulting with child welfare and juvenile justice systems, and participating in interdisciplinary teams that address shared risk and protective factors across the ACEs-suicide-overdose continuum.

Advocacy. The structural drivers of ACEs—poverty, housing instability, limited access to health care, community disinvestment—are amenable to policy intervention informed by psychological science. Psychologists have an ethical and professional warrant to engage in advocacy that translates evidence into policy, particularly when doing so serves the welfare of populations they are positioned to understand.

Ethical practice. The application of the ACEs framework raises ethical considerations that warrant explicit attention. Psychologists should avoid deterministic framing that pathologizes clients or that reduces complex life trajectories to a numerical score. They should attend to the cultural, racial, and structural contexts within which adversity occurs, recognizing that the original ACE measure does not capture the full range of adversities relevant to many populations. They should be alert to the potential for ACE-related framing to be used in ways that stigmatize or label clients, and they should advocate for uses of the framework that empower rather than constrain.

---

9. Future Directions and Research Gaps

The CDC's (2024) synthesis represents the current state of the evidence base, and it explicitly identifies itself as drawing on the *best available* evidence rather than a complete or final understanding. Several areas warrant continued investigation.

First, the measurement of adversity requires continued refinement. The original ACE scale has been enormously influential but has known limitations, including its failure to capture community violence, racism, structural disadvantage, and other forms of adversity that disproportionately affect marginalized populations. Expanded measurement frameworks that capture this fuller range, while maintaining measurement integrity, represent an active area of development.

Second, the mechanisms linking adversity to outcomes require continued elucidation. Although the broad pathways are increasingly well understood, the specific mediators and moderators that shape individual trajectories remain incompletely mapped. Research that integrates neurobiological, psychological, and social levels of analysis is particularly valuable.

Third, the evidence base for prevention interventions, while substantial, continues to develop. The CDC's (2024) synthesis identifies prevention strategies with varying degrees of empirical support, and many of the multi-level, community-based interventions that the framework endorses pose methodological challenges for evaluation. Continued investment in rigorous outcome evaluation of prevention programs is essential.

Fourth, the integration of ACEs prevention with related public health priorities—suicide prevention, overdose prevention, violence prevention, mental health promotion—offers significant opportunity. The CDC's (2024) framing of these as interconnected phenomena with shared risk and protective factors invites the development of integrated frameworks that operate across traditional silos.

Fifth, equity considerations require sustained attention. The disproportionate burden of ACEs on populations facing structural disadvantage is itself a product of historical and contemporary inequities, and prevention strategies that do not address these structural drivers will produce limited returns. Research that explicitly examines how prevention strategies operate across diverse populations, and that develops culturally responsive approaches, represents a critical frontier.

Sixth, the role of resilience and positive childhood experiences deserves expanded attention. Emerging research suggests that protective factors are not merely the absence of adversity but constitute their own positive influences on development. Frameworks that integrate adversity and protection into a unified developmental science will likely yield richer understanding and more effective intervention.

Finally, the translation of evidence into practice itself constitutes a research priority. Understanding how clinicians, organizations, and systems incorporate the ACEs framework into routine practice—and what supports and constraints shape that incorporation—is essential for realizing the public health potential that the CDC's (2024) synthesis envisions.

---

10. Conclusion

The CDC's resource *Preventing Adverse Childhood Experiences: Leveraging the Best Available Evidence* (CDC, 2024) consolidates a generation of scientific work into a framework that is at once conceptual, empirical, and actionable. For psychologists, the framework offers a powerful lens through which to understand the developmental origins of much of the distress that presents in clinical settings. It links the intimate domain of individual psychology to the broader systems that shape human lives, and it invites psychologists to engage not only as treaters of established disorder but as preventers of adversity, builders of resilience, and advocates for the conditions under which children and families can thrive.

The framework's central insight—that ACEs, suicide, and overdose are linked across the life course and across generations, sharing common risk and protective factors—dissolves the silos that have historically fragmented prevention and clinical work. It invites an integrative practice in which assessment, intervention, prevention, system engagement, and advocacy are recognized as complementary expressions of a single professional commitment to human welfare.

The clinical translation of this evidence requires sustained attention to mechanism, context, individual variation, and ethical practice. It requires psychologists to hold population-level evidence in productive tension with individualized case formulation, to communicate both the gravity and the malleability of early adversity, and to maintain the relational stance from which

therapeutic and preventive work proceeds. It requires, ultimately, a vision of the discipline that is at once scientifically rigorous and morally serious, attentive to suffering and committed to the conditions that prevent it.

The work of preventing ACEs is unfinished. The evidence base will continue to evolve, the prevention strategies will be refined, and the integration of this work with other public health priorities will deepen. The CDC's (2024) synthesis offers psychologists a place to stand within this evolving work—a place from which to bring the distinctive contributions of psychological science to a problem that is both common and consequential, and that is, as the framework affirms, preventable.

---

11. References

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention. (2024). *Preventing adverse childhood experiences (ACEs): Leveraging the best available evidence*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/82316

This continuing education manual was prepared as a synthesis of the source material identified above. Citations and content reflect only the uploaded source. Psychologists are encouraged to consult the original CDC resource for the complete text, including detailed data, prevention strategy descriptions, and supporting references.