Early Experiences and their Impact on the Developing Emotional Brain?

Hiya Jain[1], Deepika Jain[2]
1 Barnard College, Columbia University
2 Shishu Child Development and Early Intervention Centre, Ahmedabad, India

Address for correspondence
Deepika Jain
Shishu Child Development and Early Intervention Centre Ahmedabad India
Email: shishuchilddevelopment@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4583-4649

Received : 08 SEPTEMBER 2025; Accepted: 25 JANUARY 2026

Abstract

Early childhood represents a critical period of heightened neural plasticity during which environmental experiences shape the developing emotional brain, particularly limbic–prefrontal circuits involving the amygdala and prefrontal cortex. Nurturing and responsive caregiving supports the formation of balanced neural pathways, enabling effective emotion regulation, stress modulation, and social functioning. In contrast, early-life adversity such as neglect, trauma, or chronic stress disrupts this process by accelerating amygdala maturation, weakening prefrontal regulatory control, and prematurely closing sensitive developmental periods. Evidence from animal and human studies consistently demonstrates that such alterations lead to persistent changes in stress responsivity, increased emotional reactivity, and a higher risk of anxiety and behavioral disorders. These effects are mediated through experience-dependent synaptic remodeling and epigenetic mechanisms, reflecting conserved neurobiological processes across species. Understanding these pathways highlights the importance of early interventions and supportive caregiving environments to preserve neural plasticity and promote optimal emotional development.

How to cite this article:
Jain H, Jain D. Early Experiences and their Impact on the Developing, Emotional Brain?. Indian J Dev Behav Pediatr. 2026;Vol 4(1):5-11. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19659033

Keywords:
- Neural Plasticity
- Amygdala – prefrontal connectivity
- Emotional development

Introduction

Early life is a time of extraordinary neural plasticity with the brain's architecture being actively sculpted by experience. This is especially pronounced for circuits governing emotion – particularly the limbic–prefrontal networks linking the amygdala and prefrontal cortex (PFC) [1]. Synaptic connections here are particularly malleable, allowing the developing brain to calibrate itself to its environment. Early experiences function as potent 'instructional signals' that durably tune neural circuits for emotion regulation and reactivity. Nurturing, responsive care helps assemble balanced networks for fear learning, stress modulation, and social bonding. Adversity characterized by trauma, neglect, or chronic stress can derail this wiring and leave the child with lasting emotional vulnerabilities [2].

These long-lasting changes arise because the first years of life effectively program limbic–cortical connections, strengthening some synapses and eliminating others through experience-dependent processes [3]. This pruning is widespread, which is why early childhood nurturing depends so heavily on providing the right stimuli so that relevant circuitry is built and retained. One particularly striking and specific example can be found in language development where children are exposed to language early so that they can retain the necessary phonemes for their mother tongue. More broadly, a responsive caregiver versus an absent one can set the stress response system on entirely different trajectories – well-calibrated or chronically overactive [2]. Safe environments encourage neural patterns supporting adaptive emotional learning and adverse ones push the brain toward threat sensitivity and fast fear acquisition (at the expense of flexibility). Once the relevant sensitive periods close, though, the patterns harden and set. A brain that was shaped for a dangerous world keeps those features even after the danger has passed, creating an undesirable situation where early adversity becomes lifelong anxiety and depression. In short, early experiences leave an enduring neural imprint especially because early plasticity shapes emotional capacities for the long term.

With this context, in this paper we aim to demonstrate the synaptic plasticity within limbic–prefrontal circuits is a critical mechanism by which early-life experiences shape emotional development, and that disruptions during sensitive periods (when this plasticity is at its peak) can yield enduring affective and behavioral difficulties. To do so, we discuss the concepts of sensitive periods and neural plasticity, review evidence that early experiences of all valences directs the maturation of amygdala–PFC connectivity, and examine the long-term behavioral and neurobiological consequences of perturbed early development in these circuits. Throughout, mammalian cross-species findings are integrated to illustrate how fundamental and conserved these developmental processes truly are.

Sensitive Periods and Neural Plasticity:

Sensitive periods are developmental windows when the brain is particularly plastic and responsive to experience. During these intervals, environmental inputs can trigger rapid synaptic remodeling, after which circuit connectivity tends to stabilize [4]. The classic example is the development of ocular dominance columns in the visual system, but sensitive periods also govern socio-emotional circuits. In limbic development, the postnatal period through early childhood constitutes a sensitive period for organizing amygdala connections with cortical regions. Amygdala neurons are forming abundant new synapses during this time while prefrontal regions begin their prolonged maturation. Plasticity peaks as limbic and cortical circuits are first being established, so early experiences can exert pronounced effects on neural wiring [1].

A well-demonstrated example comes from infant rats: before postnatal day 10 (P10), pups are predisposed to learn attachment and resist learning aversion, a bias maintained by the

mother's presence suppressing amygdala activity. This period ends as pups develop a typical fear response. The switch is largely neurobiological — increased corticosterone and amygdala synaptic strength around the end of the second postnatal week. If this timeline is disturbed (for example, by abnormally high corticosterone in a younger pup), the sensitive period shifts and fear learning emerges prematurely [5,4]. During sensitive periods, synaptic density and receptor expression reach their highest levels, making circuits maximally modifiable. Eventually, mechanisms such as perineuronal nets (PNNs) and the maturation of inhibitory circuitry close these periods by stabilizing synapses. PNNs are extracellular matrix structures that envelop neurons, particularly fast-spiking interneurons, and consolidate synaptic connections, terminating critical period plasticity.

Early life stress can alter the rate at which PNNs develop [3]. One study demonstrated that a mother's limited bedding behaviour toward young rat pups was directly correlated with increased PNN density in the right basolateral amygdala (BLA) of male rats[6]. These changes predicted reduced fear-learning activity in parvalbumin cells. Though limited in scope, this finding illustrates the biological underpinnings of stress-modulated physiological changes during sensitive periods. This can be extrapolated to emotional circuits more broadly, especially the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC)–amygdala network, which is central to learning about threat and safety and to regulating emotional reactions.

The amygdala detects salient or threatening stimuli, while the PFC gradually assumes top-down regulatory control to modulate fear responses and extinction [7]. The functional connectivity between amygdala and PFC develops over a prolonged period extending into adolescence, indicating a protracted sensitive period for the acquisition of emotion regulation skills. In young children, the amygdala–mPFC connection tends to be positively coupled (they co-activate) which is thought to underlie higher emotional reactivity and less cortical moderation of fear during childhood. Over development, this coupling typically shifts to an inverse pattern by adulthood, with the mPFC downregulating amygdala activity as needed. The mPFC's regulatory influence comes on gradually as structural connections myelinate and strengthen through childhood and adolescence. In rodents, the prelimbic cortex (analogous to mPFC) only begins sending robust projections to the amygdala during the juvenile period and continues refining these connections into early adulthood [1].

The limbic–prefrontal network's prolonged development means it sits in a long window of both opportunity and vulnerability. When mPFC regulation is strong, emotion regulation tends to be better and anxiety lower; when the amygdala is hyperactive or poorly regulated by PFC, anxiety and mood disorders are more likely. Sensitive parenting — helping a child learn to recover after a fright, for instance — should ideally produce an appropriately tuned mPFC–amygdala connection. Chronic stress that keeps the amygdala persistently over-engaged, on the other hand, may leave top-down control underdeveloped or disorganized [8,9]. This combination of centrality to fear and anxiety, and plastic tunability across a long developmental arc, makes the limbic–prefrontal network a natural system for studying how early experience shapes emotional development.

Experience Shapes Amygdala–PFC Connectivity

Caregivers act as external regulators for infants by modulating stress responses, teaching which stimuli are safe or dangerous, and directly affecting neural activity – maternal presence, for instance, suppresses amygdala function. Therefore, whether a responsive caregiver is present or absent can dramatically shape when and how the amygdala connects with cortical control centres. In animal models, infant rats receiving consistent maternal

care maintain an attachment-biased, low-fear amygdala state for a defined sensitive period. Remove the mother and the amygdala switches on to support fear learning much earlier [9]. The implication is that normal caregiver presence delays the engagement of amygdala-dependent fear circuits, giving the cortex time to mature before it needs to assume regulatory control.

Differences in caregiving quality produce different wiring outcomes. Nurturing caregivers buffer stressors and promote strong but flexible amygdala–PFC connections. Negligent or abusive caregiving leaves the infant's amygdala frequently activated without adequate support. Rat pups exposed to abusive mothers — who simultaneously provide attachment cues — develop disrupted social and threat processing later in life. The conflict of receiving trauma from the attachment figure engages attachment and fear circuits at the same time, wiring connections that would not form under normal conditions [4]. Early abuse in rodents has been linked to increased amygdala synaptic strength and lasting epigenetic changes in prefrontal neurons; Roth et al. [10] demonstrated that adversity during infancy silences the brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) gene, impeding normal circuit maturation. Even within the non-pathological range, variations in maternal sensitivity or early stress exposure shape amygdala–PFC circuit development.

In monkeys, infants whose mothers provided less effective stress buffering showed weaker amygdala–PFC functional connectivity from an early age[8], suggesting that without the expected caregiver regulation, the PFC never properly learns to downregulate the amygdala. Limited nesting paradigms in rats also produced increased spine density and synaptic potentiation in the amygdala during juvenility[6]. Maternal separation or fragmented care can push functional milestones forward with fear learning appearing earlier than expected[11]. Oomen et al.[12] found something initially counterintuitive: deprived rats had impaired baseline neurogenesis but enhanced synaptic potentiation under stress, as though the hippocampus had been optimized for high-stress conditions at the cost of functioning well under normal ones. The takeaway here is that early adversity calibrates the brain to perform best under duress — an accelerated developmental trajectory favouring stress resilience. But while this calibration may help in the short term, it costs long-term flexibility.

Human neuroimaging tells a similar story: [7] children who had been deprived of consistent caregiving already showed adult-like amygdala–mPFC functional coupling during childhood. Typically reared children did not. The interpretation was that these children's brains had fast-tracked emotion circuit development as an ontogenetic adaptation to adversity — get the PFC online earlier, dampen the amygdala sooner. And to some extent it worked: these children had somewhat lower acute anxiety reactivity than you might expect given their histories. But they still had elevated anxiety overall, and they had forfeited the extended plasticity window their peers would go on to use.

What drives this premature maturation at the synaptic level? Stress hormones seem to be the leading candidate. Morin et al. [8] found that elevated cortisol in infancy predicted the weaker amygdala–PFC connectivity they observed in maltreated juvenile monkeys. In rat pups, high corticosterone enables fear learning at ages when it would not normally be possible [13]. The mechanism seems to be that chronic early stress floods the developing brain with maturation signals — accelerating synaptic strengthening, hastening the closure of plasticity windows, and effectively imposing adult-like architecture on a brain that is not yet ready for it. In an environment of active danger, this might be adaptive: a hypervigilant, stress-tolerant infant is more likely to survive neglect or abuse. But the moment conditions change, the architecture becomes a liability. Yet, the developmental lock-in means the child has sacrificed the extended,

slow-burn period of nurturing-driven development that would normally allow for maximal emotional flexibility.

Long-Term Impact of Altered Synaptic Development

When early experiences disrupt synaptic development in limbic–prefrontal circuits, the behavioral fallout tends to be broad. Elevated anxiety, heightened stress reactivity, poor emotion regulation — these are what you would expect from a brain calibrated for danger, and they are exactly what the literature consistently finds. Tottenham et al. [14] found that over 50% of post-orphanage children carried a diagnosable psychiatric disorder, most commonly an anxiety disorder, even years after adoption into stable homes. Adults maltreated in childhood show exaggerated emotional reactions — hypervigilance to anger, difficulty calming down — with neural correlates to match, including overactive amygdala responses.

The animal data is consistent. Rodents exposed to early stress show increased anxiety-like behaviour (avoidance of open spaces, for instance) that persists in safe laboratory conditions, suggesting the early programming resists reversal. Rats separated from their mothers in infancy have lifelong elevations in stress hormone responses and display both anxious and depression-like behaviours [3]. Their brains appear stuck in the high-alert mode established during early life. Fear extinction or the capacity to unlearn a fear response when danger has passed, is also frequently impaired in animals and humans with early trauma histories [4].

This makes sense mechanistically: a brain wired for chronic danger has no reason to let go of a fear response just because conditions have improved. HPA-axis dysregulation is another persistent finding; individuals with early adversity tend to have either hyperactive or paradoxically blunted stress responses in adulthood, indicating that the system's set-point was shifted during development [4]. These neural changes produce behavioural patterns that can self-perpetuate. A highly fearful child who struggles with emotion regulation may elicit fewer positive responses from caregivers and peers, compounding social difficulties and reinforcing the experience of the world as threatening. What is striking is the cross-species consistency.

Depriving a mammalian infant of normal caregiver care, or exposing it to chronic stress, produces a recognizably similar neurodevelopmental outcome regardless of species: an overactive amygdala coupled with weak or atypical cortical regulation. Maternal separation in rats, maternal maltreatment in monkeys, institutional rearing in humans — all converge on this pattern. Monkeys reared under unpredictable, stressful conditions develop larger amygdala volumes than controls [15] and show heightened anxious behaviour in adulthood.

The same holds in humans: children adopted later from orphanages have larger amygdalae and more anxiety symptoms[14]. The fact that this pattern recurs across rodents, primates, and humans suggests it is an evolutionarily conserved response to early adversity. Intervention studies reinforce this idea in some ways with extra licking and grooming after early stress in rats can rescue some synaptic development deficits[16], just as early adoption into nurturing homes partially buffers the effects of institutional rearing in human orphans[17]. The cross-species consistency of both the damage and the rescue shows that early caregiving environments are critical, and that intervening early when adversity occurs can meaningfully reduce the burden of lifelong anxiety and affective disorders.

Human Evidence for Early Adversity Effects

Zooming in on human studies, it is a consistent finding that children exposed to early adversity are at elevated risk for emotional and behavioural problems. Tottenham et al.[14] reported that over 50% of children who spent their early years in institutions met criteria for a psychiatric disorder by middle childhood, anxiety disorders being the

most common. These children showed heightened fearfulness even in safe environments, and the effect appeared dose-dependent: later adoption (meaning longer institutionalization) was associated with more severe anxiety and emotion-regulation deficits, along with larger amygdala volumes.

Jedd et al.[18] found hyper-responsivity of the amygdala in adults with histories of childhood maltreatment — a finding that accompanies difficulty discriminating safe from threatening cues and likely contributes to the chronic anxiety these individuals experience. At the population level, one epidemiological estimate puts the proportion of childhood-onset mental health disorders associated with adverse early experiences at roughly 45%. For adult-onset psychiatric disorders, the figure is still over 30% [3]. These numbers point to the scale of what could be gained by intervening during early childhood. The consequences extend beyond emotional difficulties to cognitive and academic problems, and to attachment disturbances. Children with early neglect frequently form insecure or disorganized attachments that manifest as anxious clinging, or as avoidance and difficulty forming close relationships. These behaviors have obvious and cascading social implications.

Conclusion

Early-life experiences shape emotional circuitry by sculpting synaptic connections in the amygdala–prefrontal network during periods of peak developmental plasticity. Consistent caregiver comfort calibrates when and how fear circuits come online: maternal presence holds the infant amygdala in check until the prefrontal cortex is ready to take over regulation. This tuning during sensitive periods produces adults who can balance threat responses and safety cues.

However, adversity tilts the scales toward hypervigilance and dysregulation where stress and deprivation accelerate amygdala development, close plasticity windows early, and impose adult-like circuit patterns on a young brain. As the evidence shows, the short-term advantage (a child with a precociously developed fear system might avoid dangers) comes at a real cost: reduced capacity to adapt to new environments or develop nuanced emotional responses.

This review, thus, converges on a clear pattern: premature closure of plasticity leaves a persistently reactive amygdala, weaker top-down control, and enduring difficulties with anxiety and emotion regulation. The core claim of this paper is that early-life synaptic plasticity within limbic–prefrontal circuits is the mechanism through which experience imprints on emotional development. By recognizing these critical periods and mechanisms and supplementing them with timely interventions and supportive environments, we can help at-risk children maintain or regain healthy plasticity – blunting the long-term effects of childhood adversity.

Funding: none

Competing interest: none

References

1. Tottenham N. Early adversity and the neotenous human brain. Biol Psychiatry. 2020;87(4):350–358.
2. Nelson CA, Gabard-Durnam LJ. Early adversity and critical periods: neurodevelopmental consequences of violating the expectable environment. Trends Neurosci. 2020;43(3):133–143.
3. Guadagno A, Belliveau C, Mechawar N, Walker CD. Effects of early life stress on the developing basolateral amygdala-prefrontal cortex circuit: the emerging role of local inhibition and perineuronal nets. Front Hum Neurosci. 2021;15:669120.
4. Opendak M, Gould E, Sullivan R. Early life adversity during the infant sensitive period for attachment: programming of behavioral neurobiology of threat processing and social behavior. Dev Cogn Neurosci. 2017;25:145–159.
5. Moriceau S, Wilson DA, Levine S, Sullivan RM. Dual circuitry for odor-shock conditioning during infancy: corticosterone switches between fear and attraction via amygdala. J Neurosci. 2006;26(25):6737–6748.

6. Guadagno A, Verlezza S, Long H, Wong TP, Walker CD. It is all in the right amygdala: increased synaptic plasticity and perineuronal nets in male, but not female, juvenile rat pups after exposure to early-life stress. J Neurosci. 2020;40(43):8276–8291.

7. Gee DG, Gabard-Durnam LJ, Flannery J, Goff B, Humphreys KL, Telzer EH, et al. Early developmental emergence of human amygdala–prefrontal connectivity after maternal deprivation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110(39):15638–15643.

8. Morin EL, Howell BR, Feczko E, Earl E, Pincus M, Reding K, et al. Developmental outcomes of early adverse care on amygdala functional connectivity in nonhuman primates. Dev Psychopathol. 2020;32(5):1579–1596.

9. Moriceau S, Sullivan RM. Maternal presence serves as a switch between learning fear and attraction in infancy. Nat Neurosci. 2006;9(8):1004–1006.

10. Roth TL, Lubin FD, Funk AJ, Sweatt JD. Lasting epigenetic influence of early-life adversity on the BDNF gene. Biol Psychiatry. 2009;65(9):760–769.

11. Manzano Nieves G, Bravo M, Baskoylu S, Bath KG. Early life adversity decreases pre-adolescent fear expression by accelerating amygdala PV cell development. eLife. 2020;9:e55263.

12. Oomen CA, Soeters H, Audureau N, Vermunt L, van Hasselt FN, Manders EM, et al. Severe early life stress hampers spatial learning and neurogenesis, but improves hippocampal synaptic plasticity and emotional learning under high-stress conditions in adulthood. J Neurosci. 2010;30(19):6635–6645.

13. Brunson KL, Kramár E, Lin B, Chen Y, Colgin LL, Yanagihara TK, et al. Mechanisms of late-onset cognitive decline after early-life stress. J Neurosci. 2005;25(41):9328–9338.

14. Tottenham N, Hare TA, Quinn BT, McCarry TW, Nurse M, Gilhooly T, et al. Prolonged institutional rearing is associated with atypically large amygdala volume and difficulties in emotion regulation. Dev Sci. 2010;13(1):46–61.

15. Coplan JD, Fathy HM, Jackowski AP, Tang CY, Perera TD, Mathew SJ, et al. Early life stress and macaque amygdala hypertrophy: preliminary evidence for a role for the serotonin transporter gene. Front Behav Neurosci. 2014;8:342.

16. Francis D, Diorio J, Liu D, Meaney MJ. Nongenomic transmission across generations of maternal behavior and stress responses in the rat. Science. 1999;286(5442):1155–1158.

17. Zeanah CH, Humphreys KL, Fox NA, Nelson CA. Alternatives for abandoned children: insights from the Bucharest Early Intervention Project. Curr Opin Psychol. 2017;15:182–188.

18. Jedd K, Hunt RH, Cicchetti D, Hunt E, Cowell RA, Rogosch FA, et al. Long-term consequences of childhood maltreatment: altered amygdala functional connectivity. Dev Psychopathol. 2015;27(4pt2):1577–1589.