

Modeling Complex Genetic and Environmental Influences on Comorbid Bipolar Disorder with Tobacco Use Disorder

McEachin RC¹, Saccone NL², Saccone, SF², Bierut LJ², Cavalcoli JC¹, McInnis MG¹ ¹University of Michigan, National Center for Integrative Biomedical Informatics, ² Washington University Saint Louis

Hypothesis: Tobacco Use Disorder (TUD) disproportionately affects psychiatric patients in general and, for patients with Bipolar Disorder (BD), the risk for TUD is almost 3 times that for the general population based on our meta-analysis consistent with some common underlying etiology. Both BD and TUD show strong evidence of genetic influences on susceptibility. Given evidence of common etiology and evidence of genetic influences, we hypothesized common genetic influences on the etiology of BD and TUD.



Networks: In each case, we set parameters to build the smallest network possible, using only the strongest evidence available. The STRING network (left) only includes 7 genes, while the MiMI network (right) includes 38 genes, and the GeneGo network (below) includes 66 genes.



Risk for Tobacco Use Disorder (TUD) among Bipolar Disorder (BD) patients is almost three times that of the general population. Using the MIX program, we conducted a meta-analysis of the seven studies that have been published on risk for comorbid BD with TUD. Relative risk is estimated at 2.77, significant at p-value < 0.01, and 95% confidence interval 2.62 to 2.92, with smoking modeled as a fixed effect and Mantel-Haenszel weighting.





Gene2MeSH provides a resource for candidate gene selection based on MeSH annotation of publications. We queried Gene2MeSH to identify candidate genes for BD and TUD, evaluated the published evidence for the set of genes that Gene2MeSH nominated for each



Each network poses
additional candidate genes,
based on interactions with
our validated candidate
genes, as well as novel
hypotheses on network
disease association. For
genes that influence
disease susceptibility, any
interacting genes may also
influence disease
susceptibility.

University of Michigar

Network hypothesis testing: We tested each of these networks for association with BD and TUD using the Genetic Association Database (GAD), available through the DAVID interface at NIAID. We submitted the list of genes from each network and DAVID returned a table of GAD terms with the genes tagged for each annotation, p-value and FDR for over-representation of genes tagged with each term, and fold enrichment. For each network, we did the hypothesis testing both including the validated candidates and excluding them. Only the GeneGo network was significantly enriched (FDR < 5%) for both BD and TUD when we excluded the validated candidates.

disorder, then selected the subset of three genes that show the strongest evidence of involvement in both BD and TUD: Catechol-O-Methyltransferase (COMT), Dopamine Transporter (SLC6A3), and Serotonin Transporter (SLC6A4)

PDG-ACE identifies common elements of Entrez Gene text describing PDG genes at pairs of genetic loci to help us understand how candidate genes work in complex disease.

We used PDG-ACE to identify statistically significant commonality among our candidate genes. Results included the expected psychiatric and substance abuse related keywords, along with attention deficit. PDG-ACE also allowed us to identify significant gender specific effects of all three of these genes in both psychiatric and substance use disorders.



A conceptually related program, GRAIL, available at the Broad Institute, mines full text publications, rather than Entrez Gene records. In this analysis, GRAIL yields results consistent with PDG-ACE.

Count	%	PValue	Genes	Fold Enrichment	FDR %
			1137, 6531, 6532, 1138, 1312, 1813, 57053, 1135,		
14	20.59%	2.77E-18	2099, 627, 55584, 1139, 1141, 1142,	36.0	0.000
			1137, 6531, 1140, 1143, 8973, 6532, 1138, 1312,		
			1813, 1136, 57053, 1135, 1636, 627, 55584, 1134,		
19	27.94%	7.18E-15	1139, 1141, 1142,	10.2	0.000
			6531, 627, 55584, 6532, 4842, 1139, 1312, 1141,		
10	14.71%	1.92E-10	1813, 1142,	21.9	0.000
	Count 14 19 19	Count % 14 20.59% 19 27.94% 10 14.71%	Count % PValue 14 20.59% 2.77E-18 19 27.94% 7.18E-15 10 14.71% 1.92E-10	Count % PValue Genes 14 20.59% 2.77E-18 1137, 6531, 6532, 1138, 1312, 1813, 57053, 1135, 2099, 627, 55584, 1139, 1141, 1142, 19 27.94% 7.18E-15 1137, 6531, 1140, 1143, 8973, 6532, 1138, 1312, 1813, 1312, 1134, 1142, 10 14.71% 1.92E-10 1813, 1142,	Count % PValue Genes Fold Enrichment 14 20.59% 2.77E-18 2099, 627, 55584, 1139, 1141, 1142, 36.0 36.0 14 20.59% 2.77E-18 2099, 627, 55584, 1139, 1141, 1142, 36.0 36.0 19 27.94% 7.18E-15 1139, 1141, 1142, 1636, 627, 55584, 1139, 1312, 1141, 10.2 10.2 10 14.71% 1.92E-10 1813, 1142, 20.532, 4842, 1139, 1312, 1141, 20.5 21.9

Gandidate SNPs: Based on the statistically significant association of the GeneGo network 0.025 methamphetamine abuse 5 7.35% 2.14E-05 6531, 627, 6532, 1312, 1813, 27.3 0.042 Wether both BD and TUD, we hypothesize 1th at any of 1the of 1the 10 penes, 447, the s, network could impact 11.3 0.042 $\frac{depressive disorder major}{depressive disorder Major} = \frac{11.2}{100} = \frac{11.2$ personality traits nicotine addiction, the GAIN GWA study for BD, and studiet ionals data based ions the GIN algorithm. 16.8 0.318We weighted each SNP by the sum of $-\log_{10}(p_{10}) = 100$ ($p_{10} = 100$) = 100 ($p_{10} =$ suicide, 13.72E-04 1636, 6531, 6532, 4842, 1312, 13.72E-04 1636, 13.72E-04 1636, 6531, 6532, 4842, 1312, 13.72E-04 1636, 13.72E-Tourette syndrome Syngols y blocus substitution, intron, and generation = 1.253generation = 1.2533generatialcoholism attention deficit hyperactivity disorder 65.6 1.390 1.390 20.6 1.508 mood disorder heroin abuse 20.6 1.508 $\frac{3}{100} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}$ dystonia. acute parkinsonism tardive dyskinesia Autocetional relative risk for BD and TUD, 441% 1.18E-03 6531, 6532, 1813, Auggesting 2.290 mechod for these disorders. 290 besive compulsive disorder Bolin disorder Control of genetic 197 1.18E-03 627, 6532, 1312, genetic etiology. Gene2MeSH nominates COMT, DA 16532 13 SERT as candidate genes for 300^{43} for 300^{3} comorbidity and we find strong evidence to support their roles. PDG-ACE identifies significant commonality among these genes consistent with psychiatric disorders, substance use disorders, attention deficit disorder, and gender specific effects in these disorders. No gene functions alone, so we used three algorithms to hypothesize gene networks consistent with roles that our

Network Generation: Given evidence that COMT, DAT and SERT play roles in comorbid BD with TUD, we next sought to understand how these genes work together in predisposing the comorbidity. We used MiMI (available at NCIBI) STRING (available at EMBL) and MetaCore (available at GeneGo Inc.) to create gene networks anchored by our validated candidate genes. MiMI focuses on direct protein-protein interactions, while STRING and MetaCore incorporate functional and text mining interactions into the networks

candidate genes might play in the comorbidity. Based on hypothesis testing via the GAD, we find that the GeneGo network is significantly associated with both disorders, even when the established candidate genes are not included. All of the genes in this network are candidates for influencing the comorbidity and we have produced a set of prioritized SNPs for follow-on work.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by NIH Grant #U54 DA021519