



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.15288/jsad.2016.77.688](https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2016.77.688)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Cecil, C., Walton, E., & Viding, E. (2016). Epigenetics of addiction: Current knowledge, challenges and future directions. *Journal of studies on alcohol and drugs*, 77(5), 688-691. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2016.77.688>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

PERSPECTIVE

Epigenetics of Addiction: Current Knowledge, Challenges, and Future Directions

ABSTRACT. Addiction to psychoactive substances is a debilitating condition underpinned by the interplay of genetic and environmental factors. At present, a key challenge for research is to delineate how, at a molecular level, these influences become “biologically embedded,” contributing to the onset and persistence of addictive behaviors. Recently, epigenetic processes that regulate gene expression have emerged as a

potential mechanism of interest. In this commentary, we discuss the relevance of epigenetics to addiction research, starting with the current state of knowledge, what challenges we have yet to overcome, and what the future may hold in terms of research methodology and translational potential. (*J. Stud. Alcohol Drugs*, 77, 688–691, 2016)

What we have learned so far

The *epigenome* refers to a collection of processes that influence when and where genes are expressed, without changing the DNA sequence itself. One of these processes, DNA methylation (DNAm), has received much attention. DNAm refers to the addition of a methyl group to DNA base pairs—primarily the cytosine base in C-G dinucleotides—which has been observed to repress transcription, resulting in decreased gene expression (Jones, 2012). Studies have found that DNAm (a) is influenced by genetic architecture (e.g., cis-SNP [single nucleotide polymorphism] effects; McRae et al., 2014), (b) is sensitive to pre- and postnatal environmental exposures (e.g., nutrition, toxins, stress; Kofink et al., 2013), and (c) plays an essential role in normative development (e.g., cellular differentiation, aging; Smith & Meissner, 2013). Importantly, disruptions in DNAm patterns have been associated with altered biological processes and the emergence of disease states (Klengel et al., 2014). Consequently, interest in the potential role of DNAm in addiction is fast increasing.

Much of what we currently know about DNAm and addiction has come from animal studies, which enable the experimental manipulation of important factors such as the type, extent, and timing of substance exposure. These studies have begun to shed light into the complex, reciprocal, and developmentally moderated relationship between substance use/exposure, DNAm, and addiction. For example, exposure to substances (as early as preconception) has been shown to alter DNAm patterns in the brain (e.g., Govorko et al., 2012). In turn, these can mediate gene activation in regions involved in reward processing (e.g., hypothalamus) and memory consolidation (e.g., hippocampus), driving long-

term neuroadaptations that underlie the onset and persistence of addiction (Gangisetty et al., 2014; Nestler, 2014).

Animal studies have also provided some tentative evidence for intergenerational transmission of DNAm patterns implicated in addiction risk (e.g., Finegersh & Homanics, 2014) as well as normalization of drug-induced DNAm changes by chemical intervention (e.g., Bekdash et al., 2013). In humans, studies have also supported a link between DNAm and addiction, reporting methylomic differences (e.g., in neurotransmitter genes) between substance users and drug-free controls across a number of tissue types and substances (Cecil et al., 2015; Harlaar & Hutchison, 2013).

What our biggest challenges are and how they may be addressed

Despite these promising findings, research on DNAm and addiction currently faces a number of challenges that limit the conclusions that can be drawn.

1. Limited knowledge of the epigenome

Commonly used platforms only capture a small percentage of the methylome (e.g., Illumina 450k, <2%) and typically focus on CpG (5′-C-phosphate-G-3′)-rich “islands” near promoter regions—as such, many regions of potential relevance to addiction remain largely inaccessible (Non & Thayer, 2015). To complicate matters (and in contrast to the genome), DNAm has been shown to vary over time and across multiple factors, including age, tissue, and cell type (Liang & Cookson, 2014). This is especially relevant for addiction—a brain-based disorder that, in human

epigenetic studies, is either examined *in vivo* via peripheral tissues (e.g., blood, saliva) or in postmortem neural tissue, thus making it difficult to infer epigenetic changes in live brain tissue.

The way forward. Rapid technological advances, such as the development of whole-genome bisulfite sequencing, will make it increasingly possible to obtain a more complete picture of DNAm, covering regions relevant to addiction in greater depth. Moreover, the compilation of reference data sets will be crucial for establishing a normative benchmark of DNAm against which to compare addiction-related epigenetic findings (Shakya et al., 2012). In particular, sampling of multiple tissues over time will make it possible to quantify peripheral-central nervous system tissue variability (e.g., Walton et al., 2016) and to establish why certain substance-induced DNAm signatures remain stable whereas others change over time. Strategies for big data integration will also help to establish the functional significance of addiction-related DNAm changes at different biological levels (e.g., transcriptomic, metabolomic, neural; Gomez-Cabrero et al., 2014).

2. Issues with research methodology

DNAm data are multifactorial, high dimensional, and inter-correlated, raising questions about how best they should be analyzed (Almouzni et al., 2014). So far, studies on DNAm and addiction have varied widely in methodology (e.g., genomic coverage, quality control, sample size, covariates, analysis, significance threshold) as well as the choice of phenotype (e.g., type of substance, severity of use, clinical features, diagnostic criteria), limiting comparability of findings. Of note, addiction studies using candidate gene versus hypothesis-free, epigenome-wide analyses have generally produced inconsistent results (Cecil et al., 2015).

The way forward. Guidelines for best practice are continuously being fine tuned, and the increased availability of standardized pipelines will help maximize convergence across studies (Morris & Beck, 2015). Furthermore, the development of data reduction strategies that draw on the interrelatedness of DNAm data (e.g., network/regional analyses) will help alleviate the burden of multiple testing and move beyond single-site analyses (Hass et al., 2015; Rotival & Petretto, 2014). Replication of findings (e.g., via independent samples/techniques) will also become increasingly important in weeding out false positives, as was the case for genetic studies. The availability of methylomic data in relation to different drug classes will make it possible to distinguish substance-specific markers from markers that are “shared” across multiple substances, which may reflect a general liability to addiction. Future work will also be needed to establish how methylomic signatures may vary depending on the phenotype of interest (e.g., chronic

vs. acute substance exposure, substance use vs. abuse vs. addiction).

3. Difficulties in establishing causal pathways

Most studies on DNAm and addiction have used a cross-sectional, case-control design. This is problematic because, unlike the genome, DNAm is sensitive to both genetic and environmental factors, raising issues of reverse causation. Thus, it is difficult to establish whether identified DNAm differences are a predisposing factor for addiction and/or a consequence of long-term substance use. Even when studies have been prospective, DNAm has typically been examined at a single time point, precluding the possibility of examining how substance exposure and DNAm interrelate over time to influence addiction risk.

The way forward. Causal inference may be strengthened by capitalizing on cross-species designs, using findings from experimental/mechanistic animal models to inform the investigation of DNAm markers in humans. Studies will also need to better quantify the relative contribution of genetic and environmental factors on DNAm (e.g., via twin, GCTA [genome-wide complex tract analysis], and $G \times E$ [Gene \times Environment] analyses; Klengel & Binder, 2015; Trzaskowski & Plomin, 2015) and use prospective designs to examine whether DNAm patterns predict substance use liability as well as addiction risk. Specifically, this will require the use of longitudinal designs that make it possible to compare pre- versus post-exposure methylomic signatures during adolescence, a key period of vulnerability for the development of substance use disorders (Crews et al., 2007). Collecting repeated-measures data on substance exposure, DNAm, and addiction status will also enable researchers to test mediation hypotheses (e.g., via structural equation modeling; Cecil et al., 2014), whereas the use of advanced inference methods (e.g., Two-Step Mendelian randomization; Relton & Davey Smith, 2012) will make it possible to use genetic instruments to examine causal pathways.

What the future might hold: Implications and translational potential

Epigenetics has been heralded as a key “missing link” in the etiology of complex disorders, including addiction. However, as we gain an appreciation of the challenges facing epigenetic research, we must be mindful to manage expectations. Bearing this in mind, there are a number of ways in which epigenetic research may contribute in the future to our understanding, prevention, and treatment of addiction. Findings may refine existing models of how risk factors for addiction become biologically embedded. Longitudinal modeling of environmental and epigenetic data may also be used to pinpoint specific windows of biological vulnerability (e.g., prenatal period, adolescence)

that may benefit most from preventive action. Over the long term, epigenetic variation in specific genes may be used as biomarkers for substance exposure, addiction risk, and response to treatment. Chemical normalization of aberrant DNAm patterns examined in animal studies may also be extended to humans. Ultimately, this knowledge may inform the development of novel strategies for treating addiction, paving the way for personalized intervention.

CHARLOTTE A. M. CECIL, PH.D.^a

charlotte.cecil@kcl.ac.uk

ESTHER WALTON, PH.D.^{a,b}

ESSI VIDING, PH.D.^c

^a*Department of Psychology,
Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience,
King's College London,
London, England*

^b*Department of Psychology,
Georgia State University,
Atlanta, Georgia*

^c*Division of Psychology and Language Sciences,
University College London,
London, England*

Acknowledgments

Preparation of this manuscript was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council (Charlotte Cecil; grant ref: ES/N001273/1) and the German Research Foundation (Esther Walton). Essi Viding is a Royal Society Wolfson Research Merit Award Holder.

Conflict of Interest Statement

All authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

- Almouzni, G., Altucci, L., Amati, B., Ashley, N., Baulcombe, D., Beaujean, N., . . . Widschwendter, M. (2014). Relationship between genome and epigenome—Challenges and requirements for future research. *BMC Genomics*, *15*, 487. doi:10.1186/1471-2164-15-487
- Bekdash, R. A., Zhang, C., & Sarkar, D. K. (2013). Gestational choline supplementation normalized fetal alcohol-induced alterations in histone modifications, DNA methylation, and proopiomelanocortin (POMC) gene expression in β -endorphin-producing POMC neurons of the hypothalamus. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, *37*, 1133–1142. doi:10.1111/acer.12082
- Cecil, C. A. M., Lysenko, L. J., Jaffee, S. R., Pingault, J.-B., Smith, R. G., Relton, C. L., . . . Barker, E. D. (2014). Environmental risk, Oxytocin Receptor Gene (OXTR) methylation and youth callous-unemotional traits: A 13-year longitudinal study. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *19*, 1071–1077. doi:10.1038/mp.2014.95
- Cecil, C. A. M., Walton, E., & Viding, E. (2015). DNA methylation, substance use and addiction: A systematic review of recent animal and human research from a developmental perspective. *Current Addiction Reports*, *2*, 331–346. doi:10.1007/s40429-015-0072-9
- Crews, F., He, J., & Hodge, C. (2007). Adolescent cortical development: A critical period of vulnerability for addiction. *Pharmacology, Biochemistry, and Behavior*, *86*, 189–199. doi:10.1016/j.pbb.2006.12.001
- Finegersh, A., & Homanics, G. E. (2014). Paternal alcohol exposure reduces alcohol drinking and increases behavioral sensitivity to alcohol selectively in male offspring. *PLoS ONE*, *9*, e99078. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0099078
- Gangisetty, O., Bekdash, R., Maglakelidze, G., & Sarkar, D. K. (2014). Fetal alcohol exposure alters proopiomelanocortin gene expression and hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis function via increasing MeCP2 expression in the hypothalamus. *PLoS ONE*, *9*, e113228. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0113228
- Gomez-Cabrero, D., Abugessaisa, I., Maier, D., Teschendorff, A., Merken-schlager, M., Gisel, A., . . . Tegnér, J. (2014). Data integration in the era of omics: Current and future challenges. *BMC Systems Biology*, *8*, Supplement 2, II. doi:10.1186/1752-0509-8-S2-II
- Govorko, D., Bekdash, R. A., Zhang, C., & Sarkar, D. K. (2012). Male germline transmits fetal alcohol adverse effect on hypothalamic proopiomelanocortin gene across generations. *Biological Psychiatry*, *72*, 378–388. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.04.006
- Harlaar, N., & Hutchison, K. E. (2013). Alcohol and the methylome: Design and analysis considerations for research using human samples. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *133*, 305–316. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2013.07.026
- Hass, J., Walton, E., Wright, C., Beyer, A., Scholz, M., Turner, J., . . . Ehrlich, S. (2015). Associations between DNA methylation and schizophrenia-related intermediate phenotypes—A gene set enrichment analysis. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology & Biological Psychiatry*, *59*, 31–39. doi:10.1016/j.pnpbp.2015.01.006
- Jones, P. A. (2012). Functions of DNA methylation: Islands, start sites, gene bodies and beyond. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, *13*, 484–492. doi:10.1038/nrg3230
- Klengel, T., & Binder, E. B. (2015). Epigenetics of stress-related psychiatric disorders and Gene \times Environment interactions. *Neuron*, *86*, 1343–1357. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2015.05.036
- Klengel, T., Pape, J., Binder, E. B., & Mehta, D. (2014). The role of DNA methylation in stress-related psychiatric disorders. *Neuropharmacology*, *80*, 115–132. doi:10.1016/j.neuropharm.2014.01.013
- Kofink, D., Boks, M. P., Timmers, H. T., & Kas, M. J. (2013). Epigenetic dynamics in psychiatric disorders: Environmental programming of neurodevelopmental processes. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *37*, 831–845. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.03.020
- Liang, L., & Cookson, W. O. C. (2014). Grasping nettles: Cellular heterogeneity and other confounders in epigenome-wide association studies. *Human Molecular Genetics*, *23*, Review Issue 1, R83–R88. doi:10.1093/hmg/ddu284
- McRae, A. F., Powell, J. E., Henders, A. K., Bowdler, L., Hemani, G., Shah, S., . . . Montgomery, G. W. (2014). Contribution of genetic variation to transgenerational inheritance of DNA methylation. *Genome Biology*, *15*, R73. doi:10.1186/gb-2014-15-5-r73
- Morris, T. J., & Beck, S. (2015). Analysis pipelines and packages for Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip (450k) data. *Methods*, *72*, 3–8. doi:10.1016/j.ymeth.2014.08.011
- Nestler, E. J. (2014). Epigenetic mechanisms of drug addiction. *Neuropharmacology*, *76 Part B*, 259–268. doi:10.1016/j.neuropharm.2013.04.004
- Non, A. L., & Thayer, Z. M. (2015). Epigenetics for anthropologists: An introduction to methods. *American Journal of Human Biology*, *27*, 295–303. doi:10.1002/ajhb.22679
- Relton, C. L., & Davey Smith, G. (2012). Two-step epigenetic Mendelian randomization: A strategy for establishing the causal role of epigenetic processes in pathways to disease. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, *41*, 161–176. doi:10.1093/ije/dyr233
- Rotival, M., & Petretto, E. (2014). Leveraging gene co-expression networks

- to pinpoint the regulation of complex traits and disease, with a focus on cardiovascular traits. *Briefings in Functional Genomics*, 13, 66–78. doi:10.1093/bfgp/elt030
- Shakya, K., O'Connell, M. J., & Ruskin, H. J. (2012). The landscape for epigenetic/epigenomic biomedical resources. *Epigenetics*, 7, 982–986. doi:10.4161/epi.21493
- Smith, Z. D., & Meissner, A. (2013). DNA methylation: Roles in mammalian development. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 14, 204–220. doi:10.1038/nrg3354
- Trzaskowski, M., & Plomin, R. (2015). DNA revolution and the social and behavioral sciences. In R. A. Scott & S. M. Kosslyn (Eds.), *Emerging trends in the social and behavioral sciences: An interdisciplinary, searchable, and linkable resource* (pp. 1–17). doi:10.1002/9781118900772.etrds0084
- Walton, E., Hass, J., Liu, J., Roffman, J. L., Bernardoni, F., Roessner, V., . . . Ehrlich, S. (2016). Correspondence of DNA methylation between blood and brain tissue and its application to schizophrenia research. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 42, 406–414. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbv074