



Published in final edited form as:

Clin Cancer Res. 2015 July 15; 21(14): 3340–3346. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-15-0168.

Genetic Modulation of Neurocognitive Function in Glioma Patients

Yanhong Liu, PhD^{1,2,*}, Renke Zhou, PhD^{1,*}, Erik P. Sulman, MD³, Michael E. Scheurer, PhD^{1,2}, Nicholas Boehling, MD³, Georgina N. Armstrong, MPH¹, Spiridon Tsavachidis, MS¹, Fu-Wen Liang, PhD⁴, Carol J. Etzel, PhD⁵, Charles A. Conrad, MD⁶, Mark R. Gilbert, MD⁷, Terri S. Armstrong, PhD⁸, Melissa L. Bondy, PhD^{1,2}, and Jeffrey S. Wefel, PhD⁶

¹Dan L. Duncan Cancer Center, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX 77030

²Department of Pediatrics, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX 77030

³Department of Radiation Oncology, The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX 77030

⁴Institute of Public Health, College of Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan

⁵Biostatistics, Corrona, LLC, Southborough, MA 01772

⁶Department of Neuro-Oncology, The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX 77030

⁷Center for Cancer Research, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD 20892-8202

⁸The University of Texas Health Science Center School of Nursing, Houston, TX 77030

Abstract

Objective—Accumulating evidence supports the contention that genetic variation is associated with neurocognitive function in healthy individuals and increased risk for neurocognitive decline in a variety of patient populations including cancer patients. However, this has rarely been studied in glioma patients.

Methods—To identify the effect of genetic variants on neurocognitive function, we examined the relationship between the genotype frequencies of 10,967 single nucleotide polymorphisms in 580 genes related to five pathways (inflammation, DNA repair, metabolism, cognitive, and telomerase) and neurocognitive function in 233 newly diagnosed glioma patients before surgical resection. Four neuropsychological tests that measured memory (Hopkins Verbal Learning Test – Revised), processing speed (Trail Making Test A), and executive function (Trail Making Test B, Controlled Oral Word Association) were examined.

Corresponding Author(s): Jeffrey S. Wefel, Section of Neuropsychology, Department of Neuro-Oncology, Section of Neuropsychology, The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, 1515 Holcombe Boulevard, Unit 431, Houston, TX 77030. Phone: 713-563-0514, jwefel@mdanderson.org; and Melissa Bondy, Dan L. Duncan Cancer Center, Baylor College of Medicine, One Baylor Plaza, Mailstop BCM305, Houston, TX 77030. Phone: 713-798-2953, mbondy@bcm.edu.

*Y. Liu and R. Zhou contributed equally to this work.

Potential Conflicts of Interest: All of the authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

Results—Eighteen polymorphisms were associated with processing speed and 12 polymorphisms with executive function. For processing speed, the strongest signals were in *IRSI* rs6725330 in inflammation pathway ($P = 2.5 \times 10^{-10}$), *ERCC4* rs1573638 in DNA repair pathway ($P = 3.4 \times 10^{-7}$), and *ABCCI* rs8187858 in metabolism pathway ($P = 6.6 \times 10^{-7}$). For executive function, the strongest associations were in *NOS1* rs11611788 ($P = 1.8 \times 10^{-8}$) and *IL16* rs1912124 ($P = 6.0 \times 10^{-7}$) in inflammation pathway, and *POLE* rs5744761 ($P = 6.0 \times 10^{-7}$) in DNA repair pathway. Joint effect analysis found significant gene polymorphism-dosage effects for processing speed ($P_{\text{trend}} = 9.4 \times 10^{-16}$) and executive function ($P_{\text{trend}} = 6.6 \times 10^{-15}$).

Conclusions—Polymorphisms in inflammation, DNA repair, and metabolism pathways are associated with neurocognitive function in glioma patients and may affect clinical outcomes.

Keywords

Glioma; Neurocognitive Function; Cognitive Decline; Prognostic; Genetic Variation

Introduction

Impaired neurocognitive function (NCF) is extremely common in patients with brain tumor, with up to 91% of patients having at least one area of deficit compared to the normal population, and 71% demonstrating at least three deficits(1). These functions include attention, ability to acquire new memories, recall of stored memories, executive functions, speed of information processing, expressive speech, language comprehension, visual-perception, reasoning, fine motor speed, emotional behavior, interpersonal behavior, and so forth. In patients with malignant glioma, NCF has been reported as a prognostic factor for overall survival (2–6), tumor progression (7, 8), and quality of life (QOL) (3, 9). However, despite the recognition that many factors can potentially impact NCF (i.e. tumor malignancy, epilepsy, anti-convulsants, radiation and chemotherapy, psychological distress) there remains heterogeneity in outcome, suggesting that additional genetic risk factors may modulate NCF. It is believed that genetic factors account for over half of the variance in adult NCF and may account for a large majority of the variance in those over the age of 80 years (10).

Accumulating evidence supports the contention that genetic variation is associated with NCF in healthy individuals and increased risk for neurocognitive decline in a variety of patient populations including cancer patients. Several single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in genes in metabolism and cognitive pathways have been reported to affect NCF in different conditions such as head trauma, temporal lobe epilepsy, dementia pugilistica, multiple sclerosis and gliosis. Even subjects with no known neurologic disease perform more poorly on tests of memory and executive function if they are carriers of an “at-risk” allele(11, 12). For example, human carriers of the *COMT* Val allele (Val158Met, rs4680) have been found to exhibit significantly lower executive function and inefficiency in working memory function (11). The *BDNF* Met allele (Val66Met, rs6265) is associated with poorer verbal episodic memory function (12, 13). The epsilon 4 allele of APOE is associated with increased vulnerability to cognitive decline in breast cancer, brain tumor patients and aging (14–18). Polymorphisms in these cognitive related genes may be mediators or

moderators of cognitive and brain reserve (16), and individuals with the variant alleles may be at greater risk for impaired NCF.

We have previously published an overview of candidate-genes association studies mainly focused on the DNA repair, metabolism, and inflammation pathways and the results are encouraging (19). Also, our group (20, 21) and others (22) found, using genome-wide association study (GWAS) methods, seven susceptibility loci for glioma risk: 5p15.33 *TERT*, 7p11.2 *EGFR*, 7q36.1 *XRCC2*, 8q24.21 *CCDC26*, 9p21.3 *CDKN2A-CDKN2B*, 11q23.3 *PHLDB1*, and 20q13.33 *RTEL1*. It is interesting to note that of the seven glioma susceptibility genes identified by GWAS, five genes (*XRCC2*, *RTEL1*, *TERT*, *CCDC26*, and *CDKN2B*) are crucial for both the repairing of DNA double-strand breaks and telomere maintenance (23). Taken together, these data provide strong evidence that common variation in DNA repair, metabolism, inflammation, and telomerase pathway genes contributes to glioma predisposition. However, none of these genes polymorphisms have been explored in relation to NCF in patients with brain tumor.

The aim of our study was to examine, the association between genetic polymorphisms and NCF in glioma patients before surgical resection. We hypothesize that polymorphisms in cognitive, metabolism, inflammation, DNA repair, and telomerase pathway genes are associated with NCF, and could potentially modulate treatment response, disease progression, and neurocognitive sequelae. This exploratory approach will permit us to assess the individual contribution of SNPs in each gene to NCF, and also potentially allow us to assess the joint effect of multiple SNPs and pathways on NCF.

Materials and Methods

Study Subjects

The population for this study was a subset of patients from a prospective epidemiological study of malignant glioma patients consecutively diagnosed and treated at The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, between 1992 to 2009 (20, 24). The patients included in this analysis were newly diagnosed and previously untreated (no tumor resection, chemotherapy, or radiation therapy) malignant gliomas. Histology was subsequently confirmed after surgical resection. Of these 1,247 patients, 233 had been clinically referred for and completed comprehensive neuropsychological evaluation prior to surgical resection and had genotype data available for analysis. Clinical data, including date of diagnosis, histology, tumor location and medication information were extracted from patients' medical records. The study was approved by The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Institutional Review Board.

Neuropsychological Tests

All patients participated in a comprehensive neuropsychological assessment before surgical resection with tests administered by licensed and board certified neuropsychologists or neuropsychology trainees and psychometrists who were trained in standardized assessment and scoring procedures. The whole neuropsychological assessment (including patient and family interview as well as testing) typically required 2–3 hours to complete. As patients

were referred for clinical purposes not all patients received the same set of cognitive tests. The most common cognitive domains assessed and their respective tests included verbal memory (Hopkins Verbal Learning Test – Revised, HVLT-R, Total Recall) (25), processing speed (Trail Making Test A, TMTA) (26), and executive function (Trail Making Test B, TMTB (26) and Controlled Oral Word Association Test, COWA (27)). All test scores for each cognitive test were converted to demographically adjusted z-scores using published normative data from healthy controls adjusting for age, education, and gender when necessary. NCF test performance was considered impaired if the z-score was at or below -1.5 .

Selection of the Pathway Genes SNPs and Genotyping Assays

Genomic DNA extracted from venous blood samples was genotyped as part of the parent epidemiological study as previously described (20) using the Human610-Quad Bead Chips according to the manufacturer's protocols (Illumina, San Diego, CA). We selected all the genes listed in the Human DNA repair genes reviewed by Wood et al (28) (http://www.cgal.icnet.uk/DNA_Repair_Genes.html) for the DNA repair pathway and genes listed in the PANTHER database (<http://www.pantherdb.org/pathway/>), KEGG (<http://www.genome.jp/kegg/pathway.html>) and BioCarta (<http://www.biocarta.com/>) for the inflammation, metabolism, cognitive, and telomerase related pathways. We identified a set of 580 candidate genes involved in the five pathways, including DNA repair (n = 176), inflammation (n = 267), metabolism (n = 66), cognitive (n = 13), and telomerase related (n = 58). A total of 12,661 SNPs belonging to the above 580 genes in these five pathways were identified from the Human 610-Quad Bead Chip. After excluding the monomorphic SNPs and SNPs with minor allele frequency (MAF) lower than 0.05, the vast majority of our final 10,967 SNPs were located in flanking and intronic regions (Table 1).

Statistical methods

Descriptive statistics were generated for patient and treatment characteristics as well as for baseline NCF measures. Chi-squared tests were performed to confirm presence or absence of allelic or genotypic associations. The effect of the genotypes on patients' NCF performances (HVLT-R, TMTA, TMTB, and COWA) was estimated using ANOVAs. Akaike's information criterion (AIC) was used to determine the best genetic model (co-dominant, dominant, recessive, over-dominant, and log-additive) for each SNP (29). To reduce the redundant information, loci in strong linkage disequilibrium (LD) with another marker ($D' > 0.9$) were dropped from further analysis. To account for multiple comparisons in our statistical testing procedures, we calculated and report False Discovery Rate (FDR) (30) adjusted *P*-values.

We conducted a joint effect analysis to test the hypothesized dose–response relationship between SNP genotype on NCF, by adding up the number of at-risk alleles of the significant SNPs identified from the main effects analysis. At-risk alleles were defined as the minor allele of the risk SNPs and the common allele as the protective SNPs. Unless otherwise specified, SNPs significantly associated with NCF at the FDR adjusted $P < 0.05$ in the main effects analyses were included in the multivariable regression models, along with clinical risk factors. Further, we conducted multivariable regression models that included the

significant clinical risk factors ($\alpha = 0.05$) and the SNPs identified from the individual SNP analysis. Finally, using stepwise minimization of the AIC, we built the most parsimonious models. All analyses were adjusted for age at the time of neurocognitive testing, education, tumor location, gender, and histology. All analyses were performed using SAS 9.2 software (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

Results

Patient Characteristics and NCF Performance

Demographic and clinical characteristics of the 233 participants are listed in Table 2. Most patients were diagnosed with a grade IV glioma (53.65%), mean age at diagnosis was 45.7 years (median, 47 years; SD, 12.9 years), and 154 were men (66.1%). The sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of the patients included in this analysis were not different from those of the patient population included in the parent epidemiological study (Supplement Table 1). NCF performance and rates of impairment on NCF tests are summarized in Table 3. Patients demonstrated significantly elevated rates of impairment in memory (HLVT-R Total Recall = 51%), executive function (TMTB = 34%, COWA = 20%), and processing speed (TMTA = 27%), compared to healthy controls from published normative data.

Individual SNP main effects on NCF

Of the 10,967 SNPs analyzed, 18 were significantly associated with processing speed as measured by TMTA and 12 SNPs were significantly associated with executive function as measured by TMTB (FDR adjusted $P < 0.05$). No significant differences at the FDR adjusted $P < 0.05$ level was found for verbal memory as measured by HLVT-R or executive function as measured by COWA. Only one SNP (DNA repair pathway gene *RAD51L1*) was identified as a potential mediator of HVLVT-R ($0.05 < \text{FDR} < 0.1$), and two SNPs (telomerase pathway genes, *MCPH1* and *TANK*) showed marginal associations with COWA (Table 3).

The genotype distributions of these 33 significant SNPs are summarized in Table 4. At the very low FDR level of 0.001, six SNPs remained associated with processing speed (TMTA), and four SNPs remained associated with executive function (TMTB). The strongest association for TMTA was *IRS1* rs6725330 ($P = 2.5 \times 10^{-10}$; $P_{\text{adjusted}} = 1.2 \times 10^{-6}$), for TMTB was *NOS1* rs11611788 ($P = 1.8 \times 10^{-8}$; $P_{\text{adjusted}} = 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$); both *IRS1* and *NOS1* were from the inflammation pathway. Several other SNPs demonstrated strong associations with TMTA including *PPARD* rs4713859 ($P = 3.4 \times 10^{-7}$; $P_{\text{adjusted}} = 0.0001$) in inflammation pathway, *ERCC4* rs1573638 ($P = 3.4 \times 10^{-7}$; $P_{\text{adjusted}} = 0.0003$) in DNA repair pathway, and *ABCC1* rs8187858 ($P = 6.6 \times 10^{-7}$; $P_{\text{adjusted}} = 0.0001$) and *SLC22A3* rs4708867 ($P = 1.8 \times 10^{-6}$; $P_{\text{adjusted}} = 0.0004$) in metabolism pathway. For TMTB, additional strong associations were found with *IL16* rs1912124 ($P = 6.0 \times 10^{-7}$; $P_{\text{adjusted}} = 0.001$) and *MSRI* rs12680230 ($P = 6.0 \times 10^{-7}$; $P_{\text{adjusted}} = 0.001$) in inflammation pathway, and *POLE* rs5744761 in DNA repair pathway ($P = 6.0 \times 10^{-7}$; $P_{\text{adjusted}} = 0.001$).

Joint SNP dose effects on NCF

We next assessed the dose-effect of the SNPs from the main effect analysis (Table 3) that were associated with processing speed (TMTA) and executive function (TMTB). We treated the minor allele of each of the risk SNPs ($OR > 1$) and the common allele as the protective SNPs ($OR < 1$) as at-risk alleles. Joint effect analysis found significant gene-dosage effects for TMTA ($P_{\text{trend}} = 9.4 \times 10^{-16}$) and TMTB ($P_{\text{trend}} = 6.6 \times 10^{-15}$), the NCF scores and β estimate values progressively decreased as the number of at-risk genotypes increased (Table 5).

Multivariate model of NCF performance

Table 5 summarizes the results of multivariate regression models and lists estimates of the effect size (β) for each variable on NCF performance. Generally, patients with less education, female gender, older age, temporal or parietal lobe tumor, left hemisphere tumor, higher grade histology, and carriers of more at-risk alleles tended to have worse NCF. Specifically, education and at-risk SNPs effects were seen in significant association with all of the four NCF tests. Gender was a significant predictor for HVLT-R ($P = 0.03$) and TMTA ($P = 0.05$); age was a significant predictor for processing speed (TMTA test $P = 0.009$) and executive function (COWA test $P = 0.03$); whereas left hemisphere tumors were significantly associated with impairment of memory (HVLT-R test $P = 0.0001$) and executive function (COWA test $P = 0.0001$). Although not significant, higher tumor grade is correlated with the risk of all the NCF impairments.

Discussion

In our comprehensive pathway-based evaluation of genetic variants associated with glioma patients' neurocognitive performance before surgical resection, we found that NCF was mediated by polymorphisms in genes related to inflammation, DNA repair, and metabolism pathways. For processing speed (TMTA), of the five strongest signals, two were in the inflammation pathway (*IRS1* rs6725330 and *PPARD* rs4713859), two in the metabolism pathway (*ABCC1* rs8187858 and *SLC22A3* rs4708867), and one in the DNA repair pathway (*ERCC4* rs1573638). For executive function (TMTB), of the four the strongest associations, three were in the inflammation pathway (*NOS1* rs11611788, *IL16* rs1912124 and *MSRI* rs12680230), and one in the DNA repair pathway (*POLE* rs5744761). Further, our joint effect results suggest that NCF risk is not only dependent on the effect size of individual SNP but also on the number of "at-risk" alleles.

A major finding in this study was the consistent association of the inflammation pathway genes, *IRS1* rs6725330 and processing speed problems, and *NOS1* rs11611788 and executive dysfunction in glioma patients. *IRS1* (Insulin Receptor Substrate 1) plays crucial roles in the regulation of cognitive performance, and neuroprotection. Aberrant expression of *IRS1* has been associated with pathogenesis and progression of breast cancer and prostate cancer (31–33). *IRS1* dysregulation is highly associated with cognitive decline (negative relationship to episodic and working memory) in Alzheimer's disease patients, and has been proposed as a new therapeutic target for Alzheimer's disease (34). Given these parallel sources of evidence, we suggest that it is likely that this *IRS1* variant exerts an effect on

NCF, although more evidence is required. *NOS1* (Nitric oxide synthase 1) synthesizes nitric oxide in both the central and peripheral nervous system. Human and animal (35) studies have implicated *NOS1* in both cognition and mental disorders, including schizophrenia susceptibility. The *NOS1* rs6490121 variant identified in a genome wide association study of schizophrenia has recently been associated with variation in general intelligence, working memory and executive function in both patients and healthy participants (36, 37). Our findings of the association with polymorphisms in executive function are consistent with cognitive studies in both animal models and humans of *NOS1* where a general rather than specific effect on cognition is suggested.

Other promising findings are the association between NCF and DNA repair genes (*ERCC4* and *POLE*) and metabolism genes (*ABCC1* and *SLC22A3*) in glioma patients. *ERCC4* is involved in nucleotide excision repair (NER), and participates in removal of DNA inter-strand cross-links and DNA double-strand breaks. *ERCC4* has been implicated in neurodegeneration and progressive cognitive impairment (38, 39). *POLE* encodes the catalytic subunit of DNA polymerase epsilon, one of the four nuclear DNA polymerases in eukaryotic cells. *POLE* mutations have been recently identified in familial colorectal cancer patients (40) and high-grade glioma (41). *ABCC1* is involved in the oxidative stress defense and also known as Multidrug Resistance Protein 1 (MRP1) from the brain in many diseases, including stroke, epilepsy and brain cancer (42). Similarly, *SLC22A3* plays a significant role in the disposition of cationic neurotoxins and neurotransmitters in the brain (43).

In silico analysis using the SNP Function Portal server (44) revealed that both the *IRSI* rs6725330 and *ERCC4* rs1573638 variants are located in recombination hotspots (typically 1–2kb wide). Recombination is important for evolution and is also highly associated with genome instability, and hotspots are the main contributor of the block-like pattern of linkage disequilibrium (haplotype blocks). A SNP in the recombination hotspot region could affect hotspot activity, disrupt the motifs of the hotspot, and lead to chromosomal rearrangements, many of which have been associated with diseases (45–47).

A number of studies have investigated putative associations between cognitive gene polymorphisms and NCF (11–13). However, the number of patients in those studies is often small, and only a very limited number of candidate SNPs have been studied as predictors of NCF. The major strengths of our study are the comprehensive pathway-based approach, the large sample size, and the fact that cases were from a single treatment center with objective, standardized NCF testing prior to surgical resection. The present analysis focuses on the relationship between germline SNPs and presurgical NCF performance (before surgery and adjuvant therapy), which helps us to understand the variability in presentation of patients with glioma and may similarly provide insights into patients at risk for different responses to therapy. To begin to address this possibility, we are conducting a separate analysis of longitudinal NCF outcomes (patients were assessed prior to surgery and during/after adjuvant therapy) in a smaller subset of patients, to reflect changes in NCF over time for each patient.

The primary limitation to our study is the inability to confirm associations for all of the significant polymorphisms. Recruitment of an independent cohort will be necessary to

validate the associations we observed in this study, in particular, the inflammation pathways genes. We have no a priori reason to believe that germline genetic polymorphisms may be differentially associated with NCF in patients with different tumor histologies. However, our sample is composed primarily of patients with GBM and thus the results may not generalize as well to patients with lower grade tumor. Additionally, our models did not include tumor size which may have an impact on cognitive function. However, we did control for other potential demographic (age, education) and clinical confounders (tumor location, histology) and even with controlling for these factors still found robust genetic associations with NCF. Future studies have the opportunity to resequence and fine map the haplotype blocks for these interesting gene regions followed by functional characterization studies to identify the causal variants to further our understanding of the influence of these genes on NCF in glioma patients. Moreover, a more agnostic approach to the genotyping and risk prediction analysis not based on a pathway approach may reveal previously unknown genetic associations with NCF that could further explain variation in NCF. Our findings of genetic variants associated with NCF in glioma patients have implications for clinical practice and could allow for the development of new neuroprotective therapies to reduce neurocognitive dysfunction, and improve QOL.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Funding: Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institutes of Health grants R01NR014195, R01CA119215, R01CA070917, R01CA139020, and K07CA131505. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. Additional support was provided by the American Brain Tumor Association, and The National Brain Tumor Society.

References

1. Tucha O, Smely C, Preier M, Lange KW. Cognitive deficits before treatment among patients with brain tumors. *Neurosurgery*. 2000; 47:324–33. discussion 33–4. [PubMed: 10942005]
2. Gorlia T, van den Bent MJ, Hegi ME, Mirimanoff RO, Weller M, Cairncross JG, et al. Nomograms for predicting survival of patients with newly diagnosed glioblastoma: prognostic factor analysis of EORTC and NCIC trial 26981-22981/CE.3. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2008; 9:29–38. [PubMed: 18082451]
3. Meyers CA, Hess KR, Yung WK, Levin VA. Cognitive function as a predictor of survival in patients with recurrent malignant glioma. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology*. 2000; 18:646–50. [PubMed: 10653880]
4. Brown PD, Jensen AW, Felten SJ, Ballman KV, Schaefer PL, Jaeckle KA, et al. Detrimental effects of tumor progression on cognitive function of patients with high-grade glioma. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology*. 2006; 24:5427–33. [PubMed: 17135644]
5. Johnson DR, Sawyer AM, Meyers CA, O'Neill BP, Wefel JS. Early measures of cognitive function predict survival in patients with newly diagnosed glioblastoma. *Neuro-oncology*. 2012; 14:808–16. [PubMed: 22508762]
6. Armstrong TS, Wefel JS, Wang M, Gilbert MR, Won M, Bottomley A, et al. Net clinical benefit analysis of radiation therapy oncology group 0525: a phase III trial comparing conventional adjuvant temozolomide with dose-intensive temozolomide in patients with newly diagnosed

- glioblastoma. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology*. 2013; 31:4076–84. [PubMed: 24101048]
7. Meyers CA, Hess KR. Multifaceted end points in brain tumor clinical trials: cognitive deterioration precedes MRI progression. *Neuro-oncology*. 2003; 5:89–95. [PubMed: 12672280]
 8. Gilbert MR, Dignam JJ, Armstrong TS, Wefel JS, Blumenthal DT, Vogelbaum MA, et al. A randomized trial of bevacizumab for newly diagnosed glioblastoma. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2014; 370:699–708. [PubMed: 24552317]
 9. Taphoorn MJ, Klein M. Cognitive deficits in adult patients with brain tumours. *Lancet neurology*. 2004; 3:159–68. [PubMed: 14980531]
 10. Deary IJ, Wright AF, Harris SE, Whalley LJ, Starr JM. Searching for genetic influences on normal cognitive ageing. *Trends in cognitive sciences*. 2004; 8:178–84. [PubMed: 15050514]
 11. Egan MF, Goldberg TE, Kolachana BS, Callicott JH, Mazzanti CM, Straub RE, et al. Effect of COMT Val108/158 Met genotype on frontal lobe function and risk for schizophrenia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2001; 98:6917–22. [PubMed: 11381111]
 12. Egan MF, Kojima M, Callicott JH, Goldberg TE, Kolachana BS, Bertolino A, et al. The BDNF val66met polymorphism affects activity-dependent secretion of BDNF and human memory and hippocampal function. *Cell*. 2003; 112:257–69. [PubMed: 12553913]
 13. Ward DD, Summers MJ, Saunders NL, Janssen P, Stuart KE, Vickers JC. APOE and BDNF Val66Met polymorphisms combine to influence episodic memory function in older adults. *Behavioural brain research*. 2014
 14. Ahles TA, Saykin AJ, Noll WW, Furstenberg CT, Guerin S, Cole B, et al. The relationship of APOE genotype to neuropsychological performance in long-term cancer survivors treated with standard dose chemotherapy. *Psycho-oncology*. 2003; 12:612–9. [PubMed: 12923801]
 15. Small BJ, Rosnick CB, Fratiglioni L, Backman L. Apolipoprotein E and cognitive performance: a meta-analysis. *Psychology and aging*. 2004; 19:592–600. [PubMed: 15584785]
 16. Correa DD, Satagopan J, Baser RE, Cheung K, Richards E, Lin M, et al. APOE polymorphisms and cognitive functions in patients with brain tumors. *Neurology*. 2014; 83:320–7. [PubMed: 24944262]
 17. Ahles TA, Li Y, McDonald BC, Schwartz GN, Kaufman PA, Tsongalis GJ, et al. Longitudinal assessment of cognitive changes associated with adjuvant treatment for breast cancer: the impact of APOE and smoking. *Psycho-oncology*. 2014; 23:1382–90. [PubMed: 24789331]
 18. Runge SK, Small BJ, McFall GP, Dixon RA. APOE moderates the association between lifestyle activities and cognitive performance: evidence of genetic plasticity in aging. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society : JINS*. 2014; 20:478–86. [PubMed: 24867440]
 19. Gu J, Liu Y, Kyritsis AP, Bondy ML. Molecular epidemiology of primary brain tumors. *Neurotherapeutics*. 2009; 6:427–35. [PubMed: 19560733]
 20. Shete S, Hosking FJ, Robertson LB, Dobbins SE, Sanson M, Malmer B, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies five susceptibility loci for glioma. *Nat Genet*. 2009; 41:899–904. [PubMed: 19578367]
 21. Sanson M, Hosking FJ, Shete S, Zelenika D, Dobbins SE, Ma Y, et al. Chromosome 7p11.2 (EGFR) variation influences glioma risk. *Human molecular genetics*. 2011; 20:2897–904. [PubMed: 21531791]
 22. Wrensch M, Jenkins RB, Chang JS, Yeh RF, Xiao Y, Decker PA, et al. Variants in the CDKN2B and RTEL1 regions are associated with high-grade glioma susceptibility. *Nat Genet*. 2009; 41:905–8. [PubMed: 19578366]
 23. Liu Y, Shete S, Hosking FJ, Robertson LB, Bondy ML, Houlston RS. New insights into susceptibility to glioma. *Archives of neurology*. 2010; 67:275–8. [PubMed: 20212223]
 24. Liu Y, Scheurer ME, El-Zein R, Cao Y, Do KA, Gilbert M, et al. Association and interactions between DNA repair gene polymorphisms and adult glioma. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2009; 18:204–14. [PubMed: 19124499]
 25. Benedict RHB, Schretlen D, Groninger L, Brandt J. Hopkins Verbal Learning Test – Revised: Normative Data and Analysis of Inter-Form and Test-Retest Reliability. *Clin Neuropsychol*. 1998; 12:43–55.

26. Lezak, M. *Neuropsychological Assessment*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2004.
27. AB; KH. *Multilingual Aphasia Examination*. Iowa City, IA: AJA Associates; 1989.
28. Wood RD, Mitchell M, Sgouros J, Lindahl T. Human DNA repair genes. *Science*. 2001; 291:1284–9. [PubMed: 11181991]
29. Akaike H. A New Look at the Statistical Model Identification. *IEEE - Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*. 1974; AC-19:716–23.
30. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J Royal Stat Soc Ser B*. 1995; 57:289–300.
31. Koller WC, Busenbark K, Gray C, Hassanein RS, Dubinsky R. Classification of essential tremor. *Clinical neuropharmacology*. 1992; 15:81–7. [PubMed: 1591741]
32. Morelli C, Garofalo C, Bartucci M, Surmacz E. Estrogen receptor-alpha regulates the degradation of insulin receptor substrates 1 and 2 in breast cancer cells. *Oncogene*. 2003; 22:4007–16. [PubMed: 12821935]
33. Reiss K, Wang JY, Romano G, Furnari FB, Cavenee WK, Morrione A, et al. IGF-I receptor signaling in a prostatic cancer cell line with a PTEN mutation. *Oncogene*. 2000; 19:2687–94. [PubMed: 10851068]
34. Lellouche F, Fradin A, Fitzgerald G, Maclouf J. Enzyme immunoassay measurement of the urinary metabolites of thromboxane A2 and prostacyclin. *Prostaglandins*. 1990; 40:297–310. [PubMed: 2247619]
35. Weitzdoerfer R, Hoeger H, Engidawork E, Engelmann M, Singewald N, Lubec G, et al. Neuronal nitric oxide synthase knock-out mice show impaired cognitive performance. *Nitric oxide : biology and chemistry/official journal of the Nitric Oxide Society*. 2004; 10:130–40. [PubMed: 15158692]
36. Donohoe G, Walters J, Morris DW, Quinn EM, Judge R, Norton N, et al. Influence of NOS1 on verbal intelligence and working memory in both patients with schizophrenia and healthy control subjects. *Archives of general psychiatry*. 2009; 66:1045–54. [PubMed: 19805695]
37. O'Donoghue T, Morris DW, Fahey C, Da Costa A, Foxe JJ, Hoerold D, et al. A NOS1 variant implicated in cognitive performance influences evoked neural responses during a high density EEG study of early visual perception. *Human brain mapping*. 2012; 33:1202–11. [PubMed: 21520349]
38. Bradford PT, Goldstein AM, Tamura D, Khan SG, Ueda T, Boyle J, et al. Cancer and neurologic degeneration in xeroderma pigmentosum: long term follow-up characterises the role of DNA repair. *Journal of medical genetics*. 2011; 48:168–76. [PubMed: 21097776]
39. Viana LM, Seyyedi M, Brewer CC, Zalewski C, DiGiovanna JJ, Tamura D, et al. Histopathology of the inner ear in patients with xeroderma pigmentosum and neurologic degeneration. *Otology & neurotology : official publication of the American Otological Society, American Neurotology Society [and] European Academy of Otology and Neurotology*. 2013; 34:1230–6.
40. Palles C, Cazier JB, Howarth KM, Domingo E, Jones AM, Broderick P, et al. Germline mutations affecting the proofreading domains of POLE and POLD1 predispose to colorectal adenomas and carcinomas. *Nat Genet*. 2013; 45:136–44. [PubMed: 23263490]
41. Erson-Omay EZ, Caglayan AO, Schultz N, Weinhold N, Omay SB, Ozduman K, et al. Somatic POLE mutations cause an ultramutated giant cell high-grade glioma subtype with better prognosis. *Neuro-oncology*. 2015
42. Kilic E, Spudich A, Kilic U, Rentsch KM, Vig R, Matter CM, et al. ABCC1: a gateway for pharmacological compounds to the ischaemic brain. *Brain : a journal of neurology*. 2008; 131:2679–89. [PubMed: 18796513]
43. Wu X, Kekuda R, Huang W, Fei YJ, Leibach FH, Chen J, et al. Identity of the organic cation transporter OCT3 as the extraneuronal monoamine transporter (uptake2) and evidence for the expression of the transporter in the brain. *The Journal of biological chemistry*. 1998; 273:32776–86. [PubMed: 9830022]
44. Wang P, Dai M, Xuan W, McEachin RC, Jackson AU, Scott LJ, et al. SNP Function Portal: a web database for exploring the function implication of SNP alleles. *Bioinformatics*. 2006; 22:e523–9. [PubMed: 16873516]

45. Hori M, Udono M, Toyoshima H, Hirose R, Yoshida H. Influences of polychlorinated dibenzofuran on pUC18 plasmid DNA. *Fukuoka igaku zasshi = Hukuoka acta medica*. 1991; 82:228–31. [PubMed: 1916592]
46. Lercher MJ, Hurst LD. Human SNP variability and mutation rate are higher in regions of high recombination. *Trends in genetics : TIG*. 2002; 18:337–40. [PubMed: 12127766]
47. Zhou T, Hu Z, Zhou Z, Guo X, Sha J. Genome-wide analysis of human hotspot intersected genes highlights the roles of meiotic recombination in evolution and disease. *BMC genomics*. 2013; 14:67. [PubMed: 23368819]

Translational relevance

Impaired neurocognitive function is extremely common in brain tumors patients, whether primary or metastatic. These functions include speed of information processing, memory, word retrieval, fine motor speed, and executive functions. Genetic variation may be associated with cognitive function, and patients with at-risk variant alleles may be at greater risk for impaired neurocognitive function. Our findings of genetic variants in inflammation, DNA repair, and metabolism pathways genes associated with glioma patients' neurocognitive performance (memory, processing speed, and executive function) before surgical resection have implications for clinical practice and could allow for the development of new neuroprotective therapies to reduce neurocognitive dysfunction, and improve quality of life.

Table 1

Pathway and Gene Selection

Pathways	No. genes	No. SNPs in the chip	No. SNPs in the analysis
DNA repair	176	2519	2083
Inflammation	267	6980	6185
Metabolism	66	1468	1196
Cognitive	13	991	886
Telomerase	58	703	617
Total	580	12661	10967

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 2

Sociodemographic and Clinical Characteristics of Patients with NCF Test (N=233)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Age at the time of NCF testing (years)		
Median	47	
Range	19–75	
Gender		
Male	154	66.1
Female	79	33.9
Education (years)		
Median	15	
Range	8–20	
Histology ^a		
Grade II	21	9.0
Grade III	84	36.0
Grade IV	125	53.7
Unclassified	3	1.3
Steroid use at baseline		
No	100	42.9
Yes	123	52.8
Unknown	10	4.3
Antiepileptic drugs use at baseline		
No	52	22.3
Yes	173	74.3
Unknown	8	3.4
Treatment ^b		
No surgery	209	89.7
Biopsy	24	10.3
Tumor location (lobe with tumor)		
Frontal	106	45.5
Temporal	75	32.2
Parietal	36	15.4
Other (thalamus/ganglia, occipital, brainstem, cerebellum, or ventricular)	16	6.9
Hemisphere		
Right	80	34.3
Left	134	57.5
Other (bilateral, midline, multi-hemisphere, or other)	19	8.2

^a Grade IV, glioblastoma, and gliosarcoma; Grade III: anaplastic oligodendroglioma and astrocytoma; Grades II: oligodendroglioma, not-otherwise-specified astrocytoma, and mixed glioma.

^b These are presurgical cases.

Table 3

Descriptive Characteristics of Patients NCF Performance

	Memory HVLТ-R	Processing Speed TMTA	Executive Function TMTB	Executive Function COWA
No. of Patients	205	220	210	203
% Impaired ^a	51	27	34	20
Mean z-score	-1.76	-1.09	-1.44	-0.46
SD z-score	1.68	2.46	2.86	1.106
Median z-score	-1.51	-0.39	-0.80	-0.41
Range z-score	-6.00 ~ 1.63	-14.32 ~ 3.00	-16.00 ~ 1.89	-2.33 ~ 2.33

HVLТ-R, Hopkins Verbal Learning Test – Revised; COWA, Controlled Oral Word Association; TMTA, Trail Making Test Part A; TMTB, Trail Making Test Part B; SD, standard deviation.

^a All test scores for each cognitive test were converted to demographically adjusted z-scores using published normative data from healthy controls. Impairment defined as z-score ≤ -1.5 .

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 4

Genetic Variants Showing Strong Association with NCF in the Single SNP Analysis (FDR P 0.05)

NCF Test & Pathway	Gene	SNP ID α	Location	Chr: Position	Allele	Raw P	FDR $P \cdot b$	Estimate (β)	In-silico prediction
HVLT-R									
DNA repair	<i>RAD51LI</i>	rs9323505 ^D	intron	14: 67856540	C/T	3.8×10^{-5}	0.0794	-1.22	TBS
TMTA									
DNA repair	<i>ERCC4</i>	rs1573638 ^R	5' flanking	16: 13810814	A/G	3.4×10^{-7}	0.0003 b	-11.50	Recombination hotspot, TBS
	<i>NEIL3</i>	rs11131792 ^R	3' flanking	4: 178534359	C/T	3.3×10^{-5}	0.0232	-4.29	Recombination hotspot, TBS
	<i>XRCC5</i>	rs207939 ^K	intron	2: 216750743	A/C	6.8×10^{-5}	0.0285	1.56	TBS
	<i>HUS1</i>	rs3176565 ^R	intron	7: 47976709	C/T	0.0001	0.0443	-6.37	TBS
	<i>MGMT</i>	rs12253191 ^D	5' flanking	10: 131062656	C/T	5.8×10^{-6}	0.0121	-1.60	TBS
Inflammation	<i>IRS1</i>	rs6725330 ^R	5' flanking	2: 227375101	A/G	2.5×10^{-10}	1.2×10^{-6} b	-6.58	Recombination hotspot, TBS
	<i>PPARD</i>	rs4713859 ^R	3' flanking	6: 35438376	C/T	3.4×10^{-7}	0.0011 b	-11.49	
	<i>MAP3K7</i>	rs12660904 ^R	5' flanking	6: 92549554	A/G	1.8×10^{-6}	0.0044	-11.34	TBS
	<i>EGFR</i>	rs10488140 ^R	intron	7: 55070695	C/T	3.0×10^{-5}	0.0466	-4.33	
Metabolism	<i>ABCC1</i>	rs8187858 ^R	synonymous	16: 16069540	C/T	6.6×10^{-7}	0.0001 b	-8.50	Regulatory region, TBS
	<i>SLC22A3</i>	rs4708867 ^R	intron	6: 160762715	A/G	1.8×10^{-6}	0.0004 b	-11.34	
	<i>GSR</i>	rs2551698 ^R	intron	8: 30700119	C/T	5.0×10^{-5}	0.0064	-9.32	TBS
	<i>ABCC1</i>	rs2269800 ^R	intron	16: 16104340	A/G	0.0002	0.0327	-4.33	TBS
	<i>PPARG</i>	rs2120825 ^R	intron	3: 12388339	G/T	0.0003	0.0410	-5.81	TBS
Cognitive	<i>NCAMI</i>	rs4937786 ^R	5' flanking	11: 112258317	A/C	1.2×10^{-5}	0.0117	-3.44	
	<i>DAOA</i>	rs16951986 ^R	3' flanking	13: 105315831	A/G	0.0001	0.0443	-1.47	
	<i>DAOA</i>	rs1009697 ^R	5' flanking	13: 104775043	C/T	0.0002	0.0443	-4.36	TBS, Conserved element
	<i>DRD1</i>	rs265995 ^K	3' flanking	5: 174782552	C/T	0.0002	0.0443	-6.00	TBS
TMTB									
DNA repair	<i>POLE</i>	rs5744761 ^R	intron	10: 131762012	C/T	6.0×10^{-7}	0.001 b	-13.62	TBS
	<i>WRN</i>	rs4398867 ^R	intron	8: 31139701	A/G	0.0001	0.0430	-12.72	TBS

NCF Test & Pathway	Gene	SNP ID ^a	Location	Chr: Position	Allele	Raw P	FDR P ^b	Estimate (β)	In-silico prediction
	<i>RTEL1</i>	rs6011002 ^R	intron	20:61768246	A/G	0.0001	0.0430	-10.46	TBS
	<i>UBE2B</i>	rs11242213 ^R	intron	5: 133747910	G/T	0.0001	0.0430	-8.29	TBS
	<i>WRN</i>	rs13269094 ^R	intron	8: 31015693	G/T	0.0001	0.0430	-6.41	TBS
Inflammation	<i>NOS1</i>	rs11611788 ^R	intron	12:116222759	C/T	1.8×10 ⁻⁸	8.6×10⁻⁵ ^b	-8.80	TBS
	<i>IL16</i>	rs1912124 ^R	intron	15: 79286026	C/T	6.0×10 ⁻⁷	0.001 ^b	-13.62	TBS
	<i>MSR1</i>	rs12680230 ^R	3' flanking	8: 16104334	C/T	6.0×10 ⁻⁷	0.0012 ^b	-13.62	TBS
	<i>IGF1R</i>	rs1980268 ^R	intron	15: 97268929	C/T	1.7×10 ⁻⁵	0.0272	-8.59	TBS
Cognitive	<i>DAOA</i>	rs323450 ^R	5' flanking	13: 104245314	C/T	9.1×10 ⁻⁶	0.0042	-7.35	TBS
	<i>DAOA</i>	rs9300953 ^R	5' flanking	13: 104060135	A/G	0.0001	0.0273	-3.16	TBS
	<i>DAOA</i>	rs556281 ^R	5' flanking	13: 104072649	A/G	0.0001	0.0273	-3.32	Recombination hotspot, TBS
COWA									
Telomerase	<i>MCPHI</i>	rs699296 ^D	5' flanking	8: 6158732	A/C	7.2×10 ⁻⁵	0.0637	-0.69	TBS
	<i>TANK</i>	rs270952 ^D	5' flanking	2: 161435957	A/C	0.0002	0.0994	-0.58	TBS

HVLT-R, Hopkins Verbal Learning Test – Revised; COWA, Controlled Oral Word Association; TMTA, Trail Making Test Part A; TMTB, Trail Making Test Part B; FDR adjusted P-value, TBS, Transfac Binding Site.

^a Akaike's information criterion (AIC) was used to determine the genetic model for each SNP. D, dominant, R, recessive, genetic model.

^b SNPs remained noteworthy at the very low FDR level of 0.001.

Table 5

Multivariate Analysis and Dose Effect on NCF Performance

Characteristic	Memory (HVLTR)		Processing Speed (TMTA)		Executive Function (TMTB)		Executive Function (COWA)	
	Estimate (β)	P	Estimate (β)	P	Estimate (β)	P	Estimate (β)	P
Education	0.18	0.00001	0.15	0.005	0.18	0.008	0.05	0.06
Age	-0.01	0.56	-0.03	0.009	-0.002	0.88	-0.01	0.03
Gender	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
	0.49	0.03	0.57	0.05	0.57	0.11	-0.21	0.14
Tumor location	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
	-0.59	0.76	-0.05	0.87	-0.54	0.15	-0.02	0.94
	-0.09	0.59	-0.71	0.08	-0.31	0.53	-0.05	0.80
	-1.58	0.006	-2.50	3.4×10^{-5}	-1.88	0.03	-0.01	0.97
Hemisphere	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
	-0.90	0.0001	0.12	0.66	-0.52	0.15	-0.57	0.0001
	-0.33	0.49	-0.50	0.39	-0.04	0.95	-0.14	0.66
Histology	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
	-0.07	0.16	-0.42	0.39	-0.22	0.71	-0.06	0.81
	-0.90	0.88	-0.48	0.31	-0.99	0.09	-0.20	0.40
SNP dose effect ^a	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
0 at-risk allele	-1.22	3.8×10^{-5}	-1.00	0.01	-2.77	0.0001	-0.61	4.1×10^{-5}
1 at-risk allele	---	---	-1.78	3.7×10^{-5}	-2.43	0.0041	-1.39	9.5×10^{-7}
2 at-risk alleles	---	---	-4.42	6.1×10^{-16}	-10.93	2.0×10^{-16}	---	---
3 at-risk alleles	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

HVLTR, Hopkins Verbal Learning Test – Revised; COWA, Controlled Oral Word Association; TMTA, Trail Making Test Part A; TMTB, Trail Making Test Part B.

^a At-risk alleles were defined as the minor allele of the risk SNPs and the common allele of the protective SNPs.