

HHS Public Access

Ann N Y Acad Sci. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 September 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Author manuscript

Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2015 September ; 1349(1): 83–95. doi:10.1111/nyas.12776.

Human cell adhesion molecules: annotated functional subtypes and overrepresentation of addiction-associated genes

Xiaoming Zhong1, **Jana Drgonova**2, **Chuan-Yun Li**1, and **George R. Uhl**2,*

¹Laboratory of Bioinformatics and Genomic Medicine, Institute of Molecular Medicine, Peking University, Beijing, China 100871

²Molecular Neurobiology, NIH-IRP (NIDA), Suite 3510, 333 Cassell Drive Baltimore, Maryland 21224

Abstract

Human cell adhesion molecules (CAMs) are essential both for a) proper development, modulation and maintenance of interactions between cells and for b) cell-to-cell (and matrix-to-cell) communication about these interactions. CAMs are thus key to proper development and plasticity of organs and tissues that include the brain. Despite recognition of the existence of these dual CAM roles and appreciation of the differential functional significance of these roles, there have been surprisingly few systematic studies that have carefully enumerated the universe of CAMs, identified the preferred roles for specific CAMs in distinct types of cellular connections and communication, or related these issues to specific brain disorders or brain circuits. In this paper, we substantially update and review the set of human genes that are likely to encode CAMs based on searches of databases, literature reviews and annotations. We describe the likely CAMs and the functional CAM subclasses into which they fall. These include "iCAMs", whose contacts largely mediate cell to cell communication, those involved in focal adhesions, CAM genes whose products are preferentially involved with stereotyped and morphologically-identifiable connections between cells (adherens junctions, gap junctions) and smaller numbers of genes in other classes. We discuss a novel proposed mechanism involving selective anchoring of the constituents of iCAM-containing lipid rafts in zones of close neuronal apposition to membranes expressing binding partners of these iCAMs. CAM data from genetic and genomic studies of addiction in humans and mouse models provide examples of the ways in which CAM variation is likely to contribute to a specific brain-based disorder. We discuss how differences in CAM splicing mediated by differences in the addiction-associated splicing regulator RBFOX1/A2BP1 could enrich this picture. CAM expression in dopamine neurons provides one of the ways in which variations in cell adhesion molecule genes could impact a specific set of circuits central to addiction and drug reward.

Keywords

cell adhesion molecules; addiction; dopamine; substance use disorders; lipid rafts; GWAS; connectome

^{*}To whom correspondence should be addressed at: Molecular Neurobiology, Box 5180, Baltimore, MD 21224 phone: (410) 550-2843 x 146, fax: (410) 550-1535, guhl@intra.nida.nih.gov.

Introduction

"Cell adhesion molecules" (CAMs) play central roles in much of the connection and communication between cells and their synapses (1–6). Cell adhesion-related communication is essential for many aspects of the proper development of a variety of organs and tissues. This cellular communication also plays substantial roles in the plasticity of cell recognition processes in developed, adult organisms.

Cell adhesion molecules are likely to be especially important in the brain. Proper brain development requires appropriate connection of perhaps 100 trillion synapses (7). Brain function requires substantial plasticity in many of these synapses, providing the bases for learning, memory, addiction and related phenotypes (8,9). Physiologic and cell biologic studies implicate CAM roles in properties that include synapse adhesion (10,11), neuronal connectivity and communication (11), signal transduction (10,12–14), and proper arrangement of pre-synaptic active zones and postsynaptic densities at classical synapses (15,16). We and others have advanced working hypotheses concerning the large contributions of cell adhesion molecules to the development and plasticities of the brain connectome (17), and the CAM "bar codes" that allow the proper connections of specific cell types (GRU and JD, *in preparation*).

Current genetic studies have linked and/or associated variants in cell adhesion molecule genes with a number of phenotypes based on variation in the brain and other organs. Vulnerabilities to addictions are associated with variants in CAM genes in studies of several independent samples (17–21). The importance of CAMs in learning and memory-associated disorders is also demonstrated in genome wide association (GWAS) data (22,23). Genetic variants of CAM genes have been associated with autism (9,24,25). Variants in neuregulin have been associated with vulnerability to schizophrenia (26,27). Variants in a CAM KIAA0319 have been associated with dyslexia (28–30).

Despite the importance of cell adhesion molecules in the normal physiologies of and in the disorders of brain and other organs, and our initial work in defining a set of these genes (2), there remains only a modest amount of updated, systematic work that: 1) enumerates the genes and gene families that function as CAMs; 2) delineates those more likely to function in proper development, modulation and maintenance of morphologically-visible sites for physical interactions between cells and between cells and matrix *vs* those "iCAMs" that appear to largely transmit information about cell-cell and cell-matrix interactions; 3) establishes the ways in which the patterns of CAM expression by any specific cell type might relate to these cells' connectivities and functions; 4) documents the ways in which CAM variation, taken as a whole, might relate to individual differences in vulnerabilities to disease and 5) explores ways in which CAM expression by specific cell types might relate to disease vulnerabilities.

We now report compilation of an updated list of potential human genes annotated or otherwise identified as possible CAMs. We annotate the members of this list that are likely to be CAMs *vs* those that are questionable *vs* those unlikely to be CAMs. For the genes that

are likely to encode *bona fide* CAMs, we describe those likely to play largely information transmission roles between cells ("iCAMs") or between cellular elements and extracellular matrix (*eg* focal adhesions). We contrast these genes to those more likely to be involved in relatively stereotypical, morphologically-visible connections between cells (*eg* adherens junctions, gap junctions). As a specific example of involvement in a complex disorder, we focus on CAMs identified by genome-wide association (GWAS) signals for addiction phenotypes that are both reproducible and modest in individual samples. This list of genes includes many that are expressed in the dopaminergic neurons that play central roles in current models of the reward that can come from abused drugs of many pharmacological classes. These data allow specific hypotheses about the differential connectivities and architectures of dopaminergic neurons in individuals who may display higher *vs* lower expression of (and/or different versions of) interesting cell adhesion molecules. Possible novel roles for glycosylphosphatidyl inositol (GPI)-coupled and other lipid-raft associated CAMs in stabilizing raft contents near areas of close cell-cell apposition are described,

providing additional testable hypotheses that flow from our current understanding of the roles for these CAMs. We underscore some of the ways in which understanding CAMs and their human variants is likely to aid understanding of both the brain connectome and a variety of human brain disorders, including addiction.

Identification of human CAM genes

Human CAM gene candidates were identified based on compilation of data from several sources (Fig 1):

- **1.** Entrez Gene query "cell adhesion molecule AND Homo sapiens [organism]".
- **2.** Interpro was searched for genes that encoded common protein domains for CAM families based on common motifs from cadherin, immunoglobulin, fibronectin, integrin, neurexin, neuroligin, cub/sushi and catenin families.
- **3.** The Gene Ontology term "cell adhesion" (GO:0007155) (31) was searched.
- **4.** Our previously-described OKCAM database (2,32) was searched.

We manually curated these candidate CAM gene lists. For each gene, we evaluated evidence from all NCBI data sources that its product(s) were likely to serve as cell adhesion molecule(s), could questionably play such a role, or were unlikely to be cell adhesion molecules. Many of the genes placed in the latter "unlikely" category received "cell adhesion" annotations in other databases due to the gene products' abilities to interact with a cell adhesion molecule, by regulating its expression, for example. We assigned a category based on both the amount and nature of evidence available for each gene (data available at [http://rhesusbase.org/OKCAM/\)](http://rhesusbase.org/OKCAM/).

Data annotations

To elucidate the functions of CAMs, further detailed annotations were assigned to each "likely" CAM gene (Table I). For these genes identified as likely CAMs, we sought evidence that might separate them into functional classes based on a) their involvement in relatively stereotypical and morphologically-recognizable cell-cell contacts, including tight

junctions, gap junctions, desmosomes and adherens junctions; b) their predominant roles in axonal guidance; c) their apparently and/or likely greater roles in transmitting information about cell-cell or cell matrix (focal adhesions) contacts than in mediating physical cell-cell/ cell-matrix contacts or their preferential roles in a number of other smaller categories (Table I; Fig 2). We term the products of the genes in the third group "iCAMs" to denote their preferential role in communication as opposed to the establishment of physical interconnections (*but see below*). Online annotations [\(http://rhesusbase.org/OKCAM/](http://rhesusbase.org/OKCAM/)) provide information about expression, regulation, functions, gene structure, genetic variations, phenotype associations, disease associations and drug development for each gene. In Table II, we list the 39 likely CAMs for which SNPs are likely to knock out their expression.

Comparison: human addiction phenotype association GWAS dataset

Data from 500000 – 1M single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) genome wide association studies for addiction-related phenotypes allowed ranking of genes based on the consistency of their identification by modest genome wide association (GWAS) signals (17). These GWAS signals were provided by clusters of at least 4 SNPs that lay within 10kb of each other and displayed 10−2 > p > 10−8 nominal significance for assessments of case *vs* control allele frequency differences. Nine hundred seventy nine genes contained clusters of SNPs that displayed such nominally-significant case control differences in at least three independent samples were identified. In classical genetic (*eg* twin) studies, the addictionrelated phenotypes examined in these studies display substantial evidence for genetic overlap (17). The fraction of the genome (within genes) identified in this way in each independent study provides a basis for identifying the extent to which multiple independent samples would identify the gene by chance. GWAS samples available for ranking these CAM genes include data from eight samples for dependence described in (21,33–37) and five samples studying individual differences in ability to quit smoking (which displays strongly overlapping genetic influences in twin data) in (35,38–42).

RESULTS

1138 candidate CAM genes were identified by one or more of the approaches used here (Fig 1). The Entrez Gene query "cell adhesion molecule AND Homo sapiens" identified 819 gene records. Interpro searches for genes that encoded common CAM protein motifs from the cadherin, immunoglobulin, fibronectin, integrin, neurexin, neuroligin, cub/sushi, and catenin families identified 1716 human proteins, which mapped to 418 human genes. The Gene Ontology term "cell adhesion" (GO:0007155) identified 595 gene records. For comparison, our previously-described OKCAM database (2) identified 424 gene records. There were thus 1138 candidate human CAM genes available for annotation.

Annotation of the records of each of these 1138 candidate CAM genes and relevant literature revealed 474 of these genes that were judged likely to encode *bona fide* cell adhesion molecules (Table I). Three hundred forty four were judged to be unlikely to encode cell adhesion molecules, and 320 were questionable [\(http://rhesusbase.org/OKCAM/](http://rhesusbase.org/OKCAM/); Fig 1). On average, the genes judged to be "likely" cell adhesion molecules were identified by

almost 2 of the four current annotation methods, while other genes were supported by less evidence. Genes classed as "unlikely" to encode cell adhesion molecules often encoded enzymes or transcription factors whose annotations appeared to arise due to their interactions with cell adhesion molecules. Many "questionable" genes were identified only by electronic annotations that provided insufficient data to provide even moderate confidence in *bona fide* roles in cell adhesion processes or in the absence of such roles. Products of other "questionable" genes displayed ambiguous functions. Such ambiguity is prominent for the large family of collagen genes, whose products contribute to the extracellular matrix which, usually when studded with more specific cell adhesion molecules, can play roles in cell/matrix interactions.

We class 283 of the members of the set of 474 "likely" CAM genes as iCAMs. This subset provided the largest subgroup of the likely cell adhesion molecules. iCAMs were judged to be more involved in providing information about the cell's environment than in participating in a stereotyped contact or axonal guidance. These iCAMs contain protein motifs from a number of classes. We placed most cadherins in this class after some internal debate, though we acknowledge that several cadherins also participate in stereotypical cell adhesions (*see below*).

The remaining 191 genes are distributed into several groups. Eighty six genes' products are likely to be involved with interactions between cells and the adjacent extracellular matrix; many of these are secreted and likely to be available in the extracellular space. Thirty six genes are involved in tight junctions. Products of 22 genes are identified primarily with cellcell recognition for *eg* immune cells, though they are likely to play other roles as well. Eighteen genes, largely expressed on cell surfaces, are involved with focal adhesions. Products of 16 genes are so identified with axonal guidance that they are categorized in this way. The products of "axonal guidance" genes are likely to play other roles. Similarly, products of other cell adhesion molecule genes not annotated in this way are also likely to play roles in axonal guidance. Six are involved selectively in adherens junctions.

We can seek patterns whereby the likely cell adhesion molecule genes are identified in genome wide association data for specific brain disorders. These patterns are likely to provide insights into the chemical coding of connectivities by cell types involved in the circuitries that underlie these disorders. We provide an example for dopaminergic neuronal expression from semiquantitative Allen Brain Atlas data for mice. These data are interpreted in the context of our working hypothesis: for specific types of neurons, the patterns of cell adhesion molecule expression provide principal determinants of the ways in which a neuron's processes contact other cells and contact itself. These patterns of cell adhesion molecule expression also regulate ways in which a neuron's processes are contacted by processes of other neurons. These genes' products thus provide the basic building blocks, or "bar code" (*GRU and JD, in preparation*) for the specificity of the brain connectome. These genes' variants provide basic underpinnings for the circuitry differences that contribute to brain disorders. In disorders in which brains do not display striking gross neuropathological abnormalities, we anticipate that the variants in these genes contribute prominently to individual differences in vulnerability.

Several specifics help to make these points:

Example: representation of CAMs of different classes among genes identified by modest GWAS signals in multiple addiction phenotype case vs control series

Substantial genetic contributions to both dependence and ability to quit smoking have strong support from classical genetic approaches that include twin studies (17). However, genome wide association studies for dependence on illegal or legal addictive substances provide few consistent signals that reach $p < 10^{-8}$ Bonferroni-corrected levels of statistical significance (21). Similar conclusions come from studies of individual differences in the abilities to quit smoking, another addiction-related phenotype (39).

In one approach to the conundrum that this GWAS data raises, phenotypes that include the number of cigarettes smoked/day have been studied, identifying acetylcholine receptor and nicotine metabolizing gene variants that reach or approach these high levels of statistical significance in the large samples that are available for this relatively simple phenotype (43– 45).

We have also studied genes that are identified in multiple independent addiction case *vs* control samples by clusters of nearby SNPs that display 10^{-2} > p > 10^{-8} levels of statistical significance (5,7,17). We have assembled the lists of genes identified by at least 3–4 such SNPs that lie within 10kb of each other in eight studies of dependence and five studies of ability to quit smoking for which we have complete data (Uhl *et al, unpublished observations* and (17)). Nine hundred seventy nine genes are identified by at least three independent samples in this way. One hundred forty six of these genes are identified in at least 6 of these studies and 16 genes are identified in at least 9 of these independent studies.

One of the initially-unanticipated results of these GWAS datasets has been the overrepresentation of cell adhesion molecules, as we have reported using earlier compilations of the lists of these genes (17). We now find 83 genes on each of two lists: 1) the "likely" cell adhesion molecules that we annotate here and 2) lists of genes identified by at least three GWAS case-control comparisons for addiction phenotypes, dependence or ability to quit smoking (Table III).

Based on the 979/20474 fraction of all genes identified in these GWAS datasets (0.0478) and the 474/20474 fraction of all genes identified in the likely cell adhesion molecule dataset (0.02315), we would expect that 22 genes would be identified in both ways by chance. We actually identify 83. Likely cell adhesion molecules, taken as a group, are thus substantially overrepresented among the genes identified by this approach to analyses of GWAS data ($p=3.17 \times 10^{-25}$, hypergeometric test). What CAM subclasses do these 83 genes fall into? Most of the 83 cell adhesion molecules that are implicated in addiction phenotypes in this fashion are annotated as "iCAMs" (53 of 83; 63% of the total) or involved in focal adhesion/extracellular matrix interactions (20 of 83 or another 25% of the total).

Individual differences in brains predispose to addiction and altered likelihood of success in quitting smoking. One of the most significant overall contributions to such individual

differences appears to come from variation in interactions between cells, likely largely neurons, that derive from individual differences in products of genes that encode CAMs. CAMs that play especial roles in these differences are largely those whose products do not typically form stereotypic, morphologically-identifiable connections. Quantitative differences in CAM "bar codes" (*GRU and JD, in preparation*) thus alter human addiction vulnerabilities.

Example: overall fit between CAMs identified by modest GWAS signals in multiple addiction phenotype case vs control series and those expressed by dopaminergic neurons

Semiquantitative information from Alan Brain Atlas *in situ* hybridization images (46) allows us to confirm dopaminergic expression for several of the addiction- associated genes that encode "likely" CAMs. For PTPRD, CLSTN2, CNTNAP2, ASTN1, CNTNAP5, CHL1, CNTN4, CNTN5, CTNND2, EPHB1 and NRXN3, there is relatively high levels of expression in neurons that are highly likely, based on locations and appearance, to be largely dopaminergic. For DAB1, CTNNA2, PTPRM, CTNNA3, DSCAM, NRG1, OPCML and NLGN1, there is substantial but more modest neuronal expression in these Allen Brain Atlas *in situ* hybridization images.

Example: candidate dopaminergic connection differences arising from variations in genes that encode dopaminergically-expressed cell adhesion molecules identified frequently in addiction GWAS

There is increasing information about the influences of common human haplotypes on several of the likely cell adhesion molecule genes that are both identified in at least 6 addiction case-control GWAS datasets by signals of at least modest magnitude and expressed by dopaminergic neurons at moderate or high levels (Table II). For CDH13 and PTPRD, we have identified 60 – 80% individual differences in expression in postmortem human brains that are associated with common 5′ haplotypes in these genes, as well as haplotypes associated with smaller *ca.* 20% differences in CSMD1 expression (JD, GRU *et al, in preparation*). For NRXN3, we and others have identified common mid-to-3′ haplotypes that alter patterns of splicing of key exons, levels of expression and physiologies of NRXN3-expressing circuits (47,48).

One way to focus on the influences of quantitative and/or qualitative differences in expression of these genes is to focus on connections from and to dopaminergic neurons.

Dopaminergic efferents: connections to striatal/accumbens cholinergic

interneurons and cortical neurons—CDH13 and PTPRD mRNAs are both expressed in large, presumable cholinergic striatal neurons and in subsets of deeper cerebral cortical neurons that are most abundant in infralimbic, cingulate and entorhinal cortices in mouse (49). Current *in vitro* data supports homophilic CDH13-CDH13 interactions that inhibit process outgrowth and homophilic PTPRD-PTPRD interactions that foster richer process outgrowth (50,51). Dopaminergic connections with subsets of CDH13-expressing ventral striatal neurons, subsets of CDH13-expressing cortical neurons and perhaps the striatal terminals of these subsets of cortical neurons could all be different in individuals with

differences in levels of expression of CDH13 and PTPRD. Interestingly, mice with deletion of CDH13 do display selective cerebral cortical differences in dopamine, its metabolites, and ratios between dopamine and its metabolites (JD, GRU *et al, in preparation*). These results are consistent with the idea that cortical dopaminergic projections are differentially wired in the absence of CDH13.

Dopaminergic afferents: connections from glutamatergic neurons—Several of the group of addiction-associated dopaminergic cell adhesion molecules defined above appear to be expressed postsynaptically by neurons that receive glutamatergic afferents. These include the products of the NLGN1 and CLSTN2 genes as well as the LRRTM3 gene product of the combined CTNNA3_ LRRTM3 locus (52–54). Double labeling experiments have identified glutamatergic synapses on dopamine neurons that come from VTA afferents of neurons whose cell bodies lie in a number of regions (55). These include regions of the prefrontal cortex, lateral and medial hypothalamic and preoptic areas, ventral pallidum, lateral habenula, dorsal and median raphe, mesopontine central gray and reticular formation, pedunculopontine and laterodorsal tegmental nuclei, parabrachial nucleus, cuneiform nucleus and medial septum/diagonal band of Broca. The LRRTM3 and NLGN1 gene products expressed by dopaminergic neurons are thus themselves likely to interact with neurexins and neurexin homologs that include CNTNAPs that are expressed in neurons in several of these zones of origin of glutamatergic VTA afferents. mRNAs for NRXN3 and CNTNAP2 are expressed robustly in neurons in most of these regions, though there are only low levels of CNTNAP5 expression (56). Conceivably, some of the influences of addictionassociated variation in genes encoding neurexin family proteins could come from variation in their expression by glutamatergic VTA afferents that arise from cell bodies in these areas.

Example: candidate addiction-associated splicing differences that could be mediated by RBFOX1 allelic variants

The RBFOX1 (or A2BP1) gene product serves as a regulator of splicing of the primary RNA transcripts of genes whose sequences include its canonical recognition motif (U)GCAUG and at sites that do not display this *cis*-acting element (57). We have identified modest associations of RBFOX1 variants with substance dependence or ability to quit smoking in 13 independent datasets (17,21,33–35,37–39,42,58,59). RBFOX1 variation has also been associated with individual differences in smoking quantity/frequency (44). Genomic markers within or quite near RBFOX1 have displayed linkage to substance dependence related phenotypes (60–62). Mice with RBFOX1 expression deleted from neurons display altered expression of splice variants from twenty genes. These genes include the NRCAM and NRXN3 iCAM genes that display association with substance dependence in several samples (47,63), as well as the iCAM PTPRO.

Shen and colleagues have recently used a variety of approaches to identify nominal high significance for RBFOX1 binding overlaps with epigenetic marks in a set of genes that includes many CAMs (64). These workers identify immunoprecipitation of RBFOX1 with antibodies that recognize the H3K4me3 modified histone (64). These workers and our laboratory have identified changes in cocaine reward with local and brain-wide knockdown/ knockout of A2BP1 activities (64) (JD, GRU *et al, in preparation*).

Taken together, these genetic, epigenetic and behavioral results support the working ideas that splicing differences mediated by RBFOX1 allelic variants, likely to include variation in expression of CAMs, contribute to vulnerabilities to addiction.

DISCUSSION

The present review provides substantial updates to the list of human "cell adhesion" molecules, identifying likely, questionable and unlikely candidates from among the longer lists of candidate CAM genes. It seeks, for the first time, to assign cell adhesion molecule gene products to categories that signify more relevance to their adhesive properties *vs* those that appear more relevant to information-transmitting properties that many of these gene products mediate. We apply each of these labels based on reviews of currently published literature and annotations for each gene. These annotations substantially update our prior work with this gene set. As information about many of the "questionable" cell adhesion molecules increases, additional genes may well be recognized as "likely" cell adhesion molecules. As more information about the properties of more of these cell adhesion molecules becomes available, the assignment of the encoded products to "more adhesion" *vs* "more information" will also change. We welcome readers' comments and will use these comments to update this list and its annotations.

The annual number of PubMed citations for "cell adhesion molecules" grew more than 6 fold between the late 1980s and 1990's, but has grown by less than 1/3 since then. Cell adhesion molecules are likely to play roles in development and adult function of virtually every cell and tissue. Brain expression of many of these molecules appears to have especial relevance for some of the most challenging problems in normal and pathological biologies: How are the *ca.*100 trillion neuronal connections in the brain established appropriately? How are these connections modified by exposures to different patterns of activity that result from experiences and from exposure to drugs that act on the nervous system? How do differences in these connections and their modification with experience result in brain disorders? This review posits central roles for cell adhesion molecules in the answers to each of these questions. While the overall complexity of the influences of CAMs on the connectome is great, this complexity may be more manageable as we focus on specific cell types, specific circuits that involve these cell types and specific disease processes. Here, we thus focus on the subsets of cell adhesion molecule genes that are identified by modest GWAS signals in multiple independent studies of addiction-related phenotypes. This approach has limits. The lists of genes identified by modest signals in multiple addictionrelated GWAS studies are likely to contain both false positives and false negatives in identifying CAM genes whose variations alter individuals' vulnerabilities to express addiction-related phenotypes. The great diversity of genes identified here is often accompanied by great diversity of splicing variants (48,65), which can both play large roles in information provided by the CAMs expression. Splicing variation introduces complexity that we have tackled from the perspective of RBFOX1, but we are likely to have omitted discussion of other important splicing events. The focus on CAMs in the current review should not obscure roles for other mechanisms that have been postulated to aid in the longterm storage of information about prior drug experiences that provides the key feature of addiction, including changes in cyclic nucleotides (66), G and RGS proteins (67,68),

neurotropic factors (69), patterns of protein phosphorylation (70), transcription factor expression (71), and histone modifications (72).

The set of genes identified here by both dopaminergic expression and addiction phenotype GWAS in multiple samples does provide evidence for biological plausibility. The plausibility of identification of specific sets of cell adhesion molecules, such as those associated with glutamatergic synapse formation, is enhanced by the relatively recent general recognition of the role of glutamate as cotransmitter for subsets of ventral midbrain dopaminergic neurons and the mapping of substantial numbers of glutamatergic neurons among the afferents to these dopaminergic neurons (73). These anatomical relationships are fit by the patterns of expression of cell adhesion molecules attributed to glutamatoceptive and glutamatergic neurons in the Alan Brain Atlas data for dopaminergic neurons, and for recipients of the efferent connections from dopamine neurons and the sources of many of their afferents.

GPI-anchored cell adhesion molecules are similarly expressed in targets of midbrain dopaminergic efferents and by neurons in regions that provide afferents to midbrain dopamine neurons. Localization of the GPI-anchored (and, likely, other) cell adhesion molecules to lipid raft domains supports an idea that has not been stated clearly previously, to our knowledge: that one of the roles of interactions between cell adhesion molecule binding partners located on adjacent neuronal processes might be to stabilize the lipid rafts that contain them in proximity to each other (Fig 3). Lipid rafts contain not only cell adhesion molecules but also transporters, G-protein coupled receptors, channels and G proteins (74,75). We can think about "presynaptic" and "postsynaptic" lipid raft pairs that are likely to be stabilized when the cell membrane elements that express them are close enough to allow interactions between the GPI-anchored and other cell adhesion molecules contained in each raft in the pair. Proximities that could facilitate such interactions can often be found in perisynaptic regions adjacent to classical synaptic specializations. Biochemical evidence supports localization of biochemically- and morphologically-defined lipid rafts that contain cell adhesion molecules next to the classical synaptic specializations (76). Other sites could also display important CAM recognition/paired raft stabilization. Monoaminergic projections to cortex are characterized by varicosities that contain clusters of apparent synaptic vesicles (77). These varicosities are often found in regions of close apposition of membranes that do not display electron densities after the heavy metal salt stains that characterize classical synapses. These likely nonclassical "synapses" also appear to be strong candidates for stabilization by CAMs expressed in lipid raft pairs from the monoaminergic projections and the cortical neuronal recipients of this innervation. The roles that GPI-anchored, and other cell adhesion molecules could play in stabilizing raft pairs at classical and nonclassical "synapses" imply their indirect roles in stabilizing the other contents of these raft pairs, (*eg* transporters, channels *etc*) in proximity to each other. To the extent that individual differences in CDH13, CNTN4 and CNTN5 expression alter the abundance of such closely-approximated "pre/perisynaptic-post/perisynaptic" lipid raft pairs in neurons that express them, the other contents of these rafts could be assembled in different abundance with significant impacts on dopaminergic functions.

Other GPI-anchored cell adhesion molecules are likely to decorate lipid rafts that are not stabilized due to expression in closely-approximated membrane domains. These cell adhesion molecules could still recognize the soluble fragments that are produced from many cell adhesion molecule genes, including interesting soluble fragment products of a CDH13 splicing variant (JD, GRU *et al, in preparation*).

The cell adhesion molecules identified and categorized here thus have functions beyond just "cell glue" in ways that can generate specific testable hypotheses about their roles in specific cell types and specific circuits, and may even provide substrates for novel therapeutics that can modify brain connections (78). These hypotheses should be assessed in light of the strengths and limitations of the approaches used here, and the strengths and limitations of the underlying datasets employed for these analyses. Cell adhesion molecules and mechanisms remain fascinating and understudied ways in which the body, and the brain in particular, assembles and changes its assemblies during its development and through its interactions with the environment.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge support by the NIH IRP (NIDA) (GRU), from the National Key Basic Research Program of China [2013CB531202] (CYL), from each of the investigators and subjects of the GWAS studies whose data is summarized here, and helpful comments on the manuscript from D Martinelli.

References

- 1. Winograd-Katz SE, Fassler R, Geiger B, Legate KR. The integrin adhesome: from genes and proteins to human disease. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2014; 15:273–288. [PubMed: 24651544]
- 2. Li CY, Liu QR, Zhang PW, Li XM, Wei L, Uhl GR. OKCAM: an ontology-based, human-centered knowledgebase for cell adhesion molecules. Nucleic Acids Res. 2009; 37:D251–260. [PubMed: 18790807]
- 3. Clarke RA, Eapen V. Balance within the Neurexin Trans-Synaptic Connexus Stabilizes Behavioral Control. Front Hum Neurosci. 2014; 8:52. [PubMed: 24578685]
- 4. Baker MW, Macagno ER. Control of neuronal morphology and connectivity: emerging developmental roles for gap junctional proteins. FEBS Lett. 2014; 588:1470–1479. [PubMed: 24560787]
- 5. Sheng L, Leshchyns'ka I, Sytnyk V. Cell adhesion and intracellular calcium signaling in neurons. Cell Commun Signal. 2013; 11:94. [PubMed: 24330678]
- 6. Yamada S, Nelson WJ. Synapses: sites of cell recognition, adhesion, and functional specification. Annu Rev Biochem. 2007; 76:267–294. [PubMed: 17506641]
- 7. Pakkenberg B, Pelvig D, Marner L, Bundgaard MJ, Gundersen HJ, Nyengaard JR, Regeur L. Aging and the human neocortex. Exp Gerontol. 2003; 38:95–99. [PubMed: 12543266]
- 8. Hishimoto A, Liu QR, Drgon T, Pletnikova O, Walther D, Zhu XG, Troncoso JC, Uhl GR. Neurexin 3 polymorphisms are associated with alcohol dependence and altered expression of specific isoforms. Hum Mol Genet. 2007; 16:2880–2891. [PubMed: 17804423]
- 9. Kim HG, Kishikawa S, Higgins AW, Seong IS, Donovan DJ, Shen Y, Lally E, Weiss LA, Najm J, Kutsche K, et al. Disruption of neurexin 1 associated with autism spectrum disorder. Am J Hum Genet. 2008; 82:199–207. [PubMed: 18179900]
- 10. Shapiro L, Love J, Colman DR. Adhesion molecules in the nervous system: structural insights into function and diversity. Annu Rev Neurosci. 2007; 30:451–474. [PubMed: 17600523]
- 11. Yamada S, Nelson WJ. Synapses: sites of cell recognition, adhesion, and functional specification. Annu Rev Biochem. 2007; 76:267–294. [PubMed: 17506641]

- 12. Stoker AW. Protein tyrosine phosphatases and signalling. J Endocrinol. 2005; 185:19–33. [PubMed: 15817824]
- 13. Salinas PC, Price SR. Cadherins and catenins in synapse development. Curr Opin Neurobiol. 2005; 15:73–80. [PubMed: 15721747]
- 14. Hirano S, Suzuki ST, Redies C. The cadherin superfamily in neural development: diversity, function and interaction with other molecules. Front Biosci. 2003; 8:d306–355. [PubMed: 12456358]
- 15. Song JY, Ichtchenko K, Sudhof TC, Brose N. Neuroligin 1 is a postsynaptic cell-adhesion molecule of excitatory synapses. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1999; 96:1100–1105. [PubMed: 9927700]
- 16. Dityatev A, Dityateva G, Schachner M. Synaptic strength as a function of post- versus presynaptic expression of the neural cell adhesion molecule NCAM. Neuron. 2000; 26:207–217. [PubMed: 10798405]
- 17. Uhl GR, Drgon T, Johnson C, Li CY, Contoreggi C, Hess J, Naiman D, Liu QR. Molecular genetics of addiction and related heritable phenotypes: genome-wide association approaches identify "connectivity constellation" and drug target genes with pleiotropic effects. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2008; 1141:318–381. [PubMed: 18991966]
- 18. Johnson C, Drgon T, Liu QR, Walther D, Edenberg H, Rice J, Foroud T, Uhl GR. Pooled association genome scanning for alcohol dependence using 104,268 SNPs: validation and use to identify alcoholism vulnerability loci in unrelated individuals from the collaborative study on the genetics of alcoholism. Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet. 2006; 141B:844–853. [PubMed: 16894614]
- 19. Liu QR, Drgon T, Johnson C, Walther D, Hess J, Uhl GR. Addiction molecular genetics: 639,401 SNP whole genome association identifies many "cell adhesion" genes. Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet. 2006; 141:918–925. [PubMed: 17099884]
- 20. Uhl GR, Liu QR, Drgon T, Johnson C, Walther D, Rose JE, David SP, Niaura R, Lerman C. Molecular genetics of successful smoking cessation: convergent genome-wide association study results. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2008; 65:683–693. [PubMed: 18519826]
- 21. Johnson C, Drgon T, Walther D, Uhl GR. Genomic regions identified by overlapping clusters of nominally-positive SNPs from genome-wide studies of alcohol and illegal substance dependence. PLoS One. 2011; 6:e19210. [PubMed: 21818250]
- 22. Butcher LM, Meaburn E, Dale PS, Sham P, Schalkwyk LC, Craig IW, Plomin R. Association analysis of mild mental impairment using DNA pooling to screen 432 brain-expressed singlenucleotide polymorphisms. Mol Psychiatry. 2005; 10:384–392. [PubMed: 15452586]
- 23. Hargreaves A, Anney R, O'Dushlaine C, Nicodemus KK, Gill M, Corvin A, Morris D, Donohoe G. The one and the many: effects of the cell adhesion molecule pathway on neuropsychological function in psychosis. Psychol Med. 2013:1–11.
- 24. Arking DE, Cutler DJ, Brune CW, Teslovich TM, West K, Ikeda M, Rea A, Guy M, Lin S, Cook EH, et al. A common genetic variant in the neurexin superfamily member CNTNAP2 increases familial risk of autism. Am J Hum Genet. 2008; 82:160–164. [PubMed: 18179894]
- 25. Girirajan S, Dennis MY, Baker C, Malig M, Coe BP, Campbell CD, Mark K, Vu TH, Alkan C, Cheng Z, et al. Refinement and discovery of new hotspots of copy-number variation associated with autism spectrum disorder. Am J Hum Genet. 2013; 92:221–237. [PubMed: 23375656]
- 26. Munafo MR, Attwood AS, Flint J. Neuregulin 1 genotype and schizophrenia. Schizophr Bull. 2008; 34:9–12. [PubMed: 18032396]
- 27. Bernstein HG, Bogerts B. Neuregulin-1 alpha, the underestimated molecule: emerging new roles in normal brain function and the pathophysiology of schizophrenia? Genome. 2013; 56:703–704. [PubMed: 24299109]
- 28. Velayos-Baeza A, Toma C, da Roza S, Paracchini S, Monaco AP. Alternative splicing in the dyslexia-associated gene KIAA0319. Mamm Genome. 2007; 18:627–634. [PubMed: 17846832]
- 29. Paracchini S, Thomas A, Castro S, Lai C, Paramasivam M, Wang Y, Keating BJ, Taylor JM, Hacking DF, Scerri T, et al. The chromosome 6p22 haplotype associated with dyslexia reduces the expression of KIAA0319, a novel gene involved in neuronal migration. Hum Mol Genet. 2006; 15:1659–1666. [PubMed: 16600991]

- 30. Mascheretti S, Riva V, Giorda R, Beri S, Lanzoni LF, Cellino MR, Marino C. KIAA0319 and ROBO1: evidence on association with reading and pleiotropic effects on language and mathematics abilities in developmental dyslexia. J Hum Genet. 2014; 59:189–197. [PubMed: 24430574]
- 31. Ashburner M, Ball CA, Blake JA, Botstein D, Butler H, Cherry JM, Davis AP, Dolinski K, Dwight SS, Eppig JT, et al. Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology. The Gene Ontology Consortium. Nat Genet. 2000; 25:25–29. [PubMed: 10802651]
- 32. Ashburner M, Ball CA, Blake JA, Botstein D, Butler H, Cherry JM, Davis AP, Dolinski K, Dwight SS, Eppig JT, et al. Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology. The Gene Ontology Consortium. Nat Genet. 2000; 25:25–29. [PubMed: 10802651]
- 33. Uhl GR, Drgon T, Liu QR, Johnson C, Walther D, Komiyama T, Harano M, Sekine Y, Inada T, Ozaki N, et al. Genome-wide association for methamphetamine dependence: convergent results from 2 samples. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2008; 65:345–355. [PubMed: 18316681]
- 34. Drgon T, Johnson CA, Nino M, Drgonova J, Walther DM, Uhl GR. "Replicated" genome wide association for dependence on illegal substances: genomic regions identified by overlapping clusters of nominally positive SNPs. American Journal of Medical Genetics Part B Neuropsychiatric Genetics. 2011; 156:125–138.
- 35. Uhl GR, Walther D, Musci R, Fisher C, Anthony JC, Storr CL, Behm FM, Eaton WW, Ialongo N, Rose JE. Smoking quit success genotype score predicts quit success and distinct patterns of developmental involvement with common addictive substances. Mol Psychiatry. 2014; 19:50–54. [PubMed: 23128154]
- 36. Johnson C, Drgon T, Liu QR, Zhang PW, Walther D, Li CY, Anthony JC, Ding Y, Eaton WW, Uhl GR. Genome wide association for substance dependence: convergent results from epidemiologic and research volunteer samples. BMC Med Genet. 2008; 9:113. [PubMed: 19094236]
- 37. Drgon T, Montoya I, Johnson C, Liu QR, Walther D, Hamer D, Uhl GR. Genome-wide association for nicotine dependence and smoking cessation success in NIH research volunteers. Mol Med. 2009; 15:21–27. [PubMed: 19009022]
- 38. Drgon T, Johnson C, Walther D, Albino AP, Rose JE, Uhl GR. Genome-wide association for smoking cessation success: participants in a trial with adjunctive denicotinized cigarettes. Mol Med. 2009; 15:268–274. [PubMed: 19593411]
- 39. Uhl GR, Liu QR, Drgon T, Johnson C, Walther D, Rose JE, David SP, Niaura R, Lerman C. Molecular genetics of successful smoking cessation: convergent genome-wide association study results. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2008; 65:683–693. [PubMed: 18519826]
- 40. Uhl GR, Walther D, Musci R, Fisher C, Anthony JC, Storr CL, Behm FM, Eaton WW, Ialongo N, Rose JE. Smoking quit success genotype score predicts quit success and distinct patterns of developmental involvement with common addictive substances. Mol Psychiatry. 2012
- 41. Uhl GR, Drgon T, Johnson C, Ramoni MF, Behm FM, Rose JE. Genome-wide association for smoking cessation success in a trial of precessation nicotine replacement. Mol Med. 2010; 16:513– 526. [PubMed: 20811658]
- 42. Uhl GR, Drgon T, Johnson C, Walther D, David SP, Aveyard P, Murphy M, Johnstone EC, Munafo MR. Genome-wide association for smoking cessation success: participants in the Patch in Practice trial of nicotine replacement. Pharmacogenomics. 2010; 11:357–367. [PubMed: 20235792]
- 43. Thorgeirsson TE, Geller F, Sulem P, Rafnar T, Wiste A, Magnusson KP, Manolescu A, Thorleifsson G, Stefansson H, Ingason A, et al. A variant associated with nicotine dependence, lung cancer and peripheral arterial disease. Nature. 2008; 452:638–642. [PubMed: 18385739]
- 44. Thorgeirsson TE, Gudbjartsson DF, Surakka I, Vink JM, Amin N, Geller F, Sulem P, Rafnar T, Esko T, Walter S, et al. Sequence variants at CHRNB3-CHRNA6 and CYP2A6 affect smoking behavior. Nat Genet. 2010; 42:448–453. [PubMed: 20418888]
- 45. Bierut LJ. Convergence of genetic findings for nicotine dependence and smoking related diseases with chromosome 15q24-25. Trends Pharmacol Sci. 2010; 31:46–51. [PubMed: 19896728]
- 46. <http://mouse.brain-map.org/>

- 47. Hishimoto A, Liu QR, Drgon T, Pletnikova O, Walther D, Zhu XG, Troncoso JC, Uhl GR. Neurexin 3 polymorphisms are associated with alcohol dependence and altered expression of specific isoforms. Hum Mol Genet. 2007; 16:2880–2891. [PubMed: 17804423]
- 48. Aoto J, Martinelli DC, Malenka RC, Tabuchi K, Sudhof TC. Presynaptic neurexin-3 alternative splicing trans-synaptically controls postsynaptic AMPA receptor trafficking. Cell. 2013; 154:75– 88. [PubMed: 23827676]
- 49. mouse.brain-map.org
- 50. Ciatto C, Bahna F, Zampieri N, VanSteenhouse HC, Katsamba PS, Ahlsen G, Harrison OJ, Brasch J, Jin X, Posy S, et al. T-cadherin structures reveal a novel adhesive binding mechanism. Nat Struct Mol Biol. 2010; 17:339–347. [PubMed: 20190755]
- 51. Wang J, Bixby JL. Receptor tyrosine phosphatase-delta is a homophilic, neurite-promoting cell adhesion molecular for CNS neurons. Mol Cell Neurosci. 1999; 14:370–384. [PubMed: 10588391]
- 52. Craig AM, Kang Y. Neurexin-neuroligin signaling in synapse development. Curr Opin Neurobiol. 2007; 17:43–52. [PubMed: 17275284]
- 53. Uvarov P, Kajander T, Airaksinen MS. Origin and loss of nested LRRTM/alpha-catenin genes during vertebrate evolution. PLoS One. 2014; 9:e89910. [PubMed: 24587117]
- 54. Pettem KL, Yokomaku D, Luo L, Linhoff MW, Prasad T, Connor SA, Siddiqui TJ, Kawabe H, Chen F, Zhang L, et al. The specific alpha-neurexin interactor calsyntenin-3 promotes excitatory and inhibitory synapse development. Neuron. 2013; 80:113–128. [PubMed: 24094106]
- 55. Geisler S, Derst C, Veh RW, Zahm DS. Glutamatergic afferents of the ventral tegmental area in the rat. J Neurosci. 2007; 27:5730–5743. [PubMed: 17522317]
- 56. mouse.brain-map.org
- 57. Gehman LT, Stoilov P, Maguire J, Damianov A, Lin CH, Shiue L, Ares M Jr, Mody I, Black DL. The splicing regulator Rbfox1 (A2BP1) controls neuronal excitation in the mammalian brain. Nat Genet. 2011; 43:706–711. [PubMed: 21623373]
- 58. Liu QR, Drgon T, Johnson C, Walther D, Hess J, Uhl GR. Addiction molecular genetics: 639,401 SNP whole genome association identifies many "cell adhesion" genes. American Journal of Medical Genetics Part B Neuropsychiatric Genetics. 2006; 141B:918–925.
- 59. Uhl GR, Liu QR, Drgon T, Johnson C, Walther D, Rose JE. Molecular genetics of nicotine dependence and abstinence: whole genome association using 520,000 SNPs. BMC Genet. 2007; 8:10. [PubMed: 17407593]
- 60. Long JC, Knowler WC, Hanson RL, Robin RW, Urbanek M, Moore E, Bennett PH, Goldman D. Evidence for genetic linkage to alcohol dependence on chromosomes 4 and 11 from an autosomewide scan in an American Indian population. Am J Med Genet. 1998; 81:216–221. [PubMed: 9603607]
- 61. Ehlers CL, Gilder DA, Wall TL, Phillips E, Feiler H, Wilhelmsen KC. Genomic screen for loci associated with alcohol dependence in Mission Indians. Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet. 2004; 129B:110–115. [PubMed: 15274051]
- 62. Morley KI, Medland SE, Ferreira MA, Lynskey MT, Montgomery GW, Heath AC, Madden PA, Martin NG. A possible smoking susceptibility locus on chromosome 11p12: evidence from sexlimitation linkage analyses in a sample of Australian twin families. Behav Genet. 2006; 36:87–99. [PubMed: 16365831]
- 63. Ishiguro H, Liu QR, Gong JP, Hall FS, Ujike H, Morales M, Sakurai T, Grumet M, Uhl GR. NrCAM in addiction vulnerability: positional cloning, drug-regulation, haplotype-specific expression, and altered drug reward in knockout mice. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2006; 31:572– 584. [PubMed: 16123759]
- 64. Feng J, Wilkinson M, Liu X, Purushothaman I, Ferguson D, Vialou V, Maze I, Shao N, Kennedy P, Koo J, et al. Chronic cocaine-regulated epigenomic changes in mouse nucleus accumbens. Genome Biol. 2014; 15:R65. [PubMed: 24758366]
- 65. Treutlein B, Gokce O, Quake SR, Sudhof TC. Cartography of neurexin alternative splicing mapped by single-molecule long-read mRNA sequencing. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014; 111:E1291– 1299. [PubMed: 24639501]

- 66. Terwilliger RZ, Beitner-Johnson D, Sevarino KA, Crain SM, Nestler EJ. A general role for adaptations in G-proteins and the cyclic AMP system in mediating the chronic actions of morphine and cocaine on neuronal function. Brain Res. 1991; 548:100–110. [PubMed: 1651140]
- 67. Nestler EJ, Erdos JJ, Terwilliger R, Duman RS, Tallman JF. Regulation of G proteins by chronic morphine in the rat locus coeruleus. Brain Res. 1989; 476:230–239. [PubMed: 2495149]
- 68. Zachariou V, Georgescu D, Sanchez N, Rahman Z, DiLeone R, Berton O, Neve RL, Sim-Selley LJ, Selley DE, Gold SJ, et al. Essential role for RGS9 in opiate action. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2003; 100:13656–13661. [PubMed: 14595021]
- 69. Berhow MT, Russell DS, Terwilliger RZ, Beitner-Johnson D, Self DW, Lindsay RM, Nestler EJ. Influence of neurotrophic factors on morphine- and cocaine-induced biochemical changes in the mesolimbic dopamine system. Neuroscience. 1995; 68:969–979. [PubMed: 8545003]
- 70. Guitart X, Nestler EJ. Second messenger and protein phosphorylation mechanisms underlying opiate addiction: studies in the rat locus coeruleus. Neurochem Res. 1993; 18:5–13. [PubMed: 8385277]
- 71. Hope B, Kosofsky B, Hyman SE, Nestler EJ. Regulation of immediate early gene expression and AP-1 binding in the rat nucleus accumbens by chronic cocaine. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1992; 89:5764–5768. [PubMed: 1631058]
- 72. Maze I, Covington HE 3rd, Dietz DM, LaPlant Q, Renthal W, Russo SJ, Mechanic M, Mouzon E, Neve RL, Haggarty SJ, et al. Essential role of the histone methyltransferase G9a in cocaineinduced plasticity. Science. 2010; 327:213–216. [PubMed: 20056891]
- 73. Trudeau LE, Hnasko TS, Wallen-Mackenzie A, Morales M, Rayport S, Sulzer D. The multilingual nature of dopamine neurons. Prog Brain Res. 2014; 211:141–164. [PubMed: 24968779]
- 74. Yu H, Wakim B, Li M, Halligan B, Tint GS, Patel SB. Quantifying raft proteins in neonatal mouse brain by 'tube-gel' protein digestion label-free shotgun proteomics. Proteome Sci. 2007; 5:17. [PubMed: 17892558]
- 75. Williamson R, Thompson AJ, Abu M, Hye A, Usardi A, Lynham S, Anderton BH, Hanger DP. Isolation of detergent resistant microdomains from cultured neurons: detergent dependent alterations in protein composition. BMC Neurosci. 2010; 11:120. [PubMed: 20858284]
- 76. Suzuki T, Zhang J, Miyazawa S, Liu Q, Farzan MR, Yao WD. Association of membrane rafts and postsynaptic density: proteomics, biochemical, and ultrastructural analyses. J Neurochem. 2011; 119:64–77. [PubMed: 21797867]
- 77. Carr DB, O'Donnell P, Card JP, Sesack SR. Dopamine terminals in the rat prefrontal cortex synapse on pyramidal cells that project to the nucleus accumbens. J Neurosci. 1999; 19:11049– 11060. [PubMed: 10594085]
- 78. Uhl GR, Drgonova J. Cell adhesion molecules: druggable targets for modulating the connectome and brain disorders? Neuropsychopharmacology. 2014; 39:235. [PubMed: 24317312]
- 79. Yang H, He B, Ma H, Tsaur SC, Ma C, Wu Y, Ting CT, Zhang YE. Expression profile and gene age jointly shaped the genome-wide distribution of premature termination codons in a Drosophila melanogaster population. Mol Biol Evol. 2014
- 80. Drgon T, Johnson CA, Nino M, Drgonova J, Walther DM, Uhl GR. "Replicated" genome wide association for dependence on illegal substances: genomic regions identified by overlapping clusters of nominally positive SNPs. Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet. 2011; 156:125– 138. [PubMed: 21302341]
- 81. Treutlein J, Cichon S, Ridinger M, Wodarz N, Soyka M, Zill P, Maier W, Moessner R, Gaebel W, Dahmen N, et al. Genome-wide association study of alcohol dependence. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2009; 66:773–784. [PubMed: 19581569]

Figure 1. Cell adhesion molecule gene identification and annotation

Identification of human cell adhesion molecules.

(A) Cell adhesion molecules were compiled by integrating Gene Ontology annotations, domain structure information and keyword queries against NCBI Entrez annotations. 794 unique human genes were identified after manual curation. (B) Overlap of the current version of OKCAM with the previous version. (C) Characteristics of the 417 newly-added CAMs. (D) Characteristics of the122 genes that were included in the prior CAM dataset but not included in the current set.

Figure 2. Functional classes of genes encoding likely CAMs

Distribution of likely CAM genes into classes annotated here. CAM types: i: information predominant CAM, m: primarily involved in interactions with cell matrix, tj: primary involvement in tight junctions c: primary roles in cell/cell interactions, principally in immune system, fa: primary involvement in focal adhesions, ag: primary roles in axonal guidance, aj: primary role in adherens junctions, my: primarily involved in myelin interactions. Please note likely involvement of many of the products of these CAM genes in multiple functions (*esp* cadherins).

Figure 3.

Schematic of pre (*eg* top) and post (*eg* bottom) membranes pulled away from each other to illustrate the way in which CAMs (L shapes) anchored to lipid rafts (ovals) might stabilize the constituents of the lipid rafts (squiggles) by allowing binding between "pre" and "postsynaptic" CAM-containing lipid raft pairs. Bottom right: Lipid raft containing CAM bound to soluble CAM, blocking possible participation in stabilization of a lipid raft pair.

Table I

Genes judged "likely" to encode bona fide human cell adhesion molecules. Genes judged "likely" to encode *bona fide* human cell adhesion molecules.

Ann N Y Acad Sci. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 September 01.

 $\Bigg\}$

Author Manuscript

sources, CAM type, then alphabetically by gene. CAM types: i: information predominant CAM, m: primarly involved in interactions with cell matrix, ag: primary roles in axonal guidance, aj: primary role sources, CAM type, then alphabetically by gene. CAM types: i: information predominant CAM, m: primarly involved in interactions with cell matrix, ag: primary roles in axonal guidance, aj: primary role ces, and gene name. Genes are sorted by number of in adherens junctions, c: primary roles in cell/cell interactions, principally in immune system, fa: primary involvement in focal adhesions, tj: primary involvement in tight junctions. Please note likely involvement of man Columns: Gene symbol, ENTREZ gene ID number, annotated CAM type (see text), sources that identify this CAM and sum of the number of sources, and gene name. Genes are sorted by number of in adherens junctions, c: primary roles in cell/cell interactions, principally in immune system, fa: primary involvement in focal adhesions, tj: primary involvement in tight junctions. Please note likely involvement of many of the products of these CAM genes in multiple functions (*esp* cadherins). Š

Table II

Likely CAMs for which single nucleotide polymorphisms are likely to provide partial or complete human "knockout" (79). Likely CAMs for which single nucleotide polymorphisms are likely to provide partial or complete human "knockout" (79).

Columns list: gene symbol, chromosome and basepair of variant, major/reference allele, minor/mutant allele, and minor allele frequencies in 1000 genomes data from African, US individuals of European
ancestry, Asian and Eur Columns list: gene symbol, chromosome and basepair of variant, major/reference allele, minor/mutant allele, and minor allele frequencies in 1000 genomes data from African, US individuals of European ancestry, Asian and European samples. Note that many CAM genes are also sites for copy number and other variation that can also provide knockouts.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table III

independent case vs control GWAS studies of addiction-related phenotypes by clusters of SNPs with 10^{-2} > p >10⁻⁸. Genes are arranged by the number independent case *vs* control GWAS studies of addiction-related phenotypes by clusters of SNPs with 10−2 > p >10−8. Genes are arranged by the number Candidate addiction-related CAMs. Genes listed both a) encode "likely" bona fide human cell adhesion molecules and b) are identified by at least 3 Candidate addiction-related CAMs. Genes listed both a) encode "likely" *bona fide* human cell adhesion molecules and b) are identified by at least 3 of addiction-related case-control sample pairs in which they are identified, then alphabetical order. of addiction-related case-control sample pairs in which they are identified, then alphabetical order.

Columns: Gene symbol, CAM type, number of samples out of 15 total that identify this gene, structural elements of protein, protein motifs. CAM types: iCAM: information predominant CAM, m: primarily Columns: Gene symbol, CAM type, number of samples out of 15 total that identify this gene, structural elements of protein, protein motifs. CAM types: iCAM: information predominant CAM, m: primarily involvement in focal adhesions, tj: primary involvement in tight junctions. Structural elements: GPI: glycosylphosphatidyl inositol modified, cyt: cytoplasmic; sec: secreted; EC: extracellular. Motifs: Cdh: thrombospondin; FReD: Fibrinogen-related domains. Samples for addiction- or quit success-related GWAS are described in (21,33,35-39,41,42,44,80,81); more details of analyses are available on request. involvement in focal adhesions, tj: primary involvement in tight junctions. Structural elements: GPI: glycosylphosphatidyl inositol modified, cyt: cytoplasmic; sec: secreted; EC: extracellular. Motifs: Cdh: thrombospondin; FReD: Fibrinogen-related domains. Samples for addiction- or quit success-related GWAS are described in (21,33,35–39,41,42,44,80,81); more details of analyses are available on request. Armad b-catenin-l: Armadillo and beta catenin like; SAM: sterile alpha motif; TNFR: tumor necrosis factor receptor; Int: integrin; sema; semaphorin domain; LRR: leucine-rich repeat; C lectin: C-type Armad b-catenin-l: Armadillo and beta catenin like; SAM: sterile alpha motif; TNFR: tumor necrosis factor receptor; Int: integrin; sema: semaphorin domain; LRR: leucine-rich repeat; C lectin: C-type involved in interactions with cell matrix, ag: primary roles in axonal guidance, aj: primary role in adherens junctions, c: primary roles in cell/cell interactions, principally in immune system, fa: primary involved in interactions with cell matrix, ag: primary roles in axonal guidance, aj: primary role in adherens junctions, c: primary roles in cell/cell interactions, principally in immune system, fa: primary lectin; Calxbeta: Calx beta domain; CSPG: chondroitin sulfate proteoglycan; LIM: LIM interacting protein; GKAP: guanylate-kinase-associated protein;CCP: complement control protein; Thrombosp: cadherin; Ig: immunoglobulin; Fn: fibronectin; lam: laminin; EGF epidermal growth factor; pTyr bind dom: phosphor tyrosine binding domain; MAM: ; Mem-attack comp: membrane attack complex; cadherin; Ig: immunoglobulin; Fn: fibronectin; lam: laminin; EGF epidermal growth factor; pTyr bind dom: phosphor tyrosine binding domain; MAM: ; Mem-attack comp: membrane attack complex; lectin; Calxbeta: Calx beta domain; CSPG: chondroitin sulfate proteoglycan; LIM: LIMinteracting protein; GKAP: guanylate-kinase-associated protein; CCP: complement control protein; Thrombosp: