



Published in final edited form as:

Psychol Inq. 2015 ; 26(3): 231–238. doi:10.1080/1047840X.2015.1039930.

Risky Business: Pathways to Progress in Biologically Informed Studies of Psychopathology

Arpana Agrawal^a and Ryan Bogdan^b

Arpana Agrawal: arpana@wustl.edu; Ryan Bogdan: Bogdan.ryan@gmail.com

^aWashington University School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, 660 S. Euclid, CB 8134, Saint Louis, MO 63110

^bWashington University in St. Louis, Department of Psychology, CB 1125, One Brookings Drive, Saint Louis, MO 63130

In the target article, Vaidyanathan, Vrieze and Iacono reflect on the lack of advancement in our etiologic understanding of psychopathology. They persuasively argue that theory-guided integrative research, due to its targeted testing of putative mechanisms, should be prioritized. Through a comprehensive narrative, and drawing elegantly on a vast body of endophenotype research, these authors suggest that “*risky tests*” of causal theories (i.e., a test that narrows the number of causal interpretations available) offer the most potential to inform our understanding of psychopathology. In addition, the authors point out that statistics and technology, when haphazardly applied, can have perilous consequences. They advocate, instead for risky study designs that are guided by a strong theoretical basis, are free of diagnostic boundaries and fueled by knowledge from multiple research domains. We could not agree more with their proposal.

Causal inference: some risks that are worth taking

My way of learning is to heave a wild and unpredictable monkey-wrench into the machinery.

Dashiell Hammett, *The Maltese Falcon*

Vaidyanathan et al note that “...the riskier the test, the stronger the inference one can draw about the theory being tested.” Such risky study designs may reflect an investigator’s ingenuity in leveraging naturally occurring patterns in the data that result in a quasi-experiment, such as the availability of identical twins discordant for early marijuana exposure. For instance, numerous independent discordant twin studies suggest that the association between early cannabis use and other illicit drugs (e.g., cocaine, heroin, amphetamine), commonly referred to as the gateway phenomenon, is not simply accounted for by a common liability to drug use (Lynskey, Vink, & Boomsma, 2006; Lynskey et al., 2003; Agrawal, Neale, Prescott, & Kendler, 2004; Lessem et al., 2006; Grant et al., 2010). Twins who use cannabis prior to age 17–18 are considerably more likely to also report other illicit drug use relative to their abstaining or late-onset genetically similar counterparts. This observation does not diminish the robust role of common genetic and environmental

influences that link cannabis and other drug use nor does it exclude the possibility that neural correlates such as P3 might serve as a component of this common liability (Vanyukov et al., 2012). However, if the basis of this common liability is anything but individual-specific, then it is adequately controlled for in the discordant twin design (Kendler et al., 1993). Something else is clearly going on.

What might this excess risk of illicit drug use in early-onset cannabis users reflect? Even though passive tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) administration in rodents modifies response to heroin, cocaine and nicotine in diverse ways, compelling evidence for a biological mechanism of causal influence (e.g. receptor sensitization) remains tenuous (Cadoni, Pisanu, Solinas, Acquas, & Di Chiara, 2001; Panlilio, Zanettini, Barnes, Solinas, & Goldberg, 2013; Panlilio, Solinas, Matthews, & Goldberg, 2007; Solinas, Panlilio, & Goldberg, 2004). Mendelian randomization might offer a solution (Smith & Ebrahim, 2003); however such experiments rely heavily on a validated genetic marker of vulnerability (e.g. *ALDH2* for alcohol consumption in Asians; Irons, McGue, Iacono, & Oetting, 2007), of which there are few. Indeed, we are not aware of any such genetic signals that might be unequivocally linked to early cannabis use. Even if such single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) were identified, tests of Mendelian randomization require that they align with pathways exclusively related to cannabis (and not other substances or confounders), such as its metabolism. Identifying such SNPs may prove to be challenging given that (a) genetic variation in enzymes responsible for the metabolism of THC are not well characterized (Huestis, 2005), and (b) early age at first cannabis use is unlikely to be influenced by genes for metabolism. It is also possible that early exposure to cannabis results in enduring alterations in neural circuitry resulting in a differential response to other psychoactive substances. However, disentangling predisposition from causation in such an experiment requires longitudinal data (e.g., the upcoming NIH-sponsored Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study¹). We speculate that the most reasonable causal explanation is the social milieu in which cannabis involvement occurs. Early cannabis use increases youth access to resources that promulgate experimentation with other drugs (Hall & Lynskey, 2005). The growing culture of legalized recreational cannabis use may afford the most practical quasi-experimental test of this hypothesis although a Dutch study of twins discordant for cannabis use did not find decriminalization to have a substantial impact on reducing its association with harder substances (Lynskey et al., 2006). While we haven't successfully "explained away" the greater odds of other illicit drug use in cannabis users with an early start, discordant pairs of identical twins provide the ideal natural setting to continue to investigate future causal hypotheses (e.g. epigenetic change in gene expression as a result of chronic early cannabis exposure).

Other quasi-experimental risky tests of causation reflect planned or unanticipated environmental occurrences, such as deployment (Nock et al., 2014) or natural disasters (Galea et al., 2007). In these cases, the serendipitous availability of pre-exposure data has been instrumental in establishing putative causal links. The authors offer several such citations in the target article. We are reminded also of the remarkable Great Smoky

¹<http://addictionresearch.nih.gov/adolescent-brain-cognitive-development-study>

Mountains Study if only for the fact that the environmental “intervention” resulted in a strong positive impact on subsequent mental health. The Great Smoky Mountains Study is a longitudinal investigation of mental health in children and youth from the highly rural southern Appalachian mountain region of North Carolina, which includes a sizeable Cherokee Nation community (Costello et al., 1996b). Comparisons of these Cherokee Nation children relative to white children from geographically matched neighborhoods as well as from urban settings underscored the important role of poverty in mental health (Costello, Farmer, Angold, Burns, & Erkanli, 1997; Costello et al., 1996a); however, disentangling its role from other socio-regional confounders was next to impossible. Three years subsequent to the baseline, a casino opened on the reservation which led Cherokee Nation families to receive income supplements as well as increased opportunities for employment, including hiring preferences. Families of similarly disadvantaged non-Native American youth did not receive these incentives. Increased educational attainment, reduced criminality and fewer psychiatric diagnoses in children and youth exposed to income supplements was noted, even extending into adulthood (Costello, Compton, Keeler, & Angold, 2003; Akee, Copeland, Keeler, Angold, & Costello, 2010). Such a substantial and long-term monetary intervention of only a controlled subset of the study population is impossible to design, yet it convincingly demonstrated the role of economic enhancements on individual mental health and behavioral outcomes.

Examining the widespread effects of state-level variation in policy also constitutes a risky quasi-experimental research design. For instance, state-level variation in alcohol (e.g. minimum legal drinking age; Plunk, Cavazos-Rehg, Bierut, & Grucza, 2013) and tobacco (e.g. vending machine restrictions; Grucza et al., 2014a) policy impact substance use (e.g. effects of MLDA on marijuana use; Krauss, Cavazos-Rehg, Agrawal, Bierut, & Grucza, 2015) and related mental health outcomes (e.g. on suicide rates; Grucza et al., 2014b; Grucza et al., 2012). In the absence of self-selection (i.e. evidence that individuals move to states with policies that align with their behavior), lower rates of current smoking, for instance, in women residing in states with vending machine and repackaging restrictions and identification requirements suggest the causal role of legislative control in population-level behavior (Grucza et al., 2013). The strengths of this design are that the environmental exposure is easy to access (although challenging to quantify, e.g. Pacula, Powell, Heaton, & Sevigny, 2014) and the sample size for the test is the U.S. population. That policy is a modifiable target for study makes such studies even more appealing.

Notably, there are powerful risky study designs that can be experimentally contrived, such as, the administration of a psychoactive substance (e.g. marijuana administration; Metrik et al., 2012), the manipulation of human pharmacology (e.g. administration of a pharmacologic agent; Grillon et al., 2011) or the environment (e.g., Trier Social Stress Test; Kirschbaum, Pirke, & Hellhammer, 1993). Broadly described as *challenge* paradigms, these experiments might be considered as the ultimate (ethically acceptable) risky study design in studies of human behavior as they explicitly test the effects of an experimentally-manipulated variable, typically within the context of a controlled within-subject design.

An illustration of such a risky challenge paradigm can be found in the extensive pharmacologic challenge literature surrounding the role of stress in the etiology of

depression and anxiety. Purely associative research has documented that depression, anxiety, and other psychiatric disorders are characterized by dysregulated stress hormone (e.g., cortisol) function within the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis (Faravelli et al., 2012; Stetler & Miller, 2011). Grillon and colleagues examined the impact of placebo-controlled hydrocortisone (i.e., natural or synthetic cortisol used as a medication) administration on startle response (Grillon et al., 2011). Guided by a theoretical model, these investigators separated short duration *fear-potentiated startle*² from long duration *anxiety-potentiated startle*³. Fear-potentiated startle has been primarily linked to signaling in the central amygdala, while anxiety-potentiated startle has been associated with signaling in the Bed Nucleus of the Stria Terminalis (BNST), a region within the extended amygdala (Davis, Walker, Miles, & Grillon, 2010; Somerville, Whalen, & Kelley, 2010). Corticosteroid receptor agonism did not affect fear-potentiated startle, but at relatively high doses, increased anxiety-related fear-potentiation, results highly consistent with clinical evidence that individuals with an anxiety disorder display normal fear-potentiated, but heightened anxiety-related startle (Grillon et al., 2008; Grillon et al., 2009; Ray et al., 2009).

There are two obvious limitations of challenge studies. First, laboratory-based pharmacological manipulations are controlled approximations of the normative context in which human psychopathology unfolds and hence, are limited in their ecological validity. Second, sample sizes for these expensive experiments are likely to be small(ish). Problems notwithstanding, pharmacologic challenge studies provide incredible power to address key mechanistic hypotheses typically derived from correlational research. Moreover, because these systems can be similarly manipulated in non-human animal models (e.g., pharmacologic challenge, optogenetics, genetic manipulation), this approach provides unprecedented synergy with non-human animal research allowing more clearly and directly comparable evidence to be integrated across species. The latter brings us to the second prominent recommendation in the target article: a call for *a strategy that looks for parallels in findings from multiple domains*.

Translational Science: Taking things apart only to put them all together

One's ideas must be as broad as Nature if they are to interpret Nature.

--Arthur C. Doyle, *A Study in Scarlet*

The ultimate goal of psychopathological research is to identify processes underlying behavior and illness that surpass mere probabilistic hiccups in individual datasets. While an expectation of reproducibility is reasonable, the advancement of etiologic pathways requires, as the authors put it, a “true synthesis of information.” It is here that “a good scientific theory” can guide the search for an improved mechanistic understanding while encouraging the use of diverse technological and statistical tools. However, such theory-driven approaches are strongly predicated on the construction and acceptance of *a priori* knowledge and perhaps no field of research underscores the complexities posed by “candidate” hypotheses as psychiatric genetics. The authors of the target article propose that GWAS is

²startle response to an explicit visual threat cue

³startle response during an aversive context unlinked to an explicit threat cue

motivated by the theory that commonly occurring genetic variation explains an appreciable proportion of heritable variation in psychopathology. Further, they argue that GWAS are risky tests because they occupy the search space encompassed by all candidate gene variants. The rather severe punishment for multiple comparisons ($p < 5 \times 10^{-8}$) is also warranted because the likelihood of chance findings in GWAS is not only high but also quite likely. Correspondingly, the constant skirmishes (e.g. Flint & Munafo, 2013) involving the relative inferiority of candidate gene studies, regardless of the technological innovation of the study design or the scientific rigor of the experiment, have resulted in the marginalization of their impact on psychopathological research. The question then arises: when it comes to gene discovery, if it doesn't appear in a GWAS, is it not real?

The widespread adoption of GWAS has resulted in some of the most prominent discoveries in psychiatric genetics⁴. In addition to major advances in the identification of single variants (Schizophrenia Working Group of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium, 2014) and pathways (Network and Pathway Analysis Subgroup of Psychiatric Genomics Consortium, 2015), we now recognize that a substantial proportion of the dark matter of heritability actually resides within the multivariate structure of genomewide data (Yang, Lee, Goddard, & Visscher, 2011), that the polygenic basis to variance in and covariance between psychiatric diagnoses can be systematically quantified (Lee et al., 2013) and that such polygenicity can be teased apart from population substructure (Bulik-Sullivan et al., 2015). However, as Vaidyanathan and colleagues sagely point out, *relying on only one source [of information] can be misleading*. We illustrate with two examples, now well known in the literature on the genetics of addictions.

The first illustration deals with the now universally recognized role of rs16969968 and other SNPs in the cholinergic nicotinic receptor genes (*CHRNA5-CHRNA3-CHRNB4*) cluster on chromosome 15 (Bierut, 2011; Ware, van den Bree, & Munafo, 2012). Rs16969968 is a missense mutation that has been identified to be associated, at extraordinarily significant levels ($p < 10^{-70}$), with cigarettes smoked per day (Liu et al., 2010; Thorgeirsson et al., 2010; Tobacco and Genetics Consortium, 2010), lung cancer (Hung et al., 2008; Thorgeirsson et al., 2008; Amos et al., 2008) and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (Saccone et al., 2010; Pillai et al., 2009) in multiple large meta-analyses of GWAS. Importantly, the identification of this SNP has spurred multi-disciplinary research into the etiology of a leading cause of preventable death. We now also know that rs16969968 modifies the function of receptors to which nicotine binds (Bierut et al., 2008; Jackson et al., 2010). Mice lacking medial habenular $\alpha 5$ receptor subunits display increases in motivation to self-administer nicotine (Fowler, Lu, Johnson, Marks, & Kenny, 2011) although a neuroimaging study of nicotine dependent humans suggests that homozygotes for the protective G allele are more likely to show brain activation (e.g. in the hippocampus) in response to smoking-related cues (Janes et al., 2010). The impact of this variant is moderated by age at onset of smoking milestones, by peer (Johnson et al., 2010) and partner (Chen et al., 2014) smoking and parental monitoring (Chen et al., 2009). Importantly, emerging evidence suggests that carriers of the risk-conferring allele (and a related high-risk haplotype) might delay their

⁴<http://www.nimh.nih.gov/about/strategic-planning-reports/highlights/highlight-skyline-drivers.shtml>

smoking cessation by two median quit years (Chen et al., 2012). However, these individuals are also ideal targets for cessation pharmacotherapy as its efficacy appears considerably enhanced in those who carry the high-risk haplotype (Chen & Bierut, 2013). In this instance, a single series of GWAS studies revolutionized our understanding of an addictive behavior. Yet, what often goes unmentioned is that *the role of rs16969968 in tobacco smoking was first isolated in a hypothesis-driven candidate gene study* (Saccone et al., 2007).

For rs16969968, it was simply a matter of statistical power and the good fortune that the associated phenotype (cigarettes per day) was relatively easy to assess in a diversity of studies. However, GWAS was only the debut of this variant and this family of genes. What we have subsequently learned about the manner in which rs16969968 affects the etiology of smoking has largely occurred in independent analytic platforms. One could argue that GWAS, in this case, did not produce a novel genomic target but reassured us about an existing one – we had to take it from there.

In our second example, GWAS have not been as charitable. Commonly occurring single nucleotide polymorphisms in the gene encoding the gamma aminobutyric acid, receptor A, subunit 2 (*GABRA2*) which have been linked to alcohol dependence, albeit inconsistently (e.g. Irons et al., 2014), across multiple independent samples (Edenberg & Foroud, 2014; Li et al., 2014). *GABRA2* was initially selected as a candidate gene because multiple family studies of alcoholism identified an excess of allele-sharing for the region of chromosome 4 which harbors *GABRA2* and other GABA-ergic genes (Edenberg et al., 2004). An accumulation of studies also document its association with a variety of externalizing outcomes (e.g. Dick et al., 2009) as well as electrophysiological endophenotypes, such as beta power (Begleiter & Porjesz, 2006; Malone et al., 2014). Even though no *GABRA2* SNP under current study results in a protein coding change (rs279858 is in an exon but is synonymous), there is some evidence that they correlate with gene expression (Haughey et al., 2008). There is evidence that variation in this gene is linked to medial frontal response to alcohol aromas (Kareken et al., 2010) and to activation in the insula during monetary reward and loss anticipation (Villafuerte et al., 2011). Rodent research suggests that abolishing the action of the *GABRA2* gene results in altered response to ethanol in rodents (Liu et al., 2011; Dixon, Walker, King, & Stephens, 2012) which is corroborated by a human study showing the role of SNPs in this gene in modulating sensitivity to alcohol's acute effects (Haughey et al., 2008). Despite these independent lines of support for a role of *GABRA2* variants in the etiology of alcohol dependence, addictions and other externalizing problems in samples from varied developmental epochs and with differing ascertainment protocols, *no GWAS to date has identified these SNPs at genomewide significant levels* (Frank et al., 2011; Treutlein et al., 2009; Bierut et al., 2010; Heath et al., 2011; Gelernter et al., 2014; McGue et al., 2013). Did all these studies get it wrong?

If we strictly adhere to the statistical gold standard of GWAS p-values, then the extant *GABRA2* signals should be considered false positives. This might also mean diminished enthusiasm regarding future risky study designs related to *GABRA2*, including the identification of functionally relevant variants in this gene. We might argue that our sample sizes for GWAS of alcohol dependence are small and that when they get large enough, we can unequivocally accept or reject the hypothesis that *GABRA2* influences risk for alcohol

involvement. However, *GABRA2* SNPs were not identified in the only large GWAS meta-analysis of drinks per week (Schumann et al., 2011) nor was it significant in a recent large GWAS of alcohol dependence (Gelernter et al., 2014) which successfully identified rs1229984⁵. We can wait until those impressive big data experiments are completed or, with appropriate circumspection, we can let a *good scientific theory* guide us towards bettering our understanding of the role of *GABRA2* in alcohol dependence right now. Much like Vaidyanathan and colleagues, we concur that approaches like GWAS or whole brain analyses (versus analyses involving regions of interest, or ROI) afford the benefit of agnosticism which is ideal for thorough statistical confidence but they devalue, and even penalize, accumulated knowledge about the etiology of psychopathology. We can and have learned amazing lessons from GWAS but quite likely, we've missed quite a few opportunities because of our reliance on a single statistical threshold.

Statistics and Technology: Just say when...or maybe not

The target article by Vaidyanathan, Vrieze and Iacono outlines a scientific outlook with the potential to unfetter progress in psychopathological research. We have elaborated on the significance of two key suggestions made by these authors: the importance of risky study designs and the value of theoretical insight when conducting biologically informed research. We are certain that readers will identify other aspects of the target article that will inspire their research objectives.

We close, however, with one potential viewpoint where we diverge (if only modestly) from the authors' position. The authors caution against "statisticism" and "technomyopia." We conceptually agree with their contention that rogue attempts at statistical modeling and technological gloss, in the absence of a theoretical mooring, are apt to generate noise. The problem with this assertion, one that we confront in our own work as well, is: in the absence of the luxury of hindsight, how do we adjudicate what constitutes an unwarranted implementation of statistics or technology? The case of GWAS is a good one. In the afterglow of the unsurpassed progress made by the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium (PGC; (Sullivan, Daly, & O'Donovan, 2012)) and other large consortia (e.g. ENIGMA; Thompson et al., 2014), we are convinced that GWAS represents a judicious use of technology. However, suspicions regarding the contributions of common variation to psychopathology in the past decade have profoundly impacted funding allocations for GWAS (Sullivan, 2012). Therefore, in most cases, the benefit or futility of a technology (or statistical approach) may play out in a future that may not be worth predicating current research effort on.

Instead of figuring out how to (or who should) arbitrate when and how technological and statistical power should be wielded, why not use multiple lines of investigation to substantiate our hypothesis? Technology and statistics are tools, inasmuch as a guiding theory is just that, a theory. What distinguishes a guiding principle from an opinion is a statistically valid experiment; while *not everything that counts can be counted*, that which can, should be counted properly. It also doesn't hurt to add a little technological savvy to the

⁵This missense variant in *ADH1B* regulates the conversion of alcohol to acetaldehyde and contribute to aversive reactions, such as flushing, upon alcohol intake.

process – a clever experiment might fail to reject the null hypothesis just as well as one that is ordinary but we may have more fun conducting the former. Our point is this: one person's risky test is another's observational study (e.g. GWAS – a risky test?); and every observational study is the progenitor of a risky study design. Research should be evaluated for its originality, scientific merit and experimental rigor, be it motivated by a guiding theory or the consequence of a sexy statistical model. Perhaps not *everything that can be counted counts*, but that's probably what peer-review is for.

Acknowledgments

K02DA32573 (AA).

Reference List

- Agrawal A, Neale MC, Prescott CA, Kendler KS. A twin study of early cannabis use and subsequent use and abuse/dependence of other illicit drugs. *Psychol Med.* 2004; 34:1227–1237. [PubMed: 15697049]
- Akee RK, Copeland WE, Keeler G, Angold A, Costello EJ. Parents' Incomes and Children's Outcomes: A Quasi-Experiment. *Am Econ J Appl Econ.* 2010; 2:86–115. [PubMed: 20582231]
- Amos CI, Wu X, Broderick P, Gorlov IP, Gu J, Eisen T, et al. Genome-wide association scan of tag SNPs identifies a susceptibility locus for lung cancer at 15q25.1. *Nat Genet.* 2008; 40:616–622. [PubMed: 18385676]
- Begleiter H, Porjesz B. Genetics of human brain oscillations. *Int J Psychophysiol.* 2006; 60:162–171. [PubMed: 16540194]
- Bierut LJ. Genetic vulnerability and susceptibility to substance dependence. *Neuron.* 2011; 69:618–627. [PubMed: 21338875]
- Bierut LJ, Agrawal A, Bucholz KK, Doheny KF, Laurie C, Pugh E, et al. A genome-wide association study of alcohol dependence. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2010; 107:5082–5087. [PubMed: 20202923]
- Bierut LJ, Stitzel JA, Wang JC, Hinrichs AL, Gruzca RA, Xuei X, et al. Variants in nicotinic receptors and risk for nicotine dependence. *American Journal of Psychiatry.* 2008; 165:1163–1171. [PubMed: 18519524]
- Bulik-Sullivan BK, Loh PR, Finucane HK, Ripke S, Yang J, Patterson N, et al. LD Score regression distinguishes confounding from polygenicity in genome-wide association studies. *Nat Genet.* 2015; 47:291–295. [PubMed: 25642630]
- Cadoni C, Pisanu A, Solinas M, Acquas E, Di Chiara G. Behavioural sensitization after repeated exposure to Delta 9- tetrahydrocannabinol and cross-sensitization with morphine. *Psychopharmacology (Berl).* 2001; 158:259–266. [PubMed: 11713615]
- Chen LS, Baker TB, Piper ME, Breslau N, Cannon DS, Doheny KF, et al. Interplay of genetic risk factors (CHRNA5-CHRNA3-CHRNA4) and cessation treatments in smoking cessation success. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2012; 169:735–742. [PubMed: 22648373]
- Chen LS, Baker TB, Piper ME, Smith SS, Gu C, Gruzca RA, et al. Interplay of genetic risk (CHRNA5) and environmental risk (partner smoking) on cigarette smoking reduction. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2014; 143:36–43. Epub; 2014 Jul 3., 36–43. 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2014.06.027 [PubMed: 25073833]
- Chen LS, Bierut LJ. Genomics and personalized medicine: and smoking cessation treatment. *J Food Drug Anal.* 2013; 21:S87–S90. [PubMed: 25214750]
- Chen LS, Johnson EO, Breslau N, Hatsukami D, Saccone NL, Gruzca RA, et al. Interplay of Genetic Risk Factors and Parent Monitoring in Risk for Nicotine Dependence. *Addiction.* 2009; 104:1731–1740. [PubMed: 20871796]

- Costello EJ, Angold A, Burns BJ, Erkanli A, Stangl DK, Tweed DL. The Great Smoky Mountains Study of Youth. Functional impairment and serious emotional disturbance. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1996a; 53:1137–1143. [PubMed: 8956680]
- Costello EJ, Angold A, Burns BJ, Stangl DK, Tweed DL, Erkanli A, et al. The Great Smoky Mountains Study of Youth. Goals, design, methods, and the prevalence of DSM-III-R disorders. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1996b; 53:1129–1136. [PubMed: 8956679]
- Costello EJ, Compton SN, Keeler G, Angold A. Relationships between poverty and psychopathology: a natural experiment. *JAMA*. 2003; 290:2023–2029. [PubMed: 14559956]
- Costello EJ, Farmer EM, Angold A, Burns BJ, Erkanli A. Psychiatric disorders among American Indian and white youth in Appalachia: the Great Smoky Mountains Study. *American Journal of Public Health*. 1997; 87:827–832. [PubMed: 9184514]
- Davis M, Walker DL, Miles L, Grillon C. Phasic vs Sustained Fear in Rats and Humans: Role of the Extended Amygdala in Fear vs Anxiety. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2010; 35(1):105–135.10.1038/Npp.2009.109 [PubMed: 19693004]
- Dick DM, Latendresse SJ, Lansford JE, Budde JP, Goate A, Dodge KA, et al. Role of GABRA2 in trajectories of externalizing behavior across development and evidence of moderation by parental monitoring. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2009; 66:649–657. [PubMed: 19487630]
- Dixon CI, Walker SE, King SL, Stephens DN. Deletion of the gabra2 gene results in hypersensitivity to the acute effects of ethanol but does not alter ethanol self administration. *PLoS ONE*. 2012; 7:e47135. [PubMed: 23115637]
- Doyle, AC. *A Study in Scarlet*. Ward Lock & Co; United Kingdom: 1887.
- Edenberg HJ, Dick DM, Xuei X, Tian H, Almasy L, Bauer LO, et al. Variations in GABRA2, encoding the alpha 2 subunit of the GABA(A) receptor, are associated with alcohol dependence and with brain oscillations. *American Journal of Human Genetics*. 2004; 74:705–714. [PubMed: 15024690]
- Edenberg HJ, Foroud T. Genetics of alcoholism. *Handb Clin Neurol*. 2014; 125:561–71.10.1016/B978-0-444-62619-6.00032-X.,561-571 [PubMed: 25307596]
- Faravelli C, Lo Sauro C, Godini L, Lelli L, Benni L, Pietrini F, Ricca V. Childhood stressful events, HPA axis and anxiety disorders. *World J Psychiatry*. 2012; 2(1):13–25.10.5498/wjp.v2.i1.13 [PubMed: 24175164]
- Flint J, Munafò MR. Candidate and non-candidate genes in behavior genetics. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. 2013; 23:57–61. [PubMed: 22878161]
- Fowler CD, Lu Q, Johnson PM, Marks MJ, Kenny PJ. Habenular alpha5 nicotinic receptor subunit signalling controls nicotine intake. *Nature*. 2011; 471:597–601. [PubMed: 21278726]
- Frank J, Cichon S, Treutlein J, Ridinger M, Mattheisen M, Hoffmann P, et al. Genome-wide significant association between alcohol dependence and a variant in the ADH gene cluster. *Addict Biol*. 2011; 17:171–180. [PubMed: 22004471]
- Galea S, Brewin CR, Gruber M, Jones RT, King DW, King LA, et al. Exposure to hurricane-related stressors and mental illness after Hurricane Katrina. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2007; 64:1427–1434. [PubMed: 18056551]
- Gelernter J, Kranzler HR, Sherva R, Almasy L, Koesterer R, Smith AH, et al. Genome-wide association study of alcohol dependence: significant findings in African- and European-Americans including novel risk loci. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2014; 19:41–49. [PubMed: 24166409]
- Grant JD, Lynskey MT, Scherrer JF, Agrawal A, Heath AC, Bucholz KK. A cotwin-control analysis of drug use and abuse/dependence risk associated with early-onset cannabis use. *Addict Behav*. 2010; 35:35–41. [PubMed: 19717242]
- Grillon C, Heller R, Hirschhorn E, Kling MA, Pine DS, Schulkin J, Vythilingam M. Acute Hydrocortisone Treatment Increases Anxiety but Not Fear in Healthy Volunteers: A Fear-Potentiated Startle Study. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2011; 69(6):549–555.10.1016/j.biopsych.2010.12.013 [PubMed: 21277566]
- Grillon C, Lissek S, Rabin S, McDowell D, Dvir S, Pine DS. Increased anxiety during anticipation of unpredictable but not predictable aversive stimuli as a psychophysiological marker of panic disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2008; 165(7):898–904.10.1176/appi.ajp.2007.07101581 [PubMed: 18347001]

- Grillon C, Pine DS, Lissek S, Rabin S, Bonne O, Vythilingam M. Increased Anxiety During Anticipation of Unpredictable Aversive Stimuli in Posttraumatic Stress Disorder but not in Generalized Anxiety Disorder. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2009; 66(1):47–53.10.1016/j.biopsych.2008.12.028 [PubMed: 19217076]
- Grucza RA, Hipp PR, Norberg KE, Rundell L, Evanoff A, Cavazos-Rehg P, et al. The legacy of minimum legal drinking age law changes: long-term effects on suicide and homicide deaths among women. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2012; 36:377–384. [PubMed: 22085045]
- Grucza RA, Plunk AD, Hipp PR, Cavazos-Rehg P, Krauss MJ, Brownson RC, et al. Long-term effects of laws governing youth access to tobacco. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2013; 103:1493–1499. [PubMed: 23763414]
- Grucza RA, Plunk AD, Krauss MJ, Cavazos-Rehg PA, Deak J, Gebhardt K, et al. Probing the smoking-suicide association: do smoking policy interventions affect suicide risk? *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2014a; 16:1487–1494. [PubMed: 25031313]
- Grucza RA, Plunk AD, Krauss MJ, Cavazos-Rehg PA, Deak J, Gebhardt K, et al. Probing the smoking-suicide association: do smoking policy interventions affect suicide risk? *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2014b; 16:1487–1494. [PubMed: 25031313]
- Hall W, Lynskey M. Is cannabis a gateway drug: Testing hypotheses about the relationship between cannabis use and use of other illicit drugs. *Drug and Alcohol Review*. 2005; 24:39–48. [PubMed: 16191720]
- Hammett, D. *The Maltese Falcon*. Random House; New York, NY: 1930.
- Haughey HM, Ray LA, Finan P, Villanueva R, Niculescu M, Hutchison KE. Human gamma-aminobutyric acid A receptor alpha2 gene moderates the acute effects of alcohol and brain mRNA expression. *Genes Brain Behav*. 2008; 7:447–454. [PubMed: 18005236]
- Heath AC, Whitfield JB, Martin NG, Pergadia ML, Goate AM, Lind PA, et al. A Quantitative-Trait Genome-Wide Association Study of Alcoholism Risk in the Community: Findings and Implications. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2011
- Huestis MA. Pharmacokinetics and metabolism of the plant cannabinoids, delta9-tetrahydrocannabinol, cannabidiol and cannabinol. *Handbook of Experimental Pharmacology*. 2005; 168:657–690. [PubMed: 16596792]
- Hung RJ, McKay JD, Gaborieau V, Boffetta P, Hashibe M, Zaridze D, et al. A susceptibility locus for lung cancer maps to nicotinic acetylcholine receptor subunit genes on 15q25. *Nature*. 2008; 452:633–637. [PubMed: 18385738]
- Irons DE, McGue M, Iacono WG, Oetting WS. Mendelian randomization: a novel test of the gateway hypothesis and models of gene-environment interplay. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2007; 19:1181–1195. [PubMed: 17931442]
- Irons DE, Iacono WG, Oetting WS, Kirkpatrick RM, Vrieze SI, Miller MB, et al. Gamma-aminobutyric acid system genes--no evidence for a role in alcohol use and abuse in a community-based sample. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2014; 38:938–947. [PubMed: 24460875]
- Jackson KJ, Marks MJ, Vann RE, Chen X, Gamage TF, Warner JA, et al. Role of alpha5 nicotinic acetylcholine receptors in pharmacological and behavioral effects of nicotine in mice. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther*. 2010; 334:137–146. [PubMed: 20400469]
- Janes AC, Pizzagalli DA, Richardt S, Frederick BB, Holmes AJ, Sousa J, et al. Neural substrates of attentional bias for smoking-related cues: an fMRI study. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2010; 35:2339–2345. [PubMed: 20703221]
- Johnson EO, Chen LS, Breslau N, Hatsukami D, Robbins T, Saccone NL, et al. Peer smoking and the nicotinic receptor genes: an examination of genetic and environmental risks for nicotine dependence. *Addiction*. 2010; 105:2014–2022. [PubMed: 20840187]
- Kareken DA, Liang T, Wetherill L, Dziedzic M, Bragulat V, Cox C, et al. A polymorphism in GABRA2 is associated with the medial frontal response to alcohol cues in an fMRI study. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2010; 34:2169–2178. [PubMed: 20698837]
- Kendler KS, Neale MC, MacLean CJ, Heath AC, Eaves LJ, Kessler RC. Smoking and major depression. A causal analysis. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1993; 50:36–43. [PubMed: 8422220]

- Kirschbaum C, Pirke KM, Hellhammer DH. The 'Trier Social Stress Test'--a tool for investigating psychobiological stress responses in a laboratory setting. *Neuropsychobiology*. 1993; 28(1-2):76-81. 119004. [PubMed: 8255414]
- Krauss MJ, Cavazos-Rehg PA, Agrawal A, Bierut LJ, Grucza RA. Long-term effects of minimum legal drinking age laws on marijuana and other illicit drug use in adulthood. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2015; 149:173-179. [PubMed: 25707705]
- Lee SH, Ripke S, Neale BM, Faraone SV, Purcell SM, Perlis RH, et al. Genetic relationship between five psychiatric disorders estimated from genome-wide SNPs. *Nat Genet*. 2013; 45:984-994. [PubMed: 23933821]
- Lessem JM, Hopfer CJ, Haberstick BC, Timberlake D, Ehringer MA, Smolen A, et al. Relationship between Adolescent Marijuana Use and Young Adult Illicit Drug Use. *Behav Genet*. 2006; 36:498-506. [PubMed: 16565887]
- Li D, Sulovari A, Cheng C, Zhao H, Kranzler HR, Gelernter J. Association of gamma-aminobutyric acid A receptor alpha2 gene (GABRA2) with alcohol use disorder. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2014; 39:907-918. [PubMed: 24136292]
- Liu J, Yang AR, Kelly T, Puche A, Esoga C, June HL Jr, et al. Binge alcohol drinking is associated with GABAA alpha2-regulated Toll-like receptor 4 (TLR4) expression in the central amygdala. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2011; 108:4465-4470. [PubMed: 21368176]
- Liu JZ, Tozzi F, Waterworth DM, Pillai SG, Muglia P, Middleton L, et al. Meta-analysis and imputation refines the association of 15q25 with smoking quantity. *Nat Genet*. 2010; 42:436-440. [PubMed: 20418889]
- Lynskey M, Vink JM, Boomsma DI. Early onset cannabis use and progression to other drug use in a sample of Dutch twins. *Behavior Genetics*. 2006; 36:195-200. [PubMed: 16402286]
- Lynskey MT, Heath AC, Bucholz KK, Slutske WS, Madden PA, Nelson EC, et al. Escalation of drug use in early-onset cannabis users vs co-twin controls. *JAMA*. 2003; 289:427-433. [PubMed: 12533121]
- Malone SM, Burwell SJ, Vaidyanathan U, Miller MB, McGue M, Iacono WG. Heritability and molecular-genetic basis of resting EEG activity: a genome-wide association study. *Psychophysiology*. 2014; 51:1225-1245. [PubMed: 25387704]
- McGue M, Zhang Y, Miller MB, Basu S, Vrieze S, Hicks B, et al. A genome-wide association study of behavioral disinhibition. *Behav Genet*. 2013; 43:363-373. [PubMed: 23942779]
- Metrik J, Kahler CW, Reynolds B, McGue JE, Monti PM, Haney M, et al. Balanced placebo design with marijuana: pharmacological and expectancy effects on impulsivity and risk taking. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2012; 223:489-499. [PubMed: 22588253]
- Network and Pathway Analysis Subgroup of Psychiatric Genomics Consortium. Psychiatric genome-wide association study analyses implicate neuronal, immune and histone pathways. *Nat Neurosci*. 2015; 18:199-209. [PubMed: 25599223]
- Nock MK, Stein MB, Heeringa SG, Ursano RJ, Colpe LJ, Fullerton CS, et al. Prevalence and correlates of suicidal behavior among soldiers: results from the Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers (Army STARRS). *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2014; 71:514-522. [PubMed: 24590178]
- Pacula RL, Powell D, Heaton P, Sevigny EL. Assessing the Effects of Medical Marijuana Laws on Marijuana and Alcohol Use: The Devil Is in the Details. NBER. 2014
- Panlilio LV, Solinas M, Matthews SA, Goldberg SR. Previous exposure to THC alters the reinforcing efficacy and anxiety-related effects of cocaine in rats. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2007; 32:646-657. [PubMed: 16738542]
- Panlilio LV, Zanettini C, Barnes C, Solinas M, Goldberg SR. Prior exposure to THC increases the addictive effects of nicotine in rats. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2013; 38:1198-1208. [PubMed: 23314220]
- Pillai SG, Ge D, Zhu G, Kong X, Shianna KV, Need AC, et al. A genome-wide association study in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD): identification of two major susceptibility loci. *PLoS Genet*. 2009; 5:e1000421. [PubMed: 19300482]

- Plunk AD, Cavazos-Rehg P, Bierut LJ, Grucza RA. The persistent effects of minimum legal drinking age laws on drinking patterns later in life. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 2013; 37:463–469. [PubMed: 23347177]
- Ray WJ, Molnar C, Aikins D, Yamasaki A, Newman MG, Castonguay L, Borkovec TD. Startle Response in Generalized Anxiety Disorder. *Depression and Anxiety.* 2009; 26(2):147–154.10.1002/Da.20479 [PubMed: 19105213]
- Saccone NL, Culverhouse RC, Schwantes-An TH, Cannon DS, Chen X, Cichon S, et al. Multiple independent loci at chromosome 15q25.1 affect smoking quantity: a meta-analysis and comparison with lung cancer and COPD. *PLoS Genet.* 2010;6.
- Saccone SF, Hinrichs AL, Saccone NL, Chase GA, Konvicka K, Madden PA, et al. Cholinergic nicotinic receptor genes implicated in a nicotine dependence association study targeting 348 candidate genes with 3713 SNPs. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2007; 16:36–49. [PubMed: 17135278]
- Schizophrenia Working Group of the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium. Biological insights from 108 schizophrenia-associated genetic loci. *Nature.* 2014; 511:421–427. [PubMed: 25056061]
- Schumann G, Coin LJ, Lourdasamy A, Charoen P, Berger KH, Stacey D, et al. Genome-wide association and genetic functional studies identify autism susceptibility candidate 2 gene (AUTS2) in the regulation of alcohol consumption. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2011; 108:7119–7124. [PubMed: 21471458]
- Smith GD, Ebrahim S. ‘Mendelian randomization’: can genetic epidemiology contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *Int J Epidemiol.* 2003; 32:1–22. [PubMed: 12689998]
- Solinas M, Panlilio LV, Goldberg SR. Exposure to delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) increases subsequent heroin taking but not heroin’s reinforcing efficacy: a self-administration study in rats. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2004; 29:1301–1311. [PubMed: 15039767]
- Somerville LH, Whalen PJ, Kelley WM. Human Bed Nucleus of the Stria Terminalis Indexes Hypervigilant Threat Monitoring. *Biological Psychiatry.* 2010; 68(5):416–424.10.1016/j.biopsych.2010.04.002 [PubMed: 20497902]
- Stetler C, Miller GE. Depression and hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal activation: a quantitative summary of four decades of research. *Psychosom Med.* 2011; 73(2):114–126.10.1097/PSY.0b013e31820ad12b [PubMed: 21257974]
- Sullivan P. Don’t give up on GWAS. *Mol Psychiatry.* 2012; 17:2–3. [PubMed: 21826059]
- Sullivan PF, Daly MJ, O’Donovan M. Genetic architectures of psychiatric disorders: the emerging picture and its implications. *Nat Rev Genet.* 2012; 13:537–551. [PubMed: 22777127]
- Thompson PM, Stein JL, Medland SE, Hibar DP, Vasquez AA, Renteria ME, et al. The ENIGMA Consortium: large-scale collaborative analyses of neuroimaging and genetic data. *Brain Imaging Behav.* 2014; 8:153–182. [PubMed: 24399358]
- Thorgeirsson TE, Geller F, Sulem P, Rafnar T, Wiste A, Magnusson KP, et al. A variant associated with nicotine dependence, lung cancer and peripheral arterial disease. *Nature.* 2008; 452:638–642. [PubMed: 18385739]
- Thorgeirsson TE, Gudbjartsson DF, Surakka I, Vink JM, Amin N, Geller F, et al. Sequence variants at CHRNA3-CHRNA6 and CYP2A6 affect smoking behavior. *Nat Genet.* 2010; 42:448–453. [PubMed: 20418888]
- Tobacco and Genetics Consortium. Genome-wide meta-analyses identify multiple loci associated with smoking behavior. *Nat Genet.* 2010; 42:441–447. [PubMed: 20418890]
- Treutlein J, Cichon S, Ridinger M, Wodarz N, Soyka M, Zill P, et al. Genome-wide association study of alcohol dependence. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2009; 66:773–784. [PubMed: 19581569]
- Vanyukov MM, Tarter RE, Kirillova GP, Kirisci L, Reynolds MD, Kreek MJ, et al. Common liability to addiction and “gateway hypothesis”: theoretical, empirical and evolutionary perspective. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2012; 123(Suppl 1):S3–17. [PubMed: 22261179]
- Villafuerte S, Heitzeg MM, Foley S, Wendy Yau WY, Majczenko K, Zubieta JK, et al. Impulsiveness and insula activation during reward anticipation are associated with genetic variants in GABRA2 in a family sample enriched for alcoholism. *Mol Psychiatry.* 2011
- Ware JJ, van den Bree M, Munafò MR. From men to mice: CHRNA5/CHRNA3, smoking behavior and disease. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2012; 14:1291–1299. [PubMed: 22544838]

Yang J, Lee SH, Goddard ME, Visscher PM. GCTA: a tool for genome-wide complex trait analysis. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2011; 88:76–82. [PubMed: 21167468]

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript