

## B vitamins and pollution, an interesting, emerging, yet incomplete picture of folate and the exposome

Mark Lucock<sup>a,1</sup>, Patrice Jones<sup>a</sup>, Martin Veysey<sup>b</sup>, and Emma Beckett<sup>a</sup>

We read the interesting article by Zhong et al. (1) describing how B-vitamin supplementation reduces the adverse epigenetic response to fine particles associated with air pollution. However, we feel it is extremely premature to suggest, as the authors do, that "individual-level prevention" via vitamin supplements "might be used as prevention to complement [environmental] regulations to attenuate the impact of air pollution" (1).

First, atmospheric pollution is a symptom of detrimental anthropogenic change to the Earth, and prevention, rather than a temporary Band-Aid fix, is the only sane approach.

Second, the pharmacology applied by Zhong et al. (1) is flawed. The level of B-vitamin intervention is excessive because it has already been established that 400 µg of pteroylmonoglutamic acid (PteGlu), the synthetic form of the vitamin, is optimal for conversion to the natural 5-methyltetrahydrofolate (5-CH3-H4PteGlu) form of folate (2). As used in the Zhong et al. (1) article, 2.5 mg of PteGlu will lead to an excessive accumulation of systemic PteGlu with attendant potential health risks (3), and is an inappropriate choice of dose, not in the least because it is 6x higher than is necessary for optimal methyl group formation (2). The possible health risks of excessive PteGlu are well documented (4-6), and need to be considered carefully in any intervention to mitigate cellular effects of air pollution (1). Indeed, one highly significant study has even reported that B vitamins increase the risk of myocardial infarction (7). It's important to note that unmetabolized PteGlu per se will not increase genomic methylation (only 5-CH3-H4PteGlu can achieve this). Unlike PteGlu, no negative health attributes are

associated with 5-CH3-H4PteGlu. Vitamin B<sub>6</sub> is also given at supraphysiological levels that are potentially harmful. The recommended daily intake is 1.3 mg/d for a 31- to 50-y-old. At almost 40x this level, as used in the Zhong et al. (1) study, long-term use might be unsafe and has been linked to neurologic effects. Additionally, B<sub>6</sub> has more relevance in the transsulphuration of homocysteine than the remethylation of this thiol to methionine/s-adenosylmethionine (8).

Third, the Zhong et al. (1) study reflects a small cohort (n = 10), and as such cannot take account of the profound influence that a large number of folaterelated genotypes will have on the production of de novo methyl groups for genomic methylation, let alone the effect of even a single gene variant. Key SNPs include MTHFR, MTR, MTRR, CBS, SHMT, DHFR, SHMT, TS, RFC, and BHMT variants. In addition, it would not take account of seasonal changes in folate status (8).

Fourth, the age range in the Zhong et al. (1) study is large (18–60 y), and takes no account of recognized age-related effects on homocysteine and the methionine cycle, and hence methyl group metabolism (9).

As an aside, we assume that in the Methods section of Zhong et al. (1), the text should read that HPLC was used to measure vitamin  $B_6$  and not vitamin  $B_{12}$ .

Despite these comments, we feel the Zhong et al. (1) report is an important piece of work, and one that draws attention to the role of exposomal factors in B-vitamin biology. We recently published just such an exposomal association between UV exposure and folate involving the key C677T-MTHFR gene variant (8), and hope others will follow suite with similar studies that take account of natural and anthropogenic environmental factors.

1 Zhong J, et al. (2017) B vitamins attenuate the epigenetic effects of ambient fine particles in a pilot human intervention trial. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 114:3503–3508.

4 Lucock MD (1999) Food fortification with folic acid. Available at www.bmj.com/rapid-response/2011/10/28/food-fortification-folic-acid. Accessed March 15, 2017.

5 Smith AD, Kim YI, Refsum H (2008) Is folic acid good for everyone? Am J Clin Nutr 87:517-533.

<sup>a</sup>Molecular Nutrition Laboratory, School of Environmental & Life Sciences, University of Newcastle, Ourimbah, NSW 2258, Australia; and <sup>b</sup>Hull-York Medical School, University of York, Heslington, York YO10 5DD, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup> Lucock MD, Wild J, Smithells RW, Hartley R (1989) In vivo characterization of the absorption and biotransformation of pteroylmonoglutamic acid in man: A model for future studies. *Biochem Med Metab Biol* 42:30–42.

<sup>3</sup> Choi JH, Yates Z, Veysey M, Heo YR, Lucock M (2014) Contemporary issues surrounding folic acid fortification initiatives. Prev Nutr Food Sci 19:247–260.

Author contributions: M.L., P.J., M.V., and E.B. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: Mark.Lucock@newcastle.edu.au.

- 6 Lucock M, Yates Z (2009) Folic acid fortification: A double-edged sword. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care 12:555–564.
  7 Bønaa KH, et al.; NORVIT Trial Investigators (2006) Homocysteine lowering and cardiovascular events after acute myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med 354:1578-1588.
- 8 Lucock M, et al. (2017) UV-associated decline in systemic folate: Implications for human nutrigenetics, health, and evolutionary processes. Am J Hum Biol 29.
- 9 Selhub J (1999) Homocysteine metabolism. Annu Rev Nutr 19:217-246.

PNAS PNAS