Variation (individual differences): Stature (in cm) in Dutch adolescent twins





stature

Stature

Individual differences in human characteristics, e.g. normal and abnormal behavior

Caused by:

- differences in genotype (G)?
- differences in environment (E)?
- interaction between G and E?

Complex: Polygenic Traits

1 Gene	2 Genes	3 Genes	4 Genes
 → 3 Genotypes → 3 Phenotypes 	 → 9 Genotypes → 5 Phenotypes 	→ 27 Genotypes → 7 Phenotypes	→ 81 Genotypes → 9 Phenotypes





<u>Mendel:</u> Laws of inheritance for monogenic traits: 1 Segregation 2 Independent Assortment

<u>Galton:</u> correlations between family members for continuous traits: Family & Twin Resemblance.

<u>Fisher:</u> traits can be influenced by more than one gene (which each can have small effects). Effects of genes add up and lead to a normal distribution in the population.







Twin Correlations MZM: 0.95, MZF: 0.92, DZM: 0.60, DZF: 0.52







Traits influenced by genes will be correlated among biological relatives

Brain volumes: resemblance of MZ and DZ twins



Brain volume MZ twin pairs (milliliter) in twin and co-twin

Brain volume DZ twin pairs (milliliter) in twin and co-twin



'Identical' twins

Monozygotic (MZ) twins: ~100% genetically identical



FRATERNAL TWINS

Are products of TWO different eggs fertilized by TWO different sperms



They have different genes and may develop in different ways, usually but not always — having separate placentas and separate fetal sacs



Also, as they are totally different individuals, they may be



Fraternal twins

Dizygotic (DZ) twins share ~50% of their segregating genes













Designs to disentangle G + E

- Family studies G + C confounded
- MZ twins alone G + C confounded
- MZ twins reared apart rare, atypical, selective placement ?
- Adoptions increasingly rare, atypical, selective placement ?
- MZ and DZ twins reared together
- Extended twin design

Bouchard & McGue: Genetic and environmental influences on human psychological differences (2003)

Intraclass correlations

	MZT (626 pairs)	MZA (74 pairs)
Positive emotionality	.55	.43
Negative emotionality	.44	.47
Constraint	.56	.58

Classical twin design: Assumptions

- * known zygosity
- * EEA: equal environment (including prenatal)
- * representative



Zygosity

DZ = DOS

DZ = very unlike in appearance
DZ = different at marker loci
(except for measurement error)
MZ = mono-chorionic
MZ = identical at marker loci
(except for rare mutations)

MZ and DZ twins: determining zygosity using ABI Profiler[™] genotyping (9 STR markers + sex)

EEA: Placentation and zygosity



Dichorionic Two placentas MZ 19% DZ 58% Dichorionic Fused placentas MZ 14% DZ 42% Monochorionic Diamniotic MZ 63% DZ 0% Monochorionic Monoamniotic MZ 4% DZ 0%

Representative?

- Test for "twin effects": Include other family members (e.g. siblings of twins)
- Look at resemblance in twins of mistaken zygosity (parents say DZ, testing says MZ)



Twin and sibs: tests of special twin effects;

increased power to detect Common environment, Non-additive genetic effects



Twin and parents: genetic and cultural transmission, GE correlation, assortment

Individual differences in response to CBCL items on gender identity (3 point scale)



van Beijsterveldt et al. Genetic and environmental influences on cross-gender behavior and relation to behavior problems: a study of Dutch twins at ages 7 and 10 years. Arch Sex Behav. 2006, 35(6):647-58

Multifactorial Threshold Model of Disease



Genetic differences

= differences in DNA sequence

Human-Human 1:1000 = 0.1%





Human-Chimp 1:100 = 1%

Human-Mouse 1:8 = 15%



Sequence differences between individuals



Resemblance between relatives caused by:

- o shared Genes (G = A + D)
- environment Common to family members (C)
- **Differences between relatives caused by:**
- non-shared Genes
- Unique environment (U or E)



Punnett square

Genetics explains both the *resemblances* and the *differences* of family members (e.g. sibs).

Distribution of phenotypes in offspring of two heterozygous parents (AaBb). (2 genes (A & B) with additive allelic effects).

K Mather, Biometrical Genetics, Dover Publ, 1949

what is a gene?

- In 2003, estimates from gene-prediction programs suggested there are 24,500 or fewer protein-coding genes.
- The Ensembl genome-annotation system estimates them at 23,299. Perhaps the biggest obstacle to gene counting is that the definition of a gene is unclear.

Is a gene:

- a heritable unit corresponding to an observable phenotype
- a packet of genetic information that encodes a protein
- a packet of genetic information that encodes RNA
- must it be translated ?
- are genes genes if they are not expressed ?

TK Attwood: The Babel of Bioinformatics, Science, 290:471, 2000

A gene is a latent factor



Structural equation modeling

- Both continuous and categorical variables
- Systematic approach to hypothesis testing
- Tests of significance (for effects of G, D, C)
- Can be extended to:
 - More complex questions
 - Multiple variables
 - Other relatives



Heritability estimates in males and females (ANTR twin data)



Genes

Shared environment

Unique environment

Boomsma et al., 2002, Nat Review Genet

3 Stages of Genetic Mapping

- Are there genes influencing this trait?
 - Genetic epidemiological studies
- Where are those genes?
 - Linkage analysis
 - (look for quantitatve trait loci: QTL)
- What are those genes?
 - Association analysis



 π (QTL correlation) is estimated from IBD (identity by descent) data

IBD data: A fully informative mating





Linkage: tracking anonymous DNA markers close to genes of interest in families / sibling pairs.

- "blind" search, low power
- new genes, new mechanisms

Genetic association (based on linkage disequilibrium): direct comparison of regulatory and coding sequences in candidate genes (or markers close to candidate genes).

- high power, high type I/II error rate
- which candidates ?
- Genome wide (GWA)

Anxiety (NL; longitudinal survey data)



Figure 1 Results of the genome-wide linkage analysis of the anxiety scores averaged across the five occasions.

Middeldorp et al, Molecular Psychiatry, 2008

Neuroticism (endophenotype for depression and anxiety) Data from the Netherlands and Australia (Wray et al. (Arch General Psychiatry, in press))

- 19,635 sibling pairs with data for neuroticism up to five times over a period of up to 22 years.
- 5,424 sib pairs genotyped with microsatellite markers; pairs concordant or discordant with respect to extreme neuroticism scores were genotyped preferentially.
- 38% (AU) and 51% (NL) of parents were genotyped.
- The average distance between markers was 8.2 cM (Australia) and 11 cM (Netherlands).
- Non-parametric linkage analysis in Merlin-Regress for mean neuroticism score across time.
- Empirical LOD thresholds for suggestive linkage derived from Merlin – simulate.

Neuroticism Netherlands and Australia



Linkage Analysis

- Models the covariance structure among family members
- Marker sharing between relatives
 - Identifies large regions

 Include several candidates
- Complex disease
 - Scans on sets of small families popular
 - No strong assumptions about disease alleles
 - Low power
 - Limited resolution

Association

- o Models "mean" values
- Looks for correlation between specific alleles and a phenotype (quantitative trait value, disease risk)
- E.g. cases and controls (affected / unaffected)
- Or high and low scoring Ss

Association

More sensitive to small effects

- Need to "guess" gene/alleles ("candidate gene") or be close enough for linkage disequilibrium with nearby loci (GWA: Genome Wide Association)
- May get spurious association ("stratification") – need to have genetic controls to be convinced
- May get too many "positive" results (if the number of tests is large)

Types of Twin Studies I

Classical MZ -DZ comparison:

- age differences in heritability
- sex differences in heritability
- genotype x environment interaction
- causal models
- multivariate genetic analyses

Genotype x Environment interaction: Heritability of Disinhibition as a function of religious upbringing



D.I. Boomsma et al. (1999) Twin Research 2, 115-125

IQ heritability (gene x age interaction)



Multivariate analysis: Genetic factor model: do the same latent factors influence multiple traits ?



Classical twin design revisited: Heritability estimation without MZ twins

Why do we use the average sib values of $r_a = 0.5$ and $r_d = 0.25$

when we can estimate the (almost) exact values for each sib pair from marker data ?

OPEN OACCESS Freely available online

PLOS GENETICS

Assumption-Free Estimation of Heritability from Genome-Wide Identity-by-Descent Sharing between Full Siblings

Peter M. Visscher^{*}, Sarah E. Medland, Manuel A. R. Ferreira, Katherine I. Morley, Gu Zhu, Belinda K. Cornes, Grant W. Montgomery, Nicholas G. Martin

Genetic Epidemiology Group, Queensland Institute of Medical Research, Brisbane, Australia





Data	Model	Estimates (95% CI)		
		f ²	h²	
Adolescents ($n = 931$)	FAE	0.00 (0.00-0.43)	0.80 (0.00-0.90)	
	FE	0.40 (0.34-0.45)		
Adults ($n = 2,444$)	FAE	0.00 (0.00-0.18)	0.80 (0.43-0.86)	
	FE	0.39 (0.36-0.43)		
Combined ($n = 3,375$)	FAE	0.00 (0.00-0.17)	0.80 (0.46-0.85)	
	FE	0.39 (0.36-0.42)		

Table 2. ML Estimates of Heritability of Height from Genome-Wide IBD Sharing between Sib Pairs

Types of Twin Studies II

- Co-twin control study
- Extended twin study including: parents: assortative mating cultural transmission siblings: social interaction MZ offspring: maternal effects

Monozygotic Twins Discordant for a trait: Identical genomes; differences caused by Environment?

- Different chromosome constitutions because of postzygotic non-disjunction: e.g. MZ male-female 46,XY - 45,XO
- Differential methylation (imprinted genes)
- CNV (copy number variation)
- Skewed X chromosome inactivation in female MZ twins
- Differential trinucleotide repeat expansion
- Post-zygotic mutation
- Prenatal differences
- Postnatal environmental differences

Martin N, Boomsma DI, Machin G. (1997) Nature Genetics

"environmental" factors in MZ twins discordant for Attention problems

Smoking mother during pregnancy			
discordant:	38%	(11/29)	
concordant affected:	38%	(8/21)	n.s.
control:	14%	(10/73)	sign.

Placentation: % of pairs with 2 placenta's in this study:

discordant:	38%	(10/26)	
concordant affected:	15%	(3/20)	sign.
control:	13%	(13/68)	sign.

Birth weight		
affected twin:	2425 g	
unaffected co-twin:	2580 a	sian.

Time in incubatoraffected twin:11 daysunaffected co-twin:7 days sign.

MZ twins discordant for depression risk: Gray Matter high risk twin < GM low risk twin



Right parahippocampus is smaller in the high risk twin from discordant MZ pairs (De Geus et al., 2007)

Types of Twin Studies III

- Genotyping of MZ twins:
 - to detect variability genes
 - to estimate penetrance
- Genotyping of DZ twins to detect linkage and association

Gene – environment interaction in GWA

- Differences within MZ pairs: (mainly) function of Environmental exposure
- Are differences within pairs a function of genotype?
- i.e. is sensitivity to the environment a function of genotype?

New trends

Human Genome Project: Sequence of the genome (base sequence)

Variation in the genome (e.g. microsatellites, SNPs, duplicons, copy number variation) related to variation in phenotype?

DNA methylation

Expression of the genome (RNA)

Metabolomics





Discordant Dutch MZ pair: One of the girls has complete duplication of the spine from L4 down

Oates et al. Increased DNA methylation at the *AXIN1* gene in an MZ twin from a pair discordant for a caudal duplication anomaly. Am J Hum Genet, 2006



Fig. 2. Patient 1. Radiograph of the vertebral column shows complete duplication of the spine from L4 down.

urethra, a dilated pelvis of the right kidney, bilateral uterus unicornis with normal ovaries, hemivertebrae of thoracic vertebrae 6 and 10, and abnormal curvature of the sacrum. A persistent ductus arteriosus and secundum atrial septum defect was suspected, but results of cardiac investigations at 10 months were normal.

At physical examination for genetic evaluation at 4 months we saw a baby girl with epicanthal folds, but no other minor anomalies. She had a capillary nevus on her left buttock. In the anal region only a dimple was seen. The patient was operated on one day after birth, when a colostomy was made and a fistula connected to the colon



Human Molecular Genetics, 2007, Vol. 16, No. 5 547–554 doi:10.1093/hmg/ddm010 Advance Access published on March 5, 2007

Heritable rather than age-related environmental and stochastic factors dominate variation in DNA methylation of the human *IGF2/H19* locus

Bastiaan T. Heijmans^{1,*}, Dennis Kremer¹, Elmar W. Tobi¹, Dorret I. Boomsma² and P. Eline Slagboom¹

¹Molecular Epidemiology Section, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden 2333 ZC, The Netherlands and ²Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam 1081 BT, The Netherlands

Epigenetic variation may significantly contribute to the risk of common disease. Currently, little is known about the extent and causes of epigenetic variation. Here, we investigated the contribution of heritable influences and the combined effect of environmental and stochastic factors to variation in DNA methylation of the *IGF2/H19* locus. Moreover, we tested whether this locus was subject to age-related degeneration of epigenetic patterns as was previously suggested for global methylation. We measured methylation of the *H19* and *IGF2* differentially methylated regions (DMRs) in 196 adolescent and 176 middle-aged twins using a recently developed mass spectrometry-based method. We observed substantial variation in DNA methylation across individuals, underscoring that DNA methylation is a quantitative trait. Analysis of data in monozygotic





Association of SNPs in the H19 and IGF2/IGF2AS regions and the MTHFR gene with methylation of individual CpGs. Symbols denote $-\log(p)$ for the association of individual SNPs with methylation).



Please cite this article in press as: Bruder et al., Phenotypically Concordant and Discordant Monozygotic Twins Display Different DNA Copy-Number-Variation Profiles, The American Journal of Human Genetics (2008), doi:10.1016/j.ajhg.2007.12.011

REPORT

Phenotypically Concordant and Discordant Monozygotic Twins Display Different DNA Copy-Number-Variation Profiles

Carl E.G. Bruder,^{1,*} Arkadiusz Piotrowski,¹ Antoinet A.C.J. Gijsbers,^{2,3} Robin Andersson,⁴ Stephen Erickson,⁵ Teresita Diaz de Ståhl,⁶ Uwe Menzel,⁶ Johanna Sandgren,⁷ Desiree von Tell,¹ Andrzej Poplawski,¹ Michael Crowley,¹ Chiquito Crasto,¹ E. Christopher Partridge,¹ Hemant Tiwari,⁵ David B. Allison,^{1,5} Jan Komorowski,⁴ Gert-Jan B. van Ommen,^{2,3} Dorret I. Boomsma,⁸ Nancy L. Pedersen,⁹ Johan T. den Dunnen,^{2,3} Karin Wirdefeldt,⁹ and Jan P. Dumanski^{1,6}



Figure 3. CNV Analysis of Twin D8 Showing the 1.6 Mb Deletion on Chromosome 2

(A) Profile of the entire chromosome 2 from Illumina HumanHap 300 Duo beadchip showing the values of SNP allele ratios. True heterozygous SNPs are expected to be distributed around a value of 0.5. In the highlighted region (white box), the allele ratios differ significantly from 0.5, indicating an imbalance in the allele signals caused by a 1.6 Mb deletion.

(B) Two enlarged views of the deleted region, plotted as values of absolute difference between the heterozygous SNP allele frequencies in twin D8 versus twin D7, calculated in a similar way as shown in Figures 1C and 1E. The red line in both graphs displays the moving average, with a period of

Unselected NTR twins (10 MZ pairs)

- CNV: gains and losses of large chunks of DNA sequence consisting of between ten thousand and five million letters (known as Copy Number Variation).
- Based on shared CNVs patterns twin pairs were easily recognized.
- However, we also detected an unexpected number of unique differences within the monozygotic twin pairs.
- The number of CNVs identified depends mainly on the settings of the scoring algorithms; in the size range of 0.3-1.2 Mb we detect 1-2 per pair.
- CNVs are not present in 100% of the cells. This suggests somatic mosaicism, i.e. a post-meiotic emergence.

OMICS A Journal of Integrative Biology Volume 12, Number 1, 2008 © Mary Ann Liebert, Inc. DOI: 10.1089/omi.2007.0048

Similarities and Differences in Lipidomics Profiles among Healthy Monozygotic Twin Pairs

HARMEN H.M. DRAISMA,¹ THEO H. REIJMERS,¹ IVANA BOBELDIJK-PASTOROVA,² JACQUELINE J. MEULMAN,³ G. FREDERIEK ESTOURGIE-VAN BURK,^{4,5} MEIKE BARTELS,⁵ RAYMOND RAMAKER,² JAN VAN DER GREEF,¹ DORRET I. BOOMSMA,⁵ and THOMAS HANKEMEIER¹

metabolomes. Here we present the results of hierarchical clustering of blood plasma lipid profile data obtained by liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry from 23 healthy, 18year-old twin pairs, of which 21 pairs were monozygotic, and 8 of their siblings. For 13

Metabolomic data characterized by large number of dependent variables



Euclidean distances among objects and corresponding dendrogram (A); scaled data for each participant (C). In Panel B co-twins are connected by colored lines. In the dendrogram of Panel A an example is drawn of our approach to characterize co-clustering of twins. The keys to Panels A, B and C are given in the upper left, upper right, and lower right corners of the figure. In Panel C lipids are labeled by their class abbreviation (LPC, PC,...) followed by the number of carbon atoms and the number of double bonds (separated by a colon) in the fatty acid.

Boulder 2008

- Dorret Boomsma, NL
- Stacey Cherny, Hong Kong
- Danielle Dick, USA
- David Evans, UK
- Manuel Ferreira, USA
- Nathan Gillespie, USA
- o John Hewitt, USA
- Matthew Keller, USA
- Jeff Lessem, USA

- o Gitta Lubke, USA
- Hermine Maes, USA
- Nick Martin, OZ
- Sarah Medland, USA
- Katherine Morley, OZ
- o Benjamin Neale, UK
- Michael Neale, USA
- o Irene Rebollo, NL
- Fruhling Rijsdijk, UK
- William Valdar, UK