

Title

Genetic liability for anxiety associates with treatment response to the monoamine stabilizer OSU6162 in alcohol dependence

Authors

Mun-Gwan Hong¹, Lotfi Khemiri², Joar Guterstam², Johan Franck², Nitya Jayaram-Lindström², Philippe A. Melas^{2,*}

Affiliations

¹ National Bioinformatics Infrastructure Sweden, Science for Life Laboratory, Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, Stockholm University, 17121, Stockholm, Sweden

² Center for Psychiatry Research, Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet & Stockholm Health Care Services, 11364 Stockholm, Sweden

* Correspondence: L8:00, Karolinska University Hospital, 17176, Stockholm, Sweden. Tel: +46 70 888 44 05. E-mail address: Philippe.Melas@ki.se

Abstract

OSU6162, a monoamine stabilizer, has demonstrated efficacy in reducing alcohol and anxiety-related behaviors in preclinical settings. In a previous randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial involving patients with alcohol dependence (AD), we found that OSU6162 significantly reduced craving for alcohol, but did not alter drinking behaviors. In the present study, we explored the hypothesis that genetic predispositions related to AD or associated traits, might influence the response to OSU6162 treatment in original trial participants (N=56). To investigate this, we calculated polygenic risk scores (PRSs) over several statistical significance thresholds from genome-wide association studies on (i) alcohol use disorder and alcohol consumption (N=200-202k), (ii) problematic alcohol use (N=435k), (iii) drinks per week (N=666k), (iv) major depression (N=500k), and (v) anxiety (using both case-control comparisons and quantitative anxiety factor scores, N=17-18k). Linear regression analyses assessing the interaction effects between PRSs and treatment type (OSU6162 or placebo) identified significant associations when considering anxiety factor scores (FDR<0.05). Specifically, in OSU6162-treated AD individuals, there was a negative correlation between anxiety factor PRS (at the genome-wide significance threshold that included one genetic variant) and several drinking outcomes, including number of drinks consumed, percentage of heavy drinking days, and changes in blood phosphatidylethanol (PEth) levels. These correlations were absent in the placebo group. While preliminary, these findings suggest the potential utility of anxiety PRS in predicting response to OSU6162 treatment in AD. Further research using larger cohorts and more comprehensive genetic data is necessary to confirm these results and to advance personalized medicine approaches in alcohol use disorder.

Keywords

Alcohol use disorder, AUD, OSU, PNU-96391, polygenic risk scores, pharmacogenetics

Introduction

Alcohol dependence (AD) is a complex disorder characterized by dysregulated dopaminergic and serotonergic brain systems, which are crucial in modulating reward, craving, and cognitive functions (Sari et al., 2011; Soderpalm and Ericson, 2013). AD is also often associated with co-occurring anxiety and depressive disorders, further complicating the clinical picture (Burns and Teesson, 2002). These comorbid conditions share underlying familial liabilities with substance misuse (Virtanen et al., 2020) and have been linked to disturbances in monoamine neurotransmitter signaling (Belujon and Grace, 2017; DeGroot et al., 2020; Lawther et al., 2020). The compound (-)-OSU6162 (OSU6162), also known as PNU-96391, has emerged as a promising candidate in addressing these neurochemical imbalances.

OSU6162 stabilizes dopaminergic and serotonergic signaling pathways by acting as a neutral antagonist or a weak partial agonist at dopamine D2 and serotonin 5-HT_{2A} receptors, (Burstein et al., 2011; Carlsson et al., 2011; Dyhring et al., 2010; Tolboom et al., 2015). Its documented efficacy in normalizing psychomotor activity and striatal dopaminergic function (Rung et al., 2008; Tedroff et al., 1998) formed the basis for its application in disorders marked by dopaminergic dysregulation, such as AD. Preclinical studies in long-term drinking rats have shown that OSU6162 reduces voluntary alcohol consumption, withdrawal symptoms, and the reinstatement of alcohol seeking (Fredriksson et al., 2019; Steensland et al., 2012), alongside mitigating anxiety-like behaviors (Melas et al., 2021) and correcting downregulated dopamine output in the nucleus accumbens (Feltmann et al., 2016).

In a Phase II human study, the efficacy of OSU6162 on drinking, craving, and mood in AD individuals was evaluated (Khemiri et al., 2015). The treatment was safe, well-tolerated, and notably reduced priming-induced craving and the subjective liking of alcohol. Additionally, OSU6162 improved certain cognitive functions, including future planning, verbal divergent thinking, and emotional recognition speed (Khemiri et al., 2019). Despite these promising findings, the study found no evidence of any treatment effects on alcohol intake (Khemiri et al., 2015). However, the study had a short duration, and there have not yet been any long-term clinical trials assessing the potential effects of OSU6162 on drinking outcomes.

In the present study, we aim to investigate whether genetic predispositions, particularly related to AD and the comorbid disorders of anxiety and depression, may influence therapeutic responses to OSU6162 treatment. By leveraging genome-wide association study (GWAS) data to calculate polygenic risk scores (PRSs) for alcohol use disorder, problematic alcohol use, alcohol consumption, major depressive disorder, and anxiety, the aim was to uncover putative genetic underpinnings of treatment response. This approach could benefit personalized medicine efforts in AD treatment, particularly when utilizing monoamine stabilizers like OSU6162, which could be tailored to individual genetic profiles.

Methods

Study design and participants

This study extends upon a previous randomized controlled trial with a double-blind, placebo-controlled design, where we enrolled 56 alcohol-dependent (AD) male and female participants, who were randomized to receive either OSU6162 (N=28) or placebo (N=28) for a 14-day period. For complete details on methods see (Khemiri et al., 2015). In brief, the study included three follow-up visits within the 14-day treatment period and a laboratory-based alcohol craving test session on day 15. Follow-up visits encompassed electrocardiogram (ECG), blood and urine sample collection, medication dispensing, breathalyzer tests, and self-reported drinking, mood, and adverse events. Participants, aged 20 to 55 years, met DSM-IV criteria for alcohol dependence, reported at least 45 heavy drinking days (HDD) in the preceding 90 days, and abstained from alcohol for 4 to 14 days before inclusion, confirmed by Timeline Follow Back (TLFB) interview (Sobell and Sobell, 1992) and breathalyzer. Exclusion criteria included other substance use disorders (except nicotine), schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, major depression, and significant cardiac or ECG abnormalities. The study was conducted in accordance with Good Clinical Practice and the Declaration of Helsinki, receiving approval from the regional ethical review board in Stockholm and the Swedish Medical Products Agency, and was registered in the European Clinical Trials Database (EudraCT; 2011-003133-34). All participants provided written informed consent.

Clinical measures and alcohol craving test sessions

Mood and craving were assessed using the Montgomery-Åsberg Depression Self-Rating Scale (MADRS-S) (Svanborg and Asberg, 2001) and the Penn Alcohol Craving Scale (PACS) (Flannery et al., 1999), respectively. Alcohol consumption was quantified through changes in percent HDD, percent drinking days, and phosphatidylethanol (PEth) serum levels, along with the number of drinks, and percentage of both drinking days and HDD during the 14-day treatment period. On day 15, laboratory-based alcohol craving test sessions were conducted based on Hammarberg et al. (Hammarberg et al., 2009), involving three sessions triggered by alcohol-specific cues, neutral stimuli, and a priming dose of alcohol. Craving was evaluated using the shortened Swedish version of the Desire for Alcohol Questionnaire (Short-DAQ) (Love et al., 1998) and the Visual Analog Scale (VAS).

GWAS data and quality control steps

AD patient genotypes were determined using the Illumina Infinium Global Screening Array-24 v2.0 (Illumina Inc., San Diego, CA, USA). Post-quality control (QC), 547,984 out of 730,059 genetic variants were retained for analysis, filtering out variants with over 10% missing genotypes, minor allele count of one or none, or significant Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium violation ($P < 1e-10$).

Polygenic risk scores

PRSs were derived from seven base datasets, including GWASs for alcohol use disorder (Kranzler et al., 2019), alcohol consumption based on Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test-Consumption (AUDIT-C) scores (Kranzler et al., 2019), problematic alcohol use (Zhou et al.,

2020), drinks per week (Saunders et al., 2022), major depression (Howard et al., 2019), and two approaches to anxiety disorder phenotyping (case-control comparisons and quantitative anxiety factor scores) (Otowa et al., 2016). The details of the base datasets, including number of subjects and ancestries, are shown in Table S1. The PRSs were computed using PRSice-2 software v. 2.3.5 (Choi and O'Reilly, 2019) and the formula:

$$PRS = \sum_i \frac{S_i \times C_i}{N}$$

, where S_i is the summary statistic for genetic variant i from the base dataset, C_i the observed effect-allele count of the variant i in the target dataset, and N the total number of alleles included in the PRS computation. The software was set to generate nine PRSs per risk for different p-value cutoffs from genome-wide significance to no-association, i.e., 5e-08, 0.001, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5 and 1, excluding variants on sex chromosomes. Default software settings were maintained for other parameters, including a clumping threshold set at $P \leq 1$, an r-squared value ≥ 0.1 , and a maximum distance between SNPs of 250kb.

Statistical analyses and bioinformatic environment

Data handling and analyses were conducted using R version 4.2.2 (2022-10-31) and the tidyverse (v. 2.0.0) package. To assess the associations between PRSs and clinical outcomes, we employed linear regression models. Specifically, we tested the interaction effects of treatment (OSU6162 or placebo) with PRS on the clinical measures. Multiple testing correction was applied using the Benjamini-Hochberg method to control the False Discovery Rate (FDR) at 5%. The strength and significance of the relationship between PRS and clinical response was also quantified using t-statistics for the estimated regression slopes.

Results

Genetic variants in PRS calculations for disorders or traits

As indicated in Table 1, the base GWAS datasets provided summary statistics for over 6 million genetic variants of European or mixed ancestry cohorts across seven disorders or traits, including alcohol use disorder, alcohol consumption (AUDIT-C), problematic alcohol use, drinks per week, depression, and anxiety disorder (binary and continuous). Matching reference SNP IDs between the base datasets and our study (target) cohort resulted in a common variant range of 256,268 – 499,638, representing approximately 47% to 91% of the QC-passed genetic variants. Due to linkage disequilibrium, the number of variants used for PRS calculations was reduced to 85,590 – 191,055 through clumping.

Table 1. Summary of statistical measures and variant counts per disorder or trait in each GWAS

Disorder or trait	Stat	Nr of variants		
		in base dataset	in both base and target dataset [‡]	after clumping
Anxiety (case-control)	Odds ratio	6,330,995	281,394	86,684
Anxiety (factor score)	β	6,306,612	279,053	85,590
Alcohol use disorder	Odds ratio	6,895,250	256,268	110,604
Alcohol consumption (AUDIT-C)	β	6,898,149	256,452	110,779
Depression	Odds ratio	8,483,301	448,812	171,188
Drinks per week	β	13,267,983	499,638	191,055
Problematic alcohol use	β	14,068,117	478,784	183,689

[‡]Number of variants shared between the base and target datasets, retained for subsequent clumping analysis.

AUDIT-C: Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test-Consumption

Genetic liability for anxiety correlates with treatment response to OSU6162

Initial analyses revealed no significant differences in PRSs between the OSU6162 and placebo groups (Table S2). Subsequent linear models examined the interaction between treatment and PRSs across fourteen clinical measures with varying p-value cutoffs. No significant interactions were found for PRSs related to alcohol use disorder, alcohol consumption (AUDIT-C), problematic alcohol use, drinks per week, and anxiety characterized as binary outcomes (Tables S3-S7). However, significant interactions were observed between treatment and the anxiety factor score PRS at the genome-wide significance level. Notably, this interaction associated with the number of drinks consumed, percentage of HDD, percentage of drinking days, and changes in blood phosphatidylethanol (PEth) levels (FDR<0.05; in bold, Table 2). A trend was also observed for the change in the percentage of drinking days before and after the trial (FDR=0.06; in bold, Table 2). Figure 1 illustrates these findings, highlighting a robust negative correlation between anxiety PRS and drinking metrics in the OSU6162-treated group, as opposed to negligible correlations in the placebo group (t-statistics for the slopes of OSU6162-treatment vs. placebo: Diff_Peth: -3.06 vs. 0.17, P=0.0057 vs. P=0.86; TLFB_study_drinks: -3.85 vs. 1.89, P=0.00086 vs. P=0.071; TLFB_study_perc_HDD: -3.84 vs. 1.00, P=0.00090 vs. P=0.33; TLFB_study_perc_drinkingdays: -4.86 vs. 1.43, P=0.000074 vs. P=0.17). This suggests that individuals with higher genetic predisposition for anxiety may drink less when treated with OSU6162. It is, however, important to note that these observations are based on a single genome-wide significant SNP (rs1067327) for the anxiety factor score PRS. Finally, in examining PRS for depression with all genetic variants included (p-value cutoff=1), a weak significance emerged in one craving session (DAQ – active cue, FDR=0.04; in bold, Table S8), with higher PRSs inversely related to craving in the placebo group (Fig. S1; t-statistic for the slope of OSU6162-treatment vs. placebo: 1.26 vs. -3.22, P=0.22 vs. P=0.0041). However, this significance did not extend to the second active cue session (VAS – active cue, FDR=0.75, Table S8) nor to other cue sessions (e.g., priming), and it was not observed in the OSU6162 group (Table S8). This isolated significance suggests the potential for a type I error in the DAQ association.

Table 2. Impact of anxiety factor score PRS on clinical measures: Interaction with OSU6162 or placebo treatment

Clinical measures [†]	5e-08	0.001	0.05	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	1
Change % heavy drinking days	0.297	0.846	0.607	0.474	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Change % drinking days	0.0654	0.967	0.607	0.337	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Change MADRS-S	0.935	0.846	0.808	0.969	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Change PACS	0.676	0.846	0.607	0.526	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Change PEth	0.0364*	0.846	0.607	0.969	0.897	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Study drinks	0.00053***	0.846	0.892	0.632	0.804	0.978	0.976	0.933	0.99

Clinical measures [‡]	5e-08	0.001	0.05	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	1
Study % heavy drinking days	0.00175**	0.846	0.971	0.632	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Study % drinking days	0.00053***	0.846	0.808	0.603	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Craving, active cue (DAQ)	0.935	0.99	0.607	0.526	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Craving, neutral cue (DAQ)	0.947	0.846	0.72	0.969	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Craving, priming (DAQ)	0.807	0.846	0.801	0.969	0.9	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Craving, active cue (VAS)	0.935	0.846	0.662	0.969	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Craving neutral cue (VAS)	0.935	0.846	0.607	0.969	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99
Craving priming (VAS)	0.935	0.846	0.607	0.337	0.804	0.978	0.972	0.933	0.99

The table header lists the p-value cut-offs for each polygenic risk score (PRS) assessed.

The p-values presented in the table result from linear regression analyses of clinical measures based on the interaction between the anxiety factor score PRS and treatment type (OSU6162 or placebo). They have been adjusted for the false discovery rate (FDR) using the Benjamini-Hochberg method to account for multiple testing across 14 clinical measures, with significance denoted as *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

[‡]Clinical measures: Change % heavy drinking days: The change in the percentage of heavy drinking days from baseline (90 days, Timeline Follow Back) to the 14-day treatment period; Change % drinking days: The change in the percentage of drinking days from baseline (90 days, Timeline Follow Back) to the 14-day treatment period; Change MADRS-S: The change in Montgomery-Åsberg Depression Self-Rating Scale (MADRS-S) scores from baseline to end of treatment (day 15); Change PACS: The change in Pennsylvania Alcohol Craving Scale (PACS) scores from baseline to end of treatment (day 15); Change PEth: The change in blood phosphatidylethanol (PEth) levels from baseline to end of treatment (day 15); Study drinks: The total number of drinks consumed during the 14-day treatment period; Study % heavy drinking days: The percentage of heavy drinking days during the 14-day treatment period; Study % drinking days: The percentage of drinking days during the 14-day treatment period; Craving (DAQ): The change in Desire for Alcohol Questionnaire (DAQ) scores immediately after the craving session compared to baseline; Craving (VAS): The change in Visual Analog Scale (VAS) scores immediately after the craving session compared to baseline.

Figure 1




Fig 1. Correlations between anxiety factor PRS and clinical outcomes in alcohol dependent individuals on OSU6162 or placebo. In OSU6162-treated AD patients, a negative correlation was found between the anxiety factor PRS (at the genome-wide significance threshold that included one SNP) and measures of alcohol consumption during the trial, specifically: the number of drinks consumed, the percentage of drinking days, the percentage of heavy drinking days (HDD), and changes in blood phosphatidylethanol (PEth) levels post-treatment. These associations were not present in the placebo group. Diff_Peth: The change in blood phosphatidylethanol (PEth) levels from baseline to end of treatment (day 15); TLFB_study_drinks: The total number of drinks consumed during the 14-day treatment period; TLFB_study_perc_drinkingdays: The percentage of drinking days during the 14-day treatment period; TLFB_study_perc_HDD: The percentage of heavy drinking days during the 14-day treatment period; 5e-08: The p-value cutoff for PRS; TLFB: Timeline Follow Back. Treatment groups are indicated by color: red for placebo and teal for OSU6162 (OSU).

Discussion

Despite AD presenting a significant global health burden, a substantial number of affected individuals do not seek treatment, and an even smaller proportion receives FDA/EMA-approved pharmacotherapies (Grant *et al.*, 2017; Grant *et al.*, 2015; Mark *et al.*, 2009; Rubinsky *et al.*, 2015). Notably, two of the most highly regarded AD pharmacotherapies—naltrexone and acamprosate—yield suboptimal responses in approximately 40 to 70% of patients (Rosner *et al.*, 2010a; Rosner *et al.*, 2010b; Srisurapanont and Jarusuraisin, 2005). A recent pharmacogenomics study highlighted the association of two intergenic SNPs with specific treatment outcomes for these medications (Biernacka *et al.*, 2021). The concept of precision medicine — tailoring treatments based on individual genetic and molecular profiles — provided the rationale for the present study’s hypothesis that genetic predispositions might reveal who would benefit most from OSU6162, a monoamine stabilizer showing promising preclinical and clinical results in AD settings (Feltmann *et al.*, 2016; Fredriksson *et al.*, 2019; Khemiri *et al.*, 2015; Khemiri *et al.*, 2019; Melas *et al.*, 2021; Steensland *et al.*, 2012).

Specifically, although OSU6162 was found to reduce alcohol craving in a 14-day randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial, no treatment effects were found on alcohol intake (Khemiri *et al.*, 2015). AD is prevalent among individuals suffering from anxiety or depression (Boschloo *et al.*, 2011) and the results of the present study suggest that taking into consideration genetic predispositions to AD-comorbid disorders can reveal who would benefit most from OSU6162. This was supported by a robust negative correlation between anxiety PRS and drinking behaviors in AD individuals treated with OSU6162 in the original trial. Specifically, we found significant associations between anxiety factor score PRS and several clinical measures of alcohol consumption, such as the number of drinks consumed during the trial, percentage of heavy drinking days (HDD), and percentage of drinking days, including changes in blood phosphatidylethanol (PEth) levels pre- and post-treatment. A trend was also noted for changes in the percentage of drinking days pre- and post-trial. Notably, none of these relationships were observed in the placebo group.

The consistency of these associations across multiple clinical outcomes, encompassing both subjective reports and objective biomarkers, such as PEth, provides compelling evidence that underscores the potential relevance of the anxiety factor score PRS in predicting OSU6162-treatment response. Our findings also point toward the potential anxiolytic effects of OSU6162, suggesting a diminished reliance on alcohol as a coping mechanism in individuals with a genetic predisposition to anxiety (Turner *et al.*, 2018). These anxiolytic effects may be driven by the compound’s monoaminergic stabilizing effects (DeGroot *et al.*, 2020; Lawther *et al.*, 2020) and are consistent with rodent studies demonstrating reduced alcohol intake and anxiety-like behaviors with OSU6162 treatment (Melas *et al.*, 2021). Interestingly, however, the associations we observed were exclusively linked to the anxiety PRS based on a quantitative factor-score approach, not a binary case-control classification (Otowa *et al.*, 2016). This emphasizes the intricate nature of anxiety phenotyping and its genetic determinants, as supported by other GWAS findings examining both continuous and binary classifications of anxiety (Levey *et al.*, 2020). Taken together, these insights stress the importance of precise measures in psychiatric phenotyping for the advancement of precision medicine.

In the present study, the notable associations with anxiety factor score PRS were driven by a genome-wide significant threshold involving a single SNP, rs1067327. This SNP lies within a chromosomal region that implicates three primary genes, i.e., calmodulin-lysine N-methyltransferase (*CAMKMT*), prolyl endopeptidase like (*PREPL*), and solute carrier family 3 member 1 (*SLC3A1*) (Otowa et al., 2016). A PRS based on a single SNP does not capture the polygenic nature of anxiety and may not robustly predict treatment response, warranting larger and more comprehensive GWASs to develop PRSs that can be reliably utilized in clinical practice. Nonetheless, the breadth of the PRS associations with diverse clinical metrics observed in our study, particularly with an objective measure like PEth, suggests that this genetic marker may have a significant impact on the pharmacological response to OSU6162, supporting the need for biological validations of the SNP's putative functional role.

Additional limitations need to be acknowledged in our study. Firstly, the analysis was conducted on a relatively small cohort of individuals (N=56), mostly of European ancestry. Consequently, the generalizability of our results to populations with diverse genetic backgrounds may be limited, highlighting the need for validation in larger and more diverse patient cohorts. Secondly, the retrospective design of our study is characteristic of early research in the field of personalized medicine for AD, where studies often retrospectively examine pharmacogenetic moderators, typically candidate SNPs, yielding results that have not been consistently replicable (Lohoff, 2020). Indeed, the retrospective approach has been shown to be a major limitation, as evidenced by pharmacogenetic biomarkers that appeared promising but later failed to demonstrate predictive power in prospective studies—such as those involving a functional SNP in the *OPRM1* gene (Anton et al., 2008; Oroszi et al., 2009; Oslin et al., 2003; Oslin et al., 2015). This underscores the imperative for prospective research to substantiate the predictive validity of genetic markers for treatment responses to interventions like OSU6162. Thirdly, our research focused solely on PRS as the predictor of treatment response, without incorporating the multiomics approaches that have been increasingly recognized as pivotal in advancing precision medicine for various diseases including asthma, cancer, infectious diseases, and metabolic disorders (Ayton et al., 2022; Hu and Jia, 2021; Logotheti et al., 2021; Ward et al., 2021). To date, only a limited number of studies have employed an omics-based strategy in AD treatment research. Notably, targeted metabolomics has been used to assess the treatment response to acamprosate, offering valuable preliminary insights (Hinton et al., 2017; Nam et al., 2015). For example, it has been shown that elevated baseline glutamate levels could predict a favorable response to acamprosate (Nam et al., 2015). Therefore, there is a compelling case for expanding precision medicine initiatives in AD to include pharmacomultiomics, aiming to uncover a broader spectrum of molecular biosignatures that could enhance the prediction of treatment outcomes.

In conclusion, although the findings of the present study are preliminary, they indicate the potential role of anxiety PRS in optimizing the use of monoaminergic stabilizers like OSU6162 for the management of alcohol use disorders. Larger clinical trials of such compounds are warranted, aiming to evaluate more comprehensive genetic data, including additional biological markers, to identify treatment responders and shed light on therapeutic mechanisms.

Additional information

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

We thank Pia Steensland and late Dr. Arvid Carlsson for their pioneering work, research contributions and inspiring discussions on OSU6162 that led to the present study. We also thank the Million Veteran Program (MVP) staff, researchers, and volunteers, who have contributed to MVP (Gaziano et al., 2016), and especially participants who previously served their country in the military and now generously agreed to enroll in the study. This research is based on data from the Million Veteran Program, Office of Research and Development, Veterans Health Administration, and was supported by the Veterans Administration (VA) Million Veteran Program (MVP) award #000 (dbGAP study accession phs001672). Support by the National Bioinformatics Infrastructure Sweden (NBIS) is also gratefully acknowledged. The computations were enabled by resources provided by the National Academic Infrastructure for Supercomputing in Sweden (NAISS) at Uppsala Multidisciplinary Center for Advanced Computational Science (UPPMAX) partially funded by the Swedish Research Council through grant agreement no. 2022-06725. This work was also supported by the Royal Physiographic Society in Lund (42797, 2022; P.A.M.), the Åke Wiberg Foundation (M22-0059, 2022; P.A.M.), the Magnus Bergvall Foundation (2022-038, 2022; P.A.M.), the Sigurd and Elsa Golje Memorial Foundation (LA2022-0139; P.A.M.), and the Karolinska Institutet Research Grants (2022-01667, 2022; PAM). The funding sources were not involved in the study design or the decision to submit the results for publication.

Author contributions

M.H.: Investigation; methodology; writing—review and editing. L.K.: Methodology; project administration; writing—review and editing. J.G.: Methodology; project administration; writing—review and editing. J.F.: Methodology; funding acquisition; project administration; resources; writing—review and editing. N.J.: Methodology; funding acquisition; project administration; resources; writing—review and editing. P.A.M.: Conceptualization; funding acquisition; methodology; project administration; resources; supervision; writing—original draft. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

References

- Anton, R.F., Oroszi, G., O'Malley, S., Couper, D., Swift, R., Pettinati, H., Goldman, D., 2008. An evaluation of mu-opioid receptor (OPRM1) as a predictor of naltrexone response in the treatment of alcohol dependence: results from the Combined Pharmacotherapies and Behavioral Interventions for Alcohol Dependence (COMBINE) study. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 65(2), 135-144.
- Ayton, S.G., Pavlicova, M., Robles-Espinoza, C.D., Tamez Pena, J.G., Trevino, V., 2022. Multiomics subtyping for clinically prognostic cancer subtypes and personalized therapy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Genet Med* 24(1), 15-25.
- Belujon, P., Grace, A.A., 2017. Dopamine System Dysregulation in Major Depressive Disorders. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 20(12), 1036-1046.
- Biernacka, J.M., Coombes, B.J., Batzler, A., Ho, A.M., Geske, J.R., Frank, J., Hodgkinson, C., Skime, M., Colby, C., Zillich, L., Pozsonyiova, S., Ho, M.F., Kiefer, F., Rietschel, M., Weinshilboum, R., O'Malley, S.S., Mann, K., Anton, R., Goldman, D., Karpyak, V.M., 2021. Genetic contributions to alcohol use disorder treatment outcomes: a genome-wide pharmacogenomics study. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 46(12), 2132-2139.
- Boschloo, L., Vogelzangs, N., Smit, J.H., van den Brink, W., Veltman, D.J., Beekman, A.T., Penninx, B.W., 2011. Comorbidity and risk indicators for alcohol use disorders among persons with anxiety and/or depressive disorders: findings from the Netherlands Study of Depression and Anxiety (NESDA). *J Affect Disord* 131(1-3), 233-242.
- Burns, L., Teesson, M., 2002. Alcohol use disorders comorbid with anxiety, depression and drug use disorders. Findings from the Australian National Survey of Mental Health and Well Being. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 68(3), 299-307.
- Burstein, E.S., Carlsson, M.L., Owens, M., Ma, J.N., Schiffer, H.H., Carlsson, A., Hacksell, U., 2011. II. In vitro evidence that (-)-OSU6162 and (+)-OSU6162 produce their behavioral effects through 5-HT_{2A} serotonin and D₂ dopamine receptors. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)* 118(11), 1523-1533.
- Carlsson, M.L., Burstein, E.S., Kloborg, A., Hansson, S., Schedwin, A., Nilsson, M., Rung, J.P., Carlsson, A., 2011. I. In vivo evidence for partial agonist effects of (-)-OSU6162 and (+)-OSU6162 on 5-HT_{2A} serotonin receptors. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)* 118(11), 1511-1522.
- Choi, S.W., O'Reilly, P.F., 2019. PRSice-2: Polygenic Risk Score Software for Biobank-Scale Data. *GigaScience* 8(7), giz082.
- DeGroot, S.R., Zhao-Shea, R., Chung, L., Klenowski, P.M., Sun, F., Molas, S., Gardner, P.D., Li, Y., Tapper, A.R., 2020. Midbrain Dopamine Controls Anxiety-like Behavior by Engaging Unique Interpeduncular Nucleus Microcircuitry. *Biol Psychiatry* 88(11), 855-866.
- Dyhring, T., Nielsen, E.O., Sonesson, C., Pettersson, F., Karlsson, J., Svensson, P., Christophersen, P., Waters, N., 2010. The dopaminergic stabilizers pridopidine (ACR16) and (-)-OSU6162 display dopamine D₂ receptor antagonism and fast receptor dissociation properties. *Eur J Pharmacol* 628(1-3), 19-26.
- Feltmann, K., Fredriksson, I., Wirf, M., Schilström, B., Steensland, P., 2016. The monoamine stabilizer (-)-OSU6162 counteracts downregulated dopamine output in the nucleus accumbens of long-term drinking Wistar rats. *Addict Biol* 21(2), 438-449.
- Flannery, B.A., Volpicelli, J.R., Pettinati, H.M., 1999. Psychometric properties of the Penn Alcohol Craving Scale. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 23(8), 1289-1295.

- Fredriksson, I., Wirf, M., Steensland, P., 2019. The monoamine stabilizer (-)-OSU6162 prevents the alcohol deprivation effect and improves motor impulsive behavior in rats. *Addict Biol* 24(3), 471-484.
- Gaziano, J.M., Concato, J., Brophy, M., Fiore, L., Pyarajan, S., Breeling, J., Whitbourne, S., Deen, J., Shannon, C., Humphries, D., Guarino, P., Aslan, M., Anderson, D., LaFleur, R., Hammond, T., Schaa, K., Moser, J., Huang, G., Muralidhar, S., Przygodzki, R., O'Leary, T.J., 2016. Million Veteran Program: A mega-biobank to study genetic influences on health and disease. *J Clin Epidemiol* 70, 214-223.
- Grant, B.F., Chou, S.P., Saha, T.D., Pickering, R.P., Kerridge, B.T., Ruan, W.J., Huang, B., Jung, J., Zhang, H., Fan, A., Hasin, D.S., 2017. Prevalence of 12-Month Alcohol Use, High-Risk Drinking, and DSM-IV Alcohol Use Disorder in the United States, 2001-2002 to 2012-2013: Results From the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *JAMA Psychiatry* 74(9), 911-923.
- Grant, B.F., Goldstein, R.B., Saha, T.D., Chou, S.P., Jung, J., Zhang, H., Pickering, R.P., Ruan, W.J., Smith, S.M., Huang, B., Hasin, D.S., 2015. Epidemiology of DSM-5 Alcohol Use Disorder: Results From the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions III. *JAMA Psychiatry* 72(8), 757-766.
- Hammarberg, A., Jayaram-Lindstrom, N., Beck, O., Franck, J., Reid, M.S., 2009. The effects of acamprosate on alcohol-cue reactivity and alcohol priming in dependent patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 205(1), 53-62.
- Hinton, D.J., Vazquez, M.S., Geske, J.R., Hitschfeld, M.J., Ho, A.M.C., Karpyak, V.M., Biernacka, J.M., Choi, D.S., 2017. Metabolomics biomarkers to predict acamprosate treatment response in alcohol-dependent subjects. *Sci Rep* 7(1), 2496.
- Howard, D.M., Adams, M.J., Clarke, T.K., Hafferty, J.D., Gibson, J., Shiralil, M., Coleman, J.R.I., Hagenaars, S.P., Ward, J., Wigmore, E.M., Alloza, C., Shen, X., Barbu, M.C., Xu, E.Y., Whalley, H.C., Marioni, R.E., Porteous, D.J., Davies, G., Deary, I.J., Hemani, G., Berger, K., Teismann, H., Rawal, R., Arolt, V., Baune, B.T., Dannlowski, U., Domschke, K., Tian, C., Hinds, D.A., and Me Research, T., Major Depressive Disorder Working Group of the Psychiatric Genomics, C., Trzaskowski, M., Byrne, E.M., Ripke, S., Smith, D.J., Sullivan, P.F., Wray, N.R., Breen, G., Lewis, C.M., McIntosh, A.M., 2019. Genome-wide meta-analysis of depression identifies 102 independent variants and highlights the importance of the prefrontal brain regions. *Nat Neurosci* 22(3), 343-352.
- Hu, C., Jia, W., 2021. Multi-omics profiling: the way towards precision medicine in metabolic diseases. *J Mol Cell Biol*.
- Khemiri, L., Steensland, P., Guterstam, J., Beck, O., Carlsson, A., Franck, J., Jayaram-Lindstrom, N., 2015. The effects of the monoamine stabilizer (-)-OSU6162 on craving in alcohol dependent individuals: A human laboratory study. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 25(12), 2240-2251.
- Khemiri, L., Steensland, P., Guterstam, J., de Manzano, O., Franck, J., Jayaram-Lindstrom, N., 2019. Effects of the monoamine stabilizer (-)-OSU6162 on cognitive function in alcohol dependence. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*.
- Kranzler, H.R., Zhou, H., Kember, R.L., Vickers Smith, R., Justice, A.C., Damrauer, S., Tsao, P.S., Klarin, D., Baras, A., Reid, J., Overton, J., Rader, D.J., Cheng, Z., Tate, J.P., Becker, W.C., Concato, J., Xu, K., Polimanti, R., Zhao, H., Gelernter, J., 2019. Genome-wide association study of alcohol consumption and use disorder in 274,424 individuals from multiple populations. *Nat Commun* 10(1), 1499.

- Lawther, A.J., Hale, M.W., Lowry, C.A., 2020. Chapter 29 - Serotonin and the neurobiology of anxious states. *Handbook of Behavioral Neuroscience* 31, 505-520.
- Levey, D.F., Gelernter, J., Polimanti, R., Zhou, H., Cheng, Z., Aslan, M., Quaden, R., Concato, J., Radhakrishnan, K., Bryois, J., Sullivan, P.F., Million Veteran, P., Stein, M.B., 2020. Reproducible Genetic Risk Loci for Anxiety: Results From approximately 200,000 Participants in the Million Veteran Program. *Am J Psychiatry* 177(3), 223-232.
- Logotheti, M., Agioutantis, P., Katsaounou, P., Loutrari, H., 2021. Microbiome Research and Multi-Omics Integration for Personalized Medicine in Asthma. *J Pers Med* 11(12).
- Lohoff, F.W., 2020. Pharmacotherapies and personalized medicine for alcohol use disorder: a review. *Pharmacogenomics* 21(15), 1117-1138.
- Love, A., James, D., Willner, P., 1998. A comparison of two alcohol craving questionnaires. *Addiction* 93(7), 1091-1102.
- Mark, T.L., Kassed, C.A., Vandivort-Warren, R., Levit, K.R., Kranzler, H.R., 2009. Alcohol and opioid dependence medications: prescription trends, overall and by physician specialty. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 99(1-3), 345-349.
- Melas, P.A., Wirf, M., Andre, H., Jayaram-Lindstrom, N., Mathe, A.A., Steensland, P., 2021. The monoamine stabilizer OSU6162 has anxiolytic-like properties and reduces voluntary alcohol intake in a genetic rat model of depression. *Sci Rep* 11(1), 11856.
- Nam, H.W., Karpyak, V.M., Hinton, D.J., Geske, J.R., Ho, A.M., Prieto, M.L., Biernacka, J.M., Frye, M.A., Weinshilboum, R.M., Choi, D.S., 2015. Elevated baseline serum glutamate as a pharmacometabolomic biomarker for acamprosate treatment outcome in alcohol-dependent subjects. *Transl Psychiatry* 5, e621.
- Oroszi, G., Anton, R.F., O'Malley, S., Swift, R., Pettinati, H., Couper, D., Yuan, Q., Goldman, D., 2009. OPRM1 Asn40Asp predicts response to naltrexone treatment: a haplotype-based approach. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 33(3), 383-393.
- Oslin, D.W., Berrettini, W., Kranzler, H.R., Pettinati, H., Gelernter, J., Volpicelli, J.R., O'Brien, C.P., 2003. A functional polymorphism of the mu-opioid receptor gene is associated with naltrexone response in alcohol-dependent patients. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 28(8), 1546-1552.
- Oslin, D.W., Leong, S.H., Lynch, K.G., Berrettini, W., O'Brien, C.P., Gordon, A.J., Rukstalis, M., 2015. Naltrexone vs Placebo for the Treatment of Alcohol Dependence: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry* 72(5), 430-437.
- Otowa, T., Hek, K., Lee, M., Byrne, E.M., Mirza, S.S., Nivard, M.G., Bigdeli, T., Aggen, S.H., Adkins, D., Wolen, A., Fanous, A., Keller, M.C., Castelao, E., Kutalik, Z., Van der Auwera, S., Homuth, G., Nauck, M., Teumer, A., Milaneschi, Y., Hottenga, J.J., Direk, N., Hofman, A., Uitterlinden, A., Mulder, C.L., Henders, A.K., Medland, S.E., Gordon, S., Heath, A.C., Madden, P.A., Pergadia, M.L., van der Most, P.J., Nolte, I.M., van Oort, F.V., Hartman, C.A., Oldehinkel, A.J., Preisig, M., Grabe, H.J., Middeldorp, C.M., Penninx, B.W., Boomsma, D., Martin, N.G., Montgomery, G., Maher, B.S., van den Oord, E.J., Wray, N.R., Tiemeier, H., Hettema, J.M., 2016. Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies of anxiety disorders. *Mol Psychiatry* 21(10), 1391-1399.
- Rosner, S., Hackl-Herrwerth, A., Leucht, S., Lehert, P., Vecchi, S., Soyka, M., 2010a. Acamprosate for alcohol dependence. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*(9), CD004332.
- Rosner, S., Hackl-Herrwerth, A., Leucht, S., Vecchi, S., Srisurapanont, M., Soyka, M., 2010b. Opioid antagonists for alcohol dependence. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*(12), CD001867.

Rubinsky, A.D., Chen, C., Batki, S.L., Williams, E.C., Harris, A.H., 2015. Comparative utilization of pharmacotherapy for alcohol use disorder and other psychiatric disorders among U.S. Veterans Health Administration patients with dual diagnoses. *J Psychiatr Res* 69, 150-157.

Rung, J.P., Rung, E., Helgeson, L., Johansson, A.M., Svensson, K., Carlsson, A., Carlsson, M.L., 2008. Effects of (-)-OSU6162 and ACR16 on motor activity in rats, indicating a unique mechanism of dopaminergic stabilization. *J Neural Transm (Vienna)* 115(6), 899-908.

Sari, Y., Johnson, V.R., Weedman, J.M., 2011. Role of the serotonergic system in alcohol dependence: from animal models to clinics. *Prog Mol Biol Transl Sci* 98, 401-443.

Saunders, G.R.B., Wang, X., Chen, F., Jang, S.K., Liu, M., Wang, C., Gao, S., Jiang, Y., Khunsriraksakul, C., Otto, J.M., Addison, C., Akiyama, M., Albert, C.M., Aliev, F., Alonso, A., Arnett, D.K., Ashley-Koch, A.E., Ashrani, A.A., Barnes, K.C., Barr, R.G., Bartz, T.M., Becker, D.M., Bielak, L.F., Benjamin, E.J., Bis, J.C., Bjornsdottir, G., Blangero, J., Bleecker, E.R., Boardman, J.D., Boerwinkle, E., Boomsma, D.I., Boorgula, M.P., Bowden, D.W., Brody, J.A., Cade, B.E., Chasman, D.I., Chavan, S., Chen, Y.I., Chen, Z., Cheng, I., Cho, M.H., Choquet, H., Cole, J.W., Cornelis, M.C., Cucca, F., Curran, J.E., de Andrade, M., Dick, D.M., Docherty, A.R., Duggirala, R., Eaton, C.B., Ehringer, M.A., Esko, T., Faul, J.D., Fernandes Silva, L., Fiorillo, E., Fornage, M., Freedman, B.I., Gabrielsen, M.E., Garrett, M.E., Gharib, S.A., Gieger, C., Gillespie, N., Glahn, D.C., Gordon, S.D., Gu, C.C., Gu, D., Gudbjartsson, D.F., Guo, X., Haessler, J., Hall, M.E., Haller, T., Harris, K.M., He, J., Herd, P., Hewitt, J.K., Hickie, I., Hidalgo, B., Hokanson, J.E., Hopfer, C., Hottenga, J., Hou, L., Huang, H., Hung, Y.J., Hunter, D.J., Hveem, K., Hwang, S.J., Hwu, C.M., Iacono, W., Irvin, M.R., Jee, Y.H., Johnson, E.O., Joo, Y.Y., Jorgenson, E., Justice, A.E., Kamatani, Y., Kaplan, R.C., Kaprio, J., Kardia, S.L.R., Keller, M.C., Kelly, T.N., Kooperberg, C., Korhonen, T., Kraft, P., Krauter, K., Kuusisto, J., Laakso, M., Lasky-Su, J., Lee, W.J., Lee, J.J., Levy, D., Li, L., Li, K., Li, Y., Lin, K., Lind, P.A., Liu, C., Lloyd-Jones, D.M., Lutz, S.M., Ma, J., Magi, R., Manichaikul, A., Martin, N.G., Mathur, R., Matoba, N., McArdle, P.F., McGue, M., McQueen, M.B., Medland, S.E., Metspalu, A., Meyers, D.A., Millwood, I.Y., Mitchell, B.D., Mohlke, K.L., Moll, M., Montasser, M.E., Morrison, A.C., Mulas, A., Nielsen, J.B., North, K.E., Oelsner, E.C., Okada, Y., Orru, V., Palmer, N.D., Palviainen, T., Pandit, A., Park, S.L., Peters, U., Peters, A., Peyser, P.A., Polderman, T.J.C., Rafaels, N., Redline, S., Reed, R.M., Reiner, A.P., Rice, J.P., Rich, S.S., Richmond, N.E., Roan, C., Rotter, J.I., Rueschman, M.N., Runarsdottir, V., Saccone, N.L., Schwartz, D.A., Shadyab, A.H., Shi, J., Shringarpure, S.S., Sicinski, K., Skogholt, A.H., Smith, J.A., Smith, N.L., Sotoodehnia, N., Stallings, M.C., Stefansson, H., Stefansson, K., Stitzel, J.A., Sun, X., Syed, M., Tal-Singer, R., Taylor, A.E., Taylor, K.D., Telen, M.J., Thai, K.K., Tiwari, H., Turman, C., Tyrfingsson, T., Wall, T.L., Walters, R.G., Weir, D.R., Weiss, S.T., White, W.B., Whitfield, J.B., Wiggins, K.L., Willemsen, G., Willer, C.J., Winsvold, B.S., Xu, H., Yanek, L.R., Yin, J., Young, K.L., Young, K.A., Yu, B., Zhao, W., Zhou, W., Zollner, S., Zuccolo, L., and Me Research, T., Biobank Japan, P., Batini, C., Bergen, A.W., Bierut, L.J., David, S.P., Gagliano Taliun, S.A., Hancock, D.B., Jiang, B., Munafo, M.R., Thorgeirsson, T.E., Liu, D.J., Vrieze, S., 2022. Genetic diversity fuels gene discovery for tobacco and alcohol use. *Nature* 612(7941), 720-724.

Sobell, L.C., Sobell, M.B., 1992. *Timeline Follow-Back*. Humana Press, Totowa, NJ.

Soderpalm, B., Ericson, M., 2013. Neurocircuitry involved in the development of alcohol addiction: the dopamine system and its access points. *Curr Top Behav Neurosci* 13, 127-161.

Srisurapanont, M., Jarusuraisin, N., 2005. Opioid antagonists for alcohol dependence. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*(1), CD001867.

- Steensland, P., Fredriksson, I., Holst, S., Feltmann, K., Franck, J., Schilström, B., Carlsson, A., 2012. The monoamine stabilizer (-)-OSU6162 attenuates voluntary ethanol intake and ethanol-induced dopamine output in nucleus accumbens. *Biol Psychiatry* 72(10), 823-831.
- Svanborg, P., Asberg, M., 2001. A comparison between the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and the self-rating version of the Montgomery Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS). *J Affect Disord* 64(2-3), 203-216.
- Tedroff, J., Torstenson, R., Hartvig, P., Sonesson, C., Waters, N., Carlsson, A., Neu, H., Fasth, K.J., Langström, B., 1998. Effects of the substituted (S)-3-phenylpiperidine (-)-OSU6162 on PET measurements in subhuman primates: evidence for tone-dependent normalization of striatal dopaminergic activity. *Synapse* 28(4), 280-287.
- Tolboom, N., Berendse, H.W., Leysen, J.E., Yaqub, M., van Berckel, B.N., Schuit, R.C., Ponsen, M.M., Bakker, E., Hoetjes, N.J., Windhorst, A.D., Carlsson, M.L., Lammertsma, A.A., Carlsson, A., 2015. The dopamine stabilizer (-)-OSU6162 occupies a subpopulation of striatal dopamine D2/D3 receptors: an [(11)C]raclopride PET study in healthy human subjects. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 40(2), 472-479.
- Turner, S., Mota, N., Bolton, J., Sareen, J., 2018. Self-medication with alcohol or drugs for mood and anxiety disorders: A narrative review of the epidemiological literature. *Depress Anxiety* 35(9), 851-860.
- Virtanen, S., Kuja-Halkola, R., Mataix-Cols, D., Jayaram-Lindström, N., D'Onofrio, B.M., Larsson, H., Ruck, C., Suvisaari, J., Lichtenstein, P., Latvala, A., 2020. Comorbidity of substance misuse with anxiety-related and depressive disorders: a genetically informative population study of 3 million individuals in Sweden. *Psychol Med* 50(10), 1706-1715.
- Ward, R.A., Aghaepour, N., Bhattacharyya, R.P., Clish, C.B., Gaudilliere, B., Hacohen, N., Mansour, M.K., Mudd, P.A., Pasupneti, S., Presti, R.M., Rhee, E.P., Sen, P., Spec, A., Tam, J.M., Villani, A.C., Woolley, A.E., Hsu, J.L., Vyas, J.M., 2021. Harnessing the Potential of Multiomics Studies for Precision Medicine in Infectious Disease. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 8(11), ofab483.
- Zhou, H., Sealock, J.M., Sanchez-Roige, S., Clarke, T.K., Levey, D.F., Cheng, Z., Li, B., Polimanti, R., Kember, R.L., Smith, R.V., Thygesen, J.H., Morgan, M.Y., Atkinson, S.R., Thursz, M.R., Nyegaard, M., Mattheisen, M., Borglum, A.D., Johnson, E.C., Justice, A.C., Palmer, A.A., McQuillin, A., Davis, L.K., Edenberg, H.J., Agrawal, A., Kranzler, H.R., Gelernter, J., 2020. Genome-wide meta-analysis of problematic alcohol use in 435,563 individuals yields insights into biology and relationships with other traits. *Nat Neurosci* 23(7), 809-818.