Published in final edited form as:

Psychiatry Res. 2013 June 30; 208(1): 62–66. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2013.03.011.

Case-control association study of *WLS* variants in opioid and cocaine addicted populations

Richard C. Crist^{a,*}, Lisa M. Ambrose-Lanci^a, Angela Zeng^a, Cindy Yuan^a, Kyle M. Kampman^b, Helen M. Pettinati^b, David W. Oslin^{b,c}, Charles P. O'Brien^b, Thomas N. Ferraro^a, Glenn A. Doyle^a, Falk W. Lohoff^a, and Wade H. Berrettini^a

^aCenter for Neurobiology and Behavior, Department of Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, 19104

^bTreatment Research Center, Department of Psychiatry, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, 19104

^cVA Medical Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, 19104

Abstract

The opioid receptor family is involved in the development and maintenance of drug addiction. The mu-opioid receptor (MOR) mediates the rewarding effects of multiple drugs, including opiates and cocaine. A number of proteins interact with MOR, potentially modulating MOR function and altering the physiological consequences of drug use. These mu-opioid receptor interacting proteins (MORIPs) are potential therapeutic targets for the treatment of addiction. The Wntless (*WLS*) protein was recently identified as a MORIP in a yeast two-hybrid screen. In this study, we conducted a case-control association analysis of 16 *WLS* genetic variants in opioid and cocaine addicted individuals of both African-American (opioid *n*=336, cocaine *n*=908) and European-American (opioid *n*=335, cocaine *n*=336) ancestry. Of the analyzed SNPs, 3 were nominally associated with opioid addiction and 4 were nominally associated with cocaine addiction. None of these associations were significant following multiple testing correction. These data suggest that the common variants of *WLS* analyzed in this study are not associated with opioid or cocaine addiction. However, this study does not exclude the possibilities that rare variants in *WLS* may affect susceptibility to drug addiction, or that common variants with small effect size may fall below the detection level of our analysis.

Keywords

drug addiction; cocaine addiction; opioid addiction; genetics

1. Introduction

In 2009, an estimated 1.1 million individuals in the United States were either addicted to cocaine or currently abusing the drug. An additional 399,000 people were addicted to or

© 2013 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

Corresponding Author: Richard C. Crist, Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, Center for Neurobiology and Behavior, Translational Research Laboratories, 125 South 31st Street, Room 2109, Philadelphia, PA 19104, Office: (215) 746-3665, Fax: (215) 573-2041, crist@mail.med.upenn.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

abusing opiates, including heroin (<http://www.oas.samhsa.gov>, 2010). Susceptibility to drug addiction is a multifactorial trait, combining both genetic and environmental factors. Twin studies have indicated that genetic factors explain 30–50% of susceptibility to both cocaine and opioid addiction (Arvidsson et al., 1995; Karkowski et al., 2000; Kendler et al., 2003; Kendler et al., 2000; Kendler and Prescott, 1998; Merikangas et al., 1998; Tsuang et al., 1998; Zhang et al., 2006). Identification of genetic variants increasing risk for drug abuse and addiction would help assess individual risk and produce new therapeutic targets. However, discovery of relevant genes affecting susceptibility has proven difficult due to the polygenic nature of these phenotypes (Wong and Schumann, 2008).

A number of studies on drug addiction have focused on genes encoding opioid receptors (Becker et al., 2002; Hall et al., 2004; Hummel et al., 2006; Matthes et al., 1996; Sora et al., 1997). The opioid receptor family consists of several transmembrane proteins that mediate the cellular effects of opioid ligands through the activation of G-protein signaling cascades (reviewed in (Law et al., 2000)). Most research on potential links between opioid receptors and drug addiction has focused on the mu-opioid receptor (MOR), encoded by the gene *OPRM1*. MOR mediates reward pathways upon interaction with both endogenous opioid proteins and exogenous opiates (Di Chiara and Imperato, 1988; Herz, 1998). The rewarding effects of cocaine are also mediated by MOR, potentially through the release of endogenous opioid peptides following cocaine use (Soderman and Unterwald, 2008). Agonist binding of the MOR protein results in activation of the mesolimbic dopamine system and subsequent release of dopamine (reviewed in (Le Merrer et al., 2009)). The downstream effects of dopamine release act as positive reinforcement, increasing the chance of future drug use (reviewed in (Le Merrer et al., 2009)). Despite the link between MOR and reward following drug use, association studies have failed to find consistent connections between common genetic variants of *OPRM1* and addiction to either heroin or cocaine (Bart et al., 2004; Crowley et al., 2003; Hoehe et al., 2000; Smith et al., 2005; Szeto et al., 2001; Tan et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2006).

Although polymorphisms in *OPRM1* may not alter susceptibility to drug addiction, other genes that encode proteins involved in reward pathways may still be relevant. MOR interacts with a variety of proteins that regulate the function of the opioid receptor and the downstream signaling caused by agonist binding (Milligan, 2005). These mu-opioid receptor interacting proteins (MORIPs) include opioid ligands and heterotrimeric G-proteins, which control receptor activation and downstream signaling, respectively (reviewed in (Law et al., 2004)). Other MORIPs are known to prevent activation of MOR signaling or regulate the desensitization of MOR by blocking access to specific protein-protein binding domains (Gainetdinov et al., 2004; Guang et al., 2004; Milligan et al., 2004; Onopriashvili et al., 2003). The Wntless homolog (*Drosophila*) (WLS) protein was identified as a MORIP during a yeast two-hybrid screen (Jin et al., 2010).

WLS (a.k.a GPR177) is a transmembrane protein that is required for proper shuttling of WNT ligands from the Golgi apparatus to the cell surface for secretion into the extracellular space (Banziger et al., 2006; Bartscherer et al., 2006). During morphine exposure, WLS binds to MOR and is sequestered on the cell surface (Jin et al., 2010; Reyes et al., 2010). The sequestered WLS protein is unable to shuttle between the Golgi and the cell surface, resulting in decreased WNT secretion (Jin et al., 2010). We performed a case-control association analysis to determine if common variants in the *WLS* gene were associated with opioid or cocaine addiction in African-American and European-American populations.

2. Methods

2.1. Population Information

2.1.1. Cases—DNA samples were requested and acquired through the NIDA Center for Genetic Studies in conjunction with Washington University and Rutgers University Cell & DNA Repository. Opioid addicted (European-American: n=335, male 63.3%; African-American: n=336, male 71.4%) and cocaine addicted subjects (European-American: n=336; male 50.3%) met DSM-IV criteria for dependence. DNA samples from African-American cocaine addicted subjects (n=908, male 66.7%) were collected during clinical studies for cocaine addiction treatment at the University of Pennsylvania Treatment Research Center as previously described (Crist et al., 2012). All protocols were approved by the Institutional Review Boards at the University of Pennsylvania. All subjects provided written informed consent before blood sample collection.

2.1.2. Controls—European-American control individuals (n=656; male=50.8%) and African-American control individuals (n=671; male= 38.6%) were acquired from the National Institute of Mental Health Genetics Initiative (NIMH-GI) (www.nimhgenetics.org). Control subjects were screened for adult psychiatric diseases using a modified version of the Composite International Diagnostic Interview – Short Form (CIDI-SF). Individuals who self-identified as having an axis-I psychiatric disorder were excluded from this study.

2.2. Genotyping

SNPs were selected using the Tagger algorithm as part of Haploview software (<http://www.broadinstitute.org/haploview>) (Barrett et al., 2005). HapMap data from the CEU population (Hapmap data release 28 phase II & III, August 10, www.hapmap.org) and ASW population (Hapmap data phase III/rel#2 Feb09) was used to identify tag SNPs with an r^2 of 0.8 and a minor allele frequency cut-off of 9% and 5.7%, respectively. The cut-off was lowered in the African-American population to include rs2820487, which was previously associated with substance dependence (Drgon et al., 2010). The boundaries of the WLS gene for SNP selection were defined as 68,615,965 bp – 68,659,904 bp on chromosome 1, which includes both the 3' and 5' UTR's but not the promoter region. At these frequency cut-offs, 13 SNPs captured 39% of alleles in the European-American population and 8 SNPs captured 8% of alleles in the African-American population. rs2033349 and rs2772297 were genotyped but not used in the coverage calculation as they are not part of the HapMap dataset. SNP genotyping was performed and analyzed as previously described (Crist et al., 2012). The number of cases and controls with each genotype are included in Supplementary Tables 1 and 2

2.3 Statistical Analysis

The allelic and genotypic associations of SNPs with opioid and cocaine addiction were determined using the Chi-square test in the software package PLINK v1.07 (Purcell et al., 2007). For each SNP, deviation from Hardy-Weinberg was assessed in the total population and also in cases and controls individually. All SNPs were in Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium in both cases and controls. Sliding window haplotype analysis was performed in PLINK using the expectation maximization algorithm included in the software packages (data not shown). Minor allele frequencies and the frequencies of all three genotypic groups were compared between cases and ethnicity-matched controls by χ^2 test for all SNPs. Sex was used as a covariate in all association analyses. P-values for all analyses were corrected for multiple testing using the false discovery rate (FDR) procedure (Benjamini et al., 2001). The FDR procedure allows control of the average fraction of false rejections made out of the number of false rejections performed. The cut-off for statistical significance for this study was $p = 0.05$ after FDR correction. Power to detect significant associations was calculated

using Quanto Version 1.2.4 (Gauderman, 2006). In the cocaine addicted African-American population, the average power to detect an association was ~76% and ~100% for associations with odds ratios of 1.3 and 1.5, respectively. In all other addicted populations, the average power to detect an association was ~42% and ~90%, respectively. Power calculations for all populations using an additive model are included in Supplemental Tables 3 and 4. The power to detect associations in dominant and recessive models was lower than the additive model (data not shown).

3. Results

Three SNPs were found to have nominally significant associations between their allelic or genotypic frequencies and cocaine addiction (Tables 1 and 2). rs1367444 (allelic $p=0.024$, genotypic $p=0.011$), rs1430753 (allelic $p=0.020$), and rs2183269 (allelic $p=0.047$) were nominally associated in European-Americans. In the African-American population, rs1337406 (genotypic $p=0.043$) was nominally associated with cocaine addiction. None of these associations were statistically significant ($p<0.05$) following FDR correction for multiple testing.

Nominally significant associations were also found between an additional 3 SNPs and opioid addiction (Tables 1 and 2). In the African-American population, rs3748705 (allelic $p=0.025$) was associated with addiction. rs983034 and rs1036066 (allelic $p=0.043$; genotypic $p=0.045$) were associated in the European-American population. None of these SNPs were significant after FDR correction for multiple testing.

No significant haplotypes were identified in African-Americans or European-Americans for either cocaine or opioid addiction (data not shown).

4. Discussion

The rewarding effect of drug use is one of the underlying causes leading to abuse and addiction (reviewed in (Le Merrer et al., 2009)). MOR is one of the primary mediators of this effect, activating dopamine release in response to both cocaine and opioid use (Di Chiara and Imperato, 1988; Herz, 1998). MOR antagonists, such as naltrexone and naloxone, have been shown to reduce the rewarding effects of drug use and are currently used to treat addiction to a variety of different drugs (reviewed in (Goodman et al., 2007)). Polymorphisms in the *OPRM1* gene may modulate the ability of MOR to activate downstream signaling, potentially explaining some of the variability in drug addiction susceptibility. Association studies of *OPRM1* in opioid and cocaine addiction, however, have produced conflicting data and highlight the need for further research on the subject (Bart et al., 2004; Crowley et al., 2003; Hoehe et al., 2000; Smith et al., 2005; Szeto et al., 2001; Tan et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2006). Although the role of *OPRM1* genetic variation in drug dependence is unclear, variants in other genes that regulate reward pathways may still affect susceptibility to addiction. MORIPs, such as WLS, have the potential to alter MOR function through direct interactions with the MOR protein. Genetic variants in genes encoding MORIPs, therefore, may affect susceptibility to drug addiction in subsections of the population. In support of this hypothesis, a SNP in the *WLS* gene (rs2820487) was previously found to be significantly associated with polysubstance abuse in a genome-wide association study of African-American patients (Drgon et al., 2010). Despite this previous association, rs2820487 was not associated with either opioid or cocaine addiction in our analysis.

The present study analyzes 16 SNPs in the *WLS* gene and is the first association study to focus on *WLS* and drug addiction. SNPs were genotyped in cocaine and opioid addicted European-American and African-American individuals, as well as control populations for

both ethnicities. 7 SNPs were found to be nominally significant ($p < 0.05$) in the initial Chi-squared analysis; however, none of these SNPs were statistically significant following FDR correction for multiple testing. These data suggest that the common variants tested are not associated with risk for cocaine or opioid addiction. However, there are several caveats to this study that suggest that more research on the role of *WLS* may be warranted. Rare variants, which have an increased chance of producing a severe phenotype, would not have been tagged by the common variants genotyped in this study. Incomplete coverage across the gene, particularly in the African-American population, may have also resulted in common risk variants not being tagged. It is also possible that the common variants tested here had effects sizes that were too small to detect given the power of this study. In addition, epigenetic variations and copy number variations may also affect gene function, although there are no known copy number variations within *WLS* (Database of Genomic Variants, <http://projects.tcag.ca/variation>). Population stratification may also be a confounding variable in these analyses, since samples were not genotyped with ancestry informative markers. Future studies are certainly needed to more fully determine the role of *WLS* in susceptibility to drug addiction, but may not be warranted unless a larger number of cases can be genotyped to improve statistical power. In the cocaine addicted European-American population and both opioid addicted populations in our study, the average power to detect an association with an odds ratio of 1.3 was only 42% (Supplementary Table 4). A ~3-fold increase in the number of cases would improve that average power to more than 75%. Given the coverage issues in our study, genotyping other genes encoding MORIPs may also be an alternative to further study of *WLS*, particularly if the other genes contain a smaller number of haplotype blocks than *WLS*.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge NIDA's Center for Genetic Studies in conjunction with Washington University and Rutgers University Cell & DNA Repository for providing DNA samples collected from the following studies and investigators: *Opioid Samples*: Addictions: Genotypes, Polymorphisms and Function, Mary Jeanne Kreek, M.D.; Genetics of Opioid Dependence, Joel Gelernter, M.D., Kathleen Brady, M.D., Ph.D., Henry Kranzler, M.D., Roger Weiss, M.D.; Opioid Dependence, Wade Berrettini, M.D., Ph.D. *Cocaine Samples*: An Introduction to the Family Study of Cocaine Dependence, Laura Bierut, M.D.; Genetics of Cocaine Induced Psychosis, Joseph F Cubells, M.D., Ph.D. The NIMH control subjects were collected by the NIMH Schizophrenia Genetics Initiative 'Molecular Genetics of Schizophrenia II' (MGS-2) collaboration. The investigators and co-investigators are: ENH/ Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, MH059571, Pablo V. Gejman, M.D. (Collaboration Coordinator; PI), Alan R. Sanders, M.D.; Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, MH59587, Farooq Amin, M.D. (PI); Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center; New Orleans, Louisiana, MH067257, Nancy Buccola APRN, BC, MSN (PI); University of California-Irvine, Irvine, CA, MH60870, William Byerley, M.D. (PI); Washington University, St. Louis, MO, U01, MH060879, C. Robert Cloninger, M.D. (PI); University of Iowa, Iowa, IA, MH59566, Raymond Crowe, M.D. (PI), Donald Black, M.D.; University of Colorado, Denver, CO, MH059565, Robert Freedman, M.D. (PI); University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, MH061675, Douglas Levinson M.D. (PI); University of Queensland, Queensland, Australia, MH059588, Bryan Mowry, M.D. (PI); Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, New York, NY, MH59586, Jeremy Silverman, Ph.D. (PI).

References

- Arvidsson U, Riedl M, Chakrabarti S, Lee JH, Nakano AH, Dado RJ, Loh HH, Law PY, Wessendorf MW, Elde R. Distribution and targeting of a mu-opioid receptor (MOR1) in brain and spinal cord. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 1995; 15:3328–3341. [PubMed: 7751913]
- Banziger C, Soldini D, Schutt C, Zipperlen P, Hausmann G, Basler K. Wntless, a conserved membrane protein dedicated to the secretion of Wnt proteins from signaling cells. *Cell*. 2006; 125:509–522. [PubMed: 16678095]

- Barrett JC, Fry B, Maller J, Daly MJ. Haploview: analysis and visualization of LD and haplotype maps. *Bioinformatics*. 2005; 21:263–265. [PubMed: 15297300]
- Bart G, Heilig M, LaForge KS, Pollak L, Leal SM, Ott J, Kreek MJ. Substantial attributable risk related to a functional mu-opioid receptor gene polymorphism in association with heroin addiction in central Sweden. *Molecular Psychiatry*. 2004; 9:547–549. [PubMed: 15037869]
- Bartscherer K, Pelte N, Ingelfinger D, Boutros M. Secretion of Wnt ligands requires Evi, a conserved transmembrane protein. *Cell*. 2006; 125:523–533. [PubMed: 16678096]
- Becker A, Grecksch G, Kraus J, Loh HH, Schroeder H, Holtt V. Rewarding effects of ethanol and cocaine in mu opioid receptor-deficient mice. *Naunyn-Schmiedeberg's Archives of Pharmacology*. 2002; 365:296–302.
- Benjamini Y, Drai D, Elmer G, Kafkafi N, Golani I. Controlling the false discovery rate in behavior genetics research. *Behavioural Brain Research*. 2001; 125:279–284. [PubMed: 11682119]
- Crist RC, Ambrose-Lanci LM, Vaswani M, Clarke TK, Zeng A, Yuan C, Ferraro TN, Hakonarson H, Kampman KM, Dackis CA, Pettinati HM, O'Brien CP, Oslin DW, Doyle GA, Lohoff FW, Berrettini WH. Case-control association analysis of polymorphisms in the delta-opioid receptor, OPRD1, with cocaine and opioid addicted populations. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2012
- Crowley JJ, Oslin DW, Patkar AA, Gottheil E, DeMaria PA Jr, O'Brien CP, Berrettini WH, Grice DE. A genetic association study of the mu opioid receptor and severe opioid dependence. *Psychiatric Genetics*. 2003; 13:169–173. [PubMed: 12960749]
- Di Chiara G, Imperato A. Opposite effects of mu and kappa opiate agonists on dopamine release in the nucleus accumbens and in the dorsal caudate of freely moving rats. *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics*. 1988; 244:1067–1080. [PubMed: 2855239]
- Drgon T, Johnson CA, Nino M, Drgonova J, Walther DM, Uhl GR. "Replicated" genome wide association for dependence on illegal substances: genomic regions identified by overlapping clusters of nominally positive SNPs. *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part B: Psychiatric Genetics*. 2010; 156:125–138.
- Gainetdinov RR, Premont RT, Bohn LM, Lefkowitz RJ, Caron MG. Desensitization of G protein-coupled receptors and neuronal functions. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*. 2004; 27:107–144.
- Gauderman, WMJ. QUANTO 1.1: A computer program for power and samples size calculations for genetic-epidemiology studies. 2006. <http://hydra.usc.edu/gxe>
- Goodman AJ, Le Bourdonnec B, Dolle RE. Mu opioid receptor antagonists: recent developments. *ChemMedChem*. 2007; 2:1552–1570. [PubMed: 17918759]
- Guang W, Wang H, Su T, Weinstein IB, Wang JB. Role of mPKCI, a novel mu-opioid receptor interactive protein, in receptor desensitization, phosphorylation, and morphine-induced analgesia. *Molecular Pharmacology*. 2004; 66:1285–1292. [PubMed: 15496510]
- Hall FS, Goeb M, Li XF, Sora I, Uhl GR. mu-Opioid receptor knockout mice display reduced cocaine conditioned place preference but enhanced sensitization of cocaine-induced locomotion. *Molecular Brain Research*. 2004; 121:123–130. [PubMed: 14969743]
- Herz A. Opioid reward mechanisms: a key role in drug abuse? *Canadian Journal Physiology and Pharmacology*. 1998; 76:252–258.
- Hoehe MR, Kopke K, Wendel B, Rohde K, Flachmeier C, Kidd KK, Berrettini WH, Church GM. Sequence variability and candidate gene analysis in complex disease: association of mu opioid receptor gene variation with substance dependence. *Human Molecular Genetics*. 2000; 9:2895–2908. [PubMed: 11092766]
- Hummel M, Schroeder J, Liu-Chen LY, Cowan A, Unterwald EM. An antisense oligodeoxynucleotide to the mu opioid receptor attenuates cocaine-induced behavioral sensitization and reward in mice. *Neuroscience*. 2006; 142:481–491. [PubMed: 16893609]
- Jin J, Kittanakom S, Wong V, Reyes BA, Van Bockstaele EJ, Stagljär I, Berrettini W, Levenson R. Interaction of the mu-opioid receptor with GPR177 (Wntless) inhibits Wnt secretion: potential implications for opioid dependence. *BMC Neuroscience*. 2010; 11:33. [PubMed: 20214800]
- Karkowski LM, Prescott CA, Kendler KS. Multivariate assessment of factors influencing illicit substance use in twins from female-female pairs. *American Journal of Medical Genetics*. 2000; 96:665–670. [PubMed: 11054775]

- Kendler KS, Jacobson KC, Prescott CA, Neale MC. Specificity of genetic and environmental risk factors for use and abuse/dependence of cannabis, cocaine, hallucinogens, sedatives, stimulants, and opiates in male twins. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2003; 160:687–695. [PubMed: 12668357]
- Kendler KS, Karkowski LM, Neale MC, Prescott CA. Illicit psychoactive substance use, heavy use, abuse, and dependence in a US population-based sample of male twins. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2000; 57:261–269. [PubMed: 10711912]
- Kendler KS, Prescott CA. Cocaine use, abuse and dependence in a population-based sample of female twins. *British Journal of Psychiatry*. 1998; 173:345–350. [PubMed: 9926041]
- Law PY, Loh HH, Wei LN. Insights into the receptor transcription and signaling: implications in opioid tolerance and dependence. *Neuropharmacology*. 2004; 47(Suppl 1):300–311. [PubMed: 15464146]
- Law PY, Wong YH, Loh HH. Molecular mechanisms and regulation of opioid receptor signaling. *Annual Review of Pharmacology and Toxicology*. 2000; 40:389–430.
- Le Merrer J, Becker JA, Befort K, Kieffer BL. Reward processing by the opioid system in the brain. *Physiological Reviews*. 2009; 89:1379–1412. [PubMed: 19789384]
- Matthes HW, Maldonado R, Simonin F, Valverde O, Slowe S, Kitchen I, Befort K, Dierich A, Le Meur M, Dolle P, Tzavara E, Hanoune J, Roques BP, Kieffer BL. Loss of morphine-induced analgesia, reward effect and withdrawal symptoms in mice lacking the mu-opioid-receptor gene. *Nature*. 1996; 383:819–823. [PubMed: 8893006]
- Merikangas KR, Stolar M, Stevens DE, Goulet J, Preisig MA, Fenton B, Zhang H, O'Malley SS, Rounsaville BJ. Familial transmission of substance use disorders. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 1998; 55:973–979. [PubMed: 9819065]
- Milligan G. Opioid receptors and their interacting proteins. *Neuromolecular Medicine*. 2005; 7:51–59. [PubMed: 16052038]
- Milligan G, Murdoch H, Kellett E, White JH, Feng GJ. Interactions between G-protein-coupled receptors and periplakin: a selective means to regulate G-protein activation. *Biochemical Society Transactions*. 2004; 32:878–880. [PubMed: 15494039]
- Onoprishvili I, Andria ML, Kramer HK, Ancevska-Taneva N, Hiller JM, Simon EJ. Interaction between the mu opioid receptor and filamin A is involved in receptor regulation and trafficking. *Molecular Pharmacology*. 2003; 64:1092–1100. [PubMed: 14573758]
- Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, Thomas L, Ferreira MA, Bender D, Maller J, Sklar P, de Bakker PI, Daly MJ, Sham PC. PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses. *American Journal of Human Genetics*. 2007; 81:559–575. [PubMed: 17701901]
- Reyes AR, Levenson R, Berrettini W, Van Bockstaele EJ. Ultrastructural relationship between the mu opioid receptor and its interacting protein, GPR177, in striatal neurons. *Brain Research*. 2010; 1358:71–80. [PubMed: 20813097]
- Smith RJ, Doyle GA, Han AM, Crowley JJ, Oslin DW, Patkar AA, Mannelli P, Demaria PA Jr, O'Brien CP, Berrettini WH. Novel exonic mu-opioid receptor gene (OPRM1) polymorphisms not associated with opioid dependence. *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics*. 2005; 133B:105–109.
- Soderman AR, Unterwald EM. Cocaine reward and hyperactivity in the rat: sites of mu opioid receptor modulation. *Neuroscience*. 2008; 154:1506–1516. [PubMed: 18550291]
- Sora I, Takahashi N, Funada M, Ujike H, Revay RS, Donovan DM, Miner LL, Uhl GR. Opiate receptor knockout mice define mu receptor roles in endogenous nociceptive responses and morphine-induced analgesia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 1997; 94:1544–1549.
- Szeto CY, Tang NL, Lee DT, Stadlin A. Association between mu opioid receptor gene polymorphisms and Chinese heroin addicts. *Neuroreport*. 2001; 12:1103–1106. [PubMed: 11338173]
- Tan EC, Tan CH, Karupathivan U, Yap EP. Mu opioid receptor gene polymorphisms and heroin dependence in Asian populations. *Neuroreport*. 2003; 14:569–572. [PubMed: 12657887]
- Tsuang MT, Lyons MJ, Meyer JM, Doyle T, Eisen SA, Goldberg J, True W, Lin N, Toomey R, Eaves L. Co-occurrence of abuse of different drugs in men: the role of drug-specific and shared vulnerabilities. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 1998; 55:967–972. [PubMed: 9819064]

- Wong CC, Schumann G. Review. Genetics of addictions: strategies for addressing heterogeneity and polygenicity of substance use disorders. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2008; 363:3213–3222.
- Zhang H, Luo X, Kranzler HR, Lappalainen J, Yang BZ, Krupitsky E, Zvartau E, Gelernter J. Association between two mu-opioid receptor gene (OPRM1) haplotype blocks and drug or alcohol dependence. *Human Molecular Genetics*. 2006; 15:807–819. [PubMed: 16476706]

Table 1

χ^2 association analysis of *WLS* variants in cocaine addicted and opioid addicted African Americans and unrelated controls.

SNP	Minor Allele	Controls MAF	Cases MAF	Cocaine Addicted			Opioid Addicted			
				Allelic P-Value	Odds Ratio (CI)	Genotypic P-value	Cases MAF	Allelic P-Value	Odds Ratio (CI)	Genotypic P-value
rs269350	A	0.46	0.46	0.90	0.99 (0.85 – 1.15)	0.93	0.47	0.56	1.06 (0.88 – 1.27)	0.40
rs944082	A	0.36	0.35	0.37	0.93 (0.80 – 1.09)	0.63	0.39	0.18	1.14 (0.94 – 1.38)	0.19
rs1036066	G	0.37	0.40	0.11	1.13 (0.97 – 1.32)	0.15	0.35	0.27	0.90 (0.74 – 1.09)	0.55
rs1337406	C	0.27	0.29	0.08	1.16 (0.98 – 1.36)	0.043	0.27	0.86	0.98 (0.80 – 1.21)	0.089
rs2033349	A	0.43	0.44	0.79	1.02 (0.88 – 1.18)	0.74	0.43	0.98	1.00 (0.83 – 1.20)	0.97
rs2772280	C	0.25	0.25	0.92	1.01 (0.85 – 1.20)	0.50	0.24	0.52	0.93 (0.75 – 1.16)	0.75
rs2772297	A	0.33	0.30	0.054	0.85 (0.72 – 1.00)	0.12	0.35	0.68	1.04 (0.85 – 1.27)	0.53
rs2820487	A	0.072	0.089	0.13	1.24 (0.94 – 1.63)	0.18	0.064	0.51	0.88 (0.61 – 1.28)	0.50
rs3736934	A	0.32	0.31	0.60	0.96 (0.82 – 1.12)	0.78	0.34	0.53	1.07 (0.87 – 1.30)	0.73
rs3748705	A	0.25	0.25	0.99	1.00 (0.84 – 1.18)	0.92	0.30	0.025	1.27 (1.03 – 1.56)	0.054

C.I. =95% Confidence Interval; MAF = minor allele frequency; Odds ratios were calculated from the allelic association test.

Table 2

X² association analysis of *WLS* variants in cocaine addicted and opioid addicted European Americans and unrelated controls.

SNP	Minor Allele	Controls MAF	Cocaine Addicted				Opioid Addicted			
			Cases MAF	Allelic P-Value	Odds Ratio (CI)	Genotypic P-value	Cases MAF	Allelic P-Value	Odds Ratio (CI)	Genotypic P-value
rs269350	G	0.32	0.31	0.73	0.97 (0.79–1.18)	0.95	0.31	0.91	0.99 (0.81–1.21)	0.64
rs944082	G	0.49	0.48	0.53	0.94 (0.78–1.14)	0.79	0.48	0.53	0.94 (0.78–1.14)	0.23
rs983034	T	0.41	0.43	0.34	1.10 (0.91–1.33)	0.54	0.36	0.043	0.82 (0.68–0.99)	0.12
rs1036066	G	0.30	0.34	0.12	1.17 (0.96–1.43)	0.26	0.33	0.20	1.14 (0.93–1.39)	0.045
rs1046852	T	0.30	0.29	0.83	1.02 (0.83–1.27)	0.97	0.29	0.69	0.96 (0.76–1.20)	0.84
rs1337406	C	0.17	0.16	0.67	0.95 (0.73–1.22)	0.33	0.16	0.93	0.99 (0.77–1.27)	1.00
rs1367444	T	0.070	0.044	0.024	0.61 (0.40–0.94)	0.011	0.064	0.64	0.91 (0.63–1.33)	0.83
rs1430753	T	0.20	0.16	0.020	0.74 (0.58–0.95)	0.062	0.19	0.052	0.78 (0.61–1.00)	0.11
rs2033349	A	0.47	0.48	0.76	1.03 (0.85–1.24)	0.96	0.45	0.49	0.94 (0.78–1.13)	0.52
rs2183269	G	0.43	0.39	0.047	0.82 (0.68–1.00)	0.13	0.40	0.23	0.89 (0.73–1.08)	0.44
rs2772280	C	0.12	0.091	0.096	0.77 (0.56–1.05)	0.075	0.12	0.86	1.03 (0.77–1.37)	0.28
rs2772297	A	0.42	0.44	0.57	1.06 (0.87–1.28)	0.81	0.42	0.79	0.97 (0.81–1.18)	0.46
rs3736934	A	0.31	0.28	0.33	0.90 (0.73–1.11)	0.65	0.34	0.074	1.20 (0.98–1.46)	0.11
rs10493436	A	0.19	0.21	0.21	1.16 (0.92–1.47)	0.46	0.19	0.71	1.05 (0.82–1.33)	0.81

C.I. =95% Confidence Interval; MAF = minor allele frequency. Odds ratios were calculated from the allelic association test.