Methylome-wide association study of antidepressant use in Generation Scotland and the

Netherlands Twin Register implicates the innate immune system

Barbu MC, PhD[1], Huider F, MSc[2], Campbell A, MA[3], Amador, C, PhD[4], Adams, MJ, PhD[1],

Lynall, ME, PhD[5], Howard, DM, PhD[1,6], Walker, RM, PhD[3], Morris SW, MSc[3], Van Dongen J[2],

Porteous, DJ, PhD[3], Evans, KL, PhD[3], Bullmore, E, PhD[5], Willemsen, G[2], Boomsma DI[2],

Whalley, HC, PhD[1], McIntosh, AM, MD[1]

[1]Division of Psychiatry, The University of Edinburgh, Royal Edinburgh Hospital, Edinburgh,

UK

[2]Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Sciences, Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit

Amsterdam, Netherlands

[3]Centre for Genomic and Experimental Medicine, The Institute of Genetics and Cancer, The

University of Edinburgh, UK

[4]MRC Human Genetics Unit, The Institute of Genetics and Cancer, The University of

Edinburgh, UK

[5]Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

[6]Social, Genetic and Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology &

Neuroscience, King's College London, UK

Correspondence can be sent to:

Dr Miruna C Barbu, mbarbu@ed.ac.uk, 0131 537 6691

Division of Psychiatry, Kennedy Tower, Royal Edinburgh Hospital, Edinburgh EH10 5HF

Running title: Methylome-wide association study of self-reported antidepressant use

Keywords: DNA methylation, methylome-wide association study, methylation-based score,

innate immune system, major depressive disorder, antidepressant use

Abstract

Antidepressants are an effective treatment for major depressive disorder (MDD), although individual response is unpredictable and highly variable. Whilst the mode of action of antidepressants is incompletely understood, many medications are associated with changes in DNA methylation in genes that are plausibly linked to their mechanisms. Studies of DNA methylation may therefore reveal the biological processes underpinning the efficacy and side effects of antidepressants.

We performed a methylome-wide association study (MWAS) of self-reported antidepressant use accounting for lifestyle factors and MDD in Generation Scotland (GS:SFHS, N=6,428, EPIC array) and the Netherlands Twin Register (NTR, N=2,449, 450K array) and ran a meta-analysis of antidepressant use across these two cohorts.

We found 10 CpG sites significantly associated with self-reported antidepressant use in GS:SFHS, with the top CpG located within a gene previously associated with mental health disorders, *ATP6V1B2* (β=-0.055, $p_{corrected}$=0.005). Other top loci were annotated to genes including *CASP10, TMBIM1, MAPKAPK3,* and *HEBP2*, which have previously been implicated in the innate immune response. Next, using penalised regression, we trained a methylation-based score of self-reported antidepressant use in a subset of 3,799 GS:SFHS individuals that predicted antidepressant use in a second subset of GS:SFHS (N=3,360, β=0.377, p=3.12x10^{-11}, R^2=2.12%). In an MWAS analysis of prescribed selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, we showed convergent findings with those based on self-report. In NTR, we did not find any CpGs significantly associated with antidepressant use. The meta-analysis identified the two CpGs of the ten above that were common to the two arrays used as being significantly associated with antidepressant use, although the effect was in the opposite direction for one of them.

Antidepressants were associated with epigenetic alterations in loci previously associated with mental health disorders and the innate immune system. These changes predicted self-reported antidepressant use in a subset of GS:SFHS and identified processes that may be relevant to our mechanistic understanding of clinically relevant antidepressant drug actions and side effects.

Introduction

Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) is a leading cause of disability worldwide (1) and is caused by a combination of environmental and genetic factors (2). MDD has a number of effective treatments, with antidepressant drugs amongst the most commonly prescribed evidence-based therapies worldwide (3,4). Response to antidepressants is nevertheless unpredictable and highly variable, with only approximately 50% of individuals achieving remission after completing two treatments (5). The unmet needs of many individuals with MDD indicate the urgency of understanding the mechanisms of effective antidepressant action (6) so that their efficacy can be improved and their delivery targeted to those most likely to benefit.

The mode of action of antidepressants was originally assumed to be through the inhibition of monoamine re-uptake. However, since synaptic monoamine concentration poorly mirrors the trajectory of symptomatic improvement, their mechanism of action remains uncertain (7). Studies of antidepressants in both animal and human studies have implicated a number of possible modes of action. These include evidence that antidepressants lead to changes in DNA methylation (DNAm) and gene expression in a number of potentially relevant pathways (8). Francois et al. (2015) (9) demonstrated that antidepressants reversed stress-induced changes in DNAm and expression of *5-HT1A* in an animal model, while Zimmermann et al. (2012) found that antidepressants affect activity of DNA methyltransferase 1 (*DNMT1*) (10). These studies demonstrate that antidepressants may lead to epigenetic changes that reveal their biologically relevant mechanisms of action.

Epigenetic processes are associated with alterations in DNA activity without alterations to the underlying genome sequence (11). DNAm is perhaps the most commonly investigated epigenetic change, owing to the availability of reliable high-throughput array technologies that can identify changes in DNAm at over 800K locations throughout the genome. Methylome-wide association studies (MWAS) have begun to identify a number of cytosine-phosphate-guanine (CpG) sites that are associated with MDD (12) and relevant environmental risk factors (13). DNAm changes may therefore capture an environmental archive of exogenous factors, including drug treatments, relevant to the onset and maintenance of MDD.

Recent studies have shown the potential of a DNAm-based risk score to predict MDD
and its associated lifestyle and environmental factors, including antidepressant use (14,15).
We previously (15) trained a DNAm predictor of MDD in 3,047 individuals using a penalised
regression model and showed that it was significantly associated with self-reported
antidepressant use in an independent cohort. This suggests that CpG sites conferring risk to
MDD may also be linked to antidepressant use. A methylation-based predictor of self-
reported antidepressant use may therefore be able to predict antidepressant use and its
effects in other samples and may signpost the development of clinical biomarkers
quantifying drug action.

Here, we sought to identify the DNAm changes associated with self-reported
antidepressant use in 6,428 individuals ($N_{antidepressant\ use}$=740) from the Generation Scotland
study (GS:SFHS) using the Illumina Infinium MethylationEPIC array (16), capturing DNAm at
approximately 850K sites and in 2,449 individuals ($N_{antidepressant\ use}$=74) from the Netherlands
Twin Register (NTR) using the Infinium HumanMethylation450 BeadChip Kit (17), capturing
DNAm at 450K sites. We then conducted a meta-analysis using the two cohorts. Further, by
splitting GS:SFHS into two DNAm datasets where the number of participants differed
according to data availability, we were able to train a DNAm-based methylation score (MS)
of self-reported antidepressant use in one dataset (N=3,799; $N_{antidepressant\ use}$=585) and test
its ability to predict self-reported antidepressant use in a second (N=3,360; $N_{antidepressant}$
$_{use}$=317). We also addressed confounding by indication and by smoking in planned sensitivity
analyses (18). Using linked National Health Service (NHS) Scotland medication prescribing
data, we were able to identify whether the MWAS findings from self-report were also found
when using contemporaneous electronic healthcare information collected around the time
of the blood draw.

Methods

Methods

Study populations

Generation Scotland – the Scottish Family Health Study (GS:SFHS)

GS:SFHS is a family-based population cohort designed to investigate the genetic and
environmental causes of common diseases and well-being in approximately 24,000
participants aged 18-98 years in Scotland. Baseline data was collected between 2006 and
2011 (19,20) and contains detailed information on a broad range of variables. DNA is also
available from blood samples taken on more than 20,000 consenting participants.

GS:SFHS received ethical approval from NHS Tayside Research Ethics Committee
(REC reference number 05/S1401/89) and has Research Tissue Bank Status (reference:
20/ES/0021). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Netherlands Twin Register (NTR)

NTR is a population-based cohort of over 200,000 participants, consisting of twins,
their parents, spouses, and siblings. Between 2004 and 2010, biosamples were collected in
the NTR-Biobank project. Full details have been reported previously (21,22). DNA was
collected from peripheral whole blood.

Informed consent was obtained from all participants. The study was approved by the
Central Ethics Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects of the VU University
Medical Centre, Amsterdam, an Institutional Review Board certified by the U.S. Office of
Human Research Protections (IRB number IRB00002991 under Federal-wide Assurance-
FWA00017598; IRB/institute codes, NTR 03-180).

Phenotypes

GS:SFHS

Self-reported antidepressant use

For self-reported antidepressant use, a text-based questionnaire was sent to
participants 1-2 weeks before attending an in-person appointment where DNAm was
collected. The questionnaire recorded medication use through a "yes/no" checkbox with the

following accompanying question: "Are you regularly taking any of the following
medications?" where available options included "Antidepressants".

Demographic data on individuals with self-reported antidepressant use is presented
in Table 1. Participants with no self-reported antidepressant use were defined as those
individuals who answered "No" to the "Antidepressants" sub-section of the questionnaire.
There were 6,428 individuals with available self-reported data who also had DNAm, lifestyle,
and MDD status data available.

Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRI) prescription and data linkage

Here, we selected antidepressants from BNF paragraph code 4.3.3 containing the
following SSRIs: Citalopram, Escitalopram, Fluoxetine, Fluvoxamine Maleate, Paroxetine,
and Sertraline (23) for individuals with medication data in GS:SFHS (see Supplementary
Materials for more information). To investigate DNAm signatures of SSRI use, we restricted
analyses to those individuals with SSRI dispensing records in the 12 months prior to blood
draw date (N=401). Individuals with DNAm data that did not have any SSRI dispensed
prescription records were marked as controls (N=5,688).

We used dates of dispensing, not prescription, when restricting antidepressant use
based on time interval. Demographic data on individuals included here is presented in Table
1. Further details with regards to SSRI prescriptions are presented in Supplementary Table 1.

Lifestyle factors and MDD status

Body mass index (BMI) was computed using height (cm) and weight (kg) as measured
by clinical staff at baseline recruitment. Participants reported the number of units of alcohol
consumed during the past week and their smoking status (never, former, current); pack
years was used to measure heaviness of smoking in current smokers (24).

MDD status was assessed using the Structured Clinical Interview of the Diagnostic
and Statistical Manual, version IV (SCID) (25). Participants with no MDD were defined as
those individuals who did not fulfil criteria for a current or previous MDD diagnosis following
the SCID interview (26).

Further details about other diagnoses and medication intake are presented in
Supplementary Tables 2 and 3. Participants who suffered from other psychiatric disorders
(e.g. bipolar disorder, psychosis) were excluded from analyses (N=11).

NTR

Demographic data on individuals with antidepressant use is presented in Table 2.

Self-reported antidepressant use

At blood draw, participants were asked about all current medication use and for all

medicines the dose, brand and chemical names were recorded directly from the medication

packaging. Following the Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) classification system,

subclasses of N06A were considered antidepressants. Antidepressant medication use was

coded as 1 (current user) / 0 (non-user).

Lifestyle factors and MDD status

Body mass index (kg/m2) was computed based on weight and height obtained at the

time of blood sampling. Current and past smoking behaviour was dummy-coded as

current/former/never smokers and pack-years were recorded as the number of cigarettes

smoked per day/20 × number of years smoked.

Lifetime MDD was derived from the Composite International Diagnostic Interview

(CIDI) (27), the Lifetime Depression Assessment Self-report (LIDAS) (28), and DSM-oriented

Adult Self Report scales (ASR) of the Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment

(ASEBA) (29) (Supplementary Materials). Data from the CIDI, LIDAS and ASR scales were

combined to form one numeric variable coded as 1 (lifetime MDD case) / 0 (lifetime MDD

control). When data from multiple sources were available for an individual, the information

from CIDI was favoured over that of LIDAS and ASR, and data from LIDAS over that of ASR.

DNA methylation

GS:SFHS

Genome-wide DNAm data profiled from whole blood samples was available for

9,873 individuals in GS:SFHS using the Illumina Human-MethylationEPIC BeadChip (16).

DNAm data for individuals was initially released in two waves (wave 1_N=5101; wave

2_N=4,450). Quality control (QC) and normalisation were conducted using R packages

ShinyMethyl (30) and watermelon (31). Details of the protocol are described in the

Supplementary Materials.

NTR

DNAm in the NTR-Biobank study (21,32,33) was assessed with the Infinium

HumanMethylation450 BeadChip Kit ((17), Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) by the Human

Genotyping facility (HugeF) of ErasmusMC, the Netherlands (http://www.glimdna.org/) as

part of the Biobank-based Integrative Omics Study (BIOS) consortium (34). DNAm

measurements have been described previously (33,34) (see Supplementary Materials for

more information).

Statistical methods

Methylome-wide association

GS:SFHS

We used linear regression models run in the "limma" package (35) in R to analyse

the association of each CpG site, included as an outcome variable, with self-reported

antidepressant use included as the predictor variable. The R code for the current analyses is

available in the Supplementary Materials. The following covariates were included: age, sex,

wave (indicating different DNAm data pre-processing waves), as well as BMI, alcohol units,

smoking status, and pack years to observe whether the inclusion of lifestyle factors

attenuates the effect of self-reported antidepressant use. MDD status was also included to

observe whether associations between CpGs and self-reported antidepressant use were

influenced by the presence of MDD and potentially confounded by the indication for

prescription, as some individuals not classed as having MDD have indicated antidepressant

use (N=320). There were 674,246 CpGs available after QC and a Bonferroni correction

(0.05/674,246) was used to define methylome-wide significance (p≤7.42×10^{-8}).

Using the same model as above, we further carried out sensitivity analyses in (1)

non-smokers (N=3,351, $N_{antidepressant\ use}$=304), (2) individuals with (N=5,368, antidepressant

users=420) and without (N=5,268, antidepressant users=320) MDD, and (3) individuals with

SSRI dispense dates within 12 months prior to blood draw date (N=7,106, $N_{antidepressant}$

$_{use}$=401) (see Supplementary Materials for more information).

We compared findings in the main antidepressant use MWAS with summary

statistics from a MDD MWAS in the same sample (N=8,844, MDD cases=1,461), by looking at

effect sizes for significant CpGs in both analyses (Supplementary Figures 2 and 3).

NTR

The association between antidepressant medication and DNAm was tested under a

generalized estimation equation (GEE) model with DNAm M-values as outcome and self-

reported antidepressant use as a predictor. The model included the following covariates:

MDD status, sex, age at blood sampling, percentages of monocytes, eosinophils, and

neutrophils, HM450k array row, 96-wells bisulfite sample plate (dummy coding), BMI,

smoking, and smoking pack-years. MWAS analyses were performed with the R package

'gee'. The following settings were used: Gaussian link function (for continuous data), 100

iterations, and the 'exchangeable' option to account for the correlation structure within

families and within persons.

Meta-analysis

There were N=6,428 and N=2,449 participants in GS and NTR, respectively, and

N=318,856 overlapping CpGs between the two cohorts. Meta-analysis of these two datasets

was performed in METAL (36) using p-value based analysis (N=8,877). The meta-analysis

was based on N=318,856 total overlapping CpGs across GS:SFHS and NTR and a Bonferroni

correction (0.05/318,856) was used to define methylome-wide significance ($p \leq 1.57 \times 10^{-7}$).

DNAm score analysis

To create a training and testing dataset, we separated individuals in GS:SFHS by

DNAm pre-processing wave ($N_{wave\ 1}$=3,799; $N_{wave\ 2}$=3,360). This number differed from the

final number included in the MWAS (N=6,428) due to data availability for covariates

included in different analyses. R package "biglasso" was used to train DNAm predictors

(Supplementary Materials).

As in the MWAS, we carried out sensitivity analyses by training a score in wave 1 in

(1) non-smokers (N=1,952, $N_{antidepressant\ use}$=226) and (2) individuals with no MDD diagnosis

(N=2,791, antidepressant users=195) (see Supplementary Materials).

There were 76, 20, and 35 CpG sites identified for the full (MS), smoker-excluded

(MS-ns), and MDD-excluded (MS-control) datasets described above, respectively. The list of

CpG sites and their corresponding weights are presented in Supplementary Tables 4, 5, and

6. MS, MS-ns, and MS-control were created for each individual in wave 2 (N=3,360;

antidepressant users=317) by taking the sum of the product of the identified DNAm

residualised M-values and supplied model coefficient values. Regression models were then

run to identify associations between the scores and self-reported antidepressant use,

lifestyle factors and MDD.

Pathway and regulatory element overlap analysis

We used the Infinium MethylationEPIC BeadChip database to annotate significant

CpG sites in GS:SFHS to genes (16). The database provides information with regards to

genes, chromosome location, start and end sites, and other features.

To assess pathway enrichment for differentially methylated CpG sites while

correcting for biases in the representation of genes on the Infinium BeadChip, we used

missMethyl (37), accessed via methylGSA (38). Gene Ontology (GO) terms were accessed

using the msigdbr package (39). Pathways included in the analysis were all GO Biological

Process pathways of size 20-500 genes inclusive. CpG sites included in the analysis were

those significant at a threshold of $p<1x10^{-5}$ (N=144), as used in previous studies (40).

To assess overlap of differentially methylated CpG sites with the 15 chromatin states

across 127 tissues from the Consolidated Roadmap Epigenomics dataset, we used eFORGE

2.0 (41), accessed via the web tool at https://eforge.altiusinstitute.org and using default

settings.

Identification of differentially-methylated regions (DMR)

We used the dmrff function implemented in the dmrff R package (42) to identify

differentially methylated regions in GS:SFHS, defined as regions containing 2-30 CpG sites

separated by ≤ 500 bp. DMR analysis uses CpGs with unadjusted MWAS p-values ≤ 0.05 and

methylation changes in a consistent direction, and DMRs with a Bonferroni-corrected p-

value ≤ 0.05 are considered statistically significant.

Results

Demographic characteristics

Individuals with self-reported antidepressant use who had incomplete lifestyle (BMI, alcohol consumption, and smoking) and disorder (MDD status) data were excluded. There were 6,428 individuals in the final MWAS of self-reported antidepressant use in GS:SFHS ($N_{antidepressant\ use}$: 740) and 2,449 ($N_{antidepressant\ use}$=74) in NTR. Descriptive and demographic characteristics for these individuals, as well as individuals with prescribing data, are presented in Table 1 for GS:SFHS and Table 2 for NTR.

Methylome-wide association

GS:SFHS

Self-reported antidepressant use

MWAS identified 10 CpG sites that were associated with self-reported antidepressant use ($p \leq 7.42 \times 10^{-8}$). Nine CpG sites were significantly hypomethylated in antidepressant users, while 1 site (cg26277237) was hypermethylated. Information about each CpG site is shown in Table 3 and depicted as a Manhattan plot in Figure 1A.

The EWAS catalogue (http://www.ewascatalog.org/) includes CpG sites represented on the Illumina 450K methylation array that have shown associations with traits at $p \leq 1 \times 10^{-4}$ in genome-wide analyses. The catalogue was used to cross-reference all CpG sites associated with self-reported antidepressant use with the wider literature. cg05603985 was previously found to be associated with smoking ($p=1.8 \times 10^{-43}$; [18]) and alcohol consumption ($p=7.9 \times 10^{-13}$ in African ancestry and $p=1.9 \times 10^{-8}$ in European ancestry; [43]; cg27589594 was found to be associated with gestational age ($p=3.5 \times 10^{-16}$; [44]). Eight of the CpG sites were represented only on the Infinium MethylationEPIC BeadChip (containing approximately 850K CpG sites) and were therefore not included in the catalogue. Searches conducted on other databases, including EWASdb [45] indicate that these 8 CpG sites have not been previously associated with any trait.

The Pearson's correlation between the MWAS effect sizes from the full-sample

MWAS and MWAS in non-smokers across all CpGs was r=0.655 (95% C.I.=0.636-0.674).

When restricting CpGs to those that reached a p-value≤5x10^{-5}, the correlation increased

further to r=0.877 (95% C.I.=0.869-0.884), and Bonferroni-corrected CpGs (N=10) in the full

sample and the same CpGs in the non-smoker sample had a high correlation (r=0.980, 95%

C.I.=0.979-0.981). Supplementary Table 7 indicates the effect size and nominal p-value for

all CpGs found to be associated with self-reported antidepressant use in the full sample and

in the non-smoker sample.

The Pearson's correlation between effect sizes obtained from the MWAS of

antidepressant use in individuals with MDD and MWAS of antidepressant use in those

without MDD across all CpGs was r=0.094 (95% C.I.=0.069-0.118). Restricting CpGs to a

significance cut-off of p≤5x10^{-5} increased the correlation in effect sizes to r=0.961 (95%

C.I.=0.959-0.963). Supplementary Table 8 indicates the effect size and nominal p-value for

all CpGs found to be associated with self-reported antidepressant use in the full sample and

in the sensitivity analysis sample.

SSRI

MWAS conducted using individuals with dispensing data identified 12 CpG sites, all

hypomethylated, associated with SSRI use (the most commonly prescribed treatment for

depression) within 12 months prior to blood draw date, which are shown in Supplementary

Table 9 and Supplementary Figure 1.

Additionally, all 10 CpG sites that were associated with self-reported antidepressant

use (p≤7.42x10^{-8}) were found to be nominally significant (p<0.05) in the MWAS including

SSRI dispensing records as a phenotype. The direction of effect was consistent for all CpG

sites identified in the self-report MWAS: 9 were hypomethylated and 1 was

hypermethylated, presented in Supplementary Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 10 (β and

p-value for smallest and largest associations included cg09511513 (β=-0.026, p=0.028) and

cg26277237 (β=0.027, p=3.09x10^{-7})). The majority (10/12) of CpG sites identified in the

MWAS of SSRI also were nominally significant in the MWAS where the self-report variable

was input as the predictor (Supplementary Table 11).

NTR

There were no methylome-wide significant findings in NTR. The top ten CpG sites

were annotated to genes implicated in psychiatric- and cognition-related phenotypes and in

disorders of the immune system and are presented Supplementary Table 12. Figure 1B

represents a Manhattan plot of NTR results.

Meta-analysis

Meta-analysis of antidepressant use MWAS across GS:SFHS and NTR revealed two

Bonferroni-corrected CpG sites, which were on the 450K array; both were identified in the

GS:SFHS MWAS; cg05603985 (β=-0.021, p=3.01x10^{-8}, q=0.009) had an opposite direction of

effect across cohorts (negative in GS:SFHS and positive in NTR), and cg27589594 (β=-0.024,

p=6.46x10^{-8}, q=0.021) had the same direction of effect (negative) in both. Methylome-wide

results are depicted in Figure 1C.

There were N=318,856 overlapping CpGs between GS:SFHS and NTR, and effect sizes

were not strongly correlated (Pearson's correlation r=0.081, 95% C.I.=0.06-0.102). When

restricting CpGs to those that reached a p-value≤0.05 across both MWAS (N=1,714), the

correlation between effect sizes increased (r=0.32, 95% C.I.=0.301-0.339). Further

information with regards to concordant signals across the two cohorts is in the

Supplementary Materials.

DNAm score analysis

LASSO regression selected 76, 20, and 35 CpGs to calculate MS, MS-ns, and MS-

control for self-reported antidepressant use, respectively, in GS:SFHS wave 2.

Briefly, the MS was associated with self-reported antidepressant use in a model

adjusted for age, sex, and 10 genetic PCs (β=0.377, p=3.12x10^{-11}, R^2=2.12%); After

adjustment for BMI, alcohol units, smoking status, pack years, and MDD, this association

remained significant, although the variance explained decreased (β=0.213, p=0.0035,

R^2=0.56%). The association between MS-ns and self-reported antidepressant use was in the

same direction but became non-significant, both in the covariate-free model (β=0.106,

p=0.075, R^2=0.16%) and in the model with the above covariates included (β= 0.04, p=0.565,

R^2=0.02%). Finally, MS-control was significantly associated with self-reported antidepressant

use in the covariate-free model (β=0.254, p=1.15x10^{-5}, R^2=0.93%), but not when including

covariates (β=0.064, p=0.381, R^2=0.05%). Table 4 indicates associations with lifestyle traits

and MDD for all scores.

Pathway and regulatory element overlap analysis

Following FDR adjustment for multiple comparisons, the only over-represented

pathways were related to regulation of myeloid cell differentiation (GO Negative Regulation

of Myeloid Cell Differentiation and GO Negative Regulation of Myeloid Leucocyte

Differentiation, $p_{adjusted}$=0.04 for both). Enrichment of these pathways was driven by

hypomethylation in the antidepressant use group in the body or 5'UTR of the following

genes: *GAT2, HOXA7, INPP5D, MEIS1, RAR* and *UBASH3B*.

Testing for overlap of differentially methylated CpG sites at $p<1\times10^{-5}$ with chromatin

states in 127 tissues from the Roadmap Epigenomics Consortium, the greatest enrichment

was seen in blood cell tissues. Of the peripheral blood cell subsets tested, the cell type

showing the greatest enrichment was monocytes (Figure 2), with significant enrichment for

monocyte enhancers ($q=4\times10^{-11}$) and regions flanking active transcription start sites in

monocytes ($q=1\times10^{-9}$).

We repeated the tests above using the results from the MEWAS of antidepressant

prescriptions   (N   CpGs   at $p<1\times10^{-5}$=484).   We did   not   find

enrichment of any specific GO biological processes but replicated the finding from the self-

reported antidepressant use MWAS that monocytes were the peripheral blood cell subset

most enriched in the MWAS signal (enhancers in primary monocytes from peripheral

blood were enriched at $q=4\times10^{-94}$) and also found strong enrichment for enhancers in

peripheral blood neutrophils ($q=4\times10^{-79}$).

DMR analysis

We identified 159 DMRs, ranging from 2-11 CpGs in length, to be associated with

self-reported antidepressant use using the DMR adjusted p-values (Supplementary Excel File

1). The region with the largest significance (p.adjust=7.54×10^{-12}) spanned 4 CpGs annotated

to *GATA2* on chromosome 3, a gene involved in stem cell maintenance and in which

mutations are associated with wide-ranging immunological disorders (46,47). The largest

DMR (p.adjust=2.04×10^{-8}) spanned 11 CpGs located on chromosome 2, where most were

annotated to *OTX1*, a gene previously associated with risk-taking behaviour (48). The gene

may also play a role in the brain and development of sensory organs (49). Only one DMR

spanning 2 CpGs (p.adjust=2.55×10^{-7}) contained a CpG that was also associated with the

trait at the level of individual probes (cg05186879, p=4.91×10^{-9}).

Discussion

Self-reported antidepressant use is associated with differences in DNAm at 10 CpG

sites in GS:SFHS located in genes that have previously been associated with psychiatric

disorders and the innate immune system. There were no methylome-wide findings in NTR.

We found that all 10 CpG sites in GS:SFHS were also nominally associated with

antidepressant prescription data obtained from the electronic health record, indicating

agreement between self-reported and record linkage data. Sensitivity analyses in GS:SFHS

indicated that results were not significantly confounded by smoking. As shown in

Supplementary Table 7, the effect for all 10 associated CpGs are in the same direction

across sensitivity analyses, and all p-values in the sensitivity analyses are nominally

significant. The effect sizes of the top 10 CpGs were also highly correlated in the full sample

and in the non-smoker sample (*r*=0.980). A DNAm score trained on one sub-sample was

associated with self-reported antidepressant use, four lifestyle factors, and MDD in a second

unrelated sample from the same study. Pathway analysis revealed an enrichment of

differentially methylated genes in myeloid cell differentiation. However, the effect size

correlation between the 10 associated CpGs and the same CpGs in a MDD MWAS (*r*=0.674)

may indicate that DNAm signatures of antidepressants act as a proxy for MDD, although

further analyses with much larger samples will be needed to disentangle the effects

between antidepressant use and MDD on DNAm. Lastly, meta-analysis of MWAS in GS:SFHS

and NTR identified two CpGs that were also found in GS:SFHS.

The CpG site with the largest effect size, both in GS:SFHS and the meta-analysis (β=-

0.055) was cg09511513, located in *ATP6V1B2*. This CpG site has not been associated with

any other traits previously, to the best of our knowledge. *ATP6V1B2* encodes a component

of vacuolar ATPase, which is a multisubunit enzyme that mediates the acidification of

eukaryotic intracellular organelles, including endosomes and lysosomes, and may be

involved in neurotransmission (50). Importantly, a single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP)

within *ATP6V1B2*, rs1106634, has exhibited a suggestive p-value in a meta-analysis in

schizophrenia and bipolar disorder (p=3.97×10^{-6}) and has been associated with lifetime risk

of depression (p<0.001) in a recent study (51–53).

In NTR, there were no methylome-wide significant findings. The 10 most
significant CpGs (Supplementary Table 12) were annotated to genes implicated in similar
processes as those found in GS:SFHS, including the innate immune and psychiatric diseases.
Although there were no significant findings, the pattern of results in NTR is similar to
significant findings in GS:SFHS.The two CpGs identified in the meta-analysis that were
present on both array types were also associated in GS:SFHS and were annotated to genes
previously implicated in psychiatric disease and the innate immune system (*SKI, SLC5A10*)
(see Table 3). These were not nominally significant in NTR (Supplementary Table 13).
cg05603985 was hypomethylated in GS:SFHS and hypermethylated in NTR, and cg27589594
was hypomethylated in both cohorts. Although the signal from one CpG was the same
across the two cohorts, further large-scale analyses on DNAm collected on the same array
will be needed to uncover the role of antidepressants in relation to psychiatric and immune
processes in DNAm.

We were able to show that a MS for self-reported antidepressant use was associated
with self-reported antidepressant use, MDD status, and 4 lifestyle factors (BMI, alcohol
units, smoking status, and pack years) in a subset of GS:SFHS. In addition, when excluding
MDD-associated signals in a second DNAm score (MS-control), we found that the predictor
was still associated with antidepressant use, although with reduced variance explained (MS
R^2=2.12%; MS-control R^2=0.93 %). This suggests that, although antidepressant use may in
part be a marker of MDD effects on DNAm, antidepressant prescription associations may be
partly independent from the condition for which they are prescribed. However, when
including lifestyle factors in the association between MS-control and antidepressant use, the
variance explained further decreased (R^2=0.05%). This may indicate that lifestyle risk factors
for MDD may play an important role in this association, even in the absence of an MDD
diagnosis.

The decreased variance explained may be in part due to differences in the training
sample sizes for the scores (MS$_N$=3,799, antidepressant users=585; MS-control$_N$=2,791,
antidepressant users=195; MS-ns$_N$=1,952, antidepressant users=226), although variation
explained in lifestyle factors is comparable between the MS and MS-control (MS R^2:
BMI=0.75%; alcohol units=1.93%; smoking status=6.11%; pack years=9.14%; MS-control R^2:
BMI=0.53%; alcohol units=1.56%; smoking status=5.08%; pack years=8.09%).

When smokers were excluded from the training sample, MS-ns associations with all

variables remained in the same direction but became non-significant. This suggests that

smoking may partially confound the associations between antidepressant use and DNAm.

However, when excluding smokers in our MWAS analyses, correlations between the effect

sizes in the full-sample and non-smoker MWAS indicated that results were not likely

confounded by smoking (r=0.980). Further, effects for all significant CpGs were in the same

direction in the reduced sample as in the full sample, and were all nominally significant in

the non-smoker sample (Supplementary Table 7). Future studies would benefit from

training DNAm predictors of self-reported antidepressant use in larger samples of lifelong

non-smokers.Only one CpG overlaps between the CpG sites in our MS and CpG sites

comprising an MDD DNAm risk score (MS) in Barbu et al. (2020) (15). This CpG (cg09935388)

has been associated with smoking in previous studies (54,55), and may therefore capture

smoking-associated effects related to both MDD and antidepressant use. Further, in both

studies, MDD MS and antidepressant use MS were both more strongly associated with

lifestyle factors than with the trait of interest (MDD MS R^2 in Barbu et al. (2020):

MDD=1.75%, BMI=0.097%, alcohol units=0.7%, smoking status=3.2%, pack years=6.5%;

Antidepressant use MS R^2: antidepressant use=2.12%, BMI=0.75%, alcohol units=1.93%,

smoking status=6.11%, pack years=9.14%). The stronger associations for both MS with

lifestyle factors may indicate that the scores capture an archive of relevant current and past

lifestyle factors that are also associated with depression and the prescription of

antidepressants. Previous large-scale studies have found profound effects of each of the

lifestyle factors on the methylome (56–58). However, the MS was still associated with

antidepressant use after accounting for the lifestyle factors mentioned above (R^2=0.56%),

indicating a possible independent effect of antidepressants. Due to the complex

associations between DNAm, MDD, and lifestyle factors, future large-scale studies, including

longitudinal studies, are warranted to investigate independent effects of each variable in

relation to MDD.

To investigate potential relationships between DNAm links to antidepressant use

and MDD, we conducted a MDD MWAS in GS (N=8,844, cases=1,641). While none of the top

10 CpGs in the antidepressant use MWAS were significantly associated with MDD, the effect

sizes showed a moderate correlation (r=0.674; See Supplementary Figures 2 and 3). This

suggests that DNAm signatures of antidepressant use may partially reflect confounding by
indication and much larger samples will be needed to disentangle this relationship.

Using missMethyl, we identified altered DNAm nearby several genes involved in
myeloid cell differentiation. Myeloid cells play an important role in the innate immune
response, and their activation and differentiation depend in part on epigenetic mechanisms
(59). Several of the genes annotated to CpGs identified at genome-wide significance here
were associated with the innate immune response in previous GWAS; this may complement
the finding that genes annotated to the 144 CpG sites differentially methylated at $p<1\times10^{-5}$
are enriched for myeloid cell differentiation.

Further, the differentially-methylated regions were annotated to genes that play a
role in cell maintenance, as well as brain and sensory organ development (46,49).
Importantly, mutations in *GATA2* have previously been related to wide-ranging
immunological disorders, providing further evidence linking antidepressant use and the
immune system (47).

The role of the innate immune system has previously been investigated in relation to
psychiatric disorders. In MDD, studies have found a number of pro-inflammatory cytokines,
such as TNF-α and IL-6, to have higher concentrations in depressed individuals, as compared
to healthy controls (60). Importantly, antidepressants, particularly SSRIs, have been shown
to exert effects on the immune system by causing a reduction in inflammatory markers.
Generally, antidepressants have been found to reduce levels of pro-inflammatory cytokine,
such as TNF-α, IL-6, and IL-1β, although their effects are complex and incompletely
understood (60). The current study suggests novel links between DNAm, antidepressants,
and processes involved in the innate immune system. Studies that investigate links between
antidepressants and DNAm alterations at CpG sites that are known to be associated with
the expression of innate immune system, myeloid cell differentiation, and MDD-specific
genes may be of interest.

There are a number of potential limitations to the current study. Firstly, although
self-reported antidepressant use could not be restricted to specific dates prior to the blood
draw date in GS:SFHS, the variable is considered contemporaneous to blood draw date as
self-report questionnaires were sent 1-2 weeks before the clinic appointment. However, the
questionnaire did not record types of antidepressants, which may explain the different top
CpG sites based on the predictor input in MWAS. The different CpG sites identified in each

MWAS may also be due in part to the proportion of overlapping individuals used in each
analysis ($N_{overlap\ in\ antidepressant\ users}$=289; $N_{overlap\ in\ controls}$=4,811). Nonetheless, as indicated in
Supplementary Table 11, most of the CpG sites significantly associated with SSRI use within
12 months prior to blood draw date were nominally significant in the MWAS where self-
reported antidepressant use was fit as the predictor. This pattern was also observed when
investigating the top 10 CpG sites associated with the self-reported measure in the SSRI use
MWAS (Supplementary Table 10). The findings above indicate there is agreement between
different forms of data collection, specifically self-reported medication use and record
linkage to PIS. The variables have previously been investigated in a study by Hafferty et al.
(2018) (61), who showed that self-reported antidepressant use in GS:SFHS showed very
good agreement with record linkage data at 3- and 6-month fixed time windows (61).

Secondly, since we chose to restrict PIS data linkage to 12 months before the blood
draw date, it seems likely that the DNAm changes reported may occur in response to
antidepressant treatment, although this requires further replication. Nevertheless, the
DNAm data provided here is cross-sectional, and it is not possible to show how the
trajectory of DNAm at each CpG site evolved over time. Future studies should therefore
collect DNAm at multiple time points and further address the possibility of confounding by
antidepressant indication.

It should also be noted that SSRI prescribing data is unable to confirm whether
individuals took the medication as prescribed (62). In addition, the current study is based
exclusively on European ancestry cohorts, and the generalisability to diverse ancestries is
unknown.

Finally, correlations of effect sizes between the two cohorts are of low magnitude
and confidence intervals are large. However, the top 10 CpGs identified in NTR, although
not significant, were implicated in similar processes as those in GS:SFHS, and the meta-
analysis uncovered two CpGs that were also uncovered in GS:SFHS. These novel findings
should serve as a stimulus for larger, international collaborations and meta-analyses in
future.

In conclusion, we conducted an MWAS of self-reported antidepressant use across
two large, population-based cohorts and identified 10 novel CpG sites in GS:SFHS located in
genes previously associated with mental health disorders, implicating the innate immune
system. Further, MS predictors were associated with self-reported antidepressant use,

MDD, and a number of lifestyle factors in a second sample from the same study. SSRI use

derived from linkage health records showed convergent effects indicating agreement with

the findings derived using only self-report. Finally, a meta-analysis revealed similar findings

to the ones in GS:SFHS. Our findings highlight biological processes that may be relevant to

furthering our understanding of antidepressant actions and their side effects.

References

1. World Health Organization. Depression and Other Common Mental Disorders. Who.

2017;24.

2. Wray NR, Gottesman II. Using summary data from the Danish National Registers to

estimate heritabilities for schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depressive

disorder. Front Genet. 2012;3(JUL).

3. I K. Antidepressants and the Placebo Effect. Z Psychol. 2014;222(3).

4. Cipriani A, Furukawa TA, Salanti G, Chaimani A, Atkinson LZ, Ogawa Y, et al.

Comparative efficacy and acceptability of 21 antidepressant drugs for the acute

treatment of adults with major depressive disorder: a systematic review and network

meta-analysis. Lancet [Internet]. 2018;391(10128):1357–66. Available from:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32802-7

5. Rush AJ, Trivedi MH, Wisniewski SR, Nierenberg AA, Stewart JW, Warden D, et al.

Acute and longer-term outcomes in depressed outpatients requiring one or several

treatment steps: A STAR*D report. Am J Psychiatry [Internet]. 2006 [cited 2020 Nov

19];163(11):1905–17. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17074942/

6. Keers R, Uher R. Gene-environment interaction in major depression and

antidepressant treatment response. Vol. 14, Current Psychiatry Reports. Curr

Psychiatry Rep; 2012. p. 129–37.

7. Berton O, Nestler EJ. New approaches to antidepressant drug discovery: Beyond

monoamines. Vol. 7, Nature Reviews Neuroscience. Nat Rev Neurosci; 2006. p. 137–

51.

8. Menke A, Binder EB. Epigenetic alterations in depression and antidepressant

treatment. Dialogues Clin Neurosci. 2014;16(3):395–404.

9. Le François B, Soo J, Millar AM, Daigle M, Le Guisquet AM, Leman S, et al. Chronic

mild stress and antidepressant treatment alter 5-HT1A receptor expression by

modifying DNA methylation of a conserved Sp4 site. Neurobiol Dis. 2015 Oct

1;82:332–41.

10.　Zimmermann N, Zschocke J, Perisic T, Yu S, Holsboer F, Rein T. Antidepressants inhibit

DNA methyltransferase 1 through reducing G9a levels. Biochem J. 2012 Nov

15;448(1):93–102.

11.　Bird A. Perceptions of epigenetics. Vol. 447, Nature. Nature Publishing Group; 2007.

p. 396–8.

12.　Jovanova OS, Nedeljkovic I, Spieler D, Walker RM, Liu C, Luciano M, et al. DNA

methylation signatures of depressive symptoms in middle-aged and elderly persons:

Meta-analysis of multiethnic epigenome-wide studies. JAMA Psychiatry.

2018;75(9):949–59.

13.　McCartney DL, Hillary RF, Stevenson AJ, Ritchie SJ, Walker RM, Zhang Q, et al.

Epigenetic prediction of complex traits and death. Genome Biol. 2018;19(1):136.

14.　Clark SL, Hattab MW, Chan RF, Shabalin AA, Han LKM, Zhao M, et al. A methylation

study of long-term depression risk. Mol Psychiatry. 2019 Jun 1;25(6):1334–43.

15.　Barbu MC, Shen X, Walker RM, Howard DM, Evans KL, Whalley HC, et al. Epigenetic

prediction of major depressive disorder. Mol Psychiatry [Internet]. 2020 Jun 10 [cited

2020 Jun 11];1–12. Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/s41380-020-

0808-3

16.　Hansen K. IlluminaHumanMethylationEPICanno.ilm10b2.hg19: Annotation for

Illumina's EPIC methylation arrays. R Packag version 060 [Internet]. 2016; Available

from: https://bitbucket.com/kasperdanielhansen/Illumina_EPIC

17.　Hansen K. IlluminaHumanMethylation450kanno. ilmn12. hg19: annotation for

Illumina's 450k methylation arrays. 2016;

18.　Joehanes R, Just AC, Marioni RE, Pilling LC, Reynolds LM, Mandaviya PR, et al.

Epigenetic Signatures of Cigarette Smoking. Circ Cardiovasc Genet. 2016;436–47.

19.　Smith BH, Campbell H, Blackwood D, Connell J, Connor M, Deary IJ, et al. Generation

Scotland: the Scottish Family Health Study; a new resource for researching genes

and heritability. BMC Med Genomics. 2006;9:1–9.

20.　Smith BH, Campbell A, Linksted P, Fitzpatrick B, Jackson C, Kerr SM, et al. Cohort

Profile: Generation Scotland: Scottish Family Health Study (GS: SFHS). The study ,

its participants and their potential for genetic research on health and illness. Int J

Epidemiol. 2013;(July 2012):689–700.

21.   Willemsen G, Geus EJC de, Bartels M, Beijsterveldt CEMT van, Brooks AI, Burk GFE, et

al. The Netherlands Twin Register Biobank: A Resource for Genetic Epidemiological

Studies. Twin Res Hum Genet [Internet]. 2010 Jun [cited 2021 Sep 7];13(3):231–45.

Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/twin-research-and-

human-genetics/article/netherlands-twin-register-biobank-a-resource-for-genetic-

epidemiological-studies/94AA0448D70BFEA4780D0CD01EB7DF05

22.   Ligthart L, Beijsterveldt CEM van, Kevenaar ST, Zeeuw E de, Bergen E van, Bruins S, et

al. The Netherlands Twin Register: Longitudinal Research Based on Twin and Twin-

Family Designs. Twin Res Hum Genet [Internet]. 2019 Dec 1 [cited 2021 Sep

7];22(6):623–36. Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/twin-

research-and-human-genetics/article/netherlands-twin-register-longitudinal-

research-based-on-twin-and-twinfamily-

designs/C68488FDD92716CB9ED7C040B9776E2F

23.   Britain RPS of G. British National Formulary 58. 2009.

24.   Karen Leffondré, Michal Abrahamowicz, Jack Siemiatycki BR. Modeling Smoking

History: A Comparison of Different Approaches. Am J Epidemiol. 2002;156(9):813–23.

25.   First MB, Spitzer RL, Gibbon M, Williams JBW, Davies M, Borus J, et al. The structured

clinical interview for DSM-III-R personality disorders (SCID-II). Part II: Multi-site test-

retest reliablity study. J Pers Disord. 1995 Feb 8;9(2):92–104.

26.   Fernandez-Pujals AM, Adams MJ, Thomson P, McKechanie AG, Blackwood DHR, Smith

BH, et al. Epidemiology and heritability of major depressive disorder, stratified by age

of onset, sex, and illness course in generation Scotland: Scottish family health study

(GS: SFHS). PLoS One. 2015 Nov 1;10(11).

27.   Kessler RC, Wittchen H-U, Abelson JM, Mcgonagle K, Schwarz N, Kendler KS, et al.

Methodological studies of the Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI) in

the US national comorbidity survey (NCS). Int J Methods Psychiatr Res [Internet].

1998 Feb 1 [cited 2021 Sep 7];7(1):33–55. Available from:

https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/mpr.33

28.   Bot M, Middeldorp CM, Geus EJC de, Lau HM, Sinke M, Nieuwenhuizen B van, et al.

Validity of LIDAS (LIfetime Depression Assessment Self-report): a self-report online

assessment of lifetime major depressive disorder. Psychol Med [Internet]. 2017 Jan 1

[cited 2021 Sep 7];47(2):279–89. Available from:

https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/psychological-medicine/article/validity-of-

lidas-lifetime-depression-assessment-selfreport-a-selfreport-online-assessment-of-

lifetime-major-depressive-disorder/97602A258E2DABA0745F8039C0F20907

29.   The Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA) for Ages 18 to 90

Years. - PsycNET [Internet]. [cited 2021 Sep 7]. Available from:

https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2004-14941-004

30.   Fortin J-P, Fertig E, Hansen K. shinyMethyl: interactive quality control of Illumina 450k

DNA methylation arrays in R. F1000Research [Internet]. 2014 Jul 30 [cited 2020 Nov

9];3:175. Available from: https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.4680.1

31.   Pidsley R, Y Wong CC, Volta M, Lunnon K, Mill J, Schalkwyk LC. A data-driven

approach to preprocessing Illumina 450K methylation array data. BMC Genomics

2013 141 [Internet]. 2013 May 1 [cited 2021 Sep 30];14(1):1–10. Available from:

https://bmcgenomics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2164-14-293

32.   Boomsma DI, Willemsen G, Sullivan PF, Heutink P, Meijer P, Sondervan D, et al.

Genome-wide association of major depression: description of samples for the GAIN

Major Depressive Disorder Study: NTR and NESDA biobank projects. Eur J Hum Genet

2008 163 [Internet]. 2008 Jan 16 [cited 2021 Sep 7];16(3):335–42. Available from:

https://www.nature.com/articles/5201979

33.   van Dongen J, Nivard MG, Willemsen G, Hottenga J-J, Helmer Q, Dolan C V., et al.

Genetic and environmental influences interact with age and sex in shaping the human

methylome. Nat Commun 2016 71 [Internet]. 2016 Apr 7 [cited 2021 Sep 7];7(1):1–

13. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms11115

34.   Bonder MJ, Luijk R, Zhernakova D V., Moed M, Deelen P, Vermaat M, et al. Disease

variants alter transcription factor levels and methylation of their binding sites. Nat

Genet. 2017 Jan 1;49(1):131–8.

35.   Matthew E Ritchie, Belinda Phipson, Di Wu, Yifang Hu, Charity W Law, Wei Shi GKS.

limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray

studies. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015;43(7):47.

36.   Willer CJ, Li Y, Abecasis GR. METAL: Fast and efficient meta-analysis of genomewide

association scans. Bioinformatics [Internet]. 2010 Jul 8 [cited 2020 Nov

9];26(17):2190–1. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20616382/

37.   Phipson B, Maksimovic J, Oshlack A. MissMethyl: An R package for analyzing data

from Illumina's HumanMethylation450 platform. Bioinformatics. 2016;32(2):286–8.

38.   Ren X, Kuan PF. methylGSA: a Bioconductor package and Shiny app for DNA

methylation data length bias adjustment in gene set testing. Bioinformatics.

2019;35(11):1958–9.

39.   Dolgalev I. msigdbr: MSigDB Gene Sets for Multiple Organisms in a Tidy Data Format.

R package version 7.1.1. [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jul 29]. Available from:

https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/msigdbr/index.html

40.   Chu AY, Tin A, Schlosser P, Ko YA, Qiu C, Yao C, et al. Epigenome-wide association

studies identify DNA methylation associated with kidney function. Nat Commun

[Internet]. 2017 Dec 1;8(1):1–12. Available from:

www.nature.com/naturecommunications

41.   Breeze CE, Reynolds AP, Van Dongen J, Dunham I, Lazar J, Neph S, et al. EFORGE v2.0:

Updated analysis of cell type-specific signal in epigenomic data. Bioinformatics.

2019;35(22):4767–9.

42.   Suderman M, Staley J, French R, Arathimos R, Simpkin A, Tilling K. dmrff: identifying

differentially methylated regions efficiently with power and control. bioRxiv

[Internet]. 2018 Dec 31 [cited 2021 May 28];508556. Available from:

https://doi.org/10.1101/508556

43.   Liu C, Marioni RE, Hedman ÅK, Pfeiffer L, Tsai P, Reynolds LM, et al. A DNA

methylation biomarker of alcohol consumption. Mol Psychiatry. 2018;(February

2016):422–33.

44.   Bohlin J, Håberg SE, Magnus P, Reese SE, Gjessing HK, Magnus MC, et al. Prediction of

gestational age based on genome-wide differentially methylated regions. Genome

Biol. 2016 Oct 7;17(1).

45.   Liu D, Zhao L, Wang Z, Zhou X, Fan X, Li Y, Xu J, Hu S, Niu M, Song X LY. EWASdb:

epigenome-wide association study database. Nucleic Acids Res. 2019;47:989–93.

46.   Li Y, Qi X, Liu B, Huang H. The STAT5–GATA2 Pathway Is Critical in Basophil and Mast

Cell Differentiation and Maintenance. J Immunol [Internet]. 2015 May 1 [cited 2021

May 31];194(9):4328–38. Available from:

http://www.jimmunol.org/content/194/9/4328http://www.jimmunol.org/content/1

94/9/4328.full#ref-list-1

47.   Collin M, Dickinson R, Bigley V. Haematopoietic and immune defects associated with

GATA2 mutation [Internet]. Vol. 169, British Journal of Haematology. Blackwell

Publishing Ltd; 2015 [cited 2021 May 31]. p. 173–87. Available from:

https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/bjh.13317

48.   Karlsson Linnér R, Biroli P, Kong E, Meddens SFW, Wedow R, Fontana MA, et al.

Genome-wide association analyses of risk tolerance and risky behaviors in over 1

million individuals identify hundreds of loci and shared genetic influences. Nat Genet

[Internet]. 2019 Feb 1 [cited 2020 Nov 9];51(2):245–57. Available from:

/pmc/articles/PMC6713272/?report=abstract

49.   Frantz GD, Weimann JM, Levin ME, McConnell SK. Otx1 and Otx2 define layers and

regions in developing cerebral cortex and cerebellum. J Neurosci [Internet]. 1994 Oct

1 [cited 2021 May 31];14(10):5725–40. Available from:

https://www.jneurosci.org/content/14/10/5725

50.   Petschner P, Gonda X, Baksa D, Eszlari N, Trivaks M, Juhasz G, et al. Genes Linking

Mitochondrial Function, Cognitive Impairment and Depression are Associated with

Endophenotypes Serving Precision Medicine. Vol. 370, Neuroscience. Elsevier Ltd;

2018. p. 207–17.

51.   Wang KS, Liu XF, Aragam N. A genome-wide meta-analysis identifies novel loci

associated with schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. Schizophr Res. 2010 Dec;124(1–

3):192–9.

52.   Shyn SI, Shi J, Kraft JB, Potash JB, Knowles JA, Weissman MM, et al. Novel loci for

major depression identified by genome-wide association study of Sequenced

Treatment Alternatives to Relieve Depression and meta-analysis of three studies. Mol

Psychiatry. 2011 Feb;16(2):202–15.

53.   Gonda X, Eszlari N, Anderson IM, Deakin JFW, Bagdy G, Juhasz G. Association of

ATP6V1B2 rs1106634 with lifetime risk of depression and hippocampal

neurocognitive deficits: possible novel mechanisms in the etiopathology of

depression. Transl Psychiatry. 2016 Nov 8;6(11):e945.

54.   Joubert BR, Håberg SE, Nilsen RM, Wang X, Vollset SE, Murphy SK, et al. 450K

epigenome-wide scan identifies differential DNA methylation in newborns related to

maternal smoking during pregnancy. Environ Health Perspect. 2012

Oct;120(10):1425–31.

55.   Küpers LK, Xu X, Jankipersadsing SA, Vaez A, La Bastide-van Gemert S, Scholtens S,

Nolte IM, Richmond RC, Relton CL, Felix JF DL. DNA methylation mediates the effect

of maternal smoking during pregnancy on birthweight of the offspring. Int J

Epidemiol. 2015;44(4):1224–37.

56.   Wahl S, Drong A, Lehne B, Loh M, Scott WR, Kunze S, et al. Epigenome-wide

association study of body mass index, and the adverse outcomes of adiposity. Nature

[Internet]. 2017 Jan 5 [cited 2021 Mar 29];541(7635):81–6. Available from:

https://www.nature.com/articles/nature20784

57.   Liu C, Marioni RE, Hedman AK, Pfeiffer L, Tsai PC, Reynolds LM, et al. A DNA

methylation biomarker of alcohol consumption. Mol Psychiatry. 2018 Feb

1;23(2):422–33.

58.   Joehanes R, Just AC, Marioni RE, Pilling LC, Reynolds LM, Mandaviya PR, et al.

Epigenetic Signatures of Cigarette Smoking. Circ Cardiovasc Genet [Internet]. 2016

Oct 1 [cited 2021 Mar 29];9(5):436–47. Available from:

http://circgenetics.ahajournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1161/CIRCGENETICS.116.00

1506/-/DC1.

59.   Álvarez-Errico D, Vento-Tormo R, Sieweke M, Ballestar E. Epigenetic control of

myeloid cell differentiation, identity and function [Internet]. Vol. 15, Nature Reviews

Immunology. Nature Publishing Group; 2015 [cited 2020 Jul 29]. p. 7–17. Available

from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25534619/

60.   Eyre HA, Lavretsky H, Kartika J, Qassim A, Baune BT. Modulatory Effects of

Antidepressant Classes on the Innate and Adaptive Immune System in Depression.

Vol. 49, Pharmacopsychiatry. Georg Thieme Verlag; 2016. p. 85–96.

61.   Hafferty JD, Campbell AI, Navrady LB, Adams MJ, MacIntyre D, Lawrie SM, et al. Self-

reported medication use validated through record linkage to national prescribing

data. J Clin Epidemiol. 2018 Feb 1;94:132–42.

62.   Arnet I, Abraham I, Messerli M, Hersberger KE. A method for calculating adherence to

polypharmacy from dispensing data records. Int J Clin Pharm. 2014 Nov 29;36(1):192–

201.

63.   Battram T, Richmond RC, Baglietto L, Haycock PC, Perduca V, Bojesen SE, et al.

Appraising the causal relevance of DNA methylation for risk of lung cancer. Int J

Epidemiol [Internet]. 2019 Oct 1 [cited 2020 Nov 10];48(5):1493–504. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/ije/article/48/5/1493/5573019

64.   Liu M, Jiang Y, Wedow R, Li Y, Brazel DM, Chen F, et al. Association studies of up to

1.2 million individuals yield new insights into the genetic etiology of tobacco and

alcohol use [Internet]. Vol. 51, Nature Genetics. Nature Publishing Group; 2019 [cited

2020 Nov 9]. p. 237–44. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC6358542/?report=abstract

65.   Chen MH, Raffield LM, Mousas A, Sakaue S, Huffman JE, Moscati A, et al. Trans-ethnic

and Ancestry-Specific Blood-Cell Genetics in 746,667 Individuals from 5 Global

Populations. Cell [Internet]. 2020 Sep 3 [cited 2020 Nov 10];182(5):1198-1213.e14.

Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32888493/

66.   Kichaev G, Bhatia G, Loh PR, Gazal S, Burch K, Freund MK, et al. Leveraging Polygenic

Functional Enrichment to Improve GWAS Power. Am J Hum Genet [Internet]. 2019

Jan 3 [cited 2020 Nov 9];104(1):65–75. Available from:

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30595370/

67.   Astle WJ, Elding H, Jiang T, Allen D, Ruklisa D, Mann AL, et al. The Allelic Landscape of

Human Blood Cell Trait Variation and Links to Common Complex Disease. Cell

[Internet]. 2016 Nov 17 [cited 2020 Nov 19];167(5):1415-1429.e19. Available from:

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27863252/

68.   Jostins L, Ripke S, Weersma RK, Duerr RH, McGovern DP, Hui KY, et al. Host-microbe

interactions have shaped the genetic architecture of inflammatory bowel disease.

Nature [Internet]. 2012 Nov 1 [cited 2020 Nov 19];491(7422):119–24. Available from:

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23128233/

69.   Liu JZ, Van Sommeren S, Huang H, Ng SC, Alberts R, Takahashi A, et al. Association

analyses identify 38 susceptibility loci for inflammatory bowel disease and highlight

shared genetic risk across populations. Nat Genet [Internet]. 2015 Aug 27 [cited 2020

Nov 19];47(9):979–86. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26192919/

70.   Din L, Sheikh M, Kosaraju N, Smedby KE, Bernatsky S, Berndt SI, et al. Genetic overlap

between autoimmune diseases and non-Hodgkin lymphoma subtypes. Genet

Epidemiol [Internet]. 2019 Oct 1 [cited 2020 Nov 19];43(7):844–63. Available from:

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31407831/

71.   Lee JJ, Wedow R, Okbay A, Kong E, Maghzian O, Zacher M, et al. Gene discovery and

polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational

attainment in 1.1 million individuals. Nat Genet. 2018;50(8):1112–21.

72. Zhu Z, Guo Y, Shi H, Liu CL, Panganiban RA, Chung W, et al. Shared genetic and
experimental links between obesity-related traits and asthma subtypes in UK
Biobank. J Allergy Clin Immunol [Internet]. 2020 Feb 1 [cited 2020 Nov
19];145(2):537–49. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31669095/

73. Lam M, Chen CY, Li Z, Martin AR, Bryois J, Ma X, et al. Comparative genetic
architectures of schizophrenia in East Asian and European populations. Nat Genet
[Internet]. 2019 Dec 1 [cited 2020 Nov 19];51(12):1670–8. Available from:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31740837/

74. Edwards TL, Giri A, Hellwege JN, Hartmann KE, Stewart EA, Jeff JM, et al. A trans-
ethnic genome-wide association study of uterine fibroids. Front Genet [Internet].
2019 [cited 2020 Nov 19];10(JUN). Available from:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31249589/

75. Evangelou E, Warren HR, Mosen-Ansorena D, Mifsud B, Pazoki R, Gao H, et al. Genetic
analysis of over 1 million people identifies 535 new loci associated with blood
pressure traits. Nat Genet [Internet]. 2018 Oct 1 [cited 2020 Nov 10];50(10):1412–25.
Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30224653/

76. Wang H, Yang J, Schneider JA, De Jager PL, Bennett DA, Zhang HY. Genome-wide
interaction analysis of pathological hallmarks in Alzheimer's disease. Neurobiol Aging
[Internet]. 2020 Sep 1 [cited 2020 Nov 10];93:61–8. Available from:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32450446/

77. Gallois A, Mefford J, Ko A, Vaysse A, Julienne H, Ala-Korpela M, et al. A
comprehensive study of metabolite genetics reveals strong pleiotropy and
heterogeneity across time and context. Nat Commun [Internet]. 2019 Dec 1 [cited
2020 Nov 19];10(1). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31636271/

78. Inouye M, Ripatti S, Kettunen J, Lyytikäinen LP, Oksala N, Laurila PP, et al. Novel Loci
for Metabolic Networks and Multi-Tissue Expression Studies Reveal Genes for
Atherosclerosis. PLoS Genet [Internet]. 2012 Aug [cited 2020 Nov 19];8(8). Available
from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22916037/

79. Li M, Maruthur NM, Loomis SJ, Pietzner M, North KE, Mei H, et al. Genome-wide
association study of 1,5-anhydroglucitol identifies novel genetic loci linked to glucose
metabolism. Sci Rep [Internet]. 2017 Dec 1 [cited 2020 Nov 19];7(1). Available from:

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28588231/

80.   Li Q, Wineinger NE, Fu DJ, Libiger O, Alphs L, Savitz A, et al. Genome-wide association

study of paliperidone efficacy. Pharmacogenet Genomics [Internet]. 2017 Jan 1 [cited

2020 Nov 19];27(1):7–18. Available from:

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27846195/

Acknowledgements

Generation Scotland is currently supported by the Wellcome Trust Investigator Award in Science 01/06/2021 to 31/05/26 'Exploiting genomic approaches to identify the environmental basis of depression'. (Reference: 220857/Z/20/Z) to McIntosh AM (PI). The DNA methylation profiling and data preparation was supported by Wellcome Investigator Award 220857/Z/20/Z and Grant 104036/Z/14/Z (PI for both grants: McIntosh AM) and through funding from NARSAD (Ref: 27404; PI: Dr DM Howard and Ref: 21956; PI: Dr Kathryn Evans) and the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh (Sim Fellowship; PI: Dr HC Whalley). Dr CA was supported by an MRC University Unit award to the MRC Human Genetics Unit, University of Edinburgh, MC_UU_00007/10. Genotyping of the GS:SFHS samples was funded by the MRC and Wellcome Trust [104036/Z/14/Z]. Generation Scotland also receives support from the Chief Scientist Office of the Scottish Government Health Directorates [CZD/16/6] and the Scottish Funding Council [HR03006]. Dr DMH is supported by a Sir Henry Wellcome Postdoctoral Fellowship (Reference 213674/Z/18/Z). Dr MCB is supported by a Guarantors of Brain Non-clinical Post-Doctoral Fellowship. Dr EB is an NIHR Senior Investigator and is a member of the scientific advisory board of Sosei Heptares. Dr ML is supported by a fellowship from the Medical Research Council (MR/S006257/1).

Financial disclosures

AMM has previously received grant support from Pfizer, Lilly and Janssen. These studies are not connected to the current investigation. Remaining authors report no conflicts of interest.

	Self-reported AD use sample		SSRI sample from NHS Scotland records	
Demographic characteristics	**AD use (N=740)**	**No AD use (N=5,688)**	**SSRI use in 12-month interval (N=401)**	**No SSRI use (N=6,705)**
Age				
Mean (SD), range	51.33 (11.07), 18 - 87	49.5 (13.73), 18 - 87	49.16 (12.35), 18 − 85	50.21 (13.65), 18 - 94
Sex (%)				
Female	564 (76%)	3,336 (59%)	364 (75%)	3,631 (54%)
Male	176 (24%)	2,352 (41%)	123 (25%)	3,074 (46%)
Wave (%)				
1	480 (65%)	2,918 (51%)	260 (65%)	3,389 (51%)
2	260 (35%)	2,770 (49%)	141 (35%)	3,316 (49%)
BMI				
Mean (SD), range	28.17 (5.58), 16.11 − 51.29	26.60 (4.95), 14.78 − 67.62	28.37 (5.97), 17.50 − 51.29	26.68 (4.96), 15.93 − 67.62
Alcohol units				
Mean (SD), range	8.99 (11.75), 0 - 105	10.56 (11.36), 0 − 146	9.46 (10.59), 0 − 72	10.91 (12.24), 0 - 326
Smoking status (%)				
Current smoker	192 (26%)	861 (15%)	104 (26%)	1,006 (15%)
Former smokers (quit < 1 year ago)	15 (2%)	146 (2%)	2 (1%)	154 (2%)
Former smokers (quit > 1 year ago)	229 (31%)	1,634 (29%)	116 (30%)	1,907 (29%)
Never smoked tobacco	304 (41%)	3,047 (54%)	179 (43%)	3,638 (54%)
Pack years				
Mean (SD), range	11.03 (16.03), 0 - 116	7.01 (13.51), 0 - 133	9.59 (14.58), 0 − 72.85	7.27 (14.07), 0 - 133
MDD status (%)				
Cases	420 (57%)	740 (13%)	201 (50%)	706 (11%)
Controls	320 (43%)	4,948 (87%)	200 (50%)	5,999 (89%)

966 **Table 1**. Demographic characteristics for GS individuals with self-reported antidepressant
967 use and SSRI prescribing data in 12 months prior to blood draw date included in MWAS,
968 including lifestyle variables and MDD; AD=antidepressant.

Demographic characteristics	Self-reported AD use sample	
	AD use (N=74)	No AD use (N=2,375)
Age		
Mean (SD), range	37.74 (12.20), 18 – 72	36.76 (3.97), 18 - 80
Sex (%)		
Female	52 (70%)	1,618 (68%)
Male	22 (30%)	757 (32%)
BMI		
Mean (SD), range	25.06 (4.25), 18.30 – 34.60	24.24 (3.97), 14.50 – 50.70
Smoking status (%)		
Current smokers	13 (17%)	434 (18%)
Former smokers	19 (26%)	506 (21%)
Never smoked tobacco	42 (57%)	1,435 (61%)
Pack years		
Mean (SD), range	3.56 (5.83), 0 - 25	3.95 (8.69), 0 – 105
MDD status (%)		
Cases	10 (14%)	395 (17%)
Controls	64 (86%)	1,980 (83%)

969 **Table 2**. Demographic characteristics for NTR individuals with self-reported antidepressant
970 use data within a week of blood draw included in MWAS, including lifestyle variables and
971 MDD; AD=antidepressant.

CpG site	Gene	Chrom	β	P-value	P-corr	CpG site information	Gene information
cg0560 3985	*SKI*	1	-0.022	3.92×10^{-10}	0.0002	Smoking (63), alcohol consumption (64)	Platelet count (65), Red cell distribution width (65), body height (66), lung function (66), self-reported educational attainment (66)
cg0527 3171	*PNKD; TMBIM1*	2	-0.013	2.35×10^{-8}	0.017	-	PNKD: red cell distribution width (65), body height (66), monocyte, reticulocyte, leukocute, granulocyte, neutrophil, and eosinophil count (67), waist-hip ratio (66) TMBIM1: red cell distribution width (65), body height (66), inflammatory bowel syndrome (68), Crohn's disease (69), cardiovascular disease (66) Related pathways: innate immune system
cg0386 4397	*CASP10*	2	-0.030	1.05×10^{-8}	0.007	-	Mean corpuscular haemoglobin (65), chronic lymphocytic leukaemia or rheumatoid arthritis (70)
cg0518 6879	*MAPKAPK3; CISH*	3	-0.023	3.3×10^{-9}	0.002	-	MAPKAPK3: self-reported educational attainment (71), BMI (72), schizophrenia (73) CISH: eosinophil count (66)
cg1631 5329	*CISH; MAPKAPK3*	3	-0.039	2.52×10^{-8}	0.018	-	MAPKAPK3: self-reported educational attainment (71), BMI (72), schizophrenia (73) CISH: eosinophil count (66)
cg2575 3411	*HEBP2*	6	-0.036	2.89×10^{-10}	0.0002	-	Related pathways: innate immune system
cg0951 1513	*ATP6V1B2*	8	-0.055	6.73×10^{-9}	0.005	-	Depression, mental or behavioural disorder (53)

cg2627 7237	*KANK1*	9	0.024	2.87×10^{-8}	0.020	-	Uterine fibroid (74), body height (66), systolic blood pressure (75), PHF-tau measurement (76)
cg2049 4891	*MYO1E*	15	-0.026	2.32×10^{-8}	0.017	-	Serum metabolite measurement (77), pulse pressure (75), coronary artery calcification (78), BMI (66), diffuse plaque measurement (76)
cg2758 9594	*SLC5A10*	17	-0.025	4.91×10^{-9}	0.004	Gestational age (44)	1.5 anhydroglucitol measurement (79), response to paliperidone (schizophrenia) (80)

Table 3. CpGs significantly associated with self-reported antidepressant use in GS (N=6,428; antidepressant use=740; N CpGs=10) along with gene annotations, chromosome, standardised effect size, nominal and Bonferroni-corrected p-values. Background information for each CpG and gene was extracted from EWAS (http://www.ewascatalog.org/; association between traits and CpGs on Illumina 450K array at $p \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-4}$; and GWAS (https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/; associations between traits and SNPs at $p \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-5}$) catalogue databases. All associations included in the table from these two catalogues are genome-wide significant.

Outcome variable (N)	MS			MS-ns			MS-control		
	β	p-value	R^2	β	p-value	R^2	β	p-value	R^2
AD use (3,360)	0.377	3.12×10^{-11}	2.12%	0.106	0.075	0.16%	0.254	1.15×10^{-5}	0.93%
AD use* (3,009)	0.213	0.0035	0.56%	0.04	0.565	0.02%	0.064	0.381	0.05%
MDD (3,360)	0.28	5.78×10^{-7}	1.14%	0.158	0.007	0.35%	0.202	0.0004	0.57%
BMI (3336)	0.088	2.54×10^{-7}	0.75%	0.021	0.23	0.01%	0.075	1.33×10^{-5}	0.53%
Alcohol units (3099)	0.141	$< 2 \times 10^{-16}$	1.93%	0.007	0.665	0%	0.127	5.08×10^{-14}	1.56%
Smoking status (3,322)	0.632	$< 2 \times 10^{-16}$	6.11%	0.077	0.028	0.11%	0.567	$< 2 \times 10^{-16}$	5.08%
Pack years (3,310)	0.305	$< 2 \times 10^{-16}$	9.14%	0.061	0.0004	0.34%	0.287	$< 2 \times 10^{-16}$	8.09%

Table 4. Association between MS (methylation score), MS-ns (methylation score trained on non-smokers), and MS-control (methylation score trained on individuals with no MDD diagnosis), and self-reported antidepressant use, MDD, and 4 lifestyle factors (BMI, smoking status, pack years, alcohol units). All regression models include age, sex, and 10 genetic principal components as covariates, except for "AD use*", which also includes BMI, smoking status, pack years, alcohol units, and MDD as covariates. Effect sizes represent standardized betas. R^2 represents the variance explained in the outcome variables by each score. The number of individuals in each model varies based on different available data for each variable.

1034

1035
Figure 1A, 1B, 1C. Manhattan plots showing MWAS of self-reported antidepressant use in
GS:SFHS (1A), MWAS of self-reported antidepressant use in NTR (1B), and meta-analysis of
MWAS in GS:SFHS and NTR (1C). The black line defines methylome-wide significance for
each analysis (GS:SFHS: p≤3.6x10^{-8}; NTR: p≤1.22x10^{-7}; meta-analysis: p≤1.57x10^{-8}) and the
dotted line defines p≤1x10^{-5}. Methylome-wide significant hits (GS:SFHS: 10; meta-analysis:
2) and the top 10 CpGs in NTR are labelled on the graph.
1042

1043

1044

1045 **Figure 2.** Differentially methylated CpG sites at p<1x10^{-5} in GS:SFHS enriched for peripheral
1046 blood cell subsets. The x-axis represents peripheral blood cell types, while the y-axis
1047 indicates corrected p-value.