Title: Differential DNA Methylation of the Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor Gene is Observed after Pediatric Traumatic Brain Injury Compared to Orthopedic Injury

Authors: Lacey W. Heinsberg, PhD, RN[1,2]; Aboli Kesbhat, BS[3,4]; Bailey Petersen, PhD, DPT[3]; Lauren Kaseman, BS[3]; Zachary Stec, BS[3]; Nivinthiga Anton, BS[3]; Patrick M. Kochanek, MD, MCCM[5]; Keith Owen Yeates, PhD, FCAHS, FRSC[6]; Daniel E. Weeks, PhD[2,7]; Yvette P. Conley, PhD, FAAN[1,2]; Amery Treble-Barna, PhD[3]

[1]Department of Health Promotion and Development, School of Nursing, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA
[2]Department of Human Genetics, School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA
[3]Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, School of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA
[4]Drexel University College of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
[5]Department of Critical Care Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA
[6]Department of Psychology, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada
[7]Department of Biostatistics and Health Data Science, School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA

Corresponding authors: Lacey W. Heinsberg, PhD, RN
Department of Health Promotion and Development
School of Nursing
University of Pittsburgh
440 Victoria Building
3500 Victoria Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15261
E-mail: law145@pitt.edu

Word count (including headings, but excluding abstract & declarations): 2996

ABSTRACT

Importance: Pediatric traumatic brain injury (TBI) triggers biological changes that may differ from those observed in non-brain injuries. *BDNF* DNA methylation (DNAm) may serve as a novel, dynamic biomarker of the brain's response and help identify TBI-specific epigenetic patterns relevant to later recovery.

Objective: To determine whether *BDNF* DNAm differed between children with TBI and those with orthopedic injury (OI, comparison group) acutely and over time.

Design: The Epigenetic Effects on TBI Recovery (EETR) study is a prospective, longitudinal, cohort study with phenotype data and peripheral blood collection at approximately 24 hours, 6 months, and 12 months post-injury.

Setting: Single-site study conducted at UPMC Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh.

Participants: Consecutive sampling of children aged 3-18 years hospitalized for a minimum of overnight for complicated mild to severe non-penetrating TBI (n=189) or OI without evidence of head trauma (n=105). Participants were excluded for pre-existing neurological or psychiatric conditions, sensory or motor impairments precluding study participation, and prior hospitalization for TBI.

Exposure: The primary exposure was injury type (TBI vs. OI), with severity examined as a secondary exposure within the TBI group.

Main outcomes and measures: The primary outcome was *BDNF* DNAm measured via pyrosequencing at seven sites (five retained for analysis) acutely (mean=31.6 hours post-injury) and 6 (mean=216.9 days) and 12 months (mean=405.9 days post-injury). Primary covariates included age, sex, and race; secondary covariates included age-adjusted body mass index, non-head injury severity score, pubertal status, socioeconomic status, and psychosocial adversity. Outcomes, covariates, and hypotheses were prespecified.

Results: Participants were 66.3% male, 82.3% White, and had a mean age of 11.7 (±4.2) years. Acutely, children with TBI showed significantly lower DNAm at three of five sites (1.8%–8.7% lower; p=0.0042 to 5.76E-06). One site remained significantly lower at 12 months (p=0.0038); no significant differences were observed at 6 months. TBI severity (measured via Glasgow Coma Scale) was not associated with DNAm at any time point.

Conclusions and relevance: *BDNF* DNAm appears to differ in children with TBI vs OI, particularly in the acute period. *BDNF* DNAm differences may reflect early biological responses that are specific to TBI.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

With an estimated annual worldwide prevalence of 69 million, traumatic brain injury (TBI) is a leading cause of disability in children.[1,2] Recovery from TBI involves a complex interplay of biological, psychosocial, and therapeutic factors. This complexity contributes to substantial heterogeneity in outcomes and remains a major barrier to developing accurate prognostic models and effective interventions.[3,4] Although biomarker discovery has advanced the field, efforts have largely focused on protein markers of structural brain injury. While informative, these markers may not fully capture the broader biological and environmental influences that shape recovery.[5–7] There is a critical need to identify dynamic and potentially modifiable biomarkers that reflect the child's psychosocial environment (e.g., social drivers of health) and respond to injury progression and recovery processes over time.

Methylomic biomarkers (i.e., DNA methylation [DNAm]) are emerging as promising tools to advance our understanding of disease mechanisms, predict outcomes, and guide therapy development.[8–12] DNAm is an epigenetic mechanism that regulates gene expression and responds dynamically to both internal (e.g., injury) and external (e.g., psychosocial adversity[13–16], rehabilitative therapies[17–20]) factors. Preclinical[21,22] and adult clinical[23,24] studies show differential DNAm both acutely and months after TBI, yet little is known about DNAm patterns in pediatric TBI. Given its responsiveness to environmental and biological cues, we hypothesize that DNAm changes occur in children with TBI, even when measured peripherally, reflecting early biological responses to brain injury. Such injury-related epigenetic differences may have relevance for long-term recovery trajectories.

To perform an initial investigation of injury-related DNAm changes, we conducted the Epigenetic Effects on TBI Recovery (EETR) study—a prospective, longitudinal cohort study of children with complicated mild to severe TBI and a comparison group of children with orthopedic injury (OI) and no evidence of brain injury.[25] As one of the first DNAm studies in complicated mild to severe pediatric TBI, we focused on the brain-derived neurotrophic factor (*BDNF*) gene, a neurotrophin well recognized to be involved in neuronal survival, differentiation, and synaptic strengthening.[26,27] BDNF levels are upregulated after TBI in preclinical[28–30] and clinical[31–34] studies and are associated with mortality and

functional outcomes in children[34,35] and adults[31,36,37], making it an ideal first target.

This initial report from the EETR study aims to characterize differences in peripheral blood *BDNF* DNAm between children with TBI and OI acutely and at 6- and 12-months post-injury, providing a foundation for future investigation of DNAm patterns in relation to recovery from pediatric TBI.

2.0 METHODS

2.1 Study overview, design, setting, and participants

The EETR study is an ongoing prospective, longitudinal cohort study of children with complicated mild to severe non-penetrating TBI and a comparison group of children with OI and no evidence of brain injury, conducted at the UPMC Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh since 2017.[25] Eligible children are aged 3-18 years and hospitalized at least overnight for their injuries. Complicated mild TBI is defined as a lowest post-resuscitation Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) score[38] of 13-15 with clinical neuroimaging indicating intracranial injury; moderate TBI is defined as GCS score of 9-12; severe TBI is defined as GCS score of 3-8. The OI group includes children with bone fractures, excluding skull or facial fractures, and no signs of head trauma or brain injury (nausea/vomiting, headache, loss of consciousness, GCS score <15 at any point) or any suspicion of TBI in the electronic medical record.

Exclusion criteria for both groups includes: (a) non-English-speaking child or parent/guardian (henceforth referred to as parent); (b) documented or parent-reported history of previous TBI or concussion requiring overnight hospitalization; (c) pre-injury neurological disorder or intellectual disability; (d) pre-injury psychiatric disorder requiring hospitalization; (e) spinal cord injury; (f) sensory or motor impairment precluding study measure completion; and (g) pregnancy at time of enrollment. Additionally, from the beginning of the study until 2/28/2023, children could provide either a blood or saliva biospecimen within 7 days post-injury for study eligibility. Since that date, provision of a blood specimen within 7 days post-injury is required for study eligibility.

Trained research staff perform assessments at three time points, acutely (prior to hospital discharge) and at 6- and 12-months post-injury. Phenotypic data (i.e., clinical, demographic, social factors, etc.) related to the injury, recovery from injury, and/or DNAm are collected. Peripheral blood

samples are collected and centrifuged, and the cellular pellet and supernatant are stored at -80º. For families open to donating a blood sample but not to fully participating in the research study, we permit "sample-only" participation. As a result, ~6% of participants contribute biospecimens without completing questionnaires, which limits the availability of phenotypic data that cannot be extracted from the medical record.

Informed written consent is obtained from parents of all participants, and written assent from children over 8 years of age capable of understanding study procedures. The study is approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Pittsburgh (STUDY19040402). A detailed description of the EETR protocol is published.[25]

2.2 Covariates

We assessed several *a priori* selected factors previously associated with TBI and/or *BDNF* DNAm (Methods S1). Primary covariates included age, sex, and race (White vs. All other racial groups, combined due to small cell sizes), with race parent-reported and rarely (<2%) supplemented from the medical record. Secondary covariates included age-adjusted body mass index (BMI) z-score (calculated using World Health Organization growth standards[39]); non-head Injury Severity Score (ISS, calculated using a combination of Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and excluding AIS codes related to head injuries[40]); pubertal status (measured using the Pubertal Development Scale[41]); socioeconomic status (SES, composite z-score based on maternal education and census tract income[42]); and psychosocial adversity assessed using the Psychosocial Assessment Tool (PAT)[43].

2.3 *BDNF* DNA methylation data

DNA was extracted from stored peripheral blood cellular pellets using the QIAmp Midi kit (Catalog #51185) from Qiagen Corp (Qiagen, Valencia, CA, USA) and sent to the Center for Inherited Disease Research (CIDR) at Johns Hopkins University (Genetic Resources Core Facility, RRID:SCR_018669) for DNAm profiling using pyrosequencing. Using 500 ng of DNA, concentration and quality checks were completed and bisulfite conversion was performed using standard protocols (Methods S2).

BDNF DNAm

DNAm profiling focused on two *BDNF* CpG sites (i.e., DNAm sites) (Chromosome 11, UCSC Genome Browser hg38 positions 27722033 and 27701612) selected based on a systematic review of epigenetic modifications associated with brain-related phenotypes in humans.[13] Probe sequences were designed to capture the two target sites and surrounding regions (Table S1). For position 27722033, five sites were captured, and for position 27701612, two sites were captured, resulting in DNAm data for seven DNAm sites in total (Table S2).

2.4 Statistical analyses

Analyses were conducted using R version 4.2.1.[44] DNAm data were analyzed as M values, the log2-transformed ratio of methylated to unmethylated probe intensities.[45] Descriptive statistics and data checks were conducted by measurement level. Data distributions, patterns, and associations were assessed across all variables. Outliers were identified using the interquartile range (IQR) method, winsorized (extreme $\geq$3×IQR), and assessed in sensitivity analyses.[46] Differences in participant characteristics based on DNAm availability were examined to evaluate potential attrition bias. DNAm data were plotted over time. Expanded statistical details are included in the in the Supplementary Information (Methods S3).

Associations between site-specific *BDNF* DNAm and injury type (TBI vs. OI) and TBI severity (severe vs. complicated mild/moderate, combined due to their clinical similarity and small sample size of the moderate group) were assessed using multiple linear regression. While linear mixed-effects models were considered to account for the repeated-measures design, the small sample sizes prevented reliable mixed modeling. Instead, cross-sectional analyses at each time point (acute, 6- months, 12-months) were prioritized to preserve robustness while minimizing model complexity. In these models, DNAm served as the outcome variable, with injury type or injury severity as the primary predictor. Primary models included covariates of age, sex, and race. In sensitivity models, secondary covariates BMI-z, non-head ISS, puberty, SES, and PAT were first added individually to the primary model to assess their influence, and then included together in a final fully adjusted model. For each model, we reported the estimated regression coefficients ($\widehat{\beta_M}$), representing the difference in DNAm between groups on the M-value scale, the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs), and adjusted R^2 values. We also reported the estimated

change in DNAm on the Beta-value scale ($\Delta\widehat{\beta_B}$) (which ranges from 0 to 100%), calculated by transforming $\widehat{\beta_M}$ back to the biologically interpretable Beta-value scale and multiplying by 100.[47] Associations with p-values <0.05 were considered nominally significant. We corrected for multiple testing based on the correlation structure among DNAm sites (Methods S3), resulting in a statistical significance threshold of p<0.0125.

3.0 RESULTS

3.1 DNAm data cleaning and quality control

Following quality control, five of the seven *BDNF* DNAm sites were retained for analyses (Table S2). One unreliable beta value of zero was set to missing, and thirteen extreme outliers were winsorized to the nearest valid value (Table S3). DNAm data were available at *any* time point from 294 unique participants (189 TBI; 105 OI). Among these, 271 participants (178 TBI; 93 OI) had DNAm data for the acute period; 121 participants (85 TBI; 36 OI) had DNAm data at 6 months; and 102 participants (72 TBI; 30 OI) had DNAm data at 12 months. Sixty-five participants (51 TBI; 14 OI) had DNAm data available at all three time points. Additional sample size details are presented in the Supplementary Information (Table S4).

3.1 Participant characteristics and descriptive overview

Baseline characteristics (collected at the acute time point) are presented in Table 1 for participants with DNAm data available at *any* of the three time points. Participants were 66.3% male, 82.3% White, and had a mean age of 11.7 (±4.2) years. Among the TBI group, 58.7% of injuries were classified as complicated mild and 30.2% as severe. No significant differences were observed between injury groups in age, sex, race, BMI-z, SES, PAT, or puberty scores. Non-head ISS was higher in the OI vs. TBI group, consistent with orthopedic injuries affecting body regions outside the head.

<TABLE 1>

Expanded participant characteristics are provided in the Supplementary Information (Table S5, Table S6, and Figure S1). Baseline characteristics were similar across groups regardless of DNAm data

availability, and across time points within the DNAm subsample (Table S5). Participants with and without DNAm data did not differ on any measures, except for lower SES in the OI group with DNAm data compared to those without DNAm data (p=0.046; Table S6). Within the subsample with DNAm, participants with TBI were more likely to complete the 12 month follow up than those with OI (p=0.0002; Figure S1). There were no statistically significant differences in time post-injury between injury groups as shown in Table 2.

<TABLE 2>

As part of data cleaning, we assessed covariate missingness (Figure S2) which was most common for PAT, follow-up BMI, and acute puberty assessments, primarily due to mid-study protocol changes and optional measures. As missingness appeared logistical rather than systematic, complete-case analysis was used for primary models.

The strongest age-related trends were with puberty and sex (Figure S3). Unadjusted exploratory plots (Figures 1 and S4-S6) showed DNAm differences by injury type at the acute and 12-month time points, and some sex-related variation, with no clear patterns by severity or race. A heatmap of DNAm-covariate correlations (Figure S7) showed within-DNAm site correlations, but limited associations amongst covariates. Expected links among social factors were observed (Figure S8). A spaghetti plot grouped by injury type illustrates individual variability and DNAm distribution over time (Figure S9).

<FIGURE 1>

3.2 Regression results

Results of linear regression examining associations between injury type (TBI vs. OI; primary predictor) and *BDNF* DNAm values (outcome) while adjusting for primary covariates of age, sex, and race are presented in Table 3. In the acute period, injury type was significantly associated with DNAm at three of the five DNAm sites (positions 1, 2, and 5), with effect sizes ($\Delta\widehat{\beta_B}$) ranging from -5.9 to -3.2, indicating lower *BDNF* DNAm in the TBI group compared to the OI group (p=5.67E-06 to p=0.0057). At 12 months post-injury, injury type was significantly associated with DNAm at a single site (position 5, p=0.0038) with the direction of effect consistent with the acute period. No statistically

BDNF DNAm
significant associations were observed at the 6-month follow-up.

<TABLE 3>

Results of sensitivity analyses examining associations between injury type and *BDNF* DNAm values while adjusting for primary covariates (age, sex, race) as well as secondary covariates (BMI z-score, ISS, puberty, SES, and/or PAT) resulted in largely consistent results, with injury type significantly associated with lower DNAm at several sites during the acute period, particularly positions 1, 2, 4, and 5 (Table S7). At 6- and 12-months post-injury, few associations reached nominal significance; after correction for multiple testing, none remained significant at 6 months, and only position 5 remained significant at 12 months in select models.

Finally, Table 4 shows regression analyses within the TBI group assessing DNAm differences by injury severity (severe vs. complicated mild/moderate), adjusted for age, sex, and race. No statistically significant differences were observed.

<TABLE 4>

4.0 DISCUSSION

4.1 Key findings

We observed significant differences in *BDNF* DNAm between children with TBI and those with OI at several sites during the acute period (mean of 31.6 hours post-injury) and at one site at 12-months (mean of 405.9 days post-injury). Across all significant findings, DNAm levels were lower in the TBI group ($\Delta\widehat{\beta_B}$ 1.8 to 8.7). These differences remained robust across sensitivity models.

4.2 Interpretation

These results suggest that *BDNF* DNAm may be responsive to acute injury and may reflect early biological changes that are specific to pediatric TBI, distinct from those observed in children with non-brain injuries. This aligns with early preclinical and adult clinical studies reporting DNAm alterations during the acute and subacute phases of TBI recovery[22,23,48–50], and supports the broader role of epigenetic regulation in neuroinflammatory processes, stress adaptation, and injury response.[51–54]

BDNF DNAm

While increased DNAm is typically associated with transcriptional repression, the relationship is site- and context-specific.[55] *BDNF* adds complexity with multiple promoters and non-coding exons that generate transcript isoforms with potentially distinct functions.[56] In our study, Positions 1-3 lie near Promoter I (exon I), and Positions 4-5 near Promoter IV (exon IV)[13], suggesting potential differential regulatory relevance in regions linked to brain function and stress response.[57] Lower *BDNF* DNAm levels observed shortly after TBI may reflect an adaptive response to upregulate expression, consistent with evidence that BDNF protein levels increase following injury.[28–34] Future work should assess whether DNAm influences isoform-specific expression or protein levels over time, and whether such changes mediate effects of therapeutic or psychosocial interventions.

Although acute group differences were strong and robust across models with different covariates, no significant differences were observed at 6-months, and only one site showed a significant difference at 12-months. The direction of effects remained consistent across all associations, with lower DNAm in the TBI group, but the strength and stability of these associations diminished over time post-injury. This pattern may reflect a transient DNAm response to injury that resolves as recovery progresses. Alternatively, greater heterogeneity in later recovery stages or reduced sample size may have obscured subtle or sustained effects. Given the complexity of DNAm dynamics and the multifactorial nature of recovery, larger longitudinal studies with additional time points are needed to clarify the significance of these epigenetic changes.

We did not observe associations between *BDNF* DNAm and TBI severity. This may reflect the limited sensitivity of the GCS, especially in pediatric populations[58,59]. Emerging classification systems may provide more biologically meaningful measures of TBI severity.[60] The observed lack of association could also suggest that factors beyond injury severity (such as psychosocial stressors) play a larger role in DNAm levels post-injury. In fact, adjusted R^2 values increased when psychosocial adversity (PAT) was added to acute models, despite PAT not showing a significant independent association. This suggests PAT may contribute modestly or interactively to DNAm variability. This merits future work focused on the biological impact of psychosocial adversity following TBI.

BDNF DNAm

Finally, one site (Position 5) exhibited a bimodal distribution in the acute period (Figure 1) that was not explained by covariates, which may reflect unmeasured genetic variation. For example, the *BDNF* Val66Met variant (rs6265)[61,62] is a well-characterized methylation quantitative trait locus (meQTL)[17,63] not captured by our study. Genotyping in future studies may help clarify genetic-epigenetic interactions shaping individual response to injury.

4.3 Limitations and strengths

The most significant limitation of this study is the reduced sample size at the 6- and 12-month follow-up periods, which limited our ability to include multiple covariates in primary models and precluded the use of more complex longitudinal analyses. Follow-up rates were affected by the COVID-19 pandemic; the broad geographic catchment area of UPMC Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, which made return visits challenging for some families; and participant hesitancy around follow-up blood draws. Importantly though, participants with and without follow-up DNAm data (Figure S1) displayed no significant differences in baseline characteristics, supporting the generalizability of findings. Additional limitations include the single-center nature of the study and the lack of an independent validation cohort, which limit the external validity of our findings. Future multi-site studies with larger, more diverse samples and replication datasets will be important to validate and extend these results.

Despite these limitations, the study has several key strengths. It represents one of the largest pediatric TBI cohorts to date and is strengthened by its prospective design, inclusion of a well-characterized OI comparison group, longitudinal biospecimen collection, and rich phenotypic and epigenetic data. Further, while DNAm varies across tissues and our focus was on brain injury, we intentionally measured DNAm in peripheral blood to identify biomarkers that may reflect systemic responses to injury from an *accessible* and therefore *clinically relevant* tissue—especially important in pediatric populations. Finally, rigorous data cleaning and quality control procedures were implemented, and sensitivity analyses confirmed the robustness of results.

5.0 CONCLUSION

This study provides initial evidence of *BDNF* DNAm differences between children with TBI and those with OI, particularly in the acute period, suggesting a role in the brain's early injury response. Further research is needed to clarify functional relevance, link DNAm to recovery, explore genome-wide DNAm patterns, and support precision rehabilitation strategies to improve outcomes.

BDNF DNAm

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of EETR participants with DNA methylation data at any timepoint by injury type.

	TBI (n=189)	**OI (n=105)**	**p**
Primary covariates			
Age (years), mean (SD)	11.77 (4.16)	11.46 (4.18)	0.629[a]
Sex, n (%)			
Male	121 (64.0)	74 (70.5)	0.321[b]
Female	68 (36.0)	31 (29.5)	
Race (%)			
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2 (1.1)	0	
Asian	2 (1.1)	2 (1.9)	
Black or African American	20 (10.6)	11 (10.5)	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1 (0.5)	0	0.657[c]
White	156 (82.5)	85 (81.0)	
Other	7 (3.7)	7 (6.6)	
Missing, n (%)	1 (0.5)	0	
TBI severity and secondary covariates			
TBI severity, n (%)			
Complicated mild	111 (58.7)		
Moderate	21 (11.1)	NA	NA
Severe	57 (30.2)		
BMI-z, mean (SD)	0.56 (1.63)	0.73 (1.63)	0.396[a]
Missing	1 (0.5)	6 (5.7)	
Non-head ISS, median [IQR]	1.0 [1.0, 5.0]	4.0 [4.0, 9.0]	**0.0001**[d]
SES, mean (SD)	-0.03 (0.79)	0.00 (0.75)	0.775[a]
Missing, n (%)	23 (12.1)	3 (2.9)	
PAT, median [IQR]	0.64 [0.30, 1.12]	0.60 [0.27, 1.17]	0.832[d]
Missing, n (%)	80 (42.1)	50 (47.6)	
Puberty, mean (SD)	1.73 (0.95)	1.76 (1.02)	0.777[a]
Missing, n (%)	76 (40.0)	41 (39.0)	

This table summarizes the characteristics of participants with DNA methylation data available at any of the measured time points (Acute (at injury), 6-months post-injury, or 12-months post-injury). TBI=traumatic brain injury; OI=orthopedic injury; BMI-z=age-adjusted body mass index Z score (World Health Organization growth standards); ISS=non-head injury severity score; SES=socioeconomic proxy score; PAT=psychosocial assessment tool total score; Puberty=puberty score; SD=standard deviation; IQR=interquartile range; Race shown here across all categories but operationalized in analyses as White vs. Other race; [a]t-test; [b]Chi-squared test; [c]Fisher's exact test; [d]Wilcoxon rank sum test. Bolded p-values indicate statistically significant difference based on a p-value<0.05. Please see Table S5 and Table S6 for expanded participant characteristics.

Table 2. Time-specific sample sizes and time post-injury of blood samples used for DNAm data collection.

Visit	All		TBI		OI		
	n	Time since injury, mean (SD)	n	Time since injury, mean (SD)	n	Time since injury, mean (SD)	p[a]
A	271	31.6 (23.1) hours	178	32.5 (24.9) hours	93	29.8 (19.2) hours	0.559
6M	121	216.9 (41.8) days	85	218.0 (38.9) days	36	214.3 (48.6) days	0.658
12M	102	405.9 (39.9) days	72	410.4 (39.7) days	30	394.9 (38.6) days	0.073

TBI=traumatic brain injury; OI=orthopedic injury; A=acute (at injury); 6M=6-months post-injury; 12M=12-months post-injury; [a]t-test comparing TBI vs. OI groups.

BDNF DNAm

Figure 1. Unadjusted *BDNF* DNA methylation by injury type across time.



TBI=traumatic brain injury; OI=orthopedic injury; A=acute (at injury); 6M=6-months post-injury; 12M=12-months post-injury; Pos1-5 indicate site-specific DNAm where Pos1=Position 1 (hg38 chr11:27722033); Pos2=Position 2 (chr11:27722036); Pos3=Position 3 (chr11:27722047); Pos4=Position 4 (chr11:27701612); Pos5=Position 5 (chr11:27701614). Green, horizontal, dashed line indicates group-specific mean values. P-values calculated using t-test (no adjustment for covariates); *p<0.05; refer to Table 3 and Table S7 for association results between *BDNF* DNA methylation and injury type while controlling for covariates.

BDNF DNAm

Table 3. Results of linear regression examining associations between injury type (primary predictor, TBI vs. OI as the reference group) and *BDNF* DNAm (outcome) while controlling for age, sex, and race.

Time	Site	Position (hg38)	n	$\widehat{\beta_M}$	95% CI Low	95% CI High	*p*	$\Delta\widehat{\beta_B}$	R^2_{adj}
A	Pos1	27722033	270	-0.185	-0.315	-0.055	**0.0057**	-3.197	3.12
	Pos2	27722036	270	-0.184	-0.309	-0.059	**0.0042**	-3.183	3.70
	Pos3	27722047	268	0.016	-0.085	0.117	0.7549	0.278	-0.29
	Pos4	27701612	263	-0.109	-0.210	-0.007	*0.0371*	-1.882	0.59
	Pos5	27701614	265	-0.340	-0.483	-0.196	**5.67E-06**	-5.860	6.82
6M	Pos1	27722033	121	0.082	-0.098	0.261	0.3748	1.412	-1.27
	Pos2	27722036	121	-0.004	-0.174	0.166	0.9666	-0.063	-2.23
	Pos3	27722047	121	-0.038	-0.173	0.098	0.5871	-0.654	-0.03
	Pos4	27701612	116	0.054	-0.124	0.232	0.5517	0.939	0.13
	Pos5	27701614	120	0.170	0.004	0.336	*0.0476*	2.938	2.20
12M	Pos1	27722033	102	-0.050	-0.256	0.156	0.6341	-0.869	1.57
	Pos2	27722036	102	-0.201	-0.397	-0.006	*0.0465*	-3.479	3.15
	Pos3	27722047	102	0.099	-0.035	0.233	0.1507	1.712	-0.87
	Pos4	27701612	95	-0.259	-0.524	0.006	0.0584	-4.478	0.32
	Pos5	27701614	97	-0.508	-0.843	-0.173	**0.0038**	-8.712	5.85

TBI=Traumatic brain injury; OI=Orthopedic injury; A=acute (at injury); 6M=6-months post-injury; 12M=12-months post-injury; $\widehat{\beta_M}$ $(M\ value)$=estimated difference in DNA methylation between participants with TBI and those with OI (reference group), derived from linear regression on the M-value (logit-transformed) scale while holding covariates constant; 95% CI Low / High=lower and upper bounds of 95% confidence interval for $\widehat{\beta_M}$; $\Delta\widehat{\beta_B}$ $(Beta, \%)$=estimated change in DNA methylation on the Beta scale (which ranges from 0 to 100 %), derived by transforming $\widehat{\beta_M}$ from the M-value scale to the biologically interpretable Beta value scale and multiplying by 100; R^2_{adj}=adjusted R^2 value for the model; Race categorized as White vs. Other races; italicized/underlined p-values indicate nominal significance at $p<0.05$; bolded p-values indicate statistical significance at $p<0.0125$; see Table S7 for expanded analyses exploring the influence of other covariates.

BDNF DNAm

Table 4. Results of linear regression examining associations between TBI injury severity (primary predictor, severe vs. complicated mild/moderate (combined) as the reference group) and *BDNF* DNAm (outcome) while controlling for age, sex, and race.

Time	Position	Position (hg38)	n	$\widehat{\beta_M}$ $(M\ value)$	95% CI Low	95% CI High	$\Delta\widehat{\beta_B}$ $(Beta, \%)$	p
A	Pos1	27722033	177	0.082	-0.064	0.229	1.43	0.2721
	Pos2	27722036	177	0.043	-0.098	0.184	0.75	0.5488
	Pos3	27722047	175	0.038	-0.090	0.165	0.65	0.5640
	Pos4	27701612	173	0.017	-0.121	0.155	0.30	0.8045
	Pos5	27701614	175	0.036	-0.157	0.228	0.62	0.7169
6M	Pos1	27722033	85	0.008	-0.195	0.212	0.14	0.9360
	Pos2	27722036	85	0.020	-0.170	0.209	0.35	0.8373
	Pos3	27722047	85	0.080	-0.072	0.231	1.38	0.3063
	Pos4	27701612	83	0.010	-0.216	0.236	0.17	0.9313
	Pos5	27701614	84	-0.090	-0.307	0.127	-1.56	0.4187
12M	Pos1	27722033	72	0.059	-0.174	0.291	1.01	0.6238
	Pos2	27722036	72	0.004	-0.227	0.235	0.07	0.9737
	Pos3	27722047	72	-0.057	-0.209	0.095	-0.99	0.4629
	Pos4	27701612	69	-0.007	-0.270	0.256	-0.11	0.9608
	Pos5	27701614	71	-0.079	-0.420	0.263	-1.36	0.6536

TBI=Traumatic brain injury; OI=Orthopedic injury; A=acute (at injury); 6M=6 months post-injury; 12M=12 months post-injury; $\widehat{\beta_M}$ $(M\ value)$=estimated difference in DNA methylation between participants with severe TBI and those with complicated mild or moderate TBI (reference group), derived from linear regression on the M-value (logit-transformed) scale while holding covariates constant; 95% CI Low / High=lower and upper bounds of 95% confidence interval for $\widehat{\beta_M}$; $\Delta\widehat{\beta_B}$ $(Beta, \%)$=estimated change in DNA methylation expressed as a percent, derived by transforming $\widehat{\beta_M}$ from the M-value scale to the biologically interpretable Beta value scale and multiplying by 100; Race categorized as White vs. Other races.

DECLARATIONS

Ethics approval, guidelines, and consent to participate: This study adhered to all ethical considerations, obtaining informed written consent from parents/guardians and child assent for ages 8 years and above. It was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Pittsburgh (STUDY19040402).

Consent for publication: Not applicable.

Availability of data: De-identified DNA methylation and phenotype data will be deposited in dbGaP (accession number phs004096.v1) for participants who provide consent for broad data sharing as part of an NIH R01-funded project currently underway. Until that time, data will be made available upon reasonable request to the Principal Investigator. All requests will be reviewed to ensure consistency with participant consent, institutional policies, and appropriate data use agreements. Please contact Amery Treble-Barna at amery.treble-barna@pitt.edu for more information.

Funding: Research reported in this publication was supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development and National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke of the National Institutes of Health under award number K01HD097030 and R01NS135492. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Competing interests: The funders had no role in the design of the study or decision to publish. As such, the authors declare no conflict of interest.

Authors contributions: Heinsberg: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; **Kesbhat**: Data curation, Project administration, Writing – review & editing; **Petersen**: Data curation, Writing – review & editing; **Kaseman**: Data curation, Project administration, Writing – review & editing; **Stec**: Data curation, Project administration, Writing – review & editing; **Anton**: Data curation, Project administration, Writing – review & editing; **Kochanek**: Writing – review & editing; **Yeates**: Writing – review & editing; **Weeks**: Writing – review & editing; **Conley**: Resources, Writing – review & editing; **Treble-Barna**: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. All authors contributed to the interpretation of data, critically reviewed the manuscript for important intellectual content, and approved the final version. All authors agree to be accountable for the work.

Acknowledgements: We thank the participants of this study and their families for generously contributing their time to advance knowledge on pediatric traumatic brain injury recovery.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies: ChatGPT 4o was used during the development of this manuscript to (1) refine R code for improved data visualization and (2) enhance the clarity, readability, and flow of the written content. All AI-generated output was reviewed, edited, and approved by the authors, who take full responsibility for the final content of the publication.

REFERENCES

1. Dewan MC, Rattani A, Gupta S, et al. Estimating the global incidence of traumatic brain injury. *J Neurosurg*. 2019;130(4):1080-1097. doi:10.3171/2017.10.JNS17352

2. Suskauer SJ, Houtrow AJ. Invited Commentary on "The Report to Congress on the Management of Traumatic Brain Injury in Children". *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2018;99(11):2389-2391. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2018.05.012

3. Saatman KE, Duhaime AC, Bullock R, Maas AIR, Valadka A, Manley GT. Classification of traumatic brain injury for targeted therapies. *J Neurotrauma*. 2008;25(7):719-738. doi:10.1089/neu.2008.0586

4. Hawryluk GWJ, Manley GT. Classification of traumatic brain injury: past, present, and future. *Handb Clin Neurol*. 2015;127:15-21. doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-52892-6.00002-7

5. Korley FK, Jain S, Sun X, et al. Prognostic value of day-of-injury plasma GFAP and UCH-L1 concentrations for predicting functional recovery after traumatic brain injury in patients from the US TRACK-TBI cohort: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Neurol*. 2022;21(9):803-813. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(22)00256-3

6. Munoz Pareja JC, Li X, Gandham N, Wang KK. Biomarkers in Moderate to Severe Pediatric Traumatic Brain Injury: A Review of the Literature. *Pediatr Neurol*. 2022;130:60-68. doi:10.1016/j.pediatrneurol.2022.03.002

7. Huie JR, Mondello S, Lindsell CJ, et al. Biomarkers for Traumatic Brain Injury: Data Standards and Statistical Considerations. *J Neurotrauma*. 2021;38(18):2514-2529. doi:10.1089/neu.2019.6762

8. Loomans-Kropp HA, Song Y, Gala M, et al. Methylated Septin9 (mSEPT9): A promising blood-based biomarker for the detection and screening of early-onset colorectal cancer. *Cancer Res Commun*. 2022;2(2):90-98. doi:10.1158/2767-9764.crc-21-0142

9. Kurkjian C, Kummar S, Murgo AJ. DNA methylation: its role in cancer development and therapy. *Curr Probl Cancer*. 2008;32(5):187-235. doi:10.1016/j.currproblcancer.2008.08.002

10. Hu C, Liu X, Zeng Y, Liu J, Wu F. DNA methyltransferase inhibitors combination therapy for the treatment of solid tumor: mechanism and clinical application. *Clin Epigenetics*. 2021;13(1):166. doi:10.1186/s13148-021-01154-x

11. Yang X, Lay F, Han H, Jones PA. Targeting DNA methylation for epigenetic therapy. *Trends Pharmacol Sci*. 2010;31(11):536-546. doi:10.1016/j.tips.2010.08.001

12. Szyf M, Tang YY, Hill KG, Musci R. The dynamic epigenome and its implications for behavioral interventions: a role for epigenetics to inform disorder prevention and health promotion. *Transl Behav Med*. 2016;6(1):55-62. doi:10.1007/s13142-016-0387-7

BDNF DNAm

13. Treble-Barna A, Heinsberg LW, Stec Z, et al. Brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) epigenomic modifications and brain-related phenotypes in humans: A systematic review. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2023;147:105078. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2023.105078

14. Blaze J, Asok A, Roth TL. The long-term impact of adverse caregiving environments on epigenetic modifications and telomeres. *Front Behav Neurosci*. 2015;9:79. doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00079

15. Unternaehrer E, Meyer AH, Burkhardt SCA, et al. Childhood maternal care is associated with DNA methylation of the genes for brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) and oxytocin receptor (OXTR) in peripheral blood cells in adult men and women. *Stress*. 2015;18(4):451-461. doi:10.3109/10253890.2015.1038992

16. Vaiserman AM. Epigenetic programming by early-life stress: Evidence from human populations. *Dev Dyn*. 2015;244(3):254-265. doi:10.1002/dvdy.24211

17. Santoro M, Siotto M, Germanotta M, et al. BDNF rs6265 Polymorphism and Its Methylation in Patients with Stroke Undergoing Rehabilitation. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2020;21(22). doi:10.3390/ijms21228438

18. Boschen KE, McKeown SE, Roth TL, Klintsova AY. Impact of exercise and a complex environment on hippocampal dendritic morphology, Bdnf gene expression, and DNA methylation in male rat pups neonatally exposed to alcohol. *Dev Neurobiol*. 2017;77(6):708-725. doi:10.1002/dneu.22448

19. Choi IA, Lee CS, Kim HY, Choi DH, Lee J. Effect of Inhibition of DNA Methylation Combined with Task-Specific Training on Chronic Stroke Recovery. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2018;19(7). doi:10.3390/ijms19072019

20. Gomez-Pinilla F, Zhuang Y, Feng J, Ying Z, Fan G. Exercise impacts brain-derived neurotrophic factor plasticity by engaging mechanisms of epigenetic regulation. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2011;33(3):383-390. doi:10.1111/j.1460-9568.2010.07508.x

21. Zhang ZY, Zhang Z, Fauser U, Schluesener HJ. Global hypomethylation defines a sub-population of reactive microglia/macrophages in experimental traumatic brain injury. *Neurosci Lett*. 2007;429(1):1-6. doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2007.09.061

22. Haghighi F, Ge Y, Chen S, et al. Neuronal DNA Methylation Profiling of Blast-Related Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2015;32(16):1200-1209. doi:10.1089/neu.2014.3640

23. Liu D, Zusman BE, Shaffer JR, et al. Decreased DNA Methylation of RGMA is Associated with Intracranial Hypertension After Severe Traumatic Brain Injury: An Exploratory Epigenome-Wide Association Study. *Neurocrit Care*. 2022;37(1):26-37. doi:10.1007/s12028-021-01424-9

24. Abu Hamdeh S, Ciuculete DM, Sarkisyan D, et al. Differential DNA Methylation of the Genes for Amyloid Precursor Protein, Tau, and Neurofilaments in Human Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2021;38(12):1679-1688. doi:10.1089/neu.2020.7283

25. Treble-Barna A, Patronick J, Uchani S, et al. Epigenetic Effects on Pediatric Traumatic Brain Injury Recovery (EETR): An Observational, Prospective, Longitudinal Concurrent Cohort Study Protocol. *Front Neurol*. 2020;11:460. doi:10.3389/fneur.2020.00460

26. Barker PA. Whither proBDNF? *Nat Neurosci*. 2009;12(2):105-106. doi:10.1038/nn0209-105

27. Lu B, Pang PT, Woo NH. The yin and yang of neurotrophin action. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2005;6(8):603-614. doi:10.1038/nrn1726

28. Rostami E, Krueger F, Plantman S, et al. Alteration in BDNF and its receptors, full-length and truncated TrkB and p75(NTR) following penetrating traumatic brain injury. *Brain Res*. 2014;1542:195-205. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2013.10.047

29. Hicks RR, Numan S, Dhillon HS, Prasad MR, Seroogy KB. Alterations in BDNF and NT-3 mRNAs in rat hippocampus after experimental brain trauma. *Brain Res Mol Brain Res*. 1997;48(2):401-406. doi:10.1016/s0169-328x(97)00158-7

30. Chen X, Li Y, Kline AE, Dixon CE, Zafonte RD, Wagner AK. Gender and environmental effects on regional brain-derived neurotrophic factor expression after experimental traumatic brain injury. *Neuroscience*. 2005;135(1):11-17. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2005.05.041

31. Failla MD, Conley YP, Wagner AK. Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor (BDNF) in Traumatic Brain Injury-Related Mortality: Interrelationships Between Genetics and Acute Systemic and Central Nervous System BDNF Profiles. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2016;30(1):83-93. doi:10.1177/1545968315586465

32. Munoz MJ, Kumar RG, Oh BM, et al. Cerebrospinal Fluid Cortisol Mediates Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor Relationships to Mortality after Severe TBI: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Front Mol Neurosci*. 2017;10:44. doi:10.3389/fnmol.2017.00044

33. Chiaretti A, Piastra M, Polidori G, et al. Correlation between neurotrophic factor expression and outcome of children with severe traumatic brain injury. *Intensive Care Med*. 2003;29(8):1329-1338. doi:10.1007/s00134-003-1852-6

34. Pinelis VG, Sorokina EG, Semenova JB, et al. [Biomarkers in children with traumatic brain injury]. *Zh Nevrol Psikhiatr Im S S Korsakova*. 2015;115(8):66-72. doi:10.17116/jnevro20151158166-72

35. Madurski C, Jarvis JM, Beers SR, et al. Serum Biomarkers of Regeneration and Plasticity are Associated with Functional Outcome in Pediatric Neurocritical Illness: An Exploratory Study. *Neurocrit Care*. 2021;35(2):457-467. doi:10.1007/s12028-021-01199-z

36. Korley FK, Diaz-Arrastia R, Wu AHB, et al. Circulating Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor Has Diagnostic and Prognostic Value in Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2016;33(2):215-225. doi:10.1089/neu.2015.3949

37. Failla MD, Juengst SB, Arenth PM, Wagner AK. Preliminary Associations Between Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor, Memory Impairment, Functional Cognition, and Depressive Symptoms Following Severe TBI. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2016;30(5):419-430. doi:10.1177/1545968315600525

38. Teasdale G, Jennett B. Assessment of coma and impaired consciousness. A practical scale. *Lancet*. 1974;2(7872):81-84. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(74)91639-0

39. Lazarus Mramba, James Berkley. MUACz: Generate MUAC and BMI z-Scores and Percentiles for Children and Adolescents. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MUACz/index.html

40. Baker SP, O'Neill B, Haddon WJ, Long WB. The injury severity score: a method for describing patients with multiple injuries and evaluating emergency care. *J Trauma*. 1974;14(3):187-196.

41. Carskadon MA, Acebo C. A self-administered rating scale for pubertal development. *J Adolesc Health*. 1993;14(3):190-195. doi:10.1016/1054-139x(93)90004-9

42. Yeates KO, Taylor HG, Walz NC, Stancin T, Wade SL. The family environment as a moderator of psychosocial outcomes following traumatic brain injury in young children. *Neuropsychology*. 2010;24(3):345-356. doi:10.1037/a0018387

43. Kazak AE, Schneider S, Didonato S, Pai ALH. Family psychosocial risk screening guided by the Pediatric Psychosocial Preventative Health Model (PPPHM) using the Psychosocial Assessment Tool (PAT). *Acta Oncol*. 2015;54(5):574-580. doi:10.3109/0284186X.2014.995774

44. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Published online 2021. https://www.R-project.org/

45. Du P, Zhang X, Huang CC, et al. Comparison of Beta-value and M-value methods for quantifying methylation levels by microarray analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2010;11:587. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-11-587

46. Heinsberg LW, Arockiaraj AI, Crago EA, et al. Genetic Variability and Trajectories of DNA Methylation May Support a Role for HAMP in Patient Outcomes After Aneurysmal Subarachnoid Hemorrhage. *Neurocrit Care*. 2020;32(2):550-563. doi:10.1007/s12028-019-00787-4

47. Xie C, Leung YK, Chen A, Long DX, Hoyo C, Ho SM. Differential methylation values in differential methylation analysis. *Bioinformatics*. 2019;35(7):1094-1097. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bty778

48. Treble-Barna A, Heinsberg LW, Puccio AM, et al. Acute Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor DNA Methylation Trajectories in Cerebrospinal Fluid and Associations With Outcomes Following Severe Traumatic Brain Injury in Adults. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2021;35(9):790-800. doi:10.1177/15459683211028245

49. Bahado-Singh RO, Vishweswaraiah S, Er A, et al. Artificial Intelligence and the detection of pediatric concussion using epigenomic analysis. *Brain Res*. 2020;1726:146510. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2019.146510

50. Bailey ZS, Grinter MB, De La Torre Campos D, VandeVord PJ. Blast induced neurotrauma causes overpressure dependent changes to the DNA methylation equilibrium. *Neurosci Lett*. 2015;604:119-123. doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2015.07.035

51. Ma Y, Wang W, Liu S, et al. Epigenetic Regulation of Neuroinflammation in Alzheimer's Disease. *Cells*. 2023;13(1). doi:10.3390/cells13010079

52. Garden GA. Epigenetics and the modulation of neuroinflammation. *Neurotherapeutics*. 2013;10(4):782-788. doi:10.1007/s13311-013-0207-4

53. Stankiewicz AM, Swiergiel AH, Lisowski P. Epigenetics of stress adaptations in the brain. *Brain Res Bull*. 2013;98:76-92. doi:10.1016/j.brainresbull.2013.07.003

54. Smith AK, Katrinli S, Maihofer AX, et al. Cell-type-specific and inflammatory DNA methylation patterns associated with PTSD. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2025;128:540-548. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2025.04.031

55. 2. Relationship between different epigenomic marks: DNA accessibility and methylation, histone marks, and RNA. *Nature*. Published online February 18, 2015. doi:10.1038/nature14310

56. Binder DK, Scharfman HE. Brain-derived neurotrophic factor. *Growth Factors*. 2004;22(3):123-131. doi:10.1080/08977190410001723308

57. Ruiz CR, Shi J, Meffert MK. Transcript specificity in BDNF-regulated protein synthesis. *Neuropharmacology*. 2014;76 Pt C(0 0):657-663. doi:10.1016/j.neuropharm.2013.05.004

58. Åkerlund CAI, Holst A, Stocchetti N, et al. Clustering identifies endotypes of traumatic brain injury in an intensive care cohort: a CENTER-TBI study. *Crit Care*. 2022;26(1):228. doi:10.1186/s13054-022-04079-w

59. Gravesteijn BY, Sewalt CA, Ercole A, et al. Toward a New Multi-Dimensional Classification of Traumatic Brain Injury: A Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research for Traumatic Brain Injury Study. *J Neurotrauma*. 2020;37(7):1002-1010. doi:10.1089/neu.2019.6764

60. Manley GT, Dams-O'Connor K, Alosco ML, et al. A new characterisation of acute traumatic brain injury: the NIH-NINDS TBI Classification and Nomenclature Initiative. *Lancet Neurol*. 2025;24(6):512-523. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(25)00154-1

BDNF DNAm

61. Knisely MR, Maserati M, Heinsberg LW, et al. Symptom Science: Advocating for Inclusion of Functional Genetic Polymorphisms. *Biol Res Nurs*. 2019;21(4):349-354. doi:10.1177/1099800419846407

62. Nguyen VT, Hill B, Sims N, et al. Brain-derived neurotrophic factor rs6265 (Val66Met) single nucleotide polymorphism as a master modifier of human pathophysiology. *Neural Regen Res*. 2023;18(1):102-106. doi:10.4103/1673-5374.343894

63. Fu X, Wang J, Du J, Sun J, Baranova A, Zhang F. BDNF Gene's Role in Schizophrenia: From Risk Allele to Methylation Implications. *Front Psychiatry*. 2020;11:564277. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2020.564277