Higher BMI, but not obesity-related genetic polymorphisms, correlates with reduced structural connectivity of the reward network

Short title: BMI and connectivity of the reward network

Frauke Beyer^{1,2}, Rui Zhang¹, Markus Scholz^{3,4}, Kerstin Wirkner⁴, Markus Loeffler^{3,4}, Michael Stumvoll^{2,5}, Arno Villringer^{1,2,6}, A. Veronica Witte^{1,2}

¹Department of Neurology, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

²Collaborative Research Centre 1052 'Obesity Mechanisms', Subproject A1, Faculty of Medicine, Leipzig University, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

³Institute for Medical Informatics, Statistics and Epidemiology (IMISE), Faculty of Medicine, Leipzig University, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

⁴Leipzig Research Center for Civilization Diseases (LIFE), Leipzig University, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

⁵Department of Endocrinology and Nephrology, Leipzig University Hospital, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

⁶Clinic of Cognitive Neurology, Leipzig University Hospital, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

The authors declare no competing financial interests in relation to this work.

Corresponding author:

A. Veronica Witte, PhD

Department of Neurology

Max-Planck-Institute of Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences

Stephanstr. 1a

04103 Leipzig

Phone: +49 (0) 341-99402426

Fax: +49 (0) 341-99402211

witte@cbs.mpg.de

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Background: Obesity is of complex origin, involving genetic and neurobehavioral factors. Most consistently, polymorphisms in the fat-and-obesity associated gene (FTO) may increase the risk for developing obesity by modulating dopaminergic signaling in the brain. Dopamine-dependent behaviors, such as reward processing, are crucial for eating behavior and are altered in obesity. Yet, few studies have investigated the association of obesity, related genetic variants and structural connectivity of the dopaminergic reward network.

Methods: We analyzed 378 participants (age range: 20 – 59 years, BMI range: 17 – 38 kg/m²) of the LIFE-Adult Study. Genotyping for the single nucleotide polymorphisms rs1558902 (FTO) and rs1800497 (near dopamine D2 receptor) was performed on a microarray. Structural connectivity of the reward network was derived from diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging at 3 Tesla using deterministic tractography of Freesurfer-derived regions of interest. Using graph metrics, we extracted summary measures of clustering coefficient and connectivity strength between frontal and striatal brain regions, normalized for global connectivity. We applied linear regression models to test the association of BMI, risk alleles of both variants and reward network connectivity.

Results: Higher BMI was significantly associated with reduced connectivity strength for fractional anisotropy ($\beta = -0.0011$, 95%-C.I. [-0.0019, -0.0003], $p = 0.0062$) and number of streamlines ($\beta = -0.0026$, 95%-C.I. [-0.004, -0.0009], $p = 0.0024$), but not clustering coefficient. Strongest associations were found for right accumbens, right lateral orbitofrontal cortex and left putamen. As expected, the polymorphism rs1558902 in FTO was associated with higher BMI ($F = 7.9$, $p < 0.001$). None of the genetic variants was associated with reward network structural connectivity.

Conclusions: Here, we provide evidence that higher BMI correlates with reduced reward network structural connectivity. This result is in line with previous findings of obesity-related decline in white matter microstructure. We did not find any association of variants in FTO or near DRD2 receptor and reward network structural connectivity, indicating that the genetic

58 influence of these variants is small or non-existent. Future research should investigate the
59 behavioral implications of structural connectivity differences in the fronto-striatal network
60 and incorporate larger sample sizes with longitudinal designs in order to gain further insight
61 into the genetic determinants of obesity in the brain.

62

63

64

65 Introduction

66 Obesity or excess body weight is the result of an imbalance in energy intake and expenditure
67 and is now mainly considered a neurobehavioral disorder which involves homeostatic brain
68 regions as well as regions engaged in salience and reward processing (1). Although increas-
69 ing obesity rates in western societies may be primarily driven by the availability of high-fat
70 diets and a sedentary lifestyle (2), the risk of developing obesity is under strong (polygenetic)
71 control, with heritability estimates of 50%-70% (3, 4). Yet, it is poorly understood which
72 individual (genetic) predispositions determine the vulnerability to those environmental influ-
73 ences and how they lead to excessive weight gain and obesity.

74 Single nucleotid polymorphisms in the fat and obesity related gene (FTO) are the most com-
75 mon genetic variants associated with obesity (5). Yet, little is known about the mechanisms
76 underlying this association (6). Variation in FTO may contribute to the risk for obesity by
77 modulating feeding behavior rather than energy expenditure (7). Here, one possible mech-
78 anism is that polymorphisms in FTO influence dopamine signaling between the Nucleus
79 accumbens (Nacc) and frontal brain regions, either directly or by interaction with dopamine-
80 related variants (8). Consequently, behavioral changes in reward processing, learning and
81 impulsivity might lead to differences in eating behavior, and ultimately, weight gain (9-12).

82 Functional neuroimaging studies have provided evidence for a main effect of FTO on the
83 neural response to food cues, and reported that this association depended on fasting state
84 and ghrelin signaling (13-17). Further studies have shown that FTO interacted with the
85 Taq1A polymorphism, located near the D2 dopamine receptor (DRD2), to modulate reward
86 learning and neural activity in response to food cues – both key functions of the Nacc (18-
87 20).

88 Besides functional activation, the strength of structural connections between the Nacc and
89 frontal brain regions plays an important role for dopamine-dependent behavior (21, 22). Van
90 Schouwenburg and colleagues showed that the effects of a dopaminergic drug depended

91 on fronto-striatal structural connectivity (23). Previously, individual effects of dopaminergic
 92 drugs have been related to baseline working memory capacity, which presumably reflects
 93 baseline dopamine levels (24). Along these lines, a DRD2 variant (rs6277 C-allele), previ-
 94 ously linked to reduced striatal binding potential, was associated with increased fronto-stri-
 95 atal structural connectivity (25). This variant is in linkage disequilibrium with the Taq-1A
 96 ($D'=0.66$) (26).

97 Regarding the structural connectivity of the reward network in obesity, studies showed con-
 98 tradicting results, with both higher and lower structural connectivity between striatum and
 99 frontal cortex associated with weight status (27-29). For other white matter tracts, studies
 100 have consistently reported associations of higher BMI and lower WM microstructure, possi-
 101 bly mediated by the negative metabolic impact of obesity (30, 31). Recently, a variant in
 102 FTO was shown to interact with weight status on fronto-striatal structural connectivity, indi-
 103 cating that some of the mixed results might be due to genetic variability or differences in
 104 tonic dopamine levels (32, 33).

105 In summary, while there is consistent evidence of obesity-related differences in global white
 106 matter microstructure, less is known about the association of BMI and reward network white
 107 matter structure, and the impact of obesity-related genotypes on this trait. In this study, we
 108 aimed to investigate the association of structural reward network connectivity, obesity and
 109 genetic variations linked to obesity in a well-characterized population-based sample. Based
 110 on previous studies, we hypothesized that a higher BMI would relate to lower reward network
 111 connectivity (27). More exploratory, we investigated whether FTO and Taq1A polymor-
 112 phisms had interactive or independent effects on structural connectivity within the reward
 113 network (19, 32). This may help to better understand the genetic and neurobehavioral back-
 114 ground of obesity.

115

116

117 **Methods**

118 **Participants**

119 All participants took part in the MRI assessment of the LIFE-Adult-Study (n ~ 2600)(34). The
 120 study was approved by the institutional ethics board of the Medical Faculty of the University
 121 of Leipzig and conducted according to the declaration of Helsinki. Besides age and sex
 122 stratification, participants were randomly selected from the registry of the city of Leipzig and
 123 gave written informed consent. We included participants aged in between 20 and 59 years
 124 (n ~ 800) with complete information on BMI and genotyping (n ~ 400). Further, we excluded
 125 participants with stroke, cancer treatment in the last 12 months, neuroradiological findings
 126 of brain pathology, epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease or intake of centrally
 127 active medication (n = 17).

128 Due to incomplete fat suppression during the diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) acquisition,
 129 we observed an artifactual rim in the parietal lobe of the brain. As this artifact was difficult to
 130 detect in an automated fashion, we manually rated all scans into three categories dependent
 131 on the number and severity of affected slices, i.e. "no/very mild", "moderate", and "severe".
 132 We restricted our analysis to those scans that were rated as "no/very mild" and "moderate".
 133 Two participants were excluded due to outlying values in structural connectivity (see Con-
 134 nectome reconstruction from DWI-data). This led to a total sample of 378 healthy volunteers
 135 eligible for analysis.

136

137 **Genotyping**

138 Genomic DNA was extracted from EDTA treated blood samples using the Autopure LS in-
 139 strument (Qiagen, Hilden). Genotyping of FTO polymorphism rs1558902 and rs1800497
 140 (Taq1A), a polymorphism near dopamine D2 receptor, was performed based on using the
 141 Affymetrix Axiom Technology with custom option (Axiom-CADLIFE). Individuals were im-

puted at the 1000Genomes reference phase 1, release 3 (http://mathgen.stats.ox.ac.uk/impute/data_download_1000G_phase1_integrated.html) using SHAPEIT v2 and IMPUTE 2.3.0. Details of the measurement and quality control can be found elsewhere (35). The risk allele of the polymorphism rs1558902 on FTO is the A allele and genotype frequencies for rs1558902 were TT n=126, AT n=186, AA n=66 (minor allele frequency = 0.42, test for Hardy-Weinberg-Equilibrium $\chi^2=.03$, df=1, n.s.). We considered three groups of risk carriers for the analysis (0: TT, 1: AT, 2: AA).

For the rs1800497 polymorphism the genotype frequencies were TT n=270, AT n=100, AA n=8 (minor allele frequency = 0.15, test for Hardy-Weinberg-Equilibrium $\chi^2=.13$, df=1, n.s.). We grouped together carriers of at least one risk allele (A).

Anthropometric measurement

Anthropometric measurements were conducted by trained study personal. Body weight was measured with scale SECA 701, height was measured with height rod SECA 220 (SECA GmbH & Co. KG). Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as the weight in kilograms divided by the square height in meters (kg/m^2).

Possible confounders

We performed sensitivity analysis of our results by considering different confounders. Head motion is an important confounder in neuroimaging studies, not only affecting measures of functional connectivity, but also measures of brain structure. Since we previously noticed a strong collinearity between BMI and head motion during resting-state, we adjusted for head motion in our analysis of structural connectivity (36). Therefore, we used the six rotation and translation parameters returned by eddy_correct during preprocessing to calculate mean framewise displacement as described by (37). Mean FD was used to adjust for head motion during the DWI scan.

Smoking status and education were derived from self-report questionnaires. Smoking status was available for N=364 participants in three levels (0 = never smoker, 1 = previous smoker, 2 = current smoker). Education was given in 3 levels (1 = left school without degree or finished secondary school after 9 years, 2 = finished secondary school after 10 years, 3 = finished secondary school after 12 or 13 years) and was available for N=376 participants. Depression scores were derived from the CES-D questionnaire as previously described and were available in n=355 participants (38). We log-transformed mean FD and CES-D score prior to the analysis because of the skewed distribution of these scores.

176

MR data acquisition

Brain imaging was performed on a 3T Verio Scanner (Siemens, Erlangen) with a 32 channel head coil. T1-weighted images were acquired using generalized autocalibrating partially parallel acquisition imaging technique (39) and the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative standard protocol with the following parameters: inversion time, 900 ms; repetition time (TR), 2300 ms; echo time, 2.98 ms; flip angle, 9°; band width, 240 Hz/pixel; image matrix, 256 × 240; 176 partitions; field of view, 256 × 240 × 176 mm³; sagittal orientation; voxel size, 1 × 1 × 1 mm³; no interpolation.

Diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) was performed using a double spin echo sequence with the following parameters: TR, 13.8 s; TE, 100 ms; image matrix, 128 × 128 × 72; field of view, 220 × 220 × 123 mm³, voxel size of 1.7 mm isotropic, max b-value = 1000 s/mm², 60 directions. T2*-weighted functional images were acquired using an echo-planar-imaging sequence with the following parameters: repetition time, 2s; echo time, 30 ms; flip angle, 90°; image matrix, 64 × 64; 30 slices; field of view, 192 × 192 × 144 mm³, voxel size of 3 mm × 3 mm, slice thickness of 4 mm, slice gap of 0.8 mm; 300 volumes; total acquisition time, 10:04 minutes.

193

194 T1-data processing

195 Cortical reconstruction and volumetric segmentation of T1-weighted MR images was per-
196 formed with the Freesurfer image analysis suite (version 5.3.0) (40, 41). Regions of interest
197 from subcortical segmentation and cortical Desikan-Killiany parcellation were used as nodes
198 in connectome reconstruction. Volumetric measures of reward network regions (bilateral lat-
199 eral and medial orbitofrontal cortex, caudate, putamen and accumbens) were averaged
200 across hemispheres for analysis.

201

202 Connectome reconstruction from DWI data

203 Connectome reconstruction was performed during the 10kin1day-workshop, a collaborative
204 science event where over 10000 DWI datasets were processed. More information and sum-
205 mary data can be found online (42). Preprocessing included correction for susceptibility and
206 eddy currents using FSL's tool eddy-correct. Freesurfer's standard Desikan-Killiany parcel-
207 lation was used to select 68 cortical and 14 subcortical regions for connectome reconstruc-
208 tion. A diffusion tensor was fitted to each voxel in a white matter mask using robust tensor
209 fitting and deterministic pathway tractography was applied to construct white matter fiber
210 tracts. Tracts were started in each voxel and then followed the main diffusion direction using
211 the fiber assignment by continuous tracking (FACT) algorithm. Stopping criteria were FA-
212 value below 0.1, crossing of the brain mask or a fiber turn of more than 45 degrees.
213 Weighted, unsigned and undirected connectivity matrices were constructed for each subject
214 by using 82 (sub)cortical regions as nodes and connectivity weights between the regions as
215 edges. Two types of connectivity weights were assessed 1) total number of connecting
216 streamlines touching both regions (NOS) and 2) mean FA across voxels included in these
217 streamlines (FA).

Reward connectivity networks were reconstructed by using bilateral lateral and medial orbitofrontal cortex, caudate, putamen and accumbens as nodes and their respective structural (NOS and FA-strength) connectivity strength as edges (27). Data quality assurance was done according to the 10kin1day-workshop guidelines by identifying subjects with outlying values in mean NOS or mean FA connectivity of existing connections or outlying values in prevalence of existing or non-existing connections. Outliers were defined as values higher than (3rd quartile + 2*interquartile range (IQR)) or lower than (1st quartile - 2*interquartile range (IQR)). This led to the exclusion of two participants with bad data quality (excessive head motion and large ventricles).

Reward network analyses

Reward connectivity networks were reconstructed by using bilateral lateral and medial orbitofrontal cortex, caudate, putamen and accumbens as nodes and their respective structural (NOS and FA-strength) connectivity strengths as edges. Graph metrics were calculated using the Matlab-based Brain Connectivity Toolbox. For each participant, whole brain connectivity was described using mean connectivity strength (CS) and mean clustering coefficient (CC) across all nodes with mean FA and NOS as structural weights. The NOS structural connectivity weights were normalized to [0, 1] prior to calculating the weighted clustering coefficient. Graph metrics were calculated in the reward network accordingly and normalized by the corresponding whole brain value (27), resulting in the following reward network (REW) metrics: FA CS, FA CC, NOS CS, and NOS CC.

For sensitivity analysis, we assessed normalized node-wise connectivity strength and clustering coefficient for the ten nodes (bilateral lateral and medial orbitofrontal cortex, caudate, putamen and accumbens) in the network.

244 Statistical analysis

245 We used univariate linear models in R version 3.3.2 to investigate the association of the
 246 BMI, genetic variants and measures of reward network (REW) structural connectivity (43).
 247 We use F-tests and associated p-values from R's anova to compare full versus null models.
 248 First, we tested the association of BMI and the four reward network measures, adjusting for
 249 age and sex (Model 1: REW metric ~ Age + sex + BMI). If there was a significant association
 250 of BMI, tested by comparing this full model against a null model including only age and sex
 251 (Bonferroni-corrected $\alpha=0.0125$), we additionally adjusted for average head motion dur-
 252 ing the DWI scan, smoking status, depression and education (Model 2: REW metric ~ Age
 253 + sex + head motion + smoking status + depression + education + BMI).
 254 We further investigated the node-wise connectivity if the edge type (i.e. FA or NOS) reached
 255 network-wide significance. Thereby we aimed to identify nodes that contributed most to the
 256 result. Here, we fitted Model 2 (node-wise REW metric ~ Age + sex + head motion + smoking
 257 status + depression + education + BMI) and used Bonferroni-corrected $\alpha=0.005$ (ac-
 258 counting for 10 regions of interest tested).
 259 In the genetic analysis, we first investigated whether the polymorphisms rs1558902 and
 260 rs180047 explained variance in BMI. We compared a full model including the interaction of
 261 rs1558902 (0/1/2 risk allele groups) with rs180047 (0/1 or 2 risk allele groups) (Model 3: BMI
 262 ~ Age + sex + FTO* Taq1A) against a null model without the interaction and main effects
 263 (Model 4: BMI ~ Age + sex + FTO + Taq1A). Without a significant interaction (Chi-Square
 264 test of Model 3 vs. 4: $p<0.05$), we report only main effects of model 4.
 265 Then, we tested whether the polymorphisms were associated with reward network connec-
 266 tivity, either independently or interacting with each other. Again, we first tested the interac-
 267 tion effect of the two variants (Model 5: REW metric ~ Age + sex + FTO*Taq1A) by compar-
 268 ing it to a null model without the interaction. If there was no indication for an interaction ($p>$
 269 0.05), we checked for independent effects of the two genotypes separately (Model 6: REW

metric ~ Age + sex + FTO + Taq1A), again by comparing against a null model including Age, sex. If we found a significant effect ($p < 0.05$) for any of the two variants, we additionally included head motion, smoking status, depression, education as covariates. The data used in this study is available upon request from the authors.

Results

In total, we analyzed 378 participants (55% women), for descriptive statistics see **Tab. 1**.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the sample (n=378, sex distribution: 170 men and 208 women). Weight groups according to WHO definition. BMI, body mass index; CES-D, Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale; mean FD, mean framewise displacement during diffusion-weighted imaging.					
	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age [years]	378	20	59	46.2	8.9
BMI [kg/m ²]	378	17.7	38.2	25.7	3.6
Weight groups (under-weight/normal weight/over-weight/obese)	378	5/157/173/43			
FTO rs1558902 polymorphism (TT/AT/AA)	378	126/186/66			
Near DRD2 Taq1A polymorphism rs1800497 (0/at least 1 risk allele)	378	270/108			
Depression scores (CES-D)	355	0	48	9.9	7.6
Smoking status (never smoker/previous smoker/current smoker)	364	191/84/89			
Education (no degree or 9 years/10 years/10 years/12-13 years)	376	10/211/155			
Mean FD	378	0.4	1.3	0.62	0.13

Fat suppression artifact in DWI data ('no/very mild' / 'moderate')	378	345/33
--	-----	--------

Association of BMI and reward network metrics

In the main linear regression analysis, reconstruction of structural connectivity showed that a higher BMI was associated with lower strength of both FA and NOS edge measures in the reward network, after adjusting for age and sex (Bonferroni corrected, all $p < 0.0062$; model 1, **Fig. 1**; **Tab. 2**). Results remained stable when additionally correcting for potential confounding effects of head motion, smoking status, depression score and education (model 2). The CC for both FA and NOS were not associated with BMI.

Fig. 1: Structural connectivity measured using mean fractional anisotropy (FA) between hubs of the reward network. OFC, orbitofrontal cortex; L, left hemisphere; R, right hemisphere.

Table 2: Results from the linear regression analysis of BMI and reward network structural connectivity strength (CS) and clustering coefficient (CC) with edge weights fractional anisotropy (FA) and number of streamlines (NOS). Given values are adjusted R^2 , β , 95% - confidence interval (C.I.) of β & p for the effect of BMI (Model 1 & 2).

		FA CS	FA CC	NOS CS	NOS CC
Model 1	Adj. R^2	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.002
	β	-0.00108	-0.024	-0.0026	0.25
	C.I.	[-0.0019, -0.0003]	[-0.046, -0.0032]	[-0.004, -0.0009]	[-0.13, 0.63]
	p	0.0062	0.024	0.0024	0.19
Model 2	Adj. R^2	0.11	-	0.09	-
	β	-0.00102	-	-0.0026	-
	C.I.	[-0.0019, -0.0002]	-	[-0.004, -0.0007]	-
	p	0.02	-	0.0073	-

In addition, within-network node-wise measures showed that for FA, lower CS of the bilateral Ncl accumbens and putamen, as well as right lateral OFC, were significantly associated with higher BMI (**Tab. 3**). For NOS, lower CS of the left putamen and left medial OFC was significantly associated with higher BMI (**Tab. 3**).

Table 3: Results from the linear regression analysis of BMI and node-wise connectivity strength (CS) with edge weights fractional anisotropy (FA) and number of streamlines (NOS). Given are adjusted R^2 , β , 95% - confidence interval (C.I.) of β and p-value for the effect of BMI (Model 2, adjusted for age, sex, depression, smoking status, education, head motion during scan). Bonferroni-corrected, significant p-values are highlighted in **bold**.

FA CS	hemi-sphere	Adj. R^2	β	C.I.	p
Nucleus accumbens	Right	0.09	-4.3 e-04	[-7.2 e-04; -1.3 e-04]	0.0043
	Left	0.08	-3.8 e-04	[-7.2 e-04; -4.4 e-05]	0.026
Caudate	Right	0.03	1.8 e-04	[-4.8 e-05; 4.1 e-04]	0.12
	Left	0	-3.7 e-05	[-2.4 e-04; 1.6 e-04]	0.72
Putamen	Right	0.10	-2.4 e-04	[-4.4 e-04; -4.3 e-05]	0.017
	Left	0.07	-3.4 e-04	[-5.5 e-04; -1.3 e-04]	0.0018
Medial OFC	Right	0.09	-7.9 e-05	[-2.7 e-04; 1.1 e-04]	0.43
	Left	0.08	-1.8 e-04	[-3.8 e-04; 2.1 e-05]	0.08
Lateral OFC	Right	0.07	-4.6 e-04	[-7.9 e-04; -1.3 e-04]	0.0056
	Left	0.07	-8.0 e-05	[-4.1 e-04; 2.5 e-04]	0.63
NOS CS					
Nucleus accumbens	Right	0.05	-5.2 e-04	[-1.0 e-03; -4.2 e-05]	0.03
	Left	0.06	-4.2 e-04	[-8.6 e-04; 2.5 e-06]	0.05

Caudate	Right	0.05	-3.7 e-05	[-5.1 e-04; 5.8 e-04]	0.89
	Left	0	-4.0 e-04	[-9.7 e-04; 1.6 e-04]	0.17
Putamen	Right	0.07	-7.2 e-04	[-1.5 e-03; 3.9 e-05]	0.06
	Left	0.08	-1.4 e-03	[-2.2 e-03; -5.3 e-04]	0.0015
Medial OFC	Right	0.03	-3.1 e-04	[-9.2 e-04; 2.9 e-04]	0.32
	Left	0.05	-7.0 e-04	[-1.3 e-03; -8.7 e-05]	0.025
Lateral OFC	Right	0.04	-3.6 e-04	[-8.5 e-04; 1.4 e-04]	0.16
	Left	0.05	-4.1 e-04	[-8.6 e-04; 4.7 e-05]	0.08

307
308

309 Association of genotypes and BMI

310 There was a trend for an interaction effect of rs1558902 and Taq1A on BMI (adjusted for
311 age and sex, $F=2.9$, $p=0.056$) seen as a less pronounced effect of Taq1A in carriers of one
312 FTO risk allele. In the following, we report the model without interaction. There was a sig-
313 nificant increase in BMI with increasing number of rs1558902 risk alleles (adjusted for age
314 and sex, $F=7.9$, $T_{ATvsTT}=2.9$, $T_{AAvsTT}=3.7$, all $p<0.001$). Carriers of at least one risk allele in
315 rs180047 had a trend towards lower BMI compared to non-risk allele carriers (adjusted for
316 age and sex, $F=3.6$, $T_{AT/AAvsTT}=-0.73$, $p=0.057$). (**Fig. 2**).

Fig. 2: Body mass index (BMI) depends on FTO- and Taq1A genotypes. Individual data points are shown for carriers of 0, 1 or 2 FTO risk alleles (x-axis) with no or at least one Taq1A risk allele (red/blue, respectively). Bars within boxes give medians, surrounding boxes show the interquartile range, vertical lines indicate 1.5 times the interquartile range above/below the upper/lower quartile, respectively.

We did not observe a significant interaction of FTO and Taq1A genotypes on reward network structural connectivity when adjusting for age and sex. Also, there were no significant main effects of these polymorphisms (see Table 4 for more details).

Table 4: Results from linear regression analysis of BMI, genetic variants and reward network structural connectivity. For the FTO x Taq1A interaction, the adjusted R^2 value of the regression model and the p-value of the interaction, derived from comparison with a null model including age and sex, are shown. For individual genetic effects the adjusted R^2 value of the regression model, and the regression coefficients β for Taq1A, FTO_{ATvsTT} (0 vs. 1 risk allele) and FTO_{AAvsTT} (0 vs. 2 risk alleles), 95% - confidence intervals (C.I.) of β coefficients and p-value of the coefficients are given. FA CC: clustering coefficient of the reward network based on fractional anisotropy, FA CS: connectivity strength of the reward network based on fractional anisotropy, NOS CC: clustering coefficient of the reward network based on number of streamlines, NOS CS: connectivity strength of the reward network based on number of streamlines.

		Adj. R^2	β	C.I.	p
FA CC	FTO x Taq1A	0.089			0.89
	FTO _{ATvsTT}	0.093	-0.013	[-0.059; 0.033]	0.58
	FTO _{AAvsTT}		0.0061	[-0.054; 0.067]	0.84
	Taq1A		0.022	[-0.023; 0.067]	0.34
FA CS	FTO x Taq1A	0.096			0.95
	FTO _{ATvsTT}	0.10	-0.000018	[-0.0017; 0.0016]	0.98
	FTO _{AAvsTT}		-0.00052	[-0.0027; 0.0017]	0.64
	Taq1A		0.00073	[-0.00091; 0.0024]	0.38
NOS CC	FTO x Taq1A	-0.003			0.58
	FTO _{ATvsTT}	0.0008	-0.61	[-1.43; 0.20]	0.14
	FTO _{AAvsTT}		-0.21	[-1.28; 0.87]	0.70
	Taq1A		0.37	[-0.43; 1.18]	0.37
NOS CS	FTO x Taq1A	0.090			0.90
	FTO _{ATvsTT}	0.095	-0.00042	[-0.0041; 0.0033]	0.82
	FTO _{AAvsTT}		-0.00011	[-0.0049; 0.0047]	0.96
	Taq1A		0.00218	[-0.0015; 0.0058]	0.24

Discussion

In this cross-sectional analysis in young to middle-aged adults, a higher BMI was significantly associated with lower structural connectivity of the reward network. More specifically, higher BMI predicted less connectivity strength (CS) for edge weights in the Nacc,

347 putamen and orbitofrontal cortex, even if adjusting for age, sex, education and other condi-
348 tions such as depressive symptoms. In addition, while obesity-related SNPs in the FTO
349 gene significantly predicted higher BMI, we did not observe genetic associations with
350 measures of structural connectivity in the reward network.

351 Our results of lower reward network connectivity with higher BMI is in line with a previous
352 study that examined obesity-related differences in measures of white matter structural co-
353 herence. Using the same graph-based approach, Marqués-Iturria et al. (2015) reported
354 lower connectivity strength and network clustering of the striatum and orbitofrontal cortex in
355 31 obese participants compared to 32 lean controls (27). In contrast, (44) reported higher
356 structural connectivity of the bilateral putamen in obese and overweight participants com-
357 pared to normal weight controls. This study also investigated sex-by-weight status interac-
358 tions and found that among individuals with overweight and obesity women had stronger
359 connectivity of reward network regions than men. While we chose the same definition of
360 structural connectivity as Marqués-Iturria, Gupta et al. derived their connectivity values from
361 the number of connections and used different graph metrics. This might be an explanation
362 for the diverging results. Yet, analyses in larger samples support our finding and showed
363 that higher BMI was associated with lower FA within white matter tracts throughout the brain,
364 including connections between reward network regions (30, 31, 45). Longitudinal studies
365 suggest that, at least in older adults, these differences may reflect damage due to the met-
366 abolic consequences of vascular risk factors (46, 47). Regardless of its origin, reduced struc-
367 tural connectivity in the reward network might underlie certain behavioral traits observed in
368 obesity, such as aberrant processing of food-related reward stimuli (12, 48)

369 Considering genetic effects, we replicated the known association of FTO risk alleles and
370 higher BMI, while carrying the Taq1A risk allele was not associated with higher BMI in our
371 cohort. We did not find an association between the genetic variants in FTO and near DRD2
372 on reward network structural connectivity, in contrast to previous results which proposed

that white matter microstructure may be genetically linked to obesity: In a large cohort of Mexican-American families, BMI and white matter microstructure in different fiber tracts were indeed genetically correlated (49). Dennis and colleagues reported that among 15 obesity-associated genetic variants, a variant in NEGR1 had the strongest effect on fractional anisotropy in the corona radiata in a sample of ~500 young adults (50). Further, cumulative effects of all considered obesity-associated genotypes predicted white matter microstructure in arcuate fasciculus, corpus callosum, fornix, and inferior frontal-occipital fasciculus. Other studies have provide evidence for a link between genetic variants in dopamine D2/D3 receptors (DRD2), reward processing and obesity (51, 52), even though the role of variation in DRD2 in obesity is still debated (53, 54). For example, both the Taq1A variant in the DRD2 receptor and a genetic sum score reflecting higher dopamine signaling capacity predicted future increases in BMI (55-57). Regarding structural connectivity, both FTO and a genetic variant in strong linkage disequilibrium with Taq1A correlated with structural connectivity of striatal-frontal tracts in two studies of small to moderate sample size (25, 32). Yet, we could not replicate these findings. There may be several reasons for this. First, the true effect of these variants is still probably small, thus we may have been underpowered to show it. Alternatively, the influence of environment (e.g. metabolic conditions associated with obesity) or gene-environment interactions might blur the link between genetic factors and brain structure in our cohort.

In summary, future studies incorporating larger samples sizes and longitudinal designs need to further address the underlying (epi-)genetics of reward structural connectivity and obesity.

Limitations

In this study, we did not investigate the causal relationship between BMI and structural connectivity of the reward network. Furthermore, our sample was not rich in obese participants, which might limit the power of our analyses. Although our sample size was adequate for an

399 imaging study, we might be underpowered to detect subtle effects of single polymorphisms
 400 on brain connectivity. Finally, we did not assess epigenetic factors in this design. Strengths
 401 of our study include the well-characterized cohort that enabled us to adjust for important
 402 confounders in our analysis, and the high-resolution DWI protocol.

403

404 Conclusions

405 We here provide evidence that higher BMI is associated with reduced reward network struc-
 406 tural connectivity. We did not find any contribution of variants in FTO or near DRD2 receptor
 407 gene to reward network structural connectivity, indicating that the genetic influence of these
 408 variants is small or non-existent. Future research should investigate the behavioral implica-
 409 tions of structural connectivity differences in the fronto-striatal network and incorporate
 410 larger sample sizes with longitudinal designs in order to gain further insight into the genetic
 411 determinants of obesity in the brain.

412

413

414 **Acknowledgments**

415 We would like to thank all participants and staff of the LIFE-Adult study. This work was
 416 supported by grants of the European Union, the European Regional Development Fund,
 417 the Free State of Saxony within the framework of the excellence initiative, the LIFE–Leip-
 418 zig Research Center for Civilization Diseases, University of Leipzig [project numbers: 713-
 419 241202, 14505/2470, 14575/2470] and by grants of the German Research Foundation,
 420 contract grant number CRC 1052 “Obesity mechanisms” Project A1, A. Villringer/M. Stum-
 421 voll, WI 3342/3-1, A.V. Witte and by the Max Planck Society.

422 **Competing Interests**

423 The authors declare no competing financial interests in relation to this work.

424

425

References

1. Berthoud H-R. Homeostatic and Non-homeostatic Pathways Involved in the Control of Food Intake and Energy Balance. *Obesity*. 2006;14(S8):197S-200S.
2. Hill JO, Peters JC. Environmental Contributions to the Obesity Epidemic. *Science*. 1998;280(5368):1371.
3. Maes HHM, Neale MC, Eaves LJ. Genetic and environmental factors in relative body weight and human adiposity. *Behav Genet*. 1997;27(4):325-51.
4. Stunkard AJ, Harris JR, Pedersen NL, McClearn GE. The Body-Mass Index of Twins Who Have Been Reared Apart. *N Engl J Med*. 1990;322(21):1483-7.
5. Locke AE, Kahali B, Berndt SI, Justice AE, Pers TH, Day FR, et al. Genetic studies of body mass index yield new insights for obesity biology. *Nature*. 2015;518(7538):197-206.
6. Speakman JR. The 'fat mass and obesity related'(FTO) gene: mechanisms of impact on obesity and energy balance. *Current obesity reports*. 2015;4(1):73-91.
7. Speakman JR, Rance KA, Johnstone AM. Polymorphisms of the FTO gene are associated with variation in energy intake, but not energy expenditure. *Obesity*. 2008;16(8):1961-5.
8. Hess ME, Hess S, Meyer KD, Verhagen LAW, Koch L, Bronneke HS, et al. The fat mass and obesity associated gene (Fto) regulates activity of the dopaminergic midbrain circuitry. *Nat Neurosci*. 2013;16(8):1042-8.
9. Vainik U, Baker TE, Dadar M, Zeighami Y, Michaud A, Zhang Y, et al. Neurobehavioral correlates of obesity are largely heritable. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2018;115(37):9312.
10. Meule A, Blechert J. Interactive and indirect effects of trait impulsivity facets on body mass index. *Appetite*. 2017;118:60-5.
11. Chuang YF, Tanaka T, Beason-Held LL, An Y, Terracciano A, Sutin AR, et al. FTO genotype and aging: pleiotropic longitudinal effects on adiposity, brain function, impulsivity and diet. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2015;20(1):140-7.
12. Volkow ND, Wang G-J, Baler RD. Reward, dopamine and the control of food intake: implications for obesity. *Trends Cogn Sci*. 2011;15(1):37-46.
13. Wiemerslage L, Nilsson EK, Solstrand Dahlberg L, Ence-Eriksson F, Castillo S, Larsen AL, et al. An obesity-associated risk allele within the FTO gene affects human brain activity for areas important for emotion, impulse control and reward in response to food images. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2016.
14. de Groot C, Feliuss A, Trompet S, de Craen AJM, Blauw GJ, van Buchem MA, et al. Association of the fat mass and obesity-associated gene risk allele, rs9939609A, and reward-related brain structures. *Obesity*. 2015;23(10):2118-22.
15. Rapuano KM, Zieselman AL, Kelley WM, Sargent JD, Heatherton TF, Gilbert-Diamond D. Genetic risk for obesity predicts nucleus accumbens size and responsivity to real-world food cues. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2017;114(1):160-5.
16. Heni M, Kullmann S, Veit R, Ketterer C, Frank S, Machicao F, et al. Variation in the obesity risk gene FTO determines the postprandial cerebral processing of food stimuli in the prefrontal cortex. *Molecular Metabolism*. 2014;3(2):109-13.
17. Karra E, x, Daly OG, Choudhury AI, Yousseif A, Millership S, et al. A link between FTO, ghrelin, and impaired brain food-cue responsivity. *The Journal of Clinical Investigation*. 123(8):3539-51.
18. Winkler JK, Woehning A, Schultz J-H, Brune M, Beaton N, Challa TD, et al. TaqIA polymorphism in dopamine D2 receptor gene complicates weight maintenance in younger obese patients. *Nutrition*. 2012;28(10):996-1001.

- 477 19. Sevgi M, Rigoux L, Kühn AB, Mauer J, Schilbach L, Hess ME, et al. An obesity-
478 predisposing variant of the FTO gene regulates D2R-dependent reward learning. The
479 Journal of Neuroscience. 2015;35(36):12584-92.
- 480 20. Heni M, Kullmann S, Ahlqvist E, Wagner R, Machicao F, Staiger H, et al. Interaction
481 between the obesity-risk gene FTO and the dopamine D2 receptor gene ANKK1/TaqIA on
482 insulin sensitivity. Diabetologia. 2016;59(12):2622-31.
- 483 21. Morales AM, Jones SA, Harman G, Patching-Bunch J, Nagel BJ. Associations
484 between nucleus accumbens structural connectivity, brain function, and initiation of binge
485 drinking. Addict Biol. 2019;0(0):e12767.
- 486 22. Forstmann BU, Anwander A, Schäfer A, Neumann J, Brown S, Wagenmakers E-J,
487 et al. Cortico-striatal connections predict control over speed and accuracy in perceptual
488 decision making. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2010;107(36):15916-
489 20.
- 490 23. van Schouwenburg MR, Zwiers MP, van der Schaaf ME, Geurts DEM, Schellekens
491 AFA, Buitelaar JK, et al. Anatomical connection strength predicts dopaminergic drug
492 effects on fronto-striatal function. Psychopharmacology. 2013;227(3):521-31.
- 493 24. Cools R, D'Esposito M. Inverted-U-Shaped Dopamine Actions on Human Working
494 Memory and Cognitive Control. Biol Psychiatry. 2011;69(12):e113-e25.
- 495 25. Markett S, de Reus MA, Reuter M, Montag C, Weber B, Schoene-Bake J-C, et al.
496 Variation on the dopamine D2 receptor gene (DRD2) is associated with basal ganglia-to-
497 frontal structural connectivity. Neuroimage. 2017;155:473-9.
- 498 26. Markett SA, Montag C, Reuter M. The association between dopamine DRD2
499 polymorphisms and working memory capacity is modulated by a functional polymorphism
500 on the nicotinic receptor gene CHRNA4. J Cogn Neurosci. 2010;22(9):1944-54.
- 501 27. Marqués-Iturria I, Scholtens LH, Garolera M, Pueyo R, Garcia-Garcia I, González-
502 Tartiere P, et al. Affected connectivity organization of the reward system structure in
503 obesity. Neuroimage. 2015;111:100-6.
- 504 28. Gupta A, Mayer EA, Sanmiguel CP, Van Horn JD, Woodworth D, Ellingson BM, et
505 al. Patterns of brain structural connectivity differentiate normal weight from overweight
506 subjects. NeuroImage: Clinical. 2015;7:506-17.
- 507 29. Riederer JW, Shott ME, Deguzman M, Pryor TL, Frank GKW. Understanding
508 Neuronal Architecture in Obesity through Analysis of White Matter Connection Strength.
509 Front Hum Neurosci. 2016;10(271).
- 510 30. Kullmann S, Schweizer F, Veit R, Fritsche A, Preissl H. Compromised white matter
511 integrity in obesity. Obesity Reviews. 2015;16(4):273-81.
- 512 31. Zhang R, Beyer F, Lampe L, Luck T, Riedel-Heller SG, Loeffler M, et al. White
513 matter microstructural variability mediates the relation between obesity and cognition in
514 healthy adults. Neuroimage. 2018;172:239-49.
- 515 32. Olivo G, Latini F, Wiemerslage L, Larsson E-M, Schiöth HB. Disruption of
516 accumbens and thalamic white matter connectivity revealed by diffusion tensor
517 tractography in young men with genetic risk for obesity. Front Hum Neurosci. 2018;12:75.
- 518 33. Horstmann A, Fenske WK, Hankir MK. Argument for a non-linear relationship
519 between severity of human obesity and dopaminergic tone. Obesity Reviews.
520 2015;16(10):821-30.
- 521 34. Loeffler M, Engel C, Ahnert P, Alfermann D, Arelin K, Baber R, et al. The LIFE-
522 Adult-Study: objectives and design of a population-based cohort study with 10,000 deeply
523 phenotyped adults in Germany. BMC Public Health. 2015;15(1):691.
- 524 35. Pott J, Burkhardt R, Beutner F, Horn K, Teren A, Kirsten H, et al. Genome-wide
525 meta-analysis identifies novel loci of plaque burden in carotid artery. Atherosclerosis.
526 2017;259(Supplement C):32-40.

36. Beyer F, Kharabian Masouleh S, Huntenburg JM, Lampe L, Luck T, Riedel-Heller SG, et al. Higher body mass index is associated with reduced posterior default mode connectivity in older adults. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2017;38(7):3502-15.
37. Power JD, Barnes KA, Snyder AZ, Schlaggar BL, Petersen SE. Spurious but systematic correlations in functional connectivity MRI networks arise from subject motion. *Neuroimage.* 2012;59(3):2142-54.
38. Beyer F, Garcia-Garcia I, Heinrich M, Schroeter ML, Sacher J, Luck T, et al. Neuroanatomical correlates of food addiction symptoms and body mass index in the general population. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2019;40(9):2747-58.
39. Griswold MA, Jakob PM, Heidemann RM, Nittka M, Jellus V, Wang J, et al. Generalized autocalibrating partially parallel acquisitions (GRAPPA). *Magn Reson Med.* 2002;47(6):1202-10.
40. Fischl B, Salat DH, Busa E, Albert M, Dieterich M, Haselgrove C, et al. Whole brain segmentation: automated labeling of neuroanatomical structures in the human brain. *Neuron.* 2002;33(3):341-55.
41. Dale AM, Fischl B, Sereno MI. Cortical surface-based analysis: I. Segmentation and surface reconstruction. *Neuroimage.* 1999;9(2):179-94.
42. van den Heuvel M, Scholtens L, van der Burgh H, Agosta F, Alloza C, Avancini T, et al. 10Kin1day: A bottom-up neuroimaging initiative. *bioRxiv.* 2019:509554.
43. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. 2019.
44. Gupta A, Mayer EA, Hamadani K, Bhatt R, Fling C, Alaverdyan M, et al. Sex differences in the influence of body mass index on anatomical architecture of brain networks. *International Journal of Obesity.* 2017;41(8):1185-95.
45. Cox SR, Lyall DM, Ritchie SJ, Bastin ME, Harris MA, Buchanan CR, et al. Associations between vascular risk factors and brain MRI indices in UK Biobank. *bioRxiv.* 2019:511253.
46. Bender AR, Raz N. Normal-appearing cerebral white matter in healthy adults: mean change over 2 years and individual differences in change. *Neurobiology of Aging.* 2015;36(5):1834-48.
47. Williams OA, An Y, Beason-Held L, Huo Y, Ferrucci L, Landman BA, et al. Vascular burden and APOE ε4 are associated with white matter microstructural decline in cognitively normal older adults. *Neuroimage.* 2019;188:572-83.
48. Devoto F, Zapparoli L, Bonandrini R, Berlingeri M, Ferrulli A, Luzi L, et al. Hungry brains: A meta-analytical review of brain activation imaging studies on food perception and appetite in obese individuals. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews.* 2018;94:271-85.
49. Spieker EA, Kochunov P, Rowland LM, Sprooten E, Winkler AM, Olvera RL, et al. Shared genetic variance between obesity and white matter integrity in Mexican Americans. *Frontiers in Genetics.* 2015;6:26.
50. Dennis EL, Jahanshad N, Braskie MN, Warstadt NM, Hibar DP, Kohannim O, et al. Obesity gene NEGR1 associated with white matter integrity in healthy young adults. *Neuroimage.* 2014;102:548-57.
51. Romer AL, Su Kang M, Nikolova YS, Gearhardt AN, Hariri AR. Dopamine genetic risk is related to food addiction and body mass through reduced reward-related ventral striatum activity. *Appetite.* 2019;133:24-31.
52. Nikolova YS, Ferrell RE, Manuck SB, Hariri AR. Multilocus genetic profile for dopamine signaling predicts ventral striatum reactivity. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2011;36(9):1940.
53. Benton D, Young HA. A meta-analysis of the relationship between brain dopamine receptors and obesity: a matter of changes in behavior rather than food addiction? *International Journal Of Obesity.* 2016;40:S12.
54. Kroemer NB, Small DM. Fuel not fun: Reinterpreting attenuated brain responses to reward in obesity. *Physiol Behav.* 2016;162:37-45.

579 55. Stice E, Spoor S, Bohon C, Veldhuizen MG, Small DM. Relation of reward from
580 food intake and anticipated food intake to obesity: a functional magnetic resonance
581 imaging study. J Abnorm Psychol. 2008;117(4):924.
582 56. Yokum S, Marti CN, Smolen A, Stice E. Relation of the multilocus genetic
583 composite reflecting high dopamine signaling capacity to future increases in BMI. Appetite.
584 2015;87:38-45.
585 57. Stice E, Yokum S, Bohon C, Marti N, Smolen A. Reward circuitry responsivity to
586 food predicts future increases in body mass: Moderating effects of DRD2 and DRD4.
587 Neuroimage. 2010;50(4):1618-25.
588
589