

***KLB* is associated with alcohol drinking, and its gene product  $\beta$ -klotho is necessary for FGF21 regulation of alcohol preference**

Excessive alcohol consumption is a major public health problem worldwide. We conducted a genome-wide association meta-analysis and replication study among 105,898 individuals of European ancestry, and identified a novel locus associated with alcohol consumption in  $\beta$ -Klotho (*KLB*) (rs11940694;  $P=9.2 \times 10^{-12}$ ), a component of Fibroblast-Growth-Factor-Receptors for FGF19/21. We show genotype-dependent alcohol preference in *klb* brain-specific knock-out mice compared with controls, and demonstrate that the effect of FGF21 on alcohol drinking depends on  $\beta$ -Klotho.

Excessive alcohol consumption is a major public health problem worldwide causing an estimated 3.3 million deaths in 2012<sup>1</sup>. Much of the behavioral research associated with alcohol has focused on alcohol-dependent patients. However, the burden of alcohol-associated disease largely reflects the amount of alcohol consumption in a population, not alcohol dependence<sup>2</sup>; it has long been recognized that small shifts in the mean of a continuously distributed behavior such as alcohol drinking can have major public health benefits<sup>3</sup>. For example, a shift from heavy to moderate drinking could have beneficial effects on cardiovascular disease risk<sup>4</sup>.

Alcohol drinking is a heritable complex trait<sup>5</sup>. Genetic variants in the alcohol and aldehyde-dehydrogenase gene family (*ADH/ALDH*) can result in alcohol intolerance mediated by altered peripheral metabolism of alcohol. However, genetic influences on brain functions affecting drinking behavior have been more difficult to detect because, as for many complex traits, the effect

24 of individual genes is small, so large sample sizes are required to detect the genetic signal<sup>6</sup>. Here  
25 we report a genome-wide association (GWAS) and replication study of over 100,000 individuals  
26 of European descent and functional characterization in a mouse knock-out. We identified a variant  
27 in a novel gene in a pathway previously described to regulate macronutrient preference. We then  
28 functionally characterized this pathway in a knock-out mouse model.

29  
30 We carried out GWAS of quantitative data on alcohol intake among up to 70,460 individuals  
31 (60.9% women) of European descent from 30 cohorts. We followed up the most significantly  
32 associated SNPs (six sentinel SNPs  $P < 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$  from independent regions) among up to 35,438  
33 individuals from 14 additional cohorts (see Supplementary Note and Supplementary Table 1). We  
34 analyzed both continuous data on daily alcohol intake in drinkers (g/day, log transformed) and a  
35 dichotomous variable of heavy vs. light or no drinking (see Online Methods and Supplementary  
36 Table 1). Average alcohol intake in drinkers across the samples was 14.0 g/day in men and 6.0  
37 g/day in women. We performed per cohort sex-specific and combined-sex single SNP regression  
38 analyses under an additive genetic model, and conducted meta-analysis across the sex-specific  
39 strata and cohorts using an inverse variance weighted fixed effects model.

40  
41 Results of the primary GWAS for log g/day alcohol are shown in Table 1, Supplementary  
42 Figure 1, and Supplementary Table 2A. We identified five SNPs for replication at  $P < 1 \times 10^{-6}$   
43 (Supplementary Table 2A). In addition to rs10950202 in *AUTS2* ( $P = 2.9 \times 10^{-7}$ ), we took forward  
44 SNP rs6943555 in *AUTS2* ( $P = 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ ), which was previously reported in relation to alcohol  
45 drinking<sup>6</sup>. Combining discovery and replication data, we report genome-wide significance for SNP  
46 rs11940694 (A/G) in *KLB* ( $P = 9.2 \times 10^{-12}$ ) (Table 1, Supplementary Figure 2), for which the minor

47 allele A was associated with reduced drinking. In the dichotomous analysis primary GWAS  
48 (Supplementary Table 2B), we took forward two SNPs (rsXXXX and rsYYYY) for replication,  
49 but neither replicated (Supplementary Table 3).

50

51 *KLB* is localized on human chromosome 4p14 and encodes a transmembrane protein,  
52  $\beta$ -Klotho, which is an essential component of oligomeric receptors for FGF19 and FGF21<sup>7,8</sup>.  
53  $\beta$ -Klotho is abundantly expressed in liver and adipose tissue, and is also expressed in discrete  
54 regions of the brain<sup>9</sup>. In mice FGF15 (homologue of FGF19) is expressed at high levels in the  
55 brain during embryogenesis and has been shown to promote neurogenesis and early brain structural  
56 development<sup>10,11</sup>. In adult mice, FGF21 is secreted from the liver in response to nutritional stress  
57 such as starvation and high-carbohydrate diets and acts co-ordinately on multiple tissues, including  
58 the brain, to regulate metabolism and related behaviors<sup>7,8</sup>. Among its actions, FGF21 suppresses  
59 sweet preference by acting on the brain<sup>12,13</sup>. FGF21 has been associated with macronutrient  
60 preference in man<sup>14</sup>.

61

62 SNP rs11940694 is localized in intron 1 of the *KLB* gene. We found no association of  
63 rs11940694 with gene expression in peripheral blood of 5,236 participants of the Framingham  
64 study<sup>15</sup> (Supplementary Table 4).

65

66 To examine whether  $\beta$ -Klotho affects alcohol drinking in mice, and whether it does so through  
67 actions in the brain, we measured alcohol intake and the alcohol preference ratio of brain-specific  $\beta$ -  
68 Klotho-knockout (*Klb*<sup>Camk2a</sup>) mice and control floxed *Klb* (*Klb*<sup>f/f</sup>) mice. We used a voluntary two-  
69 bottle drinking assay performed with water and alcohol. Since we previously showed that FGF21-

70 transgenic mice, which express FGF21 at pharmacologic levels, have a reduced alcohol preference<sup>12</sup>,  
71 we performed these studies while administering either recombinant FGF21 or vehicle by osmotic  
72 minipump. Alcohol preference vs. water was significantly increased in vehicle-treated *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>*  
73 compared to *Klb<sup>fl/fl</sup>* mice at 16 vol. % alcohol (Figure 1A). FGF21 suppressed alcohol preference  
74 in *Klb<sup>fl/fl</sup>* mice, but not in *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>* demonstrating that the effect of FGF21 on alcohol drinking  
75 depends on  $\beta$ -Klotho expressed in the brain (Figure 1A). There was a corresponding decrease in  
76 plasma alcohol levels immediately after 16 vol. % alcohol drinking, which reflects the modulation  
77 of the drinking behavior (Figure 1B). However, plasma FGF21 levels were comparable in *Klb<sup>fl/fl</sup>*  
78 and *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>* mice administered recombinant FGF21 at the end of the experiment (Figure 1C).  
79 Alcohol bioavailability was not different between FGF21 treated *Klb<sup>fl/fl</sup>* and *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>* mice (Figure  
80 1D). We have previously shown that FGF21 decreases the sucrose and saccharine preference ratio  
81 in *Klb<sup>fl/fl</sup>* but not *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>* mice, and has no effect on the quinine preference ratio<sup>12</sup>. To rule out a  
82 potential perturbation of our findings as a result of the experimental procedure, we independently  
83 measured preference and consumption of 16 vol. % alcohol in *Klb<sup>fl/fl</sup>* and *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>* mice without  
84 implantation of an osmotic minipump. Again, *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>* mice showed significantly greater alcohol  
85 consumption and increased alcohol preference compared to *Klb<sup>fl/fl</sup>* mice (Figure 2A,B), thus  
86 replicating our findings above. Alcohol bioavailability after an i.p. injection was not different between  
87 *Klb<sup>fl/fl</sup>* and *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>* mice after 1 and 3 hours (Figure 2C).

88

89 Increased alcohol drinking in humans and mice may be motivated by its reward properties  
90 or as a means to relieve anxiety<sup>16</sup>. FGF21 increases corticotrophin release factor and catecholamine  
91 release in mice<sup>17</sup>, which is linked to heightened anxiety. We therefore tested *Klb<sup>fl/fl</sup>* and *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>*  
92 mice in behavioral paradigms measuring anxiety, including novelty suppressed feeding

93 (Supplementary Figure 4A), elevated plus maze (Supplementary Figure 4B), and open field activity  
94 tests (Supplementary Figure 4C) but did not find differences between *Klb<sup>fl/fl</sup>* and *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>* mice in  
95 any of the anxiety measures, or in general locomotor activity. Our finding of increased alcohol  
96 preference in *Klb<sup>Camk2a</sup>* mice may thus be caused by alteration of alcohol-associated reward  
97 mechanisms. This notion is consistent with our previous results showing *Klb* expression in areas  
98 important for alcohol reinforcement, specifically the nucleus accumbens and the ventral tegmental  
99 area<sup>12</sup>.

100

101 Here we report results from genome-wide data in over 100,000 individuals that SNP  
102 rs11940694 in *KLB* associates with alcohol consumption. In functional animal experiments we  
103 show that  $\beta$ -Klotho controls alcohol drinking through a central nervous system mechanism  
104 involving the action of FGF21 that is secreted in the liver. Whereas most previous studies  
105 investigating the mechanisms underlying alcohol drinking behavior have focused on investigations  
106 of brain (or liver) functions alone, our results suggest the possibility of a coordinated action across  
107 the two organ systems, liver and brain. This *FGF21-KLB* axis may be involved in regulation of  
108 complex adaptive behaviors involving alcohol drinking.

**109 ONLINE METHODS****110 Alcohol phenotypes**

111 Alcohol intake in grams of alcohol per day was estimated by each cohort based on information  
112 about drinking frequency and type of alcohol consumed. For cohorts that collected data in  
113 ‘drinks per week’, standard ethanol contents in different types of alcohol drinks were provided as  
114 guidance to convert the data to ‘grams per week’, which was further divided by 7 to give intake  
115 as ‘grams per day’. Adjustment was made if cohort-specific drink sizes differed from the  
116 standard. For cohorts that collected alcohol use in grams of ethanol per week, the numbers were  
117 divided by 7 directly into ‘grams per day’. Cohorts with only a categorical response to the  
118 question for drinks per week used mid-points of each category for the calculation. All non-  
119 drinkers (individuals reporting zero drinks per week) were removed from the analysis. The  
120 ‘grams per day’ variable was then  $\log_{10}$  transformed prior to the analysis. Sex-specific residuals  
121 were derived by regressing alcohol in  $\log_{10}$ (grams per day) in a linear model on age, age-square,  
122 weight, and if applicable, study site and principal components to account for population  
123 structure. The sex-specific residuals were pooled and used as the main phenotype for subsequent  
124 analyses.

125 Dichotomous alcohol phenotype was created based on categorization of ‘drinks per week’  
126 variable. Heavy drinking was defined as  $\geq 21$  drinks per week in men, or  $\geq 14$  drinks per week  
127 in women. Light (or zero) drinking was defined if male participants had  $\leq 14$  drinks per week,  
128 or female participants had  $\leq 7$  drinks per week. Drinkers having  $> 14$  to  $< 21$  drinks for men, or  
129  $> 7$  to  $< 14$  drinks for women were excluded. Where information was available, current non-  
130 drinker who was former drinker of  $> 14$  drinker per week in men, and  $> 7$  drinks per week in  
131 women, as well as current non-drinker who was a former drinker of unknown amount were

132 excluded; whereas current non-drinkers who were former drinkers of  $\leq 14$  for men or  $\leq 7$  for  
133 women were included. Further exclusion was made if there were missing data on alcohol  
134 consumption or on the covariates. The analyses only included participants of European origin.

### 135 **Discovery GWAS in AlcGen and CHARGE+ and replication analyses**

136 Genotyping methods are summarized in Supplementary Table 1B, 1C and 1F. SNPs were  
137 excluded if: HWE  $P < 1 \times 10^{-6}$  or based on cohort-specific criteria; MAF  $< 1\%$ ; imputation  
138 information score  $< 0.5$ ; if results were only available from 2 or fewer cohorts, or total  $N < 10,000$ .  
139 Population structure was accounted for within cohorts via principal components analysis (PCA).  
140 LD score regression<sup>18</sup> was conducted on the GWAS summary results to examine the degree of  
141 inflation in test statistics, and genomic control correction was considered unnecessary ( $\lambda_{GC}=1.06$   
142 and intercept=1.00;  $\lambda=0.99$  to 1.06 for individual cohorts, Supplementary Table 1B, 1C). SNPs  
143 were taken forward for replication from discovery GWAS if they passed the above criteria and if  
144 they had  $P < 1 \times 10^{-6}$  (one SNP with the smallest  $P$  taken forward in each region, except for *AUTS2*  
145 for which two SNPs were taken forward based on previous results<sup>6</sup>). Meta-analyses were  
146 performed by METAL<sup>19</sup> or R (v3.2.2).

### 147 **Gene Expression Profiling in Framingham study**

148 In the Framingham study, gene expression profiling was undertaken for the blood samples of a  
149 total of 5,626 participants from the Offspring ( $N=2,446$ ) at examination eight and the Third  
150 Generation ( $N=3,180$ ) at examination two. Fasting peripheral whole blood samples (2.5ml) were  
151 collected in PAXgene™ tubes (PreAnalytiX, Hombrechtikon, Switzerland). RNA expression  
152 profiling was conducted using the Affymetrix Human Exon Array ST 1.0 (Affymetrix, Inc., Santa  
153 Clara, CA) for samples that passed RNA quality control. The expression values for ~ 18,000  
154 transcripts were obtained from the total 1.2 million core probe sets. Quality control procedures for

155 transcripts have been described previously. All data used herein are available online in dbGaP  
156 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gap; accession number phs000007>).

157

### 158 **The *cis*- Expression Quantitative Trait Loci Analysis in Framingham study**

159 To investigate possible effects of rs11940694 in *KLB* on gene expression, we performed *cis*-eQTL  
160 analysis. The SNP in *KLB* was used as the independent variable in association analysis with the  
161 transcript of *KLB* measured using whole blood samples in the FHS (n=5,236). Affymetrix probe  
162 2724308 was used to represent the *KLB* overall transcript levels. Age, sex, BMI, batch effects and  
163 blood cell differentials were included as covariates in the association analysis. Linear mixed model  
164 was used to account for familial correlation in association analysis.

165

### 166 **Mouse studies**

167 *klb knock-out*: All mouse experiments were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and  
168 Research Advisory Committee of the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center. Male  
169 littermates (2 to 4-month-old) maintained on a 12 hr light/dark cycle with *ad libitum* access to  
170 chow diet (Harlan Teklad TD2916) were used for all experiments. The *Klb* gene was deleted from  
171 brain by crossing *Klb*<sup>fl/fl</sup> mice with *Camk2a*-Cre mice on a mixed C57BL/6J;129/Sv background  
172 as described<sup>9</sup>.

173

### 174 *Alcohol drinking in mice*

175 For voluntary two-bottle preference experiments, male mice (n=9-13 per group) were given access  
176 to two bottles, one containing water and the other containing 2-16% ethanol (vol/vol) in water.  
177 After acclimation to the two-bottle paradigm, mice were exposed to each concentration of ethanol



178 for 4 days. Total fluid intake (water + ethanol-containing water), food intake and body weight were  
179 measured each day. Alcohol consumption (g) was calculated based on EtOH density (0.789 g/ml).  
180 To obtain accurate alcohol intake that corrected for individual differences in littermate size,  
181 alcohol consumption was normalized by body weight per day for each mouse. As a measure of  
182 relative alcohol preference, the preference ratio was calculated at each alcohol concentration by  
183 dividing total consumed alcohol solution (ml) by total fluid volume. Two-bottle preference assays  
184 were also performed with sucrose (0.5 and 5%) and quinine (2 and 20 mg/dl) solutions. For all  
185 experiments, the positions of the two bottles were changed every two days to exclude position  
186 effects.

187

#### 188 *Mouse experiments with native FGF21*

189 For FGF21 administration studies, recombinant human FGF21 protein provided by Novo Nordisk  
190 was administered at a dose of 0.7 mg/kg/day by subcutaneous osmotic mini-pumps (Alzet 1004).  
191 Mice were single caged following mini-pump surgery, which was conducted under isoflurane  
192 anesthesia and 24 hour buprenorphine analgesia. Mice were allowed to recover from mini-pump  
193 surgery for 4 days prior to alcohol drinking tests. After experiments, mice were sacrificed by  
194 decapitation and plasma was collected using EDTA or heparin after centrifugation for 15 minutes  
195 at 3000 rpm. Plasma FGF21 concentrations were measured using the Biovendor FGF21 ELISA  
196 Kit according to manufacturer's protocol.

197

198 *Plasma ethanol concentration and clearance*

199 For alcohol bioavailability tests, mice (n=4-5 per group) were injected i.p. with alcohol (2.0 g/kg,  
200 20% w/vol) in saline, and tail vein blood was collected after 1 and 3 hours. Plasma alcohol  
201 concentrations were measured using the EnzyChrom™ Ethanol Assay Kit.

202

203 *Emotional behavior in mice*

204 For open field activity assays, naïve mice were placed in an open arena (44 cm<sup>2</sup>, with the center  
205 defined as the middle 14 cm<sup>2</sup> and the periphery defined as the area 5 cm from the wall), and the  
206 amount of time spent in the center versus along the walls and total distance traveled were  
207 measured. For elevated plus maze activity assays, mice were placed in the center of a plus maze  
208 with 2 dark enclosed arms and 2 open arms. Mice were allowed to move freely around the maze,  
209 and the total duration of time in each arm and the frequency to enter both the closed and open arms  
210 was measured. For novelty suppression of feeding assays, mice fasted for 12 hours were placed in  
211 a novel environment and the time to approach and eat a known food was measured.

212

213 *Statistical Analysis*

214 All data are expressed as means  $\pm$  S.E.M. Statistical analysis between the two groups was  
215 performed by unpaired two-tailed Student's t test using Excel or GraphPad Prism (GraphPad  
216 Software, Inc.). For multiple comparisons, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with post-hoc  
217 Tukey was done using SPSS.

- 218 1. WHO. Global status report on alcohol and health 2014. (2014).  
 219 2. Rehm, J. *et al.* Global burden of disease and injury and economic cost attributable to  
 220 alcohol use and alcohol-use disorders. *Lancet* **373**, 2223-33 (2009).  
 221 3. Rose, G. Strategy of prevention: lessons from cardiovascular disease. *Br Med J (Clin Res*  
 222 *Ed)* **282**, 1847-51 (1981).  
 223 4. Hines, L.M. & Rimm, E.B. Moderate alcohol consumption and coronary heart disease: a  
 224 review. *Postgrad Med J* **77**, 747-52 (2001).  
 225 5. Heath, A.C., Meyer, J., Jardine, R. & Martin, N.G. The inheritance of alcohol consumption  
 226 patterns in a general population twin sample: II. Determinants of consumption frequency  
 227 and quantity consumed. *J Stud Alcohol* **52**, 425-33 (1991).  
 228 6. Schumann, G. *et al.* Genome-wide association and genetic functional studies identify  
 229 autism susceptibility candidate 2 gene (AUTS2) in the regulation of alcohol consumption.  
 230 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **108**, 7119-24 (2011).  
 231 7. Fisher, F.M. & Maratos-Flier, E. Understanding the Physiology of FGF21. *Annu Rev*  
 232 *Physiol* **78**, 223-41 (2016).  
 233 8. Owen, B.M., Mangelsdorf, D.J. & Kliewer, S.A. Tissue-specific actions of the metabolic  
 234 hormones FGF15/19 and FGF21. *Trends in endocrinology and metabolism: TEM* **26**, 22-  
 235 9 (2015).  
 236 9. Bookout, A.L. *et al.* FGF21 regulates metabolism and circadian behavior by acting on the  
 237 nervous system. *Nat Med* **19**, 1147-52 (2013).  
 238 10. Borello, U. *et al.* FGF15 promotes neurogenesis and opposes FGF8 function during  
 239 neocortical development. *Neural Dev* **3**, 17 (2008).  
 240 11. Fischer, T. *et al.* Fgf15-mediated control of neurogenic and proneural gene expression  
 241 regulates dorsal midbrain neurogenesis. *Dev Biol* **350**, 496-510 (2011).  
 242 12. Talukdar, S. *et al.* FGF21 Regulates Sweet and Alcohol Preference. *Cell Metab* **23**, 344-9  
 243 (2016).  
 244 13. von Holstein-Rathlou, S. *et al.* FGF21 Mediates Endocrine Control of Simple Sugar Intake  
 245 and Sweet Taste Preference by the Liver. *Cell Metab* **23**, 335-43 (2016).  
 246 14. Chu, A.Y. *et al.* Novel locus including FGF21 is associated with dietary macronutrient  
 247 intake. *Hum Mol Genet* **22**, 1895-902 (2013).  
 248 15. Splansky, G.L. *et al.* The Third Generation Cohort of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood  
 249 Institute's Framingham Heart Study: design, recruitment, and initial examination. *Am J*  
 250 *Epidemiol* **165**, 1328-35 (2007).  
 251 16. Muller, C.P. & Schumann, G. Drugs as instruments: a new framework for non-addictive  
 252 psychoactive drug use. *Behav Brain Sci* **34**, 293-310 (2011).  
 253 17. Owen, B.M., Mangelsdorf, D.J. & Kliewer, S.A. Tissue-specific actions of the metabolic  
 254 hormones FGF15/19 and FGF21. *Trends Endocrinol Metab* **26**, 22-9 (2015).  
 255 18. Bulik-Sullivan, B.K. *et al.* LD Score regression distinguishes confounding from  
 256 polygenicity in genome-wide association studies. *Nat Genet* **47**, 291-5 (2015).  
 257 19. Willer, C.J., Li, Y. & Abecasis, G.R. METAL: fast and efficient meta-analysis of  
 258 genomewide association scans. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 2190-1 (2010).

259