Genes, environment and individual risk: an incoherent question with misleading "answers"

George Davey Smith

Centre for Causal Analyses in Translational Epidemiology (CAiTE) / Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC)

University of Bristol

Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the International Epidemiological Association © The Author 2011; all rights reserved.

International Journal of Epidemiology 2011;40:537–562 doi:10.1093/ije/dyr117

IEA JOHN SNOW LECTURE 2011

Epidemiology, epigenetics and the 'Gloomy Prospect': embracing randomness in population health research and practice

George Davey Smith

MRC Centre for Causal Analyses in Translational Epidemiology, School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Oakfield House, Oakfield Grove, Bristol BS8 2BN, UK

Epidemiologists aim to identify modifiable causes of disease, this often being a prerequisite for the application of epidemiological findings in public health programmes, health service planning and clinical medicine. Despite successes in identifying causes, it is often claimed that there are missing additional causes for even reasonably well-understood conditions such as lung cancer and coronary heart disease. Several lines of evidence suggest that largely chance events, from

The Gloomy Prospect

Mis-specifying individual risk of IHD: what to do?

"... within any risk group, prediction is poor; it is not at present possible to express individual risk more precisely than as about a 1 in 6 chance of a hitherto healthy man developing clinical IHD in the next 5 years if he is at high risk" "There is a pressing need for prospective observational studies in which new risk factors are identified"

Meade TW, Chakrabarti R. Arterial disease research: observation or intervention? Lancet 1972;ii:913-6



Why are children in the same family so different from one another?



- Genetics apart, siblings are no more similar than two randomly selected individuals from the population they are from
 - They share many of the things that lifecourse epidemiologists have been interested in!

Plomin and Daniels, Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 1987 (IJE 2011)

Shared environment: a meaningful concept?

- Shared environment in childhood: declining effects on outcomes such as obesity
- Shared environment in adulthood extended pedigree studies; spousal studies
- Face validity of estimates e.g. music lessons vs playing in adulthood; child being read to but not reading on their own (Vinkhuyzen et al 2010)

Effects of heritable and environmental factors in cancers at various sites. Proportion of variance (95% CI)

Site or type	Heritable factors	Shared environment	Non-shared environment
Stomach	0.28 (0-0.51)	0.10 (0-0.34)	0.62 (0.49-0.76)
Colorectum	0.35 (0.10-0.48)	0.05 (0-0.23)	0.60 (0.52-0.70)
Pancreas	0.36 (0-0.53)	0 (0-0.35)	0.64 (0.47-0.86)
Lung	0.26 (0-0.49)	0.12 (0-0.34)	0.62 (0.51-0.73)
Breast	0.27 (0.04-0.41)	0.06 (0-0.22)	0.67 (0.59-0.76)
Cervix uteri	0 (0-0.42)	0.20 (0-0.35)	0.80 (0.57-0.97)
Corpus uteri	0(0-0.35)	0.17 (0-0.31)	0.82 (0.64-0.98)
Ovary	0.22 (0-0.41)	0 (0-0.24)	0.78 (0.59-0.99)
Prostate	0.42 (0.29-0.50)	0 (0-0.09)	0.58 (0.50-0.67)
Bladder	0.31 (0-0.45)	0 (0-0.28)	0.69 (0.53-0.86)
Leukemia	0.21 (0-0.54)	0.12 (0-0.41)	0.66 (0.45-0.88)

Lichtenstein P, Holm MV, Verkasalo OK et al. Environmental and heritable factors in the causation of cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2000;**343**:78-85.

Categories of "environmental" factors that cause children in same family to differ

- Measurement error (non-shared environment is from subtraction)
- "Non-systematic non-shared environment"

 stochastic processes during development and beyond
- Systematic differences birth order, sib-sib interactions, peer effects etc

Plomin and Daniels, Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 1987 (IJE 2011)

V

"life's single lesson: that there is more accident to it than a man can ever admit to in a lifetime and stay sane"

V, Thomas Pynchon, 1964

Lifecourse epidemology of C elegans



Although factors in the microenvironment or life histories of individuals (for example, the amount of time spent in food as opposed to near it) could profoundly affect ageing rates, we repeatedly observed a stochastic occurrence of cellular demise within the same cell types of individual animals.

Herndon et al. Stochastic and genetic factors influence tissue-specific decline in ageing C. elegans Nature, 2002

Variation of growth of genetically identical marbelled crayfish in an aquarium



How well would epidemiologists be able to predict outcome? Vogt et al. J Exp Biol 2008;211:510-23



Laboratory Animals (1990) 24, 71-77

71

A third component causing random variability beside environment and genotype. A reason for the limited success of a 30 year long effort to standardize laboratory animals?

KLAUS GÄRTNER

Medizinische Hochschule Hannover, Abt. Versuchstierkunde Konstanty-Gutschow-Str. 8, D-3000 Hannover, Federal Republic of Germany

Summary

This paper is a review of experiments, performed in our laboratory during the past 20 years, designed to analyse the significance of different components of random variability in quantitative traits in laboratory rats and mice. Reduction of genetic variability by using inbred strains and than the consequence of heterogeneous environmental influences. In a group of inbred rats, the males with the highest chance of parenting the next generation were gathered in the central classes of the distribution of the body weight.

Keywords: Components of variance of body



Sewall Wright holding a guinea pig in each hand circa 1920.

Random phenotypic variance? Piebald pattern in guinea pigs



Sewall Wright 1921

58% of the variance intangible ..



"differences .. must be due to irregularities in development due to the intangible sort of causes to which the word chance is applied"

Sewall Wright 1921

Stochastic events at the level of gene expression and epigenetic processes



Waddington's epigenetic landscape



The advantages of being random?

Saccharomyces cerevisiae



Blake WJ et al. Phenotypic consequences of promoter-mediated transcriptional noise. Molecular Cell 2006; 24: 853-65.



Chance from the subcellular to the biographical level

Chance at the ontological or epistemological level

Consider contralateral breast cancer

Smoking and lung cancer

- lung cancer in cohort studies, pseudovariance explained 5-10% at best
- lung cancer trends in US, 93% of variance (Whittmore 1989)
- geographical differences within US virtually all variance (Weinberg 1982)
- between-country differences ditto

Lung cancer

- Heritable: 26%
- Shared environment 12%
- Non-shared environment 62%

Lichtenstein P, Holm MV, Verkasalo OK et al. Environmental and heritable factors in the causation of cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2000;**343**:78-85.

- Most traits have a non-trivial heritable component good news in that genetic variants can tell us about modifiable causes
- Exposures with apparently small contributions in terms of variance explained can account for most cases of disease in a population
- Unstable aspects of non-shared environment may account for high proportions of the variance but are intractable; luckily they will often not be confounders
- Modifiable exposures that the genetic and shared environmental components are informative about are likely to be the appropriate group-level public health targets

Mis-specifying individual risk of IHD: what to do?

"... within any risk group, prediction is poor; it is not at present possible to express individual risk more precisely than as about a 1 in 6 chance of a hitherto healthy man developing clinical IHD in the next 5 years if he is at high risk" "There is a pressing need for prospective observational studies in which new risk factors are identified"

Meade TW, Chakrabarti R. Arterial disease research: observation or intervention? Lancet 1972;ii:913-6