

Twin studies of cardiorespiratory disease, daily cardiovascular activity and imaging

Adam D. Tarnoki^a, Gonneke Willemsen^{b,c}, Eco de Geus^{b,c}, David L. Tarnoki^a

^a*Medical Imaging Centre, Semmelweis University, Hungarian Twin Registry, Budapest, Hungary*

^b*Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

^c*Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

24.1 Introduction

In 2019, the top three global causes of death consisted of noncommunicable cardiovascular and lung diseases, with ischemic heart disease being the number one cause of death, followed by stroke and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease¹. Furthermore, cardiovascular diseases and chronic lung diseases, which also include asthma, are among the leading causes of morbidity worldwide.¹ Twin research provides important insights into the underlying causes of cardiorespiratory disease. Twin studies provide information on the degree of heritability for the various diseases and related traits, and may also add to our understanding of the interplay of genetic factors with various environmental risk factors (gene–environment interactions). A large body of twin studies on cardiorespiratory disease already exists. As it is impossible to review the full scope of the literature here, in part A of this chapter we provide examples of twin studies for a wide range of cardiovascular and respiratory diseases focusing on their results for the role of heritability and the interplay with the environment in cardiorespiratory disease. To fully understand disease development it is also important to understand related processes in a nonpatient population during everyday life. In part B of this chapter, an overview is provided of twin studies using ambulatory monitoring to determine the heritability of everyday variation in blood pressure and heart action. Ambulatory monitoring, however, is not the only way to capture disease processes. In the last few decades, imaging has undergone an extensive development and it now plays a crucial role in the detection and

characterization of most cardiorespiratory phenotypes. In part C of this chapter, we illustrate the opportunities which arise from combining twin research and imaging research.

24.2 Cardiorespiratory twin studies

Adam D Tarnoki, David L Tarnoki

24.2.1 Heritability of the most common cardiovascular diseases

24.2.1.1 *Hypertension: blood pressure, blood pressure components, and vascular elasticity*

Hypertension is a common complex polygenetic trait, traditionally considered to have a moderate genetic component that interacts with various environmental risk factors such as diet, physical activity, and alcohol consumption, which affects ≤ 1 billion adults globally.² Unraveling the multifactorial basis of essential hypertension has been a central question of numerous twin studies, which have demonstrated moderate heritability of 30%–65%, with the remaining variance explained by unique environmental factors. A meta-analysis of 17 studies found that the mean heritability of systolic (SBP) and diastolic (DBP) blood pressure was 54% and 49%, respectively. The effect of common environmental factors was negligible.³ Gene-environment (GxE) interaction studies have found that several factors, such as education, eating habits, obesity, and the associated gut microbiota, may change the role of genetic factors.⁴

In the last decade, specific blood pressure components, such as the pulsatile component of blood pressure, pulse pressure (PP), and central blood pressure, have also received attention as they have been shown to predict later cardiovascular events.⁵ Twin studies confirmed a moderate heritability for these blood pressure components, with a higher inheritance for the central blood pressure variables than the peripheral blood pressure values.⁶

Arterial stiffness is a dynamic property defined by vascular function and vascular wall structure, which is also a good predictor for future cardiovascular events.⁵ Pulse wave velocity (PWV), characterizing vascular elasticity, and augmentation index (AIx), an indicator of wave reflection and peripheral vascular resistance have been also studied and a moderate genetic effect was observed for these traits.^{7–10}

The genetic origin of the association of hypertension with BMI has also been the focus of a number of studies. These studies have shown that common genetic factors may for a large part explain the correlation of blood pressure components with BMI.^{11–14} Blood pressure components were moderately correlated with BMI, largely because of shared genetic factors. However, for the association of BMI with brachial SBP and DBP, aortic SBP, and mean arterial pressure, acquired, modifiable factors were also found to be important.¹¹

24.2.1.2 Carotid atherosclerosis

Carotid atherosclerosis, a risk factor of stroke, is one of the most commonly studied atherosclerotic phenotypes as the degree of carotid atherosclerosis can be easily obtained for the carotid artery using ultrasound. The timeline of atherosclerotic progression includes carotid stiffening, increased intima-media thickness (IMT), and plaque development.

Carotid IMT is a reliable marker of subclinical atherosclerosis. Twin studies attributed a moderate role to genetic factors (25%–60%).¹⁵ The Healthy Twin Study provided evidence for segment-specific heritability of carotid IMT (48% for common, 38% for carotid bifurcation, and 45% for internal carotid artery (ICA), respectively) and a shared genetic variation was reported for the three carotid segments.¹⁶

Plaque formation in the carotid artery has been associated with a number of cardiovascular (e.g., myocardial infarction), retinal, and cerebral ischemia (stroke) complications. Based on the findings of a twin study involving Italian, Hungarian and American twins, heritability was 78% for the presence of carotid plaque, 74% for plaque-type based on its echogenicity, 69% for plaque size, 74% for plaque sidedness, 74% for plaque numerosity, 68% and 66% for the presence of plaque in carotid bulbs and proximal internal carotid arteries. Unique environmental factors were responsible for the remaining variance (22%–34%).¹⁷ An Italian twin study reported additive genetics to be responsible for the variance of carotid plaques in 52%, with unique factors explaining the remaining variance in the trait.¹⁸ Whole-genome association studies confirmed the role of 14 loci on chromosomes 14 loci with at least suggestive significance in the formation of carotid plaques.¹⁹ Numerous single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) have been linked to the increased risk for the development of subclinical or clinical carotid atherosclerosis, though only a minority of these genes seem to be potential future therapeutic targets.

Carotid flow velocities, determinate by ultrasound, showed a moderate and low (63% and 18%) heritability of the ICA peak systolic velocity and ICA/common carotid artery ratio. One of the few twin studies conducted for three traits showed little evidence for the role of genes as common (56%–63%) and individual environmental factors (37%–44%) explained the vast majority of the variance.²⁰ An Italian twin study showed carotid vascular wall elasticity to be moderately heritable (19%–46%).²¹ These findings support the value of the prevention of modifiable environmental factors in case of altered carotid flow velocities.

24.2.1.3 Coronary atherosclerosis

The classic risk factors associated with coronary heart disease (CHD), which may lead to acute myocardial infarction, are well known. Genetic predisposition was shown to play a role in CHD in family studies, but limited information is available from twin studies. A Swedish large twin study involving 51065 same-sex twins showed that during the 40-year follow-up, the heritability of CHD decreased with increasing age, as well as with increasing levels of BMI, in both men and women. Thus, genetic factors may play a more prominent role for CHD development in the

absence of important environmental factors such as BMI.²² Another Swedish twin study reported that, in general, probandwise concordances and intraclass correlations for angina pectoris (AP) and CHD death were greater in monozygotic (MZ) than dizygotic (DZ) twins among both sexes, indicating moderate heritability estimates for AP in both sexes (39% for males and 43% for females). The correlation between AP and CHD was almost exclusively explained by the influence of familial factors in both sexes, pointing to both shared genetic as shared environmental pathways.²³ Coronary calcification has been found to be moderately heritable in twins (67%, 95% CI: 37%–100%) when adjusted for age and sex, and overlapping genetic factors are largely responsible for the phenotypical resemblance of coronary and carotid or femoral atherosclerotic calcification.²⁴ These findings are supported by several published case studies where both twin brothers suffered acute myocardial infarction. In those cases, both twins usually have similar comorbidities as well as a similar course of the acute coronary syndrome.^{25–26} This emphasizes the need for screening people with a higher risk of future myocardial infarction. GWAS studies of common SNPs already found some genomic regions explaining ~2.4% of coronary artery calcification's heritability.²⁷

24.2.1.4 Aortic atherosclerosis and aneurysm

Calcified aortic plaque, assessed by computed tomography (CT), has shown a high heritability (61%), and the association between aortic wall calcification and increased arterial stiffness can be explained by a common genetic background.²⁸ Aortic atherosclerosis might lead to abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) formation, which is an abnormal dilation of the aorta and may progress to rupture and death. The Danish Twin Registry reported that the probandwise concordance rate for AAA was 2.5 times higher in MZ compared with DZ twins indicating a heritability of 77%.²⁹

24.2.1.5 Peripheral arterial disease

Peripheral arterial disease (PAD) means the reduction of blood flow to the lower extremities due to slow and progressive narrowing, blockage, or spasms in a blood vessel.³⁰ The most common risk factors for PAD are well known, and also include genetic predisposition. A Swedish twin study confirmed the role of genetic (58%) and individual environmental factors (42%) in PAD development.³¹ A study of 21 discordant twin pairs revealed that the twin with PAD was more likely to be sedentary and a persistent smoker.³¹ An ultrasound twin study revealed a heritability of 44%–47% for common and superficial femoral IMT.³² The variance in femoral plaques was due to genetic factors and the remaining 50% was explained by common (15%) and unique (35%) environmental factors. Sidedness and number of femoral plaques were mainly under genetic control. Femoral plaque composition was explained by genetics (64%) and unique environment (36%). Covariation between the liabilities to carotid and femoral plaques was mainly attributed to shared genes (77%).¹⁸ Recent forays into GWAS and epigenetics studies have suggested an important role of environmental factors in DNA methylation, histone acetylation signatures, and miRNA regulation.³³

24.2.2 Twin studies in frequent respiratory diseases

24.2.2.1 Lung function

A lung function test is a noninvasive method to investigate how well the lungs are working. Lung function variables (derived from spirometry) are moderately to highly genetically determined based on the results of multiple twin studies.^{34–38} GWAS studies identified a number of genes related to respiratory function, such as TMEM132C, UNC93A, and TTLL2, and PPT2 on chromosome 21 in a Korean twin population.³⁹

24.3 Twin studies of common chronic lung diseases

24.3.1 Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)

COPD is a chronic inflammatory lung disease that causes obstructed airflow from the lungs, leading to airflow limitation by inflammation and destruction of the airways and lung parenchyma. The vast majority of COPD cases (80%–90%) are caused by smoking, which by itself is heritable, as discussed in Chapter 23. The susceptibility to develop severe COPD is strongly influenced by genetic factors (approximately 60%).⁴⁰ Heritability was also suggested for specific COPD components in a pilot study of one COPD-concordant and five COPD discordant twin pairs who underwent high resolution CT (HRCT).⁴¹ Lung density and radiological markers of small airway disease (bronchial wall thickening, bronchiectasis, mucus plug formation, air trapping, and emphysema score) were very similar in identical twins, while other components were less similar among MZ twin pairs.⁴¹ Behaviors, such as eating fruit, smoking, and alcohol use may also influence disease risk and those health behaviors are also in part heritable (see other chapters).

24.3.2 Chronic bronchitis

Chronic bronchitis, long-term inflammation of the bronchi, is characterized by chronic cough and sputum from the airways. A Danish twin study found a hereditary predisposition to chronic bronchitis with heritability estimates of 55% in women and 25% in men.⁴² The heritability estimate for self-reported chronic bronchitis was a moderate 40% in Swedish samples, with common genetic factors explaining only 14% of the association with smoking.⁴³ Among twin pairs discordant for smoking, chronic bronchitis was significantly more common in the smoking twin compared with the nonsmoking cotwin.⁴⁴

24.3.3 Asthma

Asthma is a chronic inflammatory disease of the airways. Its development was linked to genetic factors in around 35%–80%. A study in the Netherlands Twin Register confirmed high heritabilities for asthma (75%) and allergy (66%).⁴⁵ Childhood

asthma was also highly heritable (82%) in a Swedish twin study.⁴⁶ Nonadditive genetic influences may also be important, which may have consequences for gene hunting strategies. A population-based, cross-sectional Swedish twin study involving 612 MZ and same-sex DZ schoolchildren found that the association between asthma and exhaled nitric oxide level is to a large extent explained by genetics via allergen-specific IgE level and not blood eosinophils which might partly explain the clinical heterogeneity of asthma.⁴⁷ Environmental factors play a role in determining individual variations in the severity of asthma symptoms. A retrospective cohort study in twins aged 3–10 years showed that early life antibiotic use, particularly prescribed for respiratory infections, was associated with an increased risk of asthma.⁴⁸ In addition, epigenetic changes such as DNA methylation and histone acetylation can be modified by certain environmental factors, such as maternal nutrition, smoking, microbiome, xenobiotic exposure, and stress. Discordant twin studies found DNA methylation differences (HLX gene cg23603194) among asthma patients.⁴⁹

24.3.4 Lung cancer

Smoking is the most important cause of lung cancer. However, genetic effects account for a significant amount of the variation in the liability to develop lung cancer. Heritability of lung cancer among current smokers was 41% and forever smoking pairs 37% according to the Nordic Twin Study of Cancer.⁴³ GWAS studies found an association with the *CHRNA5* functional D398N (rs16969968) variant, which was identified for smoking as well. This might explain the link with lung cancer.⁵⁰

24.3.5 Exhaled biomarkers

Human-exhaled breath contains a mixture of over 3000 volatile organic compounds (VOCs), this exhaled breath pattern can be distinguished by pattern recognition using electronic noses (e-noses). Most human diseases such as lung cancer are affiliated with multiple chemical compounds. VOC pattern was determined by shared environmental rather than hereditary factors in twins.⁵¹ The bronchodilator response to airway inflammation was studied in healthy twin pairs by measuring FEV1 before and after inhalation of 400 µg salbutamol. A heritability of 14.9% to 44% was found in twin studies.^{38,52}

24.3.6 Obstructive sleep apnoea (OSA)

OSA is caused by the repetitive collapse of the upper airway during sleep and one of the major sources of excessive daily sleepiness and cognitive dysfunction. Hereditary factors explained the background of snoring.^{53, 54} The heritability of OSA was studied using polysomnography. Heritability estimates for apnoea hypopnea index, respiratory disturbance index (RDI), and oxygen desaturation index ranged from 69% to 83%, while OSA was itself 73% heritable.⁵⁵ Genetic factors determinate the co-occurrence of OSA with hypertriglyceridaemia.⁵⁶

24.3.7 In conclusion

Twin research has provided insight into the genetic and environmental factors and gene–environment interactions of cardiorespiratory diseases. Most studies confirmed the relevance of genetic factors and underline the role of screening high-risk individuals. Reducing cardiovascular risk factors is of paramount importance for individuals genetically susceptible to cardiovascular disease. Findings of twin studies may help guide personalized therapy for at-risk patients in the future, as well as prevention strategies, thereby reducing the incidence of chronic cardiovascular and lung diseases.

24.4 Gaining insight into the heritability of everyday cardiovascular function by twin studies

Gonneke Willemsen & Eco de Geus

24.4.1 Introduction

As outlined above, genetic variation plays a large role in the development of cardiovascular diseases. However, to fully understand the pathway from genes to disease, we also need to understand normal everyday functioning of the systems involved, not only in patients but also in the nonpatient population. For this purpose, it may not be sufficient to obtain momentary physiological measurements during a check-up, whether it be at a GP-office or during a large-scale population screening. Such momentary measurements are unlikely to capture all the individual variation in daily life, and the situation may also influence the measurement (think of the white coat effect on blood pressure). Studies have tried to mimic the response to daily challenges within the laboratory, measuring cardiovascular activity while exposing study participants to mental and/or physical challenges. Such laboratory stressors will often be of insufficient intensity and duration to trigger the full set of physiological responses that come into play when stress is “for real.”⁵⁷ They will thus fail to reveal the slower counter-regulatory responses as well as allostatic adaptations that occur on a time scale of days or weeks. An example is the gradual build-up in resting blood pressure over the course of a stressful work week that subsides in the weekend.^{58,59} Laboratory studies also preclude examination of the activities that may have the largest clinical relevance like job-related strain, marital conflict, child care or, at the other end of the spectrum, restful sleep. The solution to increase ecological validity of cardiovascular assessment has been to use ambulatory monitoring of cardiovascular signals in real-life settings, using the increasingly advanced technological solutions that enable this. Superior predictive validity for long term cardiovascular health has repeatedly been shown for ambulatory blood pressure, where full 24-h recordings proved better predictors for cardiovascular morbidity and mortality than laboratory or office measurements.^{60–63}

24.4.2 Ambulatory studies of blood pressure and heart rate

Over the last three decades, several ambulatory studies have also been performed in twin families. These studies have focused mostly on the data obtained with an ambulatory blood pressure monitor with blood pressure as well as average heart rate (HR) obtained at intervals over a 24-h period.^{64–71} The first twin study on 24-h blood pressure monitoring was published in 1994 and included only 28 MZ and 16 DZ male twin pairs. Participants wore a blood pressure monitor while freely moving around in a hospital, where they slept in the sleep laboratory. No exact heritability estimates were provided but based on the twin comparisons the authors concluded that genetic effects were present for the 24-h profile, in particular the daytime values, of DBP and HR.⁶⁴ While this study did not demonstrate genetic effects for SBP, two other small scale studies published in the 1990s,^{65, 66} which allowed participants to engage in their normal day life, showed heritability for all three cardiovascular parameters, SBP, DBP, and HR. From 2003 onwards several larger twin studies on ambulatory blood pressure monitoring were conducted.^{67–73} As can be seen in Table 24.1, the outcomes of these twin studies are, overall, very much in line with each other and show clear evidence for heritability of SBP (ranging from 32% to 71%) and DBP (ranging from 31% to 70%). Only one of the larger studies⁶⁷ included heritability estimates for HR, estimating this to be 70% in men and 51% in women, when including all participants.

Generally, the estimates for the different quantifications of the blood pressure or HR level (e.g., 24-h average, day-time average, night-time average) do not vary strongly across the larger studies. Differences between studies may be mostly due to choices in design and operationalization of the blood pressure measure. For instance, the lowest estimates for SBP (38% and 32%) were seen by Kupper et al.⁶⁸ for the morning and evening average, respectively, when excluding participants on antihypertensive medication (more on this later), while the outcomes for the 24-h average for SBP were closer together at 60%⁶⁷ and 70%.⁶⁹ Indeed, when Xu et al.⁷⁰ compared the heritability using data from two different twin registers (East Flanders Prospective Twin Survey and the Georgia Cardiovascular Twin Study) but with the same operationalization, they found that the estimates could be considered equal. Wang et al.⁶⁹ examined whether the same genes may influence daytime levels as night-time levels. The genetic correlation between daytime and nighttime levels was 0.77 for SBP and 0.66 for DBP indicating that common genes underlie the blood pressure levels during the day and night. However, additional unique genetic influences emerged for the nighttime levels. While most studies focused on the levels during the day and night, one study looked at particular aspect during the night, namely dipping.⁷¹ In most individuals blood pressure decreases during the night, and not showing this drop may be related to an increased risk for mortality⁷⁴ and morbidity,⁷⁵ though being an extreme dipper at night may also be associated with an increased morbidity.⁷⁶ Wang et al.⁷¹ showed that this trait of having a nocturnal fall in blood pressure was highly heritable with an estimate of 59% for SBP and 81% for DBP.

So far, none of the studies conducting formal twin modeling of ambulatory measured blood pressure showed any evidence for the influence of common environmental factors. Although power may have been low to detect small effects of a shared twin environment, a fair conclusion is that the individual variation in blood pressure is predominantly

TABLE 24.1 Overview of the papers and heritability estimates referred to in the book chapter with regards to ambulatory blood pressure monitoring (ordered by publication date).

First author and year of publication	Sample	Age (years)	Cohort	Measurement	Variable	Heritability estimates ^a
Degaute et al. (1994) ⁶⁴	28 MZ & 16 DZ male pairs	Range: 16–36	Recruited via Belgian Twin Registers and university records	25-h measurement using Medilog blood pressure monitor	SBP DBP HR	No evidence for genetic influences for any of the operationalizations 24-hr: genetic effect Daytime: genetic effect Additional indicators: not clear 24-h: trend Daytime: trend Additional indicators: trend Conventional: 64 24-hr: 70 Awake: 63 Asleep: 72 Awake crest: 61 Awake 2pm-8pm: 4 ^d Nighttime trough: 77 Conventional: 73 24-h: 73 Awake: 55 Asleep: 51 Awake crest: 56 Awake 2pm-8pm: 1 ^d Nighttime trough: 57 24-h: 70 Awake: 65 Asleep: 52
Fagard et al. (1995) ⁶⁵	26 MZ & 27 DZ male pairs	Range: 18–38	East Flanders Prospective Twin Survey	Conventional measurement in the morning During the rest of the day and subsequent night measurements using Spacelab blood pressure monitor	SBP DBP HR	

(Continued)

TABLE 24.1 Cont'd

First author and year of publication	Sample	Age (years)	Cohort	Measurement	Variable	Heritability estimates ^a
Somes et al. (1995) ⁶⁶	38 MZ & 28 DZ pairs	Range: 15–17	The Medical College of Virginia Twin Study	24-h measurement using Accutracker blood pressure monitor	SBP DBP HR	24-h: 22 (incl all DZ pairs) 24-h: 38 (incl all DZ pairs) 24-h: 32 (incl all DZ pairs)
Vinck et al. (2001) ⁷²	150 MZ & 122 same sex DZ pairs	Range: 18–76 Analyses in all versus 3 age groups	East Flanders Prospective Twin Survey, registers from Leuven, Hasselt and Sint-Truiden	24-h measurement using Spacelab blood pressure monitor Conventional BP during separate visit	SBP DBP	Conventional: 62 (all ages) Daytime: 49 (all ages) Nighttime: 49 (all ages) Conventional 57 (all ages) Daytime 49 (all ages) Nighttime 50 (all ages)
Fagard et al. (2003) ⁶⁷	125 DZ, 97 MZ-DC & 128 MZ-MC	Range: 18–34	East Flanders Prospective Twin Survey	24-h measurement using Spacelab blood pressure monitor Conventional BP during separate visit	SBP DBP HR	Conventional 63 24-h average 60 Conventional 55 24-h average 62 Conventional 50 24-h average: 70 (men), 51 (women) Excluding MZ-MC: 66 (no gender difference) Awake: 48 Awake: 44
Hot-tenga et al. (2005) ⁷³	165 MZ twins, 217 DZ twins, 184 single-ton siblings	Range: 17–81	Netherlands Twin Register	Ambulatory measurements during the day using Spacelab blood pressure monitor	SBP DBP	

First author and year of publication	Sample	Age (years)	Cohort	Measurement	Variable	Heritability estimates ^a
Kupper et al. (2005) ⁶⁸	230 MZ twins, 305 DZ twins and 257 singleton siblings	Mean = 31.3 (SD = 11.2)	Netherlands Twin Register	Measurements during the day using Spacelab blood pressure monitor	SBP	Normotensive only/no antihypertensive medication/correction for antihypertensive medication Morning: 38/49/50 Afternoon: 50/57/57 Evening: 32/42/44 Normotensive only/no antihypertensive medication/correction for antihypertensive medication Morning: 40/52/55 Afternoon: 55/61/63 Evening: 31/43/46 Day: 70 Night: 68 Day-night: 75 Night-specific: 30
Wang et al. (2009) ⁷¹	European Americans: 51 MZ and 54 DZ pairs, 30 singleton twins African-American: 36 MZ & 46 DZ pairs, 26 singleton twins	Mean = 17.2 (SD = 3.4)	Georgia Cardiovascular Twin Study	24-h measurement using Spacelab blood pressure monitor	SBP	Dipping: 59 Day: 70 Night: 64 Day-night: 56 Night-specific: 43 Dipping: 81

(Continued)

TABLE 24.1 Cont'd

First author and year of publication	Sample	Age (years)	Cohort	Measurement	Variable	Heritability estimates ^a
Wang et al. (2011) ⁶⁹	European Americans: 104 pairs, 30 single-ton twins African-American: 78 pairs, 30 single-ton twins	Mean = 17.1 (SD = 3.4)	Georgia Cardiovascular Twin Study	24-h measurement using Spacelab blood pressure monitor	SBP DBP	Office: 63 24-hr: 71 Office: 59 24-hr: 69
Xu et al. (2015) ⁷⁰	703 twins – 308 pairs and 87 singletons Meta-analysis including additional 242 white and 188 black twins	Range 18–34	East Flanders Prospective Twin Survey Meta-analysis including Georgia Cardiovascular Twin Study	24-h measurement using Spacelab blood pressure monitor Conventional BP (Office)	SBP DBP	Daytime: 60; meta: 63 Nighttime: 51; meta: 56 Nighttime-specific: 21; meta: 22 Daytime 54; meta: 59 Nighttime 46; meta: 53 Nighttime-specific 26; meta: 30

^a Model fitting results are presented when given.

^b Heritability estimates for three separate laboratory studies were also included in the paper, but not presented here as they involved different participant groups.

^c In addition, two 10-min stress tasks were performed in the laboratory. Data not presented as outside the scope of this chapter.

^d Indicates occasions when common environment could not be excluded from the model.

Note. Conventional or office BP is the average of several, generally three, sitting BP measurements conducted by or in the presence of the experimenter.

determined by genetic and unique environmental factors. This echoes similar findings for conventional blood pressure.⁷⁷ Several twin studies directly compared the heritability of ambulatory and conventional blood pressure measurements (e.g., the average of two or three measurements taken while sitting) obtained in the same individuals,^{65,69,72} generally concluding that there were no differences in the extent of heritability of ambulatory and conventionally obtained blood pressure measurements. This was confirmed by Hot-tenga et al.⁷³ who compared blood pressure data from three laboratory twin studies and one ambulatory monitoring study. However, Wang et al.⁶⁹ suggested that there may be differences in the genes influencing conventional blood pressure measurements versus blood pressure measured over a prolonged period using ambulatory monitoring.

The outcomes of the twin studies on blood pressure heritability seem generalizable to other populations. Two studies^{68,73} included in addition to twins also their singleton siblings. No differences in means, variances, and covariances emerged for blood pressure in twins and their singleton siblings, indicating that the results of twin studies may be generalized to nontwin populations. Also, studies exploring sex differences found no evidence for different heritability estimates for men and women in SBP or DBP.^{67,69,71,73} Furthermore, Wang et al.^{69,71} reported similar heritability estimates for European-American and African-American twins. The one study to examine age differences⁷² pointed to a trend for a higher heritability in younger cohorts but this did not reach significance. Finally, Fagard et al.⁶⁷ examined whether the chorionicity of MZ twins (whether they were mono- or bichorionic) may influence the heritability of ambulatory blood pressure. Using data from the East Flanders Prospective Twin Study, the authors showed that chorionicity did not influence the heritability estimates for blood pressure. Only for HR gender differences emerged when monochorionic MZ twins were excluded.

Importantly, Kupper et al.⁶⁸ replicated previous findings from a family based design,⁷⁸ by showing that excluding participants on antihypertensive medication has substantial effects on heritability estimation. Heritability estimates were at its highest when, instead of excluding participants on antihypertensive medication, a correction was made for the average effects of the anti-hypertensive medication used. This correction should thus be applied in genetic investigations of ambulatory blood pressure as it provides the best reflection of the true population variance in blood pressure.

24.4.3 Ambulatory monitoring of other cardiovascular parameters

While the heritability of ambulatory monitored blood pressure and simultaneously measured HR has received much attention, very few heritability studies focused on the ambulatory monitoring of other parameters of cardiovascular function. These parameters are generally obtained by more continuous measurement of the heart function, extracting indicators of HR variability which may reflect parasympathetic or sympathetic influences on the heart. For an extensive explanation of these indicators and a general overview of the heritability of these indicators, the reader is referred to de Geus et al.⁷⁹. The Netherlands Twin Register conducted several studies^{80–82,84,85} on ambulatory cardiac parasympathetic nervous system activity using HR variability data obtained in twins and their singleton siblings with an ambulatory monitor of the electro- and impedance cardiogram (see [box 24.1](#)). As can be seen in [Table 24.2](#), these studies demonstrated heritability for root mean square

Box 24.1 The monitor was developed for easy wear, allowing for normal everyday activities. To show the size of the monitor, it is here worn outside the clothing. The inset shows the monitor in more detail.

The Netherlands Twin Register has conducted a number of studies on daily life cardiovascular activity. The vast majority of these studies made use of the VU-AMS, which continuously monitors the electrocardiogram and impedance cardiogram. The monitor was developed at the Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit to allow participants freedom of movement and enable the measurement of continuous heart action during several days to provide insight into the different factors influencing normal day cardiac action. Since this department also houses the Netherlands Twin Register (www.twinregister.org) this resulted in the largest twin study to date on ambulatory recorded indices of cardiac function. For an overview of the papers including the use of the VU-AMS, see www.vu-ams.nl/research.



TABLE 24.2 Overview of the papers and heritability estimates with regards to ambulatory monitoring of heart action (as mentioned in the chapter and ordered by publication date).

First author and year of publication	Sample	Age	Cohort	Monitor	Variable	Heritability estimate (%) ^a
Kupper et al. (2004) ⁸¹	218 MZ twins, 301 DZ twins and 253 singleton siblings	Men: mean = 1.3 (SD = 10.6) Women: mean = 30.8 (SD = 10.9)	Netherlands Twin Register	24-h ambulatory electro- and impedance cardiography using the VU-AMS	SDNN	Morning: 35 Afternoon: 36 Evening: 47 Night: 43 Morning: 41 Afternoon: 48 Evening: 48 Night: 40
Kupper et al. (2005) ⁸⁴	222 MZ twins, 305 DZ twins and 253 singleton siblings	Mean = 31.0 (SD = 10.8)	Netherlands Twin Register	24-h ambulatory electro- and impedance cardiography using the VU-AMS	Respiration rate InRSA	Morning: 27 Afternoon: 44 Evening: 50 Night: 81 Morning: 40 Afternoon: 49 Evening: 55 Night: 54
Kupper et al. (2006) ⁸⁰	215 MZ twins, 296 DZ twins and 244 singleton siblings	Mean = 30.6 (SD = 10.4).	Netherlands Twin Register	24-h ambulatory electro- and impedance cardiography using the VU-AMS	Heart period PEP PEP/LVET ratio	Morning: 37 Afternoon: 45 Evening: 40 Night: 48 Morning: 62 Afternoon: 62 Evening: 55 Night: 48 Morning: 58 Afternoon: 56 Evening: 48 Night: 35

(Continued)

TABLE 24.2 Cont'd

First author and year of publication	Sample	Age	Cohort	Monitor	Variable	Heritability estimate (%) ^a
Su et al. (2010) ⁸³	121 MZ twins and 77 DZ twins	MZ twins: mean = 54.3 (SD = 2.9) DZ twins: mean = 54.9 (SD = 2.7)	The Twins Heart Study, within the Vietnam Era Twin Registry	24-h ECG (Holter) monitor	InTPow	Univariate: 63 Bivariate with BDI - unadjusted: 64
					InULF	Bivariate with BDI - adjusted for covariates: 62 Univariate: 59
					InVLF InLF InHF	Bivariate with BDI - unadjusted: 61 Bivariate with BDI - adjusted for covariates: 60 Univariate: 57 Univariate: 43 Univariate: 56
				24-h ambulatory electro- and impedance cardiography using the VU-AMS	pvRSA	Including/excluding participants with a ceiling effect Sleep: 48/53 Sitting: 53/57 Active: 57/57
		Mean = 33.5 (SD = 9.2)	Netherlands Twin Register			Max during night: 53 Max during night corrected for ceiling: 55
					RMSSD	Daytime RSA-IBI slope: 35 Including/excluding participants with a ceiling effect Sleep: 53/53 Sitting: 54/52 Active: 49/46
					SDNN	Including/excluding participants with a ceiling effect Sleep: 46/47 Sitting: 48/46 Active: 53/54
Neijts et al. (2014) ⁸²	486 MZ twins, 517 DZ twins and 285 nontwin siblings				IBImax	52% (corrected for ceiling effects)

First author and year of publication	Sample	Age	Cohort	Monitor	Variable	Heritability estimate (%) ^a
Neijts et al. (2015) ⁸⁵	486 MZ twins, 517 DZ twins and 285 nontwin siblings	Mean age 28.5 yrs (SD = 9.6) to 37.2 yrs (SD = 5.4) for the three different waves of data collection	Netherlands Twin Register	24-hr ambulatory electro- and impedance cardiography using the VU-AMS	IBI ^a	Sleep: 52 Leisure: 51 Wake: 52 Work (sitting): 69 Work peak level: 60 5 of 6 reactivity scores were significant: 29–40
					pvRSA ^a	Sleep: 46 Leisure: 43 Wake: 55 Work (sitting): 53 Work peak level: 33 4 of 6 reactivity scores were significant: 34 to 47
					PEP ^a	Sleep average: 38 Leisure average: 25 Wake average: 41 Work (sitting): 44 Work peak level: 39 3 of 6 reactivity scores were significant: 10–19

^a Outcomes of different bivariate models differed slightly for the mean level. In case of differences, the lowest value was taken. MZ, monozygotic; DZ, dizygotic; SD, standard deviation; SDNN, standard deviations of all normal-to-normal intervals; RMSSD, root mean square of successive differences between adjacent normal-to-normal intervals; ln, logarithm transformation; pvRSA, peak valley respiratory sinus arrhythmia; PEP, pre-ejection period; LVET, left ventricular ejection time; TP, total power; VLF, very low frequency; LF, low frequency; IBI, interbeat interval.

of successive differences between adjacent normal-to-normal intervals (RMSSD, 40%–54%), and for respiratory sinus arrhythmia (RSA, 33%–57%). The NTR also examined ambulatory pre-ejection period (PEP), an indicator of cardiac sympathetic nervous system activity.⁸⁰ The heritability for PEP ranged somewhat more than for the parasympathetic indicators, from 25% to 62%, depending on the sample and operationalization. When PEP was corrected for left ventricular ejection time heritability estimates ranged from 35% at night to 58% in the morning. A further indicator of autonomic activity, the standard deviations of all normal-to-normal intervals (SDNN) were also found to be heritable in these studies, with a narrow range from 35% to 48%.^{81,82} Additional indicators of HR variability, obtained by spectral analysis were studied by Vaccarino et al.⁸³ who showed all to be highly heritable. Interestingly, they also found that common genes underlay the association of two indicators total power and ultra-low frequency with the score on the Beck Depression Inventory.

The NTR studies further showed that common genes influenced the parameters across the different periods of the day though at night new specific genes may also emerge.^{80,81} Common genes also explain a large part of the association between closely related variables such as RSA with respiration rate and heart period⁸⁴ and SDNN, RSA, and RMSSD.⁸² To gain more insight into the response to challenges during the day, Neijts et al.⁸⁵ expanded upon the findings by Kupper et al.⁸⁰ by operationalizing several definitions of reactivity (e.g., work levels while sitting versus average sleep or leisure levels). Significant heritability was seen for HR and parasympathetic reactivity (here indexed by RSA) and to a lesser extent for sympathetic reactivity (indexed by PEP). Further analyses showed that the response to the challenging periods of the day compared to resting levels was due to the emergence of additional genes influencing the response.

24.4.4 In conclusion

Overall, twin studies of ambulatory monitored cardiovascular activity show the importance of genetic factors for cardiovascular activity during the day and night. In addition, by studying cardiovascular function for prolonged periods of time valuable insights can be obtained in specific phenomena relevant to cardiovascular morbidity and mortality. Further studies are expected to provide more insight into the interplay of genetic and environmental factors on daily cardiovascular function and cardiovascular risk.

25.5 Imaging of twins

Adam D. Tarnoki, David L. Tarnoki

Imaging has developed rapidly in recent decades, with the emergence of new techniques. X-ray, mammography, and CT involve ionizing radiation. Therefore, most of these twin studies are mainly retrospective. Ultrasound propagates by sound waves, while magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) operates through a magnetic field.

Given their lack of harmful effect, these imaging modalities are frequently applied in twin studies. Here we briefly describe the techniques and present some examples to illustrate the enormous potential of imaging twin studies for gaining insight into disease processes.

25.5.1 X-ray

The use of X-ray has become the gold standard, among others, to analyze bone structure and abnormalities as well as certain thoracic abnormalities. There are some case studies with radiographs on twins, including a case study of a Scottish identical twin pair with recurrent right elbow dislocation⁸⁶ and a case of conjoined twins.⁸⁷

Taking into account the effects of ionizing radiation, most twin studies analyze X-ray image data that were obtained in hospitals as part of the screening of potentially affected twins. A UK twin study examined the heritability of osteoarthritis of the hip joint which was between 58% and 64%.⁸⁸ Genetic determinants of hip joint morphometry and their relationship to hip cartilage thickness were also studied, and genetic factors accounted for most of the variation in minimal joint space and acetabular anatomy.⁸⁹

Additional radiography studies analyzed the spine in the development of idiopathic scoliosis. Twin studies have shown that MZ twins are more often concordant for idiopathic adult scoliosis than DZ twin pairs. Phenotypic differences between MZ twins may also be the result of epigenetic differences. Genetic factors contributing to the spine curvature were also raised, as well as the severity of the curvature of scoliosis.^{90, 91}

A population-based Korean twin study examined the origin of a common foot deformity, hallux valgus, in twins and their families with X-Ray. Heritability was estimated at 51% for hallux valgus and 47% for hallux valgus angle, and it was suggested that genetic vulnerability may be reinforced by lifestyle factors, such as shoe wearing habits or preference.⁹²

Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DEXA) was used for measuring bone mineral density and body composition in twins which indicated that 20% of adult hip axis length is associated with environmental factors. Accordingly, any environmental effects of physical activity or nutrition on hip geometry must occur before early teenage years.⁹³ Bone mineral density was strongly heritable in twins, especially in females at all locations using both DEXA and quantitative bone ultrasound (QUS), which may explain the importance of family history as a risk factor for bone fractures. Unshared environmental effects accounted for the rest of the variance with slight differences in magnitude across various bone regions, supporting the role of lifestyle in preventing osteoporotic fractures with various efficacy in different bone regions.⁹⁴

25.5.2 Breast mammography

Compared to the traditional X-ray, breast mammography is performed with different physical parameters and photographic techniques. It is therefore suitable for detecting

subtle structural differences in the soft parts of the breast. For women of equivalent age, those whose breasts display greater white or bright areas on a mammogram—i.e. greater mammographic density—are at 1.8–6 times greater risk of developing breast cancer. Twin studies have reported that, under the assumptions of the classic twin model and after adjusting for age, BMI, and other determinants, the patterns of twin correlations for mammographic density measures are consistent with additive genetic factors explaining ~60% of their residual variances.^{95,96} An Australian twin study also revealed that at least two common breast cancer susceptibility genetic variants were associated with mammographic density measures that predict breast cancer. These findings could help elucidate how those variants and mammographic density measures are associated with breast cancer susceptibility.⁹⁷ The heritability of the extent of dense and nondense areas within the dense breasts was also examined, and a negative genetic correlation was found between these two parameters. This may mean that the same genetic factors affect both parameters, but in different ways.⁹⁶ In a Korean twin study, the same high heritability of mammographic density was found as in Western women indicating that environmental factors are responsible for the differences in the risk of breast cancer across populations. An inverse additive genetic correlation was reported between dense and nondense mammographic area predicting that genes positively associated with dense area may have the opposite effect on nondense area.⁹⁸

25.5.3 Ultrasound

Ultrasound is one of the most commonly involved imaging modality in twin research. The first twin studies using ultrasound began in the mid-1990s and have examined a wide variety of disorders. To name a few, in 1995, a study of twin pairs with polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS, a disease where numerous small cysts are seen in the ovaries together with an abnormal amount of androgen production) showed that 5 of 19 pairs of MZ twins were discordant for PCOS. Accordingly, the authors concluded that PCOS may be a polygenic condition, an X-linked disorder, the result of an intrauterine or a postnatal event, or the result of an interaction between genetic and environmental factors.⁹⁹ In a Finnish twin study, transvaginal ultrasound was applied, and heritability of the number of uterine fibroids (myomas, benign tumors) was found to be 26%. The incidence of myomas was associated with a higher BMI, which is known to be a highly hereditary trait¹⁰⁰ (see Cancer and Twin Research chapter). A Hungarian twin study analyzed the background of the common liver lesion of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and found this to have no genetic background, that is, common (74.2%) and individual (25.8%) environmental factors accounted for the variance of the disease.¹⁰¹ Thyroid gland is easily examinable with ultrasound, therefore, various twin studies analyzed this endocrin organ. Based on a Danish twin study, genetic factors accounted for 71% of the individual differences in thyroid volume. This fits the observation that not all individuals develop goiter even in iodine-deficient areas.¹⁰²

25.5.4 Computed tomography (CT)

CT is a diagnostic imaging procedure that involves rotating X-ray beams around the body to build cross-sectional images. In most cases, intravenous contrast material is administered in order to observe enhancement of certain organs or lesions for better characterization. Given the invasive nature and the ionizing radiation exposure, most twin studies are retrospective or case studies in this field or in the case of prospective study conducted with low or ultralow radiation.

A CT study on twin pairs found no significant differences between MZ and DZ twins in the development of paranasal sinuses which was mainly influenced by environmental factors, while the development of one common normal anatomical variant, the concha bullosa was partly genetically influenced.¹⁰³

Since CT is the best choice for imaging the bone structure, several twin studies analyzed heritability of bone structures. To understand the genetic background of the microarchitecture of the distal tibia and distal radius and remodeling markers, female twin pairs aged 40 to 61 years underwent high-resolution peripheral quantitative CT. A substantial genetic component has been found, which indicates that middle-aged women differ in their bone microarchitecture and remodeling markers more because of differences in their genetic factors than differences in their environment.¹⁰⁴ The same group reported that a larger within twin pair difference in cortical porosity of the distal tibia was associated with a larger within twin pair differences in height. Accordingly, taller women assemble wider bones with relatively thinner and more porous cortices predisposing to fracture.¹⁰⁵

25.5.5 Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)

MRI is a noninvasive imaging technology that produces three-dimensional detailed anatomical images based on the detection of change in the direction of the rotational axis of hydrogen protons. Based on its noninvasive nature and lack of ionizing radiation, MRI is a popular multiparametric imaging modality in prospective study of twins.

Obesity is a common trait in the field of MRI twin research. Finnish twin researchers have shown by MR examination of long-term discordant twin pairs in terms of physical activity that regular physical activity is an important factor in preventing the deposition of high-risk adipose tissue, even though genetic determinants and childhood environmental factors play a role.^{106,107} Australian researchers used MR to show a link between low birth weight and abdominal visceral and subcutaneous adipose tissue volume, which means that low birth weight is a high risk for abdominal obesity.¹⁰⁸ This is consistent with the results of epigenetic studies, as it reflects abnormal programming during pregnancy. An interesting example of high-risk adipose tissue accumulation was presented in 16 middle-aged (50–74 years) same-sex twin pairs with long-term discordance in physical activity habits. The inactive twins had 50% more visceral adipose tissue, 54% higher intramuscular adipose tissue, and 170% higher liver fat score compared to the physically active twins.¹⁰⁶

The same Finnish research group also found a link between pancreatic fat content, insulin resistance and liver fat content.¹⁰⁹

25.5.6 Neuroimaging

Neuroimaging is the other field where numerous twin studies have been conducted. To name a few, structural MRI data from the Human Connectome Project was used to investigate body mass index (BMI) associated differences in gray matter volume (GMV) within MZ twin pairs discordant for BMI. Heavier MZ twin siblings demonstrated less GMV within certain brain cortical areas. These results indicated that nongenetic influences and the mere presence of a higher BMI constitute relevant factors in the context of body weight-related structural brain alterations.¹¹⁰

A quantitative neuroimaging study in twins between 13 and 24 years of age using diffusion tensor imaging confirmed that genetic factors play a key role in the development of white matter microstructure.¹¹¹ MRI-visible dilated perivascular spaces (dPVS) in brain are common findings even in healthy young persons. A study on healthy young adult twins and nontwin siblings confirmed that dPVS volumes within basal ganglia and white matter were highly determined by genetic factors, especially in white matter.¹¹²

25.6 Future directions: radiogenomics and imaging epigenetics

The radiological and pathological sciences have developed closely together in recent decades, leading to the emergence of radiogenomics (or imaging genomics), a new branch of research that examines the relationships between radiological and histological features. Radiological tumor phenotypes can be used to provide noninvasive information on gene expression patterns, tumor subtypes, and even molecular biology data.¹¹³ Radiogenomics has not yet been applied to discordant twins. However, valuable studies could be performed involving twins, investigating not only the radiomorphology but also the underlying epigenetic or environmental factors in the affected sibling compared to the healthy twin.¹¹⁴

The combination of epigenetics with imaging can answer questions whether various imaging phenotypes can predict epigenetic modification, that are related to organ (such as brain) structure, function, and metabolism, which impact disease risk and progression. The integration of genetic imaging methods with epigenetic markers in humans appears promising, especially in neuroimaging.¹¹⁵ Imaging epigenetics will provide deeper insight into the causative pathogenetic and pathophysiological pathways through which genes and environment interrelate during life and impact physiology, pathophysiology, aging, and disease, especially in MZ twins discordant for a chronic disease.¹¹⁴ This knowledge may open doors for the development of novel biomarkers and preventive and disease-modifying treatments.

References

1. World Health Organization (WHO): The top 10 causes of death. available at: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/the-top-10-causes-of-death>. (Accessed December 10, 2021).
2. Forouzanfar MH, Liu P, Roth GA, et al. Global burden of hypertension and systolic blood pressure of at least 110 to 115 mm Hg, 1990-2015. *JAMA*. 2017;317:165–182.
3. Wang B, Liao C, Zhou B, et al. Genetic contribution to the variance of blood pressure and heart rate: a systematic review and meta-regression of twin studies. *Twin Res Hum Genet*. 2015;18:158–170.
4. Marques FZ. Missing heritability of hypertension and our microbiome. *Circulation*. 2018;138:1381–1383.
5. Safar ME. Pulse pressure, arterial stiffness and wave reflections (augmentation index) as cardiovascular risk factors in hypertension. *Ther Adv Cardiovasc Dis*. 2008;2:13–24.
6. Tarnoki AD, Tarnoki DL, Stazi MA, et al. Heritability of central blood pressure and arterial stiffness: a twin study. *J Hypertens*. 2012;30:1564–1571.
7. Huang Y, Su S, Snieder H, Treiber F, Kapuku G, Wang X. Decreased heritability and emergence of novel genetic effects on pulse wave velocity from youth to young adulthood. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11:8911.
8. Ye C, Pan Y, Xu X, et al. Pulse wave velocity in elastic and muscular arteries: tracking stability and association with anthropometric and hemodynamic measurements. *Hypertens Res*. 2016;39:786–791.
9. Ge D, Young TW, Wang X, Kapuku GK, Treiber FA, Snieder H. Heritability of arterial stiffness in black and white american youth and young adults. *Am J Hypertens*. 2007;20:1065–1072.
10. Snieder H, Hayward CS, Perks U, Kelly RP, Kelly PJ, Spector TD. Heritability of central systolic pressure augmentation: a twin study. *Hypertension*. 2000;35:574–579.
11. Tarnoki AD, Tarnoki DL, Bogl LH, et al. Association of body mass index with arterial stiffness and blood pressure components: a twin study. *Atherosclerosis*. 2013;229:388–395.
12. Wu Y, Zhang D, Pang Z, et al. Multivariate modeling of body mass index, pulse pressure, systolic and diastolic blood pressure in chinese twins. *Twin Res Hum Genet*. 2015;18:73–78.
13. Wu T, Snieder H, Li L, et al. Genetic and environmental influences on blood pressure and body mass index in han chinese: a twin study. *Hypertens Res*. 2011;34:173–179.
14. Wang B, Wu T, Neale MC, et al. Genetic and environmental influences on blood pressure and body mass index in the national academy of sciences-national research council world war ii veteran twin registry. *Hypertension*. 2020;76:1428–1434.
15. Zhao J, Cheema FA, Bremner JD, et al. Heritability of carotid intima-media thickness: a twin study. *Atherosclerosis*. 2008;197:814–820.
16. Lee K, Sung J, Lee SC, et al. Segment-specific carotid intima-media thickness and cardiovascular risk factors in koreans: the healthy twin study. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil*. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. 2012;19:1161–1172.
17. Tarnoki AD, Baracchini C, Tarnoki DL, et al. Evidence for a strong genetic influence on carotid plaque characteristics: an international twin study. *Stroke*. 2012;43:3168–3172.
18. Lucatelli P, Fagnani C, Tarnoki AD, et al. Genetic influence on femoral plaque and its relationship with carotid plaque: an international twin study. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*. 2018;34:531–541.

19. Franceschini N, Giambartolomei C, de Vries PS, et al. GWAS and colocalization analyses implicate carotid intima-media thickness and carotid plaque loci in cardiovascular outcomes. *Nat Commun*. 2018;9:5141.
20. Lucatelli P, Tarnoki AD, Tarnoki DL, et al. Genetic and environmental effects on carotid flow velocities: an international twin study. *Atherosclerosis*. 2013;231:205–210.
21. Fagnani C, Meneghetti G, Baracchini C, Tarnoki AD, Tarnoki DL, Schillaci G. Genetic and environmental components of carotid artery elasticity: an Italian twin study. *Eur J Intern Med*. 2013;24:e53–e54.
22. Song C, Chang Z, Magnusson PK, Ingelsson E, Pedersen NL. Genetic factors may play a prominent role in the development of coronary heart disease dependent on important environmental factors. *J Intern Med*. 2014;275:631–639.
23. Zdravkovic S, Wienke A, Pedersen NL, de Faire U. Genetic influences on angina pectoris and its impact on coronary heart disease. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2007;15:872–877.
24. Hernyes A, Pirooska M, Fejer B, et al. Overlapping genetic background of coronary artery and carotid/femoral atherosclerotic calcification. *Medicina (Kaunas)*. 2021;57:252.
25. Kern A, Bojko K, Sienkiewicz E, Zarzecki A, Bil J. Non-st-elevation acute coronary syndrome due to a totally occluded coronary artery: a history of two twin brothers. *Wiad Lek*. 2020;73:201–202.
26. Murray SW, Cooper RM, Appleby C, et al. Double jeopardy: multi-modality imaging of mz “twin cap” atherosclerosis. *Atherosclerosis*. 2014;237:264–267.
27. Bielak LF, Peyser PA. Genetics of subclinical coronary atherosclerosis. *Curr Genet Med Rep*. 2018;6:116–123.
28. Cecelja M, Jiang B, Bevan L, Frost ML, Spector TD, Chowienczyk PJ. Arterial stiffening relates to arterial calcification but not to noncalcified atheroma in women. a twin study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2011;57:1480–1486.
29. Joergensen TM, Christensen K, Lindholt JS, Larsen LA, Green A, Houliand K. Editor’s choice—high heritability of liability to abdominal aortic aneurysms: a population based twin study. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*. 2016;52:41–46.
30. Fowkes FGR, Rudan D, Rudan I, et al. Comparison of global estimates of prevalence and risk factors for peripheral artery disease in 2000 and 2010: a systematic review and analysis. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9901):1329–1340.
31. Wahlgren CM, Magnusson PK. Genetic influences on peripheral arterial disease in a twin population. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. 2011;31:678–682.
32. Fejer B, Tarnoki AD, Tarnoki DL, et al. Heritability of the femoral intima media thickness. *Eur J Intern Med*. 2017;41:44–48.
33. Belkin N, Damrauer SM. Peripheral arterial disease genetics: progress to date and challenges ahead. *Curr Cardiol Rep*. 2017;19:131.
34. Ingebrigtsen TS, Thomsen SF, van der Sluis S, et al. Genetic influences on pulmonary function: a large sample twin study. *Lung*. 2011;189 323e30.
35. Hubert HB, Fabsitz RR, Feinleib M, Gwinn C. Genetic and environmental influences on pulmonary function in adult twins. *Am Rev Respir Dis*. 1982;125 409e15.
36. McClearn GE, Svartengren M, Pedersen NL, Heller DA, Plomin R. Genetic and environmental influences on pulmonary function in aging Swedish twins. *J Gerontol*. 1994;49 264e8.
37. Hukkinen M, Kaprio J, Broms U, et al. Heritability of lung function: a twin study among never-smoking elderly women. *Twin Res Hum Genet*. 2011;14 401e7.
38. Wu T, Boezen HM, Postma DS, et al. Genetic and environmental influences on objective intermediate asthma phenotypes in Dutch twins. *Eur Respir J*. 2010;36:261–268.

39. Kim WJ, Lee MK, Shin C, et al. Genome-wide association studies identify locus on 6p21 influencing lung function in the korean population. *respirol.* 2014;19:360–368.
40. Ingebrigtsen T, Thomsen SF, Vestbo J, et al. Genetic influences on chronic obstructive pulmonary disease - a twin study. *Respir Med.* 2010;104:1890–1895.
41. Tarnoki DL, Tarnoki AD, Lazar Z, et al. A possible genetic influence in parenchyma and small airway changes in COPD: a pilot study of twins using hrct. *Acta Physiol Hung.* 2014;101:167–175.
42. Hjelmborg J, Korhonen T, Holst K, et al. Lung cancer, genetic predisposition and smoking: the nordic twin study of cancer. *Thorax.* 2017;72:1021–1027.
43. Hallberg J, Dominicus A, Eriksson UK, et al. Interaction between smoking and genetic factors in the development of chronic bronchitis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2008;177:486–490.
44. Meteran H, Thomsen SF, Harmsen L, KO K, Skytthe A, Backer V. Risk of chronic bronchitis in twin pairs discordant for smoking. *Lung.* 2012;190:557–561.
45. Willemsen G, van Beijsterveldt TC, van Baal CG, Postma D, Boomsma DI. Heritability of self-reported asthma and allergy: a study in adult dutch twins, siblings and parents. *Twin Res Hum Genet.* 2008;11:132–142.
46. Ullemar V, Magnusson PK, Lundholm C, et al. Heritability and confirmation of genetic association studies for childhood asthma in twins. *Allergy.* 2016;71:230–238.
47. Hedman AM, Kuja-Halkola R, Örtqvist AK, van Hage M, Almqvist C, Nordlund B. Genetic effects of allergen-specific ige levels on exhaled nitric oxide in schoolchildren with asthma: the stoppa twin study. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol.* 2021;32:709–719.
48. Slob EMA, Brew BK, Vijverberg SJH, et al. Early-life antibiotic use and risk of asthma and eczema: results of a discordant twin study. *Eur Respir J.* 2020;55:1902021.
49. Murphy TM, Wong CC, Arseneault L, et al. Methylomic markers of persistent childhood asthma: a longitudinal study of asthma-discordant monozygotic twins. *Clin Epigenetics.* 2015;7:130.
50. Gabrielsen ME, Romundstad P, Langhammer A, Krokan HE, Skorpen F. Association between a 15q25 gene variant, nicotine-related habits, lung cancer and copd among 56,307 individuals from the hunt study in norway. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2013;21:1293–1299.
51. Tarnoki DL, Bikov A, Tarnoki AD, et al. Lack of heritability of exhaled volatile compound pattern: an electronic nose twin study. *J Breath Res.* 2014;8:016001.
52. Tarnoki DL, Medda E, Tarnoki AD, et al. Modest genetic influence on bronchodilator response: a study in healthy twins. *Croat Med J.* 2015;56:152–158.
53. Ferini-Strambi L, Calori G, Oldani A, et al. Snoring in twins. *Respir Med.* 1995;89:337–340.
54. Desai AV, Cherkas LF, Spector TD, Williams AJ. Genetic influences in self-reported symptoms of obstructive sleep apnoea and restless legs: a twin study. *Twin Res.* 2004;7:589–595.
55. Szily M, Tarnoki AD, Tarnoki DL, et al. Genetic influences on the onset of obstructive sleep apnoea and daytime sleepiness: a twin study. *Respir Res.* 2019;20:125.
56. Meszaros M, Tarnoki AD, Tarnoki DL, et al. Obstructive sleep apnea and hypertriglyceridaemia share common genetic background: results of a twin study. *J Sleep Res.* 2020;29(4):e12979.
57. Busscher B, Spinhoven P, de Geus EJ. Psychological distress and physiological reactivity during in vivo exposure in people with aviophobia. *Psychosom Med.* 2015;77:762–774.
58. Vrijkotte TG, van Doornen LJ, de Geus EJ. Effects of work stress on ambulatory blood pressure, heart rate, and heart rate variability. *Hypertension.* 2000;35:880–886.

59. Vrijkotte TG, van Doornen LJ, de Geus EJ. Overcommitment to work is associated with changes in cardiac sympathetic regulation. *Psychosom Med.* 2004;66:656–663.
60. Hansen TW, Jeppesen J, Rasmussen S, Ibsen H, Torp-Pedersen C. Ambulatory blood pressure monitoring and risk of cardiovascular disease: a population based study. *Am J Hypertens.* 2006;19:243–250.
61. Mallion JM, Baguet JP, Siche JP, Tremel F, de Gaudemaris R. Clinical value of ambulatory blood pressure monitoring. *J Hypertens.* 1999;17:585–595.
62. Verdecchia P. Using out of office blood pressure monitoring in the management of hypertension. *Curr Hypertens Rep.* 2001;3:400–405.
63. Ward AM, Takahashi O, Stevens R, Heneghan C. Home measurement of blood pressure and cardiovascular disease: systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. *J Hypertens.* 2012;30:449–456.
64. Degaute JP, Vancauter E, Vandeborne P, Linkowski P. 24-Hour blood-pressure and heart-rate profiles in humans—a twin study. *Hypertension.* 1994;23:244–253.
65. Fagard R, Brguljan J, Staessen J, et al. Heritability of conventional and ambulatory blood pressures—a study in twins. *Hypertension.* 1995;26:919–924.
66. Somes GW, Harshfield GA, Alpert BS, Goble MM, Schieken RM. Genetic influences on ambulatory blood-pressure patterns - the medical-college-of-virginia twin study. *Am J Hypertens.* 1995;8:474–478.
67. Fagard RH, Loos RJF, Beunen G, Derom C, Vlietinck R. Influence of chorionicity on the heritability estimates of blood pressure: a study in twins. *J Hypertens.* 2003;21:1313–1318.
68. Kupper N, Willemsen G, Riese H, Posthuma D, Boomsma DI, de Geus EJ. Heritability of daytime ambulatory blood pressure in an extended twin design. *Hypertension.* 2005;45:80–85.
69. Wang XL, Ding XH, Su SY, Harshfield G, Treiber F, Snieder H. Genetic influence on blood pressure measured in the office, under laboratory stress and during real life. *Hypertens Res.* 2011;34:239–244.
70. Xu XJ, Su SY, Treiber FA, et al. Specific genetic influences on nighttime blood pressure. *Am J Hypertens.* 2015;28:440–443.
71. Wang XL, Ding XH, Su SY, et al. Genetic influences on daytime and night-time blood pressure: similarities and differences. *J Hypertens.* 2009;27:2358–2364.
72. Vinck WJ, Fagard RH, Loos R, Vlietinck R. The impact of genetic and environmental influences on blood pressure variance across age-groups. *J Hypertens.* 2001;19:1007–1013.
73. Hottenga JJ, Boomsma DI, Kupper N, et al. Heritability and stability of resting blood pressure. *Twin Res Human Genetics.* 2005;8:499–508.
74. Ohkubo T, Imai Y, Tsuji I, et al. Relation between nocturnal decline in blood pressure and mortality. the ohasama study. *Am J Hypertens.* 1997;10:1201–1207.
75. Hoshide S, Kario K, Hoshide Y, et al. Associations between nondipping of nocturnal blood pressure decrease and cardiovascular target organ damage in strictly selected community-dwelling normotensives. *Am J Hypertens.* 2003;16:434–438.
76. Kario K, Matsuo T, Kobayashi H, Imiya M, Matsuo M, Shimada K. Nocturnal fall of blood pressure and silent cerebrovascular damage in elderly hypertensive patients. advanced silent cerebrovascular damage in extreme dippers. *Hypertension.* 1996;27:130–135.
77. Evans A, van Baal GC, McCarron P, et al. The genetics of coronary heart disease: the contribution of twin studies. *Twin Res Human Genetics.* 2003;6:432–441.
78. Cui JSS, Hopper JL, Harrap SB. Antihypertensive treatments obscure familial contributions to blood pressure variation. *Hypertension.* 2003;41:207–210.

79. de Geus EJC, van Lien R, Neijts M, Willemsen G. Genetics of autonomic nervous system activity. In: Canli T, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Molecular Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015:357–390.
80. Kupper N, Willemsen G, Boomsma DI, de Geus EJ. Heritability of indices for cardiac contractility in ambulatory recordings. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. 2006;17:877–883.
81. Kupper NH, Willemsen G, van den Berg M, et al. Heritability of ambulatory heart rate variability. *Circulation*. 2004;110:2792–2796.
82. Neijts M, Van Lien R, Kupper N, Boomsma D, Willemsen G, de Geus EJ. Heritability of cardiac vagal control in 24-h heart rate variability recordings: influence of ceiling effects at low heart rates. *Psychophysiology*. 2014;51:1023–1036.
83. Kupper N, Willemsen G, Posthuma D, de Boer D, Boomsma DI, de Geus EJ. A genetic analysis of ambulatory cardiorespiratory coupling. *Psychophysiology*. 2005;42:202–212.
84. Neijts M, van Lien R, Kupper N, Boomsma D, Willemsen G, de Geus EJ. Heritability and temporal stability of ambulatory autonomic stress reactivity in unstructured 24-Hour recordings. *Psychosom Med*. 2015;77:870–881.
85. Su S, Lampert R, Lee F, et al. Common genes contribute to depressive symptoms and heart rate variability: the twins heart study. *Twin Res Hum Genet*. 2010;13:1–9.
86. Fazzi UG, Rymaszewski LA. Recurrent dislocation of the elbow in identical twins. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*. 1996;5:401–403.
87. Muhammad S, Laraswati B, Violetta L. Radiology assessment of omphalopagus conjoined twins: a case report. *Radiol Case Rep*. 2022;17:1169–1174.
88. MacGregor AJ, Antoniadou L, Matson M, Andrew T, Spector TD. The genetic contribution to radiographic hip osteoarthritis in women: results of a classic twin study. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2000;43:2410–2416.
89. Antoniadou L, Spector TD, Macgregor AJ. The genetic contribution to hip joint morphometry and relationship to hip cartilage thickness. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2001;9:593–595.
90. Hermus JPS, van Rhijn LW, Ooij AV. Non-genetic expression of adolescent idiopathic scoliosis: a case report and review of the literature. *Eur Spine J*. 2007;16(Suppl 3):338–341.
91. Ponseti IV, Friedman B. Prognosis in idiopathic scoliosis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 1950;32A:381–395.
92. Lee CH, Lee S, Kang H, et al. Genetic influences on hallux valgus in Koreans: the healthy twin study. *Twin Res Hum Genet*. 2014;17:121–126.
93. Goulding A, Gold E, Cannan R, Williams S, Lewis-Barned NJ. Changing femoral geometry in growing girls: a cross-sectional dEXA study. *Bone*. 1996;19:645–649.
94. Pirooska M, Tarnoki DL, Szabo H, et al. Strong genetic effects on bone mineral density in multiple locations with two different techniques: results from a cross-sectional twin study. *Medicina (Kaunas)*. 2021;57:248.
95. Boyd NF, Dite GS, Stone J, et al. Heritability of mammographic density, a risk factor for breast cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347:886–894.
96. Stone J, Dite GS, Gunasekara A, et al. The heritability of mammographically dense and nondense breast tissue. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2006;15:612–617.
97. Odefrey F, Stone J, Gurrin LC, et al. Common genetic variants associated with breast cancer and mammographic density measures that predict disease. *Cancer Res*. 2010;70:1449–1458.
98. Sung J, Song YM, Stone J, Lee K, Jeong JI, Kim SS. Genetic influences on mammographic density in Korean twin and family: the healthy twin study. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2010;124:467–474.

99. Jahanfar S, Eden JA, Warren P, Seppälä M, Nguyen TV. A twin study of polycystic ovary syndrome. *Fertil Steril*. 1995;63:478–486.
100. Luoto R, Kaprio J, Rutanen EM, Taipale P, Perola M, Koskenvuo M. Heritability and risk factors of uterine fibroids—the finnish twin cohort study. *Maturitas*. 2000;37:15–26.
101. Tarnoki AD, Tarnoki DL, Bata P, et al. Heritability of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and association with abnormal vascular parameters: a twin study. *Liver Int*. 2012;32:1287–1293.
102. Hansen PS, Brix TH, Bennedbaek FN, Bonnema SJ, Kyvik KO, Hegedüs L. Genetic and environmental causes of individual differences in thyroid size: a study of healthy danish twins. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2004;89:2071–2077.
103. Chaiyasate S, Baron I, Clement P. Analysis of paranasal sinus development and anatomical variations: a ct genetic study in twins. *Clin Otolaryngol*. 2007;32:93–97.
104. Bjørnerem Å, Bui M, Wang X, et al. Genetic and environmental variances of bone microarchitecture and bone remodeling markers: a twin study. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2015;30:519–527.
105. Bjørnerem Å, Bui QM, Ghasem-Zadeh A, Hopper JL, Zebaze R, Seeman E. Fracture risk and height: an association partly accounted for by cortical porosity of relatively thinner cortices. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2013;28:2017–2026.
106. Leskinen T, Sipilä S, Alen M, et al. Leisure-time physical activity and high-risk fat: a longitudinal population-based twin study. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2009;33:1211–1218.
107. Leskinen T, Rinnankoski-Tuikka R, Rintala M, et al. Differences in muscle and adipose tissue gene expression and cardio-metabolic risk factors in the members of physical activity discordant twin pairs. *PLoS One*. 2010;5:e12609.
108. Hng TM, McLean M, Cheung NW, Thompson CH. The interrelation of birth weight and regional lipid deposition: a twins study. *Metabolism*. 2006;55:561–562.
109. Hannukainen JC, Borra R, Linderborg K, et al. Liver and pancreatic fat content and metabolism in healthy mz twins with discordant physical activity. *J Hepatol*. 2011;54:545–552.
110. Weise CM, Bachmann T, Pleger B. Brain structural differences in mz twins discordant for body mass index. *Neuroimage*. 2019;201:116006.
111. Luo Z, Adluru N, Dean 3rd DC, Alexander AL, Goldsmith HH. Genetic and environmental influences of variation in diffusion mri measures of white matter microstructure. *Brain Struct Funct*. 2022;227:131–144.
112. Choi Y, Nam Y, Choi Y, et al. MRI-visible dilated perivascular spaces in healthy young adults: a twin heritability study. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2020;41:5313–5324.
113. Mazurowski MA. Radiogenomics: what it is and why it is important. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2015;12:862–866.
114. Tárnoki AD, Tárnoki DL. Imaging epigenetics and the radiogenomics. *Twin and Family Studies of Epigenetics*. United States: Elsevier; 2021:261–276. ISBN 978-0-12-820951-6.
115. Abdel Razek AAK, Alksas A, Shehata M, et al. Clinical applications of artificial intelligence and radiomics in neuro-oncology imaging. *Insights Imaging*. 2021;12:152.



TWIN RESEARCH FOR EVERYONE

From Biology to Health, Epigenetics, and Psychology

Edited by Adam D. Tarnoki, David L. Tarnoki, Jennifer R. Harris, and Nancy L. Segal



Twin Research for Everyone

From Biology to Health,
Epigenetics, and Psychology

Twin Research for Everyone

From Biology to Health, Epigenetics, and Psychology

Edited by

Adam D. Tarnoki

Medical Imaging Centre, Semmelweis University, Hungarian
Twin Registry, Budapest, Hungary

David L. Tarnoki

Medical Imaging Centre, Semmelweis University, Hungarian
Twin Registry, Budapest, Hungary

Jennifer R. Harris

Centre for Fertility and Health, The Norwegian Institute of
Public Health, Oslo, Norway

Nancy L. Segal

Department of Psychology, California State University,
Fullerton, CA, United States



ACADEMIC PRESS

An imprint of Elsevier

elsevier.com/books-and-journals

Academic Press is an imprint of Elsevier
125 London Wall, London EC2Y 5AS, United Kingdom
525 B Street, Suite 1650, San Diego, CA 92101, United States
50 Hampshire Street, 5th Floor, Cambridge, MA 02139, United States
The Boulevard, Langford Lane, Kidlington, Oxford OX5 1GB, United Kingdom

Copyright © 2022 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. Details on how to seek permission, further information about the Publisher's permissions policies and our arrangements with organizations such as the Copyright Clearance Center and the Copyright Licensing Agency, can be found at our website: www.elsevier.com/permissions.

This book and the individual contributions contained in it are protected under copyright by the Publisher (other than as may be noted herein).

Notices

Knowledge and best practice in this field are constantly changing. As new research and experience broaden our understanding, changes in research methods, professional practices, or medical treatment may become necessary.

Practitioners and researchers must always rely on their own experience and knowledge in evaluating and using any information, methods, compounds, or experiments described herein. In using such information or methods they should be mindful of their own safety and the safety of others, including parties for whom they have a professional responsibility.

To the fullest extent of the law, neither the Publisher nor the authors, contributors, or editors, assume any liability for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions, or ideas contained in the material herein.

ISBN: 978-0-12-821514-2

For Information on all Academic Press publications visit our website
at <https://www.elsevier.com/books-and-journals>

Publisher: Stacy Masucci
Acquisitions Editor: Peter B. Linsley
Editorial Project Manager: Samantha Allard
Production Project Manager: Omer Mukthar
Cover Designer: Vicky Pearson Esser



Typeset by Aptara, New Delhi, India

Contents

Contributors	xxiii
Editor Biographies	xxxi
Preface.....	xxxiii
Introduction to twin research for everyone: From biology to health, epigenetics, and psychology	xxxv

SECTION 1 Background 1

CHAPTER 1 History of Twin Studies 3

John C. Loehlin

1.1 Twins	3
1.2 Twin studies.....	3
1.3 History of twin studies	4
1.4 Early twin studies of cognition and personality	5
1.5 Combining other relatives with twins.....	5
1.6 Heritability over age	5
1.7 Increasing sample sizes	6
1.8 Twin studies nowadays.....	6
1.9 Summary	6
References.....	6

CHAPTER 2 Prevalence of twinning worldwide 9

András Pári

2.1 How is that possible? One delivery and two childbirths at least	9
2.2 Questions of the methodology of twinning rate	13
2.3 Effect of assisted reproductive treatment	14
2.4 One out of twenty-eight births.....	15
Acknowledgments.....	19
References.....	19
Further readings	21

CHAPTER 3 Twin family registries worldwide 23

Yoon-Mi Hur, Veronika V. Odintsova, Juan R. Ordoñana,

Karri Silventoinen, Gonneke Willemsen

3.1 Introduction	23
3.2 Twin family registries across the continents.....	24
3.2.1 Europe.....	24
3.2.2 North America	38
3.2.3 Australia.....	39

3.2.4 Asia and Middle East	40
3.2.5 Africa	41
3.2.6 Latin America and the Caribbean	42
3.3 International consortia.....	42
3.4 Concluding remarks	43
References.....	44

SECTION 2 Phenomenon of Twinning 51

CHAPTER 4 Biology of natural twinning 53

Gary Steinman

4.1 Introduction	53
4.2 Defining factors	54
4.3 Conception issues.....	55
4.4 Maternal dietary factors affecting the frequency of multifetal gestations	57
4.5 Maternal physical factors and the rate of twinning	58
4.6 Biological factors tending to increase twinning	59
4.7 Some unique complications in twin pregnancies	61
4.8 Maternal risks with a twin pregnancy	64
4.9 Conclusions and prospectus	65
Acknowledgments.....	65
References.....	66

CHAPTER 5 Management and outcome of twin pregnancies 67

Gian Carlo Di Renzo, Valentina Tosto, Irene Giardina, Valentina Tsibizova

5.1 Introduction	67
5.2 Antenatal care.....	67
5.2.1 Diagnosis and chorionicity	67
5.2.2 Nutritional advice	68
5.2.3 Chromosomal screening: new challenges?.....	69
5.2.4 Monitoring: timing and frequency	69
5.2.5 Laboratory investigations.....	70
5.3 Antenatal complications	70
5.3.1 Chorionicity	70
5.3.2 Fetal growth restriction (FGR)	71
5.4 Specific monochorionic pregnancy complications.....	72
5.4.1 Fetal-fetal transfusion syndrome (TTTS)	72
5.4.2 Anemia-polycythemia sequence (TAPS)	74
5.4.3 Inverted arterial perfusion sequence (TRAP sequence).....	74
5.4.4 Monoamniotic twins and cord entanglement.....	74
5.4.5 Cerebral palsy risk	75
5.4.6 Antenatal preventive interventions.....	76

5.5 Peripartum care..... 76
 5.5.1 Timing of birth..... 77
 5.5.2 Mode of delivery and induction of labor 77
5.6 Peri-conceptual period: a “key window” of intervention? 79
5.7 Conclusion..... 81
 References..... 81

CHAPTER 6 Conjoined twins..... 85

Julia Métékei, Peter Varjassy

6.1 Introduction 85
6.2 History of conjoined twins 85
6.3 Conjoined status in plants and animals 91
6.4 Development of conjoined twins..... 92
6.5 Embryology of conjoined twins, mechanism
 of their development..... 92
6.6 Classification of conjoined twins 93
6.7 Etiology 102
6.8 Epidemiology of conjoined twins, genetic
 and demographic risk factors 103
6.9 Ethnicity 104
6.10 Summary 108
 References..... 108

SECTION 3 Twin Families 113

**CHAPTER 7 Growing up as twins: the perspectives of twin
 researchers..... 115**

Adam D. Tárnoki, David L. Tárnoki, Júlia Métékei, Nancy L. Segal

7.1 Introduction 115
7.2 Adam & David Tarnoki (MZ twins or Identical Twins)..... 115
7.3 Julia Metneki (MZ twin) 119
7.4 Nancy L. Segal (DZ twin) 124
 7.4.1 Personal background..... 124
 7.4.2 Professional history 126
 7.4.3 Professional activities 126
 7.4.4 Closing statement..... 128
 References..... 128

CHAPTER 8 Parenting twins, triplets, or more 131

Monica Rankin

8.1 Parenting twins, triplets, or more 131
8.2 Pregnancy 131
8.3 Birth..... 132

8.4	Early months.....	133
8.5	Toddler.....	134
8.6	School years	134
8.7	Adolescence.....	135
8.8	Special situations.....	136
8.9	Adult twins	136
CHAPTER 9	Reared apart twins: Background, research, case studies and what they reveal about human development.....	139
	<i>Nancy L. Segal, Francisca J. Niculae</i>	
9.1	Introduction	139
9.2	Twins raised apart: Past, present, and future	140
9.3	Fullerton study of Chinese twins reared apart.....	142
9.4	Unique case studies	144
9.5	Twin study controversy	149
9.6	Research directions.....	150
9.7	A quote that will endure	151
	References.....	151
CHAPTER 10	Opposite-sex twins in medical research.....	155
	<i>Lucas Calais-Ferreira, Sue Malta, John L. Hopper</i>	
10.1	Introduction	155
10.2	Sharing more than a womb	156
	10.2.1 Biological effects	156
	10.2.2 Socialisation effects	157
10.3	What can sex differences in opposite-sex twin pairs tell us?... 158	
10.4	Conclusions	158
	References.....	159
SECTION 4	Twin Methodologies	161
CHAPTER 11	Establishing a resource for genetic, epidemiological, and biomarker studies: The important role of twin registers	163
	<i>Veronika Odintsova, Gonneke Willemsen, Conor V. Dolan, Jouke-Jan Hottenga, Nicholas G. Martin, P. Eline Slagboom, Juan R. Ordoñana, Dorret I. Boomsma</i>	
11.1	The first steps	165
11.2	Strategic planning.....	167
11.3	Basic elements.....	167
	11.3.1 Recruitment methods	167
	11.3.2 Informed consent	169
	11.3.3 Determination of zygosity in twin registries.....	170

11.3.4	Phenotyping: from survey to record linkage.....	173
11.3.5	Possibilities for biobanking in twin registers.....	174
11.3.6	Databases for twin registers.....	176
11.3.7	Data analyses issues in twin studies: batch effects and family clustering	177
11.3.8	Retaining the twins	178
11.4	Conclusion.....	179
	Appendix.....	180
	Acknowledgments.....	183
	Disclosure of Interests.....	183
	References.....	183
CHAPTER 12	Methodology of twin studies.....	189
	<i>José J. Morosoli, Brittany L. Mitchell, Sarah E. Medland</i>	
12.1	Introduction.....	189
12.2	A brief note on the biometrical model	189
12.3	Classical twin study.....	191
12.4	Methodological assumptions.....	195
	12.4.1 The equal environments assumption.....	195
	12.4.2 The representativeness assumption.....	196
	12.4.3 The assumption of random mating	196
12.5	Use of structural equation modeling in twin analysis	197
12.6	Analysis of discrete traits.....	199
	12.6.1 Binary data.....	200
	12.6.2 Threshold approaches	201
12.7	Extension of the classical twin model.....	204
12.8	Gene–environment correlation vs interaction	205
	12.8.1 Genotype–environment correlation and assortative mating	205
	12.8.2 Gene–environment interaction.....	207
12.9	Structural equation modeling for rGE and $G \times E$ interaction.....	207
	12.9.1 Analysis of sex differences	208
	12.9.2 $G \times E$ with continuous moderators	209
12.10	Final remarks	211
	References.....	211
CHAPTER 13	Twin studies of complex traits and diseases.....	215
	<i>Christopher R. Beam, Alice J. Kim, Tinca J.C. Polderman</i>	
13.1	All traits are heritable.....	216
13.2	Landmark study in twin research: MATCH.....	216
13.3	Sex differences in heritability	217
13.4	Are twin designs the holy grail in heritability studies?.....	218

13.5 Psychiatric disorders, comorbidity, and genetic overlap..... 219

13.6 Gene-environment interplay..... 220

 13.6.1 Gene-environment correlation and gene-environment interaction 220

 13.6.2 Gene-environment correlation (r_{GE})..... 220

 13.6.3 Gene-environment interaction (GxE) 222

13.7 Mechanisms that lead to r_{GE} and GxE..... 223

 13.7.1 Cognitive ability 223

 13.7.2 Personality 224

 13.7.3 Externalizing behaviors 225

13.8 Future directions of twin studies of traits and diseases..... 227

References..... 228

CHAPTER 14 Use of twin studies to make inference about causation for measured exposures by examining familial confounding..... 235

Vivienne F.C. Esser, Shuai Li, Minh Bui, John L. Hopper

14.1 Introduction..... 235

 14.1.1 The importance of understanding causation 235

 14.1.2 Association is not necessarily evidence for causation 236

 14.1.3 Proof of causation..... 236

 14.1.4 A implies B does not imply B implies A 237

 14.1.5 Bradford Hill's so-called criteria for causation..... 237

 14.1.6 Randomized controlled trials..... 237

 14.1.7 Mendelian randomization..... 238

14.2 Previous twin and family study approaches to address causation..... 238

 14.2.1 Within-family designs: differences versus differences... 238

 14.2.2 RCTs involving twins 239

 14.2.3 Classic multivariate twin model (CMTM) and components of covariance..... 239

 14.2.4 The direction of causation (DoC) model and the MR-DoC model 240

14.3 Inference about causation from examination of familial confounding (ICE FALCON)..... 241

 14.3.1 Model description 241

 14.3.2 Formal model description 242

 14.3.3 Interpretation of changes in regression coefficients 242

 14.3.4 Statistical inference for ICE FALCON estimates..... 244

14.4 Comparison of the CMTM, DoC model, and ICE FALCON 246

14.5 Applications of ICE FALCON..... 247

14.6 Further developments..... 248

Funding	249
References.....	249
CHAPTER 15 Twins in clinical trials	253
<i>Athula Sumathipala, Kaushalya Jayaweera</i>	
15.1 What is a randomized controlled trial?	253
15.2 Role of twins in RCTs.....	254
15.3 Zygosity and twin assignment across the randomized controlled trials.....	255
15.3.1 The impact of twins on sample size and power	256
15.3.2 Implications for future work and directions	257
Acknowledgments.....	258
References.....	258
SECTION 5 Behavior	259
CHAPTER 16 Twin studies in social science	261
<i>Elena Cristina Mitrea, Levente Littvay</i>	
16.1 Introduction.....	261
16.2 Findings from the literature.....	262
16.3 The classical twin design	264
16.4 Assumptions of the twin model.....	264
16.4.1 Type I error for heritability	265
16.4.2 Type II error for heritability	266
16.5 The future of twin research in the social sciences.....	267
16.6 Conclusions	270
References.....	271
CHAPTER 17 Childhood development of psychiatric disorders and related traits.....	277
<i>Isabell Brikell, Paul Lichtenstein, Henrik Larsson</i>	
17.1 Introduction.....	277
17.2 Heritability of childhood psychiatric disorders and traits	277
17.3 Childhood psychiatric disorder and population traits have shared genetic origins.....	279
17.4 Genetic contributions to comorbidity across childhood psychiatric disorders and traits.....	280
17.5 Stability and change in the development of childhood psychiatric disorders and traits.....	282
17.6 Environmental influences on the developmental of childhood psychiatric disorders and traits.....	284
17.7 Implications & concluding remarks	287
References.....	288

CHAPTER 18 Happiness and well-being: The value and findings from genetic studies 295

Margot P. van de Weijer, Lianne P. de Vries, Meike Bartels

18.1 What is well-being?.....	295
18.2 Earlier reviews on twin studies on well-being	296
18.3 New findings of twin studies on well-being.....	297
18.4 Related phenotypes	304
18.4.1 Optimism	305
18.4.2 Meaning in life.....	305
18.4.3 Self-esteem	308
18.4.4 Resilience.....	308
18.4.5 Multivariate models of positive psychological traits	309
18.5 Specific molecular genetic and environmental influences	310
18.6 Future directions.....	312
18.6.1 Well-being fluctuations	313
18.6.2 MZ difference/causality	313
18.6.3 Nuclear twin family design.....	314
18.7 Conclusion.....	315
References.....	315

CHAPTER 19 Twin study of personality 323

Juko Ando

19.1 Description of personality	324
19.2 Twin studies of personality traits	325
19.3 Development trends of personality	327
19.4 Genetic structure of personality	328
19.5 Personality as a social behavior	329
19.6 Discordant identical twin method	330
References.....	331

CHAPTER 20 Twin research in psychopathology..... 337

Lisabeth Fisher DiLalla, Matthew R. Jamnik, Riley L. Marshall, Emily Pali,

David L. DiLalla

20.1 Schizophrenia.....	339
20.2 Depression and bipolar disorders	342
20.2.1 Depressive disorders	342
20.2.2 Bipolar disorders.....	343
20.2.3 Depression and bipolar disorder	343
20.3 Antisocial personality disorder (ASPD).....	343
20.3.1 Antisocial behavior (AB).....	344
20.3.2 Antisocial personality disorder	345
20.4 Implications and future directions.....	346
References.....	348

CHAPTER 21 Cognitive aging: the role of genes and environments in patterns of change..... 351

Deborah Finkel, Nancy L. Pedersen, Chandra A. Reynolds

21.1 General cognitive ability 351

21.2 Specific cognitive abilities 352

 21.2.1 Age changes in genetic variance 353

 21.2.2 Traditional cognitive domains 353

 21.2.3 Emerging cognitive domains 355

 21.2.4 Summary 356

21.3 Molecular genetics 356

 21.3.1 Missing heritability? 358

 21.3.2 Gene environment interplay 359

 21.3.3 Summary 360

21.4 Cognitive aging in context 361

 21.4.1 Lung function and cognitive aging 361

 21.4.2 Socioeconomic status and cognitive aging 361

21.5 Future directions..... 363

References..... 364

CHAPTER 22 Twin studies of smoking and tobacco use 371

Jaakko Kaprio

22.1 Introduction 371

22.2 Natural history of smoking behavior..... 372

22.3 Twin studies past and present—the aim of the review 373

22.4 Genetic and environmental influences on smoking behavior... 374

22.5 Beyond twins..... 378

22.6 Causes and consequences of tobacco use..... 379

22.7 Conclusion..... 380

References..... 380

SECTION 6 Health 385

CHAPTER 23 Anthropometric twin studies..... 387

Karri Silventoinen

23.1 Introduction 387

23.2 Genetic and environmental variation in anthropometric measures..... 388

23.3 Birth outcomes 389

23.4 Height..... 390

23.5 Body mass index 392

23.6 Other anthropometric measures 393

23.7 Genetics of growth and development..... 394

23.8 Growth in height..... 395
23.9 Development of body mass index 395
23.10 Gene–environment interactions 396
23.11 Height..... 397
23.12 Body mass index 397
23.13 Conclusions..... 398
References..... 399

CHAPTER 24 Twin studies of cardiorespiratory disease, daily cardiovascular activity and imaging 403

Adam D. Tarnoki, Gonneke Willemsen, Eco de Geus, David L. Tarnoki

24.1 Introduction 403
24.2 Cardiorespiratory twin studies 404
 24.2.1 Heritability of the most common cardiovascular diseases ... 404
 24.2.2 Twin studies in frequent respiratory diseases 407
24.3 Twin studies of common chronic lung diseases 407
 24.3.1 Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)..... 407
 24.3.2 Chronic bronchitis 407
 24.3.3 Asthma 407
 24.3.4 Lung cancer 408
 24.3.5 Exhaled biomarkers 408
 24.3.6 Obstructive sleep apnoea (OSA)..... 408
 24.3.7 In conclusion..... 409
24.4 Gaining insight into the heritability of everyday cardiovascular function by twin studies 409
 24.4.1 Introduction..... 409
 24.4.2 Ambulatory studies of blood pressure and heart rate..... 410
 24.4.3 Ambulatory monitoring of other cardiovascular parameters 415
 24.4.4 In conclusion..... 420
25.5 Imaging of twins 420
 25.5.1 X-ray 421
 25.5.2 Breast mammography 421
 25.5.3 Ultrasound..... 422
 25.5.4 Computed tomography (CT)..... 423
 25.5.5 Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) 423
 25.5.6 Neuroimaging 424
25.6 Future directions: radiogenomics and imaging epigenetics 424
References..... 425

CHAPTER 25 Pediatric twin studies 431*Catarina Almqvist, Paul Lichtenstein*

25.1 Introduction	431
25.2 Respiratory and allergic diseases	431
25.2.1 Causes	431
25.2.2 Consequences	432
25.3 Autoimmune disorders	433
25.4 Hemato-oncological disorders	433
25.5 Comorbidity	434
25.6 Conclusion.....	434
References.....	434

CHAPTER 26 Twin-singleton differences 439*Kaare Christensen, Matt McGue*

26.1 Why are twin-singleton differences of interest to twin research generally?.....	439
26.2 Intrauterine and perinatal twin-singleton differences.....	439
26.2.1 Intrauterine growth	440
26.2.2 Intrauterine risk factors occurring in twins but not in singletons	441
26.2.3 Congenital malformations	442
26.2.4 Perinatal mortality	442
26.3 Twin-singleton differences in development	443
26.3.1 Neurodevelopment.....	443
26.3.2 Anthropometric development.....	445
26.4 Twin-singleton differences in behavior and personality	446
26.4.1 Lifestyle factors	446
26.4.2 Behavior.....	446
26.4.3 Personality	447
26.4.4 Divorce.....	447
26.5 Twin-singleton differences in morbidity and survival.....	447
26.5.1 Early life morbidity and survival	447
26.5.2 Adulthood morbidity and survival	448
26.6 Twin-singleton differences in genetic studies	450
26.7 Conclusion.....	450
References.....	450

CHAPTER 27 Twin studies of puberty and behavior 457*Holly T. Pham, Adriene M. Beltz, Robin P. Corley, Sheri A. Berenbaum*

27.1 What is puberty?	457
27.2 Measuring puberty	458

27.3	Variations in puberty: Gene and environment.....	462
27.4	Twin studies of puberty	463
27.4.1	Heritability of pubertal timing.....	463
27.4.2	Twin studies of links between puberty and behavior.....	464
27.5	Other uses of twin data on puberty when studying behavior...	466
27.5.1	Replication analyses	466
27.5.2	Examining sex differences.....	467
27.6	Methodological issues.....	467
27.7	Future directions.....	468
27.7.1	Studying links between puberty and the brain.....	468
27.7.2	Potential impact of cultural differences	469
27.7.3	Continued use of the discordant design	469
27.7.4	Addressing limitations	469
27.8	Conclusion.....	469
27.9	Takeaways	470
	References.....	470
CHAPTER 28	Musculoskeletal twin studies	475
	<i>Munkh-Erdene Bayartai, Paulo H. Ferreira</i>	
28.1	Introduction (MSK conditions).....	475
28.2	How twins can help musculoskeletal research.....	476
28.2.1	The classical twin design in musculoskeletal research.....	476
28.2.2	The cotwin control design in musculoskeletal research.....	479
	References.....	482
CHAPTER 29	Contributions of twin studies to cancer epidemiology	485
	<i>Wendy Cozen, Esther Lam, Maryam Salehi, Victoria K. Cortessis, Tuong L. Nguyen, James G. Dowty, John L. Hopper, Shuai Li, Thomas M. Mack</i>	
29.1	Introduction.....	485
	<i>Wendy Cozen and Victoria K. Cortessis</i>	
29.2	Risk of cancer in twins compared to singletons.....	488
	<i>Thomas Mack</i>	
29.3	Patterns of occurrence of cancer in twins.....	490
	<i>Thomas Mack and Wendy Cozen</i>	
29.4	Studies of acquired risk factors for cancer in twins	494
	<i>Wendy Cozen and Thomas Mack</i>	
29.5	Intraplacental metastasis of infantile leukemia	496
	<i>Wendy Cozen and Esther Lam</i>	
29.6	Cancer treatment, screening and survivorship in twins.....	497
	<i>Esther Lam and Maryam Salehi</i>	

29.7	A novel epidemiological approach to quantify the familial and non-familial, genetic and non-genetic, measured and unmeasured causes of variation in risk	499
	<i>John L. Hopper, James G. Dowty, Shuai Li, Tuong L. Nguyen</i>	
29.7.1	Variance of Age-specific Log Incidence Decomposition (VALID)	499
29.7.2	Measuring risk discrimination	500
29.7.3	The familial risk ratio caused by the familial aspects of a risk factor	500
29.7.4	Modeling the familial causes of variance in risk	501
29.7.5	Application of variance of age-specific incidence decomposition (VALID)	501
29.8	Summary	503
	References	503
CHAPTER 30	Epigenetic studies of neurodevelopment in twins.....	509
	<i>Namitha Mohandas, Yuk Jing Loke, Yen Ting Wong, Garth Stephenson, Jeffrey M. Craig</i>	
30.1	Introduction	509
30.2	The role of epigenetics in neurodevelopmental disorders.....	510
30.2.1	The developmental origins of health and disease (DOHaD) hypothesis	510
30.2.2	Epigenetic mechanisms	511
30.3	The role of twins in studying epigenetics of NDDs.....	512
30.3.1	Twin models.....	512
30.3.2	The use of twin models in epigenetic studies	513
30.4	Epigenetic twin studies in autism spectrum disorder.....	513
30.5	Epigenetic twin studies in attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder.....	514
30.6	Epigenetic twin studies of dimensions of cognitive development	515
30.7	Epigenetic twin studies in cerebral palsy	517
30.8	Epigenetic twin studies in epilepsy	518
30.9	Current issues for study of NDDs in twins	519
30.9.1	Can twin studies tease out cause versus effect?.....	519
30.9.2	Incidence of neurodevelopmental disorders in twins versus singletons	520
30.9.3	Choice and availability of tissue samples	520
30.9.4	Study sample sizes and power of epigenetic analyses....	521
30.10	The future of twin studies in contributing to understanding the role of epigenetics in neurodevelopmental disorders.....	521
	References.....	522

CHAPTER 31 Contributions of twin research to the study of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias..... 529

Matthew S. Panizzon, Jeremy A. Elman, Eero Vuoksima

31.1 Genetic and environmental influences of ADRD..... 530
 31.1.1 Sex differences..... 531
 31.1.2 Age at onset..... 532
 31.1.3 Intermediate ADRD phenotypes..... 533
31.2 Evaluating ADRD risk and protective factors 534
 31.2.1 Co-twin control studies..... 534
 31.2.2 Opposite sex twins 537
31.3 A new conceptualization of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias..... 538
31.4 Summary and future directions 540
 References..... 541

SECTION 7 Twin Research: Genetics, Epigenetics, Microbiome, and Environmental Adaptation 545

CHAPTER 32 Twins and omics: the role of twin studies in multi-omics 547

Fiona A. Hagenbeek, Jenny van Dongen, René Pool, Dorret I. Boomsma

32.1 Introduction..... 547
32.2 Genomics..... 549
 32.2.1 What is genomics and how do we measure the genome?..... 549
 32.2.2 Sequence differences between monozygotic twins 550
 32.2.3 Sequence differences between dizygotic twins 552
32.3 Epigenomics..... 553
 32.3.1 What is epigenomics and how do we measure the epigenome?..... 553
 32.3.2 Causes of epigenetic variation 554
 32.3.3 MZ discordant design applied to epigenomics studies 555
32.4 Transcriptomics..... 557
 32.4.1 What is transcriptomics and how do we measure the transcriptome?..... 557
 32.4.2 Causes of variation in gene expression levels..... 557
 32.4.3 MZ discordant design applied to transcriptomics studies 559
 32.4.4 Other applications of twin research in transcriptomics studies 561

32.5 Metabolomics 562
 32.5.1 What is metabolomics and how do we measure
 the metabolome? 562
 32.5.2 Causes of variation in metabolite levels 563
 32.5.3 MZ discordant design applied to metabolomics
 studies 566
 32.5.4 Other application of twin research in metabolomics
 studies 566
32.6 Twin studies in other omics domains 567
32.7 Discussion 569
32.8 Conclusion 572
 Acknowledgments 572
 References 572

CHAPTER 33 Epigenetics 585

Aino Heikkinen, Sara Lundgren, Miina Ollikainen
33.1 Introduction to epigenetics and epigenomics 585
 33.1.1 DNA methylation 586
 33.1.2 Histone modifications 588
 33.1.3 Noncoding RNAs 589
 33.1.4 Complex interactions between epigenetic marks 589
33.2 Challenges in epigenetic research 589
33.3 Value of twins in epigenetic research 590
 33.3.1 Classical twin model 592
 33.3.2 Within-pair comparisons 592
 33.3.3 Inferring causality 593
33.4 Key findings from epigenetic studies involving twins 594
 33.4.1 The contribution of the genome and environment
 to the establishment and maintenance of
 DNA methylation 594
 33.4.2 The contribution of epigenetic variation to
 phenotypic variation 596
 33.4.3 Stability and drift of methylation in time 596
 33.4.4 Inferring causality for epigenetic associations
 by using twins 602
 33.4.5 Epigenetic aging 602
33.5 Technical and statistical methods in epigenetics 603
 33.5.1 Methods to measure DNA methylation 603
 33.5.2 Methods to analyze DNA methylation data 604
 33.5.3 DNA methylation as a surrogate measure 605
33.6 Future of epigenetic twin studies 607
 References 608

CHAPTER 34 An experiment in cotwin control: Adaptation to space travel	617
<i>Carole Tafforin, Nancy L. Segal</i>	
34.1 Introduction	617
34.2 Twins reared apart and together	617
34.3 Space travel: effects on adaptive systems.....	618
34.4 Review of findings: a twin in space.....	619
34.5 Discussion	621
Acknowledgments.....	622
References.....	623
CHAPTER 35 Environmental risk factors for neurodevelopmental disorders: Evidence from twin studies.....	625
<i>Garth Stephenson, Jeffrey M. Craig</i>	
35.1 Rationale and aims	625
35.2 Introduction.....	625
35.3 Zygosity and chorionicity	627
35.4 Twins as a model for developmental variation.....	628
35.5 The intrauterine environment	628
35.6 Twin to twin transfusion syndrome (TTTS).....	629
35.7 Selective fetal growth restriction (sFGR).....	631
35.8 Twin anemia–polycythemia sequence (TAPS).....	632
35.9 Neurodevelopmental disorders.....	632
35.10 Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder.....	632
35.11 Autism spectrum disorder	633
35.12 Cerebral palsy	633
35.13 Schizophrenia.....	633
35.14 Epilepsy.....	634
35.15 Environmental influences on neurodevelopment in twins	634
35.16 Maternal immune activation	634
35.17 Maternal obesity and gestational diabetes	635
35.18 Maternal hypertension	636
35.19 Maternal smoking	636
35.20 Alcohol.....	637
35.21 The female reproductive microbiome	637
35.22 Conclusion	639
References.....	639

CHAPTER 36 Microbiome studies and twin research 649

Joohon Sung, Hang A. Park, Soo Ji Lee

36.1 Basic concepts of the microbiome and microbial analysis:
 what are the differences between classical microbiology
 and microbiome studies?..... 649

36.2 Analytic approaches in microbiome studies 652

36.3 Assessing taxonomic composition, function, and diversity
 of microbial community..... 652

36.4 Microbiome associations with human diseases and
 the application of the knowledge to the treatment 654

36.5 Twin research for microbiome studies 656

36.6 Summary and conclusion 660

References..... 660

**CHAPTER 37 Chromosomal anomalies, monogenetic diseases,
 and leukaemia in twins..... 665**

Irén Haltrich, Anna Lengyel

37.1 Genetic background 665

37.2 Mechanisms of twin discordance 668

37.3 Postzygotic chromosomal nondisjunction and chromosomal
 mosaicism..... 668

37.4 Different levels of triplet repeat expansion 672

37.5 Postzygotic point mutations 673

37.6 Skewed X-inactivation 673

37.7 Other epigenetic mechanisms 674

37.8 Copy number variations (CNVs)..... 674

37.9 The value of twin studies in leukaemia research..... 674

Gene abbreviation list 680

References..... 681

SECTION 8 Conclusion..... 687

Adam D. Tarnoki, David L. Tarnoki, Jennifer R. Harris, Nancy L. Segal

Summary and concluding statement 689

Appendix—Resources 691

Index 693

Contributors

Catarina Almqvist

Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden; Pediatric Allergy and Pulmonology Unit at Astrid Lindgren Children's Hospital, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden

Juko Ando

Keio University, Tokyo, Japan

Meike Bartels

Department of Biological Psychology, Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam University Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Munkh-Erdene Bayartai

The University of Sydney, Charles Perkins Centre, Sydney School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health

Christopher R. Beam

University of Southern California, Department of Psychology

Adriene M. Beltz

Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, MI, United States

Sheri A. Berenbaum

Department of Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, United States; Department of Pediatrics, The Pennsylvania State University, Hershey, PA, United States

Dorret I. Boomsma

Netherlands Twin Register, Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Reproduction and Development Research Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Isabell Brikell

Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden

Minh Bui

Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

Lucas Calais-Ferreira

Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia; Centre for Adolescent Health, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Kaare Christensen

The Danish Twin Registry, Department of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark

Robin P. Corley

Institute for Behavioral Genetics, University of Colorado Boulder, CO, United States

Victoria K. Cortessis

Department of Population and Public Health Science, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, United States; Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, United States

Wendy Cozen

Division of Hematology-Oncology, Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, University of California at Irvine, Orange, CA, United States; Department of Pathology, School of Medicine, University of California at Irvine, Orange, CA, United States; Chao Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of California at Irvine, Orange, CA, United States

Jeffrey M. Craig

Environmental & Genetic Epidemiology Research, Molecular Immunity, Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, VIC, Australia; IMPACT Institute, School of Medicine, Deakin University, Geelong, VIC, Australia

Lisabeth Fisher DiLalla

Southern Illinois University School of Medicine

David L. DiLalla

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Conor V. Dolan

Netherlands Twin Register, Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, and Amsterdam Public Health (APH), Amsterdam, The Netherlands

James G. Dowty

Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

Jeremy A. Elman

Department of Psychiatry, University of California San Diego; Center for Behavior Genetics of Aging, University of California San Diego

Vivienne F.C. Esser

Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

Paulo H. Ferreira

The University of Sydney, Charles Perkins Centre, Sydney School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health

Deborah Finkel

Department of Psychology, Indiana University Southeast, United States; Institute for Gerontology, School of Health and Welfare, Jönköping University, Sweden

Irene Giardina

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Centre of Perinatal and Reproductive, Medicine, University of Perugia, Italy

Fiona A. Hagenbeek

Netherlands Twin Register, Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Irén Haltrich

2nd Department of Pediatrics, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary

Aino Heikkinen

Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland FIMM, HiLIFE, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

John L. Hopper

Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

Jouke-Jan Hottenga

Netherlands Twin Register, Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, and Amsterdam Public Health (APH), Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Yoon-Mi Hur

College of General Education, Kookmin University, Seoul, South Korea

Matthew R. Jamnik

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Kaushalya Jayaweera

Institute for Research & Development in Health & Social Care

Jaakko Kaprio

Institute for Molecular Medicine FIMM, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Alice J. Kim

University of Southern California, Department of Psychology

Esther Lam

Division of Hematology-Oncology, Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, University of California at Irvine, Orange, CA, United States; Chao Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of California at Irvine, Orange, CA, United States

Henrik Larsson

Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden; School of Medical Sciences, Örebro University, Sweden

Soo Ji Lee

Genome and Health Big Data Lab, Graduate School of Public Health, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea; Institute of Health and Environment, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

Anna Lengyel

2nd Department of Pediatrics, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary

Shuai Li

Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

Paul Lichtenstein

Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

Levente Littvay

Central European University

John C. Loehlin

University of Texas at Austin, Department of Psychology, Austin, TX, USA

Yuk Jing Loke

Environmental & Genetic Epidemiology Research, Molecular Immunity, Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, VIC, Australia

Sara Lundgren

Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland FIMM, HiLIFE, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Thomas M. Mack

Department of Population and Public Health Science, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, United States

Sue Malta

Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

Riley L. Marshall

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Nicholas G. Martin

Genetic Epidemiology Group, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

Matt McGue

The Danish Twin Registry, Department of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark; Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, United States

Sarah E. Medland

Mental Health & Neuroscience Department, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, QLD, Australia

Brittany L. Mitchell

Mental Health & Neuroscience Department, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, QLD, Australia

Elena Cristina Mitrea

Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu

Namitha Mohandas

Environmental & Genetic Epidemiology Research, Molecular Immunity, Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, VIC, Australia; Department of Paediatrics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia; IMPACT Institute, School of Medicine, Deakin University, Geelong, VIC, Australia

José J. Morosoli

Mental Health & Neuroscience Department, QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, QLD, Australia

Julia Métneki

Retired, Twin Researcher, Foundation of Hungarian Twin Registry; Hungarian Twin Registry, Budapest, Hungary

Tuong L. Nguyen

Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

Francisca J. Niculae

Department of Psychology, California State University, Fullerton, CA, United States

Veronika Odintsova

Netherlands Twin Register, Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, and Amsterdam Public Health (APH), Amsterdam, The Netherlands; National Medical Research Center for Obstetrics, Gynecology and Perinatology named after Academician V.I.Kulakov of Ministry of Healthcare of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia

Miina Ollikainen

Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland FIMM, HiLIFE, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Juan R. Ordoñana

Department of Human Anatomy and Psychobiology, University of Murcia, Murcia Institute for BioHealth Research (IMIB-Arrixaca-UMU), Murcia, Spain

Emily Pali

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Matthew S. Panizzon

Department of Psychiatry, University of California San Diego; Center for Behavior Genetics of Aging, University of California San Diego

Hang A. Park

Genome and Health Big Data Lab, Graduate School of Public Health, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea; Department of Emergency Medicine, Hallym University Dongtan Sacred Heart Hospital, Hwaseong-si, Korea

Nancy L. Pedersen

Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden; Department of Psychology, University of Southern California, United States

Holly T. Pham

Department of Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, United States

Tinca J.C. Polderman

Amsterdam UMC, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Child and Adolescent, Psychiatry & Psychosocial Care, Amsterdam Public Health; Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Clinical and Developmental Psychology, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

René Pool

Netherlands Twin Register, Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

András Pári

Pázmány Péter Catholic University (PPKE), Maria Kopp Institute for Demography and Families (KINCS), Budapest, Hungary

Monica Rankin

International Council of Multiple Birth Organisations (ICOMBO)

Gian Carlo Di Renzo

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Centre of Perinatal and Reproductive, Medicine, University of Perugia, Italy

Chandra A. Reynolds

Department of Psychology, University of California – Riverside, United States

Maryam Salehi

Division of Hematology-Oncology, Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, University of California at Irvine, Orange, CA, United States; Chao Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of California at Irvine, Orange, CA, United States

Nancy L. Segal

California State University, Fullerton and Director of the Twin Studies Center, CA, USA; Department of Psychology, California State University, Fullerton, CA, United States

Karri Silventoinen

Population Research Unit, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

P. Eline Slagboom

Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, The Netherlands

Gary Steinman

Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Hadassah Hospital—Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel

Garth Stephenson

IMPACT Institute, School of Medicine, Deakin University, Geelong, VIC, Australia

Athula Sumathipala

Institute for Research & Development in Health & Social Care; School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences, Keele University

Joonho Sung

Genome and Health Big Data Lab, Graduate School of Public Health, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea; Institute of Health and Environment, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

Carole Tafforin

Ethospace, Research and Study Group in Human and Space Ethology, Toulouse, France

Adam D. Tarnoki

Medical Imaging Centre, Semmelweis University, Hungarian Twin Registry, Budapest, Hungary

David L. Tarnoki

Medical Imaging Centre, Semmelweis University, Hungarian Twin Registry, Budapest, Hungary

Valentina Tosto

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Centre of Perinatal and Reproductive, Medicine, University of Perugia, Italy; Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Giannina Gaslini Children's Hospital, Genova, Italy

Valentina Tsibizova

Almazov State Perinatal Research Centre, St Petersburg, Russia

Peter Varjassy

Retired, Chief Physician, Medical Historian

Eero Vuoksima

Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland, University of Helsinki, Finland

Gonneke Willemsen

Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Yen Ting Wong

IMPACT Institute, School of Medicine, Deakin University, Geelong, VIC, Australia

Eco de Geus

Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Lianne P. de Vries

Department of Biological Psychology, Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam University Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Jenny van Dongen

Netherlands Twin Register, Department of Biological Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Reproduction and Development Research Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Margot P. van de Weijer

Department of Biological Psychology, Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Amsterdam University Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Editor Biographies

Dr Adam D. Tarnoki is an assistant professor, radiologist, and twin researcher at Semmelweis University Medical Imaging Center and Department Head, Department of Radiology at National Institute of Oncology, Budapest, Hungary. He is a founding member of the Hungarian Twin Registry. He has presented more than 200 international lectures and has authored over 150 publications. He is a board member of the Hungarian Society of Radiologists and teaches radiology in English, German, and Hungarian at Semmelweis University. Dr. Tarnoki serves as vice-president of the Hungarian Medical Association of America Hungary Chapter. He has also served as a member of the local organizing committee and Faculty of the 3rd World Congress on Twin Pregnancy and the 15th Congress of the International Society for Twin Studies (ISTS) in Budapest, Hungary, 2014, and the local host of the 19th International Congress on Twin Studies hold online in November 2021. He serves as deputy editor-in-chief of the *Hungarian Radiology Journal*, and he is the president of the International Society of Twin Studies (ISTS) since 2022.

Dr David L. Tarnoki is an assistant professor, radiologist, and twin researcher at Semmelweis University Medical Imaging Center and Head of Oncologic Imaging Diagnostic Center, National Institute of Oncology, Budapest, Hungary. He is a founding member of the Hungarian Twin Registry and has presented more than 200 international lectures and authored over 150 publications. He is the board member of the Hungarian Society of Radiologists and teaches radiology in English, German, and Hungarian at Semmelweis University. Dr. Tarnoki serves as secretary of the Hungarian Medical Association of America Hungary Chapter and is a member of the Academy of Young Researchers, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He has also served as a member of the local organizing committee and Faculty of the 3rd World Congress on Twin Pregnancy and the 15th Congress of the International Society for Twin Studies (ISTS) in Budapest, Hungary, 2014, and the local host of the 19th International Congress on Twin Studies hold online in November 2021. He is the secretary of the International Society of Twin Studies (ISTS) since 2022.

Dr Jennifer R. Harris is currently a research director at the Centre for Fertility and Health at the Norwegian Institute of Public Health in Oslo, Norway. She has interdisciplinary training in life-span development and genetics. She has been conducting twin research throughout her academic career. She is the past president of the International Society for Twin Studies, a recipient of the James Shields Award for outstanding research in behavioral genetics, and is the scientific director of the Norwegian Twin Registry. Dr. Harris has a broad commitment to the wider scientific community and serves on several expert panels, boards, steering groups, scientific advisory committees, and editorial boards.

Dr Nancy L. Segal is currently a professor of psychology at California State University, Fullerton, and Director of the Twin Studies Center. She has authored over 250 scientific articles and book chapters, as well as seven books on twins, most recently, *Deliberately Divided: Inside the Controversial Study of Twins and Triplets Adopted Apart*. Her 2012 book, *Born Together-Reared Apart: The Landmark Minnesota Twin Study*, won the 2013 William James Award from the American Psychological Association. Dr. Segal has received several international awards including the James Shields Award for Lifetime Contributions to Twin Research (International Society for Twin Studies) and the International Making a Difference Award (Multiple Births Canada). She is also the 2016 recipient of the prestigious Wang Family Excellence Award from California State University. Dr. Segal has contributed to national and international media, including the New York Times and the Washington Post. She has been a frequent guest on national and international television and radio programs, such as the Today Show, Good Morning America, The Martha Stewart Show, the Oprah Winfrey Show, The Forum (BBC), and the Hidden Brain National Public Radio.