Nicotine Metabolite Ratio Predicts Smoking Topography and Carcinogen Biomarker Level
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Abstract

Background: Variability in smoking behavior is partly attributable to heritable individual differences in nicotine clearance rates. This can be assessed as the ratio of the metabolites cotinine and 3'-hydroxycotinine (referred to as the nicotine metabolism ratio; NMR). We hypothesized that faster NMR would be associated with greater cigarette puff volume and higher levels of total 4-(methylnitrosamino)-1-(3-pyridyl)-1-butanol (NNAL), a carcinogen biomarker.

Methods: Current smokers (n = 109) smoked one of their preferred brand cigarettes through a smoking topography device and provided specimens for NMR and total NNAL assays.

Results: Faster nicotine metabolizers (third and fourth quartiles versus first quartile) based on the NMR exhibited significantly greater total puff volume and total NNAL; the total puff volume by daily cigarette consumption interaction was a significant predictor of total NNAL level.

Conclusion: A heritable biomarker of nicotine clearance predicts total cigarette puff volume and total NNAL.

Impact: If validated, the NMR could contribute to smoking risk assessment in epidemiologic studies and potentially in clinical practice. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev; 20(2); 234–8. 2011 AACR.
the University of California, San Francisco via liquid chromatography with tandem mass spectrometry (9). Genotyping for CYP2A6 variants was done at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (Toronto, Canada) as previously described (17). A 30-mL urine sample was provided and assayed for total NNAL, the sum of NNAL, and its glucuronides at the University of Minnesota, per standard procedures (18).

In a smoking-approved ventilated room, participants smoked one of their own brand cigarettes under ad libitum conditions, using a smoking topography device (Clinical Research Support System) validated in previous research (19, 20). Participants were asked to refrain from smoking for 1 hour prior to their laboratory smoking session, and were generally compliant (mean = 64.3 minutes; SD = 35.4; range, 42–190). Total puff volume, defined as the sum of all puffs taken, was a priori selected as the outcome measure for analysis (21, 22).

NMR values were positively skewed (+1.8) and have positive kurtosis (+4.8) consistent with previously results, and was therefore log-transformed (15, 17). NMR quartiles were created (15, 23) and CYP2A6 genotypes were coded as previously (17). NMR quartiles, previously determined from receiver operator characteristic analyses, have been used to characterize smokers’ response to transdermal nicotine treatment and bupropion (15, 17, 24), and therefore were used in this study to assist comparisons to previous research that utilized NMR. Hypotheses were tested using analysis of covariance where total puff volume and total NNAL were the outcome measures and NMR quartile was the between group factor. Fisher’s post hoc analyses were used to identify quartile differences. Regression analysis was used to examine the association between smoking behavior (daily cigarette consumption, total puff volume, and their product as an index of daily puff volume) and total NNAL levels, retaining covariates at $P < 0.2$.

Results

The participant sample was 59% men, 96% Caucasian with an average age of 45.4 years ($SD = 10.8$). On average, they had been smoking for 29.3 years ($SD = 11.2$), smoked an average of 20.5 cigarettes per day ($SD = 8.4$), with an average nicotine dependence score of 4.9 ($SD = 2.1$). Most participants smoked light brand (55%) and nonmenthol (71%) cigarettes. This study sample is similar to the full clinical study sample, ($n = 568$; see ref. 15), but with a significantly greater proportion of Caucasians (84% in the full sample). Of the 142 participants who attended these initial intake sessions, 131 (92%) agreed to complete a smoking topography assessment with their own brand cigarettes; of these 131, 14 withdrew prior to having assays completed, 5 had contaminated urine samples, and 3 had failed topography assessment. Topography session completers did not differ from noncompleters on demographic or smoking variables.

Mean plasma NMR value was 0.395 ($SD = 0.20$; range, 0.012–1.246). Mean ($SD$; lower limit and upper limit) for quartiles were as follows (for additional data see Table 1): Quartile 1, 0.192 (0.06; 0.010–0.259); Quartile 2, 0.313 (0.03; 0.260–0.357); Quartile 3, 0.410 (SD0.036; 0.358–0.477); Quartile 4, 0.668 (0.21; 0.478–1.246). Women were more likely to be in the highest NMR (faster metabolism; $P = 0.02$), consistent with previous reports that women metabolize nicotine faster than men (25). NMR was non-significantly higher among participants who were older ($P = 0.10$), who had higher nicotine dependence levels ($P = 0.09$), and who smoked nonmenthol cigarettes.

<p>| Table 1. Descriptive measures for overall study sample and nicotine metabolism ratio quartiles |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Overall ($n = 109$)</th>
<th>Quartile 1 ($n = 26$)</th>
<th>Quartile 2 ($n = 28$)</th>
<th>Quartile 3 ($n = 28$)</th>
<th>Quartile 4 ($n = 27$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicotine</td>
<td>0.395 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.192 (0.06)</td>
<td>0.313 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.410 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.668 (0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metabolism</td>
<td>0.395 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.192 (0.06)</td>
<td>0.313 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.410 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.668 (0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ratio</td>
<td>262.8 (110)</td>
<td>230.4 (122)</td>
<td>308.6 (112)</td>
<td>285.5 (110)</td>
<td>211.4 (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotinine, ng/mL</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, % male</td>
<td>45.4 (10.8)</td>
<td>41.3 (11.5)</td>
<td>45.6 (11.6)</td>
<td>45.7 (9.2)</td>
<td>48.8 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, y</td>
<td>20.5 (8.4)</td>
<td>19.8 (9.9)</td>
<td>18.9 (4.7)</td>
<td>21.7 (10.8)</td>
<td>22.2 (7.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily cigarette</td>
<td>4.9 (2.1)</td>
<td>4.0 (2.1)</td>
<td>5.0 (1.7)</td>
<td>5.3 (2.3)</td>
<td>5.3 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consumption, n</td>
<td>55/33/12</td>
<td>36/56/8</td>
<td>47/47/6</td>
<td>39/47/14</td>
<td>18/62/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTND</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menthol/nonmenthol, % nonmenthol</td>
<td>1.47 (0.79)</td>
<td>1.09 (0.63)</td>
<td>1.42 (0.70)</td>
<td>1.76 (0.97)</td>
<td>1.61 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Descriptive measures for overall study sample and nicotine metabolism ratio quartiles

NOTE: The values are given as mean (SD), unless noted otherwise. Reg, regular cigarette; Lt, light cigarette; U-Lt, ultralight cigarette, based on Federal Trade Commission (FTC) cigarette classifications used at the time data were collected (FTC, 2000).
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(P = 0.10). Thus, these variables were included as covariates.

Mean total puff volume was 785.1 mL (SD = 284.9; range, 247.4–1776.1). There was an overall association of NMR quartiles with total puff volume (F = 2.62, P = 0.05); smokers in the third quartile (P = 0.042) and fourth quartile (P = 0.016) exhibited significantly higher total puff volumes than those in the first quartile (Table 1; Fig 1A). Faster metabolizers by CYP2A6 (*1/*1, n = 89) genotype also had higher puff volumes than slower metabolizers (defined as any of *2, *4, *9, *12 variants, n = 19); means were 816.8 mL (SD = 206.9), respectively (F = 6.04, P = 0.02; results the same when the 5 non-European ancestry subjects were excluded).

Mean total NNAL was 1.47 pmol/mg creatinine (SD = 0.79; range, 0.10–4.2). There was a significant main effect of the NMR (F = 3.59, P = 0.02); smokers in the third quartile (P = 0.001) and fourth quartile (P = 0.033) had higher total NNAL levels than those in the first quartile (Table 1; Fig 1B). A similar, nonsignificant difference was seen in genotypic fast versus slow metabolizers (1.54 pmol/mg creatinine (SD = 0.92) versus 1.34 pmol/mg creatinine (SD = 0.68), P = 0.35). Results were unchanged when the nicotine dependence (FTND) covariate was replaced with smoking rate.

Linear regression analysis indicated a positive association between log-transformed NMR and total puff volume (beta = 321.2, t = 2.35, P = 0.024, R² = 0.051); and log-transformed NMR and total NNAL (beta = .831, t = 2.41, P = 0.02, R² = 0.052). Stepwise regression analysis indicated that the total puff volume by daily cigarette consumption product was positively associated with total NNAL level (beta = 2.538 × 10⁻⁵, t = 2.94, P = 0.004), controlling for sex (P = 0.02), years smoking (P = 0.04), and menthol (P = 0.16); the overall model was significant [F(4,104) = 4.85, P = 0.001, R² = 0.16].

Discussion

This study is the first to show that a heritable biomarker of nicotine clearance, the NMR, predicts total cigarette puff volume and overall carcinogen exposure based on total NNAL. Compared with the slowest metabolizers (first quartile), smokers in the third and fourth quartiles exhibited 23% and 28% increases in cigarette puff volume, respectively, and total NNAL levels that are 61% and 53% higher, respectively. These results are consistent with our previous study (26) and current results showing increased puff volume among fast metabolizers by CYP2A6 genotype. Results potentially could be interpreted as faster metabolizers take greater puffs to obtain a desired, greater level of nicotine, or that slow metabolizers smoke less intensely to avoid excessive or toxic nicotine levels. We suggest that it is more likely that faster metabolizers smoke more to obtain a desired level of nicotine, as there is little support for slow metabolizers reporting nausea when learning to smoke (27) and in high-dose transdermal nicotine studies, continued smoking did not lead to signs of nicotine toxicity (28).

The availability of a phenotypic measure of CYP2A6 activity, such as the NMR, is useful as it captures both genetic, such as yet unidentified alleles or other genes, and environmental influences, such as estrogen levels (25), on CYP2A6 activity and nicotine clearance, and NMR can be measured noninvasively (e.g., saliva) without additional drug administration (29, 30).

Cigarette smoking causes the majority of lung cancer cases (31) and total NNAL is a biomarker for one of the most prevalent systemic lung carcinogens in tobacco (32, 33). Yet, there is substantial variability in lung cancer risk at a given level of smoking (34, 35). This may be attributable to individual differences in the amount of toxin exposure per cigarette, and in activation in carcinogens (13). Because lung cancer can take years to develop, the...
identification of practical biomarkers to improve risk assessment would be of great value.

There are some limitations of this study. Although puff volume is reliable and stable (19, 20), repeated assessments, rather than the single assessment here, may better reflect daily smoking patterns. Participants in this study were restricted to treatment-seeking smokers who smoked 10 or more cigarettes per day, and may not represent the general smoking population. One might postulate that because slow metabolizers have lower daily cigarette consumption, a high percentage may have not met study inclusion criteria (26). Therefore, these findings should also be replicated in a population-based sample. Lastly, a more comprehensive biomarker panel that includes not only the NMR, but also information on cigarette brand features (e.g., filter ventilation; ref. 6), and diurnal variations in smoking patterns (36) may provide a more refined assessment of risk from smoking. Such measures could potentially enhance risk assessment in epidemiologic studies and, if replicated, could be translated in the future to clinical practice.
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