

Polymorphisms in dopamine system genes are associated with individual differences in attention in infancy

Article

Accepted Version

Holmboe, K., Nemoda, Z., Fearon, R. M. P., Csibra, G., Sasvari-Szekely, M. and Johnson, M. H. (2010)

Polymorphisms in dopamine system genes are associated with individual differences in attention in infancy. *Developmental Psychology*, 46 (2). pp. 404-416. ISSN 0012-1649 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018180> Available at <http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/17514/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Published version at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018180>

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018180>

Publisher: American Psychological Association

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other

copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1 Polymorphisms in Dopamine System Genes are Associated with Individual Differences in
2 Attention in Infancy

3 Karla Holmboe

4 Birkbeck, University of London

6 Zsofia Nemoda

7 Semmelweis University

9 R. M. Pasco Fearon

10 University of Reading

12 Gergely Csibra

13 Birkbeck, University of London

15 Maria Sasvari-Szekely

16 Semmelweis University

18 Mark H. Johnson

19 Birkbeck, University of London
20

Abstract

Knowledge about the functional status of the frontal cortex in infancy is limited. This study investigated the effects of polymorphisms in four dopamine system genes on performance in a task developed to assess such functioning, the Freeze-Frame task, at 9 months of age.

Polymorphisms in the catechol-*O*-methyltransferase (*COMT*) and the dopamine D4 receptor (*DRD4*) genes are likely to impact directly on the functioning of the frontal cortex, while polymorphisms in the dopamine D2 receptor (*DRD2*) and dopamine transporter (*DAT1*)

genes might influence frontal cortex functioning indirectly via strong fronto-striatal connections. A significant effect of the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism was found. Infants

with the Met/Met genotype were significantly less distractible than infants with the Val/Val genotype in Freeze-Frame trials presenting an engaging central stimulus. In addition, there

was an interaction with the *DAT1* 3' VNTR polymorphism; the *COMT* effect was only

present in infants who did not have two copies of the *DAT1* 10-repeat allele. These findings

indicate that dopaminergic polymorphisms already affect selective aspects of attention in infancy, and further validate the Freeze-Frame task as a frontal cortex task.

Key words: Frontal cortex, Infancy, Dopamine genes, Attention, Frontal-subcortical circuits

1 Polymorphisms in Dopamine System Genes are Associated with Individual Differences in
2 Attention in Infancy

3
4 Introduction

5 The frontal cortex is associated with important cognitive functions such as working
6 memory and various aspects of cognitive control (for review, see Fuster, 1997; Gazzaley &
7 D'Esposito, 2007). Despite years of intensive study of this area in adults and non-human
8 primates, relatively little is known about the functional status of the frontal cortex in infancy.

9 The frontal cortex has a more protracted development than other areas of the brain, with
10 synaptogenesis continuing well into middle childhood (Glantz, Gilmore, Hamer, Lieberman,
11 & Jarskog, 2007; Huttenlocher, 1990). Glucose metabolism and regional cerebral blood flow
12 also peak later in the frontal cortex (Chugani & Phelps, 1986; Chugani, Phelps, & Mazziotta,
13 1987; Franceschini et al., 2007). Despite this protracted developmental course, infant
14 neuroimaging studies have shown activation in the frontal cortex during language processing,
15 processing of novel stimuli, and working memory (Baird et al., 2002; Bell, 2001; Bell & Fox,
16 1992, 1997; Dehaene-Lambertz, Dehaene, & Hertz-Pannier, 2002; Homae, Watanabe,
17 Nakano, & Taga, 2007; Nakano, Watanabe, Homae, & Taga, 2008). Furthermore, Diamond
18 and colleagues have shown that performance on a task which has been directly associated
19 with the frontal cortex, the A-not-B task (Piaget, 1954), improves drastically during the
20 second half of the first year of life (Diamond, 1985; Diamond & Goldman-Rakic, 1989;
21 Diamond, Zola-Morgan, & Squire, 1989).

22 A previous report sought to validate a new infant frontal cortex task, the Freeze-Frame
23 task, by investigating the relationship between this task and other infant and toddler frontal
24 cortex tasks (Holmboe, Fearon, Csibra, Tucker, & Johnson, 2008). The Freeze-Frame task
25 was developed to assess various aspects of inhibitory control in infancy using eye movements

1 as the dependent measure. In the task, infants are encouraged to stay fixated on an animated
2 cartoon in the centre of a computer screen. On every trial a peripheral distractor (a white
3 square) is presented. If the infant looks to this distractor, the animation is frozen for a brief
4 period of time. Furthermore, the task involves two alternating trial types. In the *interesting*
5 trials a dynamic and changeable animation is presented, whereas the *boring* trials present the
6 same simple animation (a rotating orange star) every time.

7 In the study by Holmboe and colleagues (2008) it was found that 9-month-old infants
8 stopped looking to the distractors during the course of the test session. Infants also looked
9 less to the distractors in the interesting trials right from the beginning of the session. No
10 evidence of an interaction between trial type and phase of the test session was found.
11 Individual performance indices suggested that infants who looked less to the distractors in the
12 interesting trials than the boring trials early in the Freeze-Frame session performed better on
13 the A-not-B task at 9 months of age. Another index, which assessed infants' ability to
14 selectively learn to inhibit looks to the distractors, was associated with significantly better
15 performance on a frontal cortex task at 24 months of age, the Spatial Conflict task (Gerardi-
16 Caulton, 2000; Rothbart, Ellis, Rueda, & Posner, 2003), suggesting that Freeze-Frame
17 performance at 9 months is predictive of later frontal cortex functioning (Holmboe et al.,
18 2008).

19 Even though these results indicate that performance on the Freeze-Frame task shares a
20 significant proportion of its variance with performance on other infant and toddler frontal
21 cortex tasks, this is still relatively indirect evidence that the task depends on the frontal
22 cortex. More definitive evidence that the task is indeed associated with the functioning of the
23 frontal cortex would involve establishing a direct relationship between performance on the
24 task and biological markers of frontal cortex functioning. One way to address this issue is to
25 investigate the potential effect of genetic variation. In the present study we therefore

1 investigated the relationship between performance on the Freeze-Frame task and well-
2 established candidate polymorphisms in dopamine system genes.

3 The neurotransmitter dopamine plays a major role in the frontal cortex. For example,
4 depletion of dopamine, but not noradrenaline or serotonin, in the dorsolateral prefrontal
5 cortex causes delayed-response deficits similar to those seen after ablation of that area
6 (Brozoski, Brown, Rosvold, & Goldman, 1979; Collins, Roberts, Dias, Everitt, & Robbins,
7 1998; Roberts et al., 1994). Furthermore, recordings from prefrontal dopamine-sensitive
8 neurons in primates have shown these neurons to be active during the delay period in
9 working memory tasks (Goldman-Rakic, Muly, & Williams, 2000; Sawaguchi & Goldman-
10 Rakic, 1991; Vijayraghavan, Wang, Birnbaum, Williams, & Arnsten, 2007). Finally,
11 Diamond and colleagues investigated children treated early and continuously for
12 phenylketonuria (PKU) and found that estimated dopamine levels in the frontal cortex
13 affected children's performance on frontal cortex tasks throughout infancy and early
14 childhood (Diamond, Prevor, Callender, & Druin, 1997).

15 We investigated two dopamine system genes which have been demonstrated to impact on
16 frontal cortex function in several studies: the catechol-*O*-methyltransferase (*COMT*) gene and
17 the dopamine D4 receptor (*DRD4*) gene. However, the dopamine system is not restricted to
18 the frontal cortex. It also plays an important role in subcortical areas such as the striatum. We
19 therefore included two dopaminergic polymorphisms believed to affect neurotransmission
20 primarily in the striatum: the TaqIA polymorphism in the dopamine D2 receptor (*DRD2*)
21 gene and the 40-bp 3' VNTR polymorphism in the dopamine transporter (*DAT1, SLC6A3*)
22 gene. These polymorphisms could potentially affect performance in the Freeze-Frame task
23 via frontal-subcortical circuits linking the frontal cortex to distinct areas of the striatum
24 (Alexander, DeLong, & Strick, 1986; Cummings, 1993; Cummings & Miller, 2007; Di
25 Martino et al., 2008; Nieoullon, 2002).

1 The striatum used to be regarded as a subcortical relay of information from diverse
2 cortical areas, especially in relation to movement control (reviewed in Alexander et al.,
3 1986). However, Alexander and colleagues (1986) proposed a model whereby distinct basal
4 ganglia-thalamo-cortical circuits process information relevant to different functional
5 domains. Two of these circuits involve parts of the prefrontal cortex (the dorsolateral
6 prefrontal and the lateral orbitofrontal circuits), and one involves the anterior cingulate. In
7 support of this model, work on experimental animals as well as neuropsychological studies of
8 human patients have shown deficits in the functions associated with specific frontal areas
9 (e.g., working memory function associated with the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex) after lesion
10 of other nodes in the relevant frontal-subcortical circuit (Cummings, 1993; Divac, Rosvold,
11 & Szwarcbart, 1967; Stuss et al., 1998; Yehene, Meiran, & Soroker, 2008). Furthermore, the
12 existence of strong functional connections between the striatum and different parts of the
13 frontal cortex has been confirmed in an analysis of human functional magnetic resonance
14 imaging (fMRI) data (Di Martino et al., 2008). Given this extensive evidence for frontal-
15 subcortical networks, it seemed important to investigate not just dopamine genes likely to
16 affect processing in the frontal cortex, but also dopamine genes acting at the subcortical level.

17 Looking at the individual genes in more detail, the COMT enzyme metabolizes
18 catecholamines such as dopamine and noradrenaline (Chen et al., 2004; Männistö &
19 Kaakkola, 1999; Tunbridge, Harrison, & Weinberger, 2006). The role of COMT in
20 catabolizing dopamine in the frontal cortex is particularly important due to the relative lack of
21 dopamine transporters and the positioning of these transporters at a distance from synaptic
22 release sites (Sesack, Hawrylak, Matus, Guido, & Levey, 1998). Thus, COMT accounts for
23 approximately 50-60% of the metabolic degradation of dopamine in the frontal cortex
24 (Karoum, Chrapusta, & Egan, 1994; Yavich, Forsberg, Karayiorgou, Gogos, & Männistö,
25 2007). In contrast, COMT catabolism only plays a minor role in the striatum where the

1 dopamine transporter is abundant and better situated for dopamine reuptake (Karoum et al.,
2 1994; Yavich et al., 2007; for review, see Tunbridge et al., 2006). Consistent with this,
3 studies of COMT-deficient mice have demonstrated increased dopamine availability in the
4 frontal cortex, but not the striatum (Gogos et al., 1998; Yavich et al., 2007). The important
5 role of COMT in the cortex compared to the striatum has also recently been shown *in vivo* in
6 the human brain using positron emission tomography (PET) (Slifstein et al., 2008).

7 The Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism in the *COMT* gene affects the activity level of the COMT
8 enzyme. The polymorphism is an evolutionarily recent G (guanine) to A (adenine) missense
9 mutation at codon 158, resulting in a substitution of methionine (Met) for valine (Val) in the
10 COMT enzyme (Chen et al., 2004; Lachman et al., 1996; Tunbridge et al., 2006; Tunbridge
11 et al., 2007). The Val and Met alleles are almost equally frequent in populations of European
12 descent (Met-allele frequency = .47; heterozygosity = .48), whereas the Val-allele is more
13 common in other parts of the world (Met-allele frequency = .16-.34; heterozygosity = .27-
14 .45) (Palmatier, Kang, & Kidd, 1999).

15 The Met variant of the enzyme is less stable at body temperature (Chen et al., 2004; Lotta
16 et al., 1995), resulting in 3 to 4 times less COMT enzyme activity in the human liver and red
17 blood cells (Männistö & Kaakkola, 1999). In the human brain this difference is smaller, but
18 still considerable, with Met/Met homozygotes having approximately 40% less COMT
19 activity than Val/Val homozygotes in the prefrontal cortex (Chen et al., 2004). The alleles are
20 codominant, resulting in Val/Met heterozygotes having an intermediate level of COMT
21 activity (Egan et al., 2001; Männistö & Kaakkola, 1999; Tunbridge et al., 2006). This
22 evidence strongly suggests that Met/Met homozygotes have the *highest* baseline level of
23 dopamine available in the prefrontal cortex (because less dopamine is catabolized) with
24 Val/Met heterozygotes having an intermediate level, and Val/Val homozygotes having the
25 lowest level of prefrontal dopamine (Tunbridge et al., 2006; Tunbridge et al., 2007).

1 Several studies have demonstrated a relationship between the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met
2 polymorphism and performance on tasks associated with the frontal cortex. For example,
3 Egan et al. (2001) found that the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism affected performance on
4 the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST). Val/Val homozygotes performed significantly
5 worse than Met/Met homozygotes and heterozygotes. Furthermore, the number of Met-alleles
6 (0-2) that an individual had significantly predicted neural efficiency in the frontal cortex
7 during an fMRI task, the N-back task (Egan et al., 2001). In this task all genotype groups
8 performed at the same level, but Val/Val homozygotes showed significantly greater
9 activation (indicating lower neural efficiency) in the frontal cortex than heterozygotes, and
10 heterozygotes showed significantly greater activation than Met/Met homozygotes. Recent
11 meta-analyses have been inconsistent in terms of the relationship between performance on the
12 WCST and the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism (Barnett, Jones, Robbins, & Müller, 2007;
13 Barnett, Scoriels, & Munafò, 2008). However, the evidence for an effect on neural efficiency
14 as well as on a range of frontal cortex tasks has been replicated in several studies (Bertolino
15 et al., 2006; Blasi et al., 2005; Caldú et al., 2007; Diaz-Asper et al., 2008; Krämer et al.,
16 2007; Mattay et al., 2003; Meyer-Lindenberg et al., 2006; Sheldrick et al., 2008; Stefanis et
17 al., 2005), and has recently been extended to a mouse model of the Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism
18 (Papaleo et al., 2008). Finally, a study by Diamond and colleagues (2004) demonstrated an
19 effect of the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism on school-age children's performance on a task
20 hypothesized to depend on dopamine in the prefrontal cortex. This finding demonstrates the
21 potential effect of variation in COMT activity at younger ages, and opens up the possibility
22 that the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism might have an effect on frontal cortex functioning
23 already in infancy.

24 The second candidate gene in our study was the *DRD4* gene. Knowledge about the
25 distribution of the D₄ receptor in the human brain is limited due to the lack of appropriate

1 radioligands (Hurd & Hall, 2005; Oak, Oldenhof, & Van Tol, 2000). However, existing
2 evidence suggests that D₄ receptors are most abundant in the retina, followed by the
3 prefrontal cortex (Oak et al., 2000). Hurd and Hall (2005) suggest that transmission via D₄
4 receptors is predominantly inhibitory in nature, resulting in disinhibition of excitatory
5 transmission when these receptors are blocked (Hurd & Hall, 2005). Thus, a lack of or less
6 efficient D₄ receptors may lead to deficits in frontal cortex functioning.

7 The most widely studied polymorphism of the *DRD4* gene is located in the third exon
8 and contains a 48 base pair variable number of tandem repeats (48-bp VNTR). Nine alleles of
9 the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR have been identified world-wide, with the number of repeats ranging
10 between 2 and 10. The 4- and 7-repeat alleles are the most common globally, though the 2-
11 repeat allele is prevalent in South and East Asia. In a population of mixed European ancestry,
12 allele frequencies are .57, .21 and .12 for the 4-, 7- and 2-repeat alleles respectively (Chang,
13 Kidd, Livak, Pakstis, & Kidd, 1996).

14 The number of 48-bp repeats has been hypothesized to affect the transmitted signal in the
15 postsynaptic neuron. However, findings from *in vitro* studies have shown that the *DRD4* 48-
16 bp VNTR does not significantly alter D₄ receptor activity (Oak et al., 2000). A more recent
17 study suggests that the different repeat sequences may affect gene expression differentially,
18 i.e., the density of D₄ receptors in the brain. This study found that the 7-repeat allele had
19 reduced expression compared to the 2-repeat and 4-repeat alleles (Schoots & Van Tol, 2003).

20 The *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR has been extensively studied in relation to Attention Deficit
21 Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) (Li, Sham, Owen, & He, 2006). ADHD has been linked to
22 performance deficits on tasks assessing frontal cortex functions such as response inhibition,
23 selective attention and set shifting (for review, see Cornish et al., 2005). The 7-repeat allele
24 has been consistently associated with ADHD in recent meta-analyses (Faraone et al., 2005; Li
25 et al., 2006). Furthermore, the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR has been shown to affect prefrontal grey

1 matter volume in a sample of boys diagnosed with ADHD, their siblings and controls
2 (Durstun et al., 2005). Recently, the 7-repeat allele has also been found to be associated with
3 impulsivity and lower levels of response inhibition in healthy adults, both on its own
4 (Congdon, Lesch, & Canli, 2008) and in combination with other polymorphisms in dopamine
5 system genes (Congdon et al., 2008; Eisenberg et al., 2007). Finally, the 7-repeat allele has
6 been linked to faster habituation in infancy and increased novelty seeking in adolescence
7 (Laucht, Becker, & Schmidt, 2006), and to sensation seeking in toddlers when combined with
8 poor parenting (Sheese, Voelker, Rothbart, & Posner, 2007). Therefore, the *DRD4* 48-bp
9 VNTR can be considered a candidate polymorphism for frontal cortex functioning in infancy.

10 Turning to the genes most likely to act at the subcortical level, the D_2 receptor is
11 considerably less prevalent in the cerebral cortex than in the striatum (Ito, Okubo, Halldin, &
12 Farde, 1999; Lidow, Goldman-Rakic, Rakic, & Innis, 1989). The *DRD2* TaqIA
13 polymorphism is located in the 3' untranslated region, 10 kb downstream from the *DRD2*
14 gene, actually in the adjacent gene *ANKK1* (Neville, Johnstone, & Walton, 2004). A1 is the
15 minor allele. The A1-present (A1+) genotype has a prevalence of approximately 31% in
16 Caucasian individuals (Noble, 2000). The presence of this allele has been associated with
17 lower D_2 receptor density in the human brain using PET, especially in the striatum (Jönsson
18 et al., 1999; Pohjalainen et al., 1998; Ritchie & Noble, 2003; Thompson et al., 1997).

19 In contrast to the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR, the *DRD2* TaqIA polymorphism is not associated
20 with ADHD (Faraone et al., 2005). However, the A1 allele has been associated with various
21 addictions (Munafò, Matheson, & Flint, 2007; Young, Lawford, Nutting, & Noble, 2004) and
22 a more impulsive response style in a monetary reward task in healthy adults (Eisenberg et al.,
23 2007). Little evidence exists for a role of the *DRD2* TaqIA polymorphism in frontal cortex
24 functioning. However, Reuter and colleagues (2005) showed a significant interaction between
25 the *DRD2* TaqIA polymorphism and the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism on a Stroop-like

1 task where participants had to respond to the written form of color words written in
2 incongruent colors as quickly as possible. The interaction effect accounted for 13% of the
3 variance in performance on this task. This result opens up the possibility that the *DRD2* gene
4 (and perhaps other subcortical dopaminergic genes) impacts indirectly on frontal cortex
5 functioning via interactions with genes affecting dopaminergic neurotransmission directly in
6 the frontal cortex (e.g., *COMT* and *DRD4*).

7 Finally, we investigated the potential effect of a well-known polymorphism of the
8 dopamine transporter (*DAT1*) gene. The dopamine transporter is primarily expressed in the
9 mesencephalon (a subcortical area with strong dopaminergic projections to the striatum and
10 frontal cortex), with the highest density in the basal ganglia (Hurd & Hall, 2005). The *DAT1*
11 gene contains a 40-bp VNTR in the 3' untranslated region. Alleles range from 3 to 13 repeats,
12 but the most common are the 9-repeat and 10-repeat alleles (Cornish et al., 2005). In
13 populations of European ancestry the frequencies of the 9- and 10-repeat alleles vary, but
14 most studies report frequencies of approximately .30 for the 9-repeat allele and .70 for the 10-
15 repeat allele (Kang, Palmatier, & Kidd, 1999). Although analyses of mRNA levels in brain
16 regions resulted in contradictory findings (Mill, Asherson, Browes, D'Souza, & Craig, 2002;
17 Wonodi et al., 2009), two independent large-scale *in vivo* single photon emission computed
18 tomography (SPECT) studies have shown that healthy individuals with at least one copy of
19 the 9-repeat allele (9/9 and 9/10 genotypes) had higher transporter density, and therefore
20 presumably more effective dopamine removal at the synapse, than the 10/10 genotype (van
21 de Giessen et al., 2008; van Dyck et al., 2005).

22 In terms of phenotypes, the *DAT1* gene has been studied extensively in relation to ADHD
23 because stimulant medication used in its treatment acts by blocking the dopamine transporter.
24 Evidence suggests that 10/10 homozygosity is associated with a slightly increased risk of
25 ADHD (Faraone et al., 2005). Furthermore, Cornish and colleagues (2005) reported an

1 association between the 10/10 genotype and ADHD symptoms in a general population
2 sample. This group also found an independent association between the 10/10 genotype and
3 poorer performance on measures of selective attention and response inhibition in their
4 selected high- and low-risk sample. A similar trend was found by Congdon and colleagues
5 (2008) in a sample of healthy adults. Despite these findings, recent neuroimaging studies in
6 adults have indicated a more efficient neural response in the prefrontal cortex of 10/10
7 homozygotes during a working memory task (Bertolino et al., 2006; Caldú et al., 2007), a
8 pattern similar to that which is seen in subjects with the *COMT* Met/Met genotype. One
9 recent study also found higher levels of impulsivity in healthy adults with at least one 9-
10 repeat allele (Forbes et al., 2007), contradicting other behavioral results. The behavioral
11 effects of the *DATI* 3' VNTR polymorphism may depend on the population studied.

12 In summary, the present study investigated whether performance on the Freeze-Frame
13 task at 9 months of age was associated with genetic polymorphisms affecting important
14 aspects of dopamine function in the brain. Since dopamine plays an important role in both the
15 frontal cortex and the striatum, direct effects of the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met and *DRD4* 48-bp
16 VNTR were hypothesized, with potential interacting or indirect effects of the *DRD2* TaqIA
17 and the *DATI* 3' VNTR polymorphisms.

18 Methods

19 *Sample*

20 Infants were recruited from the greater London area. Data from two independent cohorts
21 of infants were combined in the present study. Cohort 1 consisted of a small group of infants
22 ($N = 24$). Behavioral results from this cohort have been reported previously (Holmboe et al.,
23 2008). Cohort 2 consisted of a considerably larger group of infants ($N = 104$) who took part
24 in a longitudinal study of frontal cortex functioning during the first year of life. Ninety-four

1 infants from the original cohort of 104 infants (recruited at 4 months) participated in the
2 study at 9 months. Data from this cohort have not been reported previously.

3 Data on parental education and household income were only collected in Cohort 2, but
4 generally represent families recruited for studies at our laboratory. Parents were in their mid-
5 thirties (mothers: $M = 34.43$, $SD = 4.90$; fathers: $M = 36.45$, $SD = 6.61$) and primarily, but not
6 exclusively, of middle or upper-middle class socio-economic status (maternal years of
7 education: $M = 17.80$, $SD = 3.55$; household income in £: $M = 65,076$, $SD = 61,854$ ¹).

8 Seventy-nine percent of the infants tested (Cohorts 1 and 2 combined) had a White/Caucasian
9 ethnic background (approx. $\frac{3}{4}$ of these infants were of British or Irish descent), and 21% had
10 other or mixed ethnic background. Of the infants with other than Caucasian ethnic
11 background ($N = 26$), 8% of infants had an Asian ethnic background, 15% had a Black ethnic
12 background, and 77% had a mixed ethnic background (e.g., mother Asian and father
13 Caucasian). Ethical permission for the study was obtained from the School of Psychology
14 ethics board at Birkbeck, University of London.

15 *The Freeze-Frame task*

16 A detailed description of the Freeze-Frame task can be found in Holmboe et al. (2008). In
17 short, infants were presented with animations in the centre of a 19-inch color monitor. Infants
18 were seated in their parent's lap at a 60-cm distance from the monitor. On every trial a white
19 square was flashed on the right or left side of the screen (the distractor). If the infant looked
20 to the distractor, the animation was stopped for 3000 ms. If the infant did not look to the
21 distractor, the animation continued after distractor presentation for the duration of the trial.
22 Distractor duration was calibrated individually for each infant by increasing it by 40 ms on

¹ Approximate US\$ equivalent: $M = 120,511$, $SD = 114,544$, based on the average GB£ per US\$ exchange rate of 0.54 in 2006 (NationMaster.com, 2009) when the majority of the data was collected.

1 every trial where the infant did not look to the distractor. When the infant had looked to the
2 distractor on two consecutive trials, distractor duration was fixed at the current duration for
3 the rest of the test session. The even-numbered trials presented dynamic and colorful
4 animations changing every 2 s (interesting trials), whereas the odd-numbered trials always
5 presented the same uninteresting rotating orange star (boring trials). Infants were encouraged
6 to complete 60 trials.

7 A few minor adjustments were made to the task used in Cohort 2. Most importantly, the
8 animations were slightly smaller and a different set of animations was used for the interesting
9 trials. The procedure used in Cohort 2 was the same as the procedure used in Cohort 1. In the
10 new version distractor duration did not increase beyond 1200 ms. Infants were encouraged to
11 complete 80 trials. The data were analyzed as described in Holmboe et al. (2008). That is, the
12 session was divided into phases (from two trials before the calibration trial), invalid trials
13 were excluded, and the proportion of looks to the distractors was calculated separately for
14 boring and interesting trials in each phase. However, the additional data collection allowed an
15 extra phase in the analyses. Thus, there were 4 phases of the experiment, each containing 16
16 trials (8 boring and 8 interesting).

17 Video recordings of each infant's behavior were coded offline. The coding procedure in
18 Cohort 2 was similar to the procedure reported in Holmboe et al. (2008). The trial was
19 considered invalid if the infant was not looking at the central stimulus at distractor onset. The
20 trial was also considered invalid if the infant blinked (i.e., the pupils were fully covered)
21 during distractor presentation. In addition, the trial was considered invalid if these behaviors
22 occurred during the 1000 ms following distractor presentation. This criterion was added
23 because in trials where the infant looks away immediately following distractor presentation, it
24 is impossible to know whether the infant *would have* looked to the distractor if they had not
25 looked away from the screen. On rare occasions, a trial was excluded because the infant's

1 eyes were out of view (e.g., if the infant's hand was in front of his or her eyes); such trials
2 were considered invalid if the eyes were out of view for more than 2 frames (80 ms) during
3 distractor presentation or within the 1000 ms following distractor presentation. Finally, trials
4 where a saccade to the distractor was initiated earlier than 3 frames (120 ms) after distractor
5 onset were also considered invalid; such saccades were most likely anticipatory or random.
6 Inter-coder reliability in Cohort 2 was satisfactory for both looking behavior ($\kappa = .94$) and
7 trial validity ($\kappa = .86$), based on data from 10 participants. (Inter-coder reliability in Cohort 1
8 was similar; see Holmboe et al., 2008.)

9 *Collection of buccal swabs and DNA extraction*

10 Buccal (cheek) swabs were collected at 3.5 years of age in Cohort 1 as part of a follow-
11 up study, and at 4 months in Cohort 2. The buccal swab was collected by the parent in the lab
12 (by rubbing the cotton bud on the inside of the child's cheeks for approximately 5-10
13 seconds), and then put in a sample tube by the experimenter. Two swabs per DNA sample
14 tube were collected, and two independent samples per infant were shipped and isolated
15 separately using a DNA-purification kit obtained from Gentra (Minneapolis, US), yielding
16 total of 2-10 μg DNA per sample.

17 *Genotyping*

18 Genotyping procedures were carried out using published protocols (*DRD2* TaqIA:
19 Grandy, Zhang, & Civelli, 1993; *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR: Ronai et al., 2000; *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met:
20 Tarnok et al., 2007; *DAT1* 3' VNTR: Vandenberg et al., 1992). Both DNA samples from
21 each infant were genotyped for all the investigated polymorphisms. In order to ensure
22 successful genotyping, the following precautions were taken: In case of unsuccessful
23 amplification (~10%) at the *DRD4* and *DAT1* VNTR genotyping, the PCR reaction was
24 repeated, hence the genotyping success rate was 100%. In addition, independent

1 amplification reactions were carried out for 50% of the samples at the DRD4 VNTR, because
2 of the problematic amplification of the longer alleles (Ronai et al., 2000), this quality
3 checkup yielded the same genotypes as the ones originally obtained. At the DRD2 TaqI
4 restriction enzyme digestion genotyping was repeated in case of unsuccessful amplification
5 (~5%) or non-identical results for the two samples (~8%). The *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met SNP
6 (rs4680) was also genotyped by an alternative method using a pre-designed TaqMan kit
7 (C_25746809_50, Applied BioSystem, Foster City, USA) on a 7300 Real-Time PCR System;
8 the genotypes were in accordance with the original ones.

9 *Data analyses*

10 Behavioral data were analyzed using repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA).
11 For the genotype analyses, data were analyzed using a Linear Mixed Model analysis (LMM)
12 assuming a diagonal covariance structure. Phase and Trial Type were entered as repeated
13 measures and proportion of looks to the distractors was entered as the dependent measure.
14 The advantage of LMM is that data from participants with missing data points, in this case
15 missing data from one or more phases of the experiment, can be included in the analysis
16 (Garson, 2008). Missing data points are inevitable in infant studies, and, given the fact that
17 the genotype effects we were interested in were likely to be modest in magnitude, we wished
18 to include as much of the data in the analyses as possible.

19 Due to the risk of population stratification in ethnically mixed samples (Hutchison,
20 Stallings, McGeary, & Bryan, 2004), genotype analyses were carried out on both the entire
21 sample and on the subsample of infants of Caucasian ethnic origin. Significant main effects
22 and interactions were followed up by posthoc tests and checked against a False Discovery
23 Rate (FDR) adjusted *p*-value based on the total number of posthoc tests carried out across all
24 genotype analyses in both the total sample and the Caucasian subsample (33 posthoc tests in
25 total). The FDR was controlled at $p < .05$ using the method described by Benjamini et al.

1 (2001). Only posthoc comparisons that remained significant after controlling the FDR are
2 reported.

3 The Hardy-Weinberg (HW) equilibrium test was calculated using Knud Christensen's
4 program (Christensen, 1999); for the *DATI* 3' VNTR the three common genotypes from two
5 frequent alleles (9- and 10-repeat) were included in the analysis, and for the *DRD4* 48-bp
6 VNTR, genotypes from 4 common alleles (2-, 3-, 4-, 7-repeat) were analyzed. For the *COMT*
7 Val¹⁵⁸Met and *DRD2* TaqIA polymorphisms there were only 3 genotypes, and therefore all
8 infants could be included in the HW test.

9 In the analyses investigating potential genotype effects on Freeze-Frame performance,
10 the most frequent 10/10 genotype of the *DATI* 3' VNTR was compared to all other genotypes
11 (9/9, 9/10 and other types of heterozygotes, i.e., 3/10, 7/10, 10/11). The latter group is
12 referred to as the non-10/10 group. Genotype grouping for the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR
13 polymorphism was based on the presence or absence of the 7-repeat allele (the 7+ group and
14 the 7- group, respectively). One infant with the genotype 4/8 was included in the 7+ group.

15 Results

16 *Genotype and allele distribution*

17 Genotype data were available for 19 out of the 24 infants in Cohort 1. Seventeen of these
18 infants were of Caucasian ethnic origin. In Cohort 2 genotype data were available for all 94
19 infants (71 Caucasian) tested at 9 months of age. When the two cohorts were pooled,
20 genotype data were available for 113 infants (88 Caucasian). One hundred and two of these
21 infants calibrated in the task (see below) and could be included in the analyses. Genotype
22 frequencies for each of the four polymorphisms are presented in Table 1, and allele
23 frequencies are presented in the Supplementary Table. Alleles and genotypes were in Hardy-
24 Weinberg equilibrium for all polymorphisms, with the exception of the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR

1 polymorphism in the total sample (see note to Table 1). When the Hardy-Weinberg analysis
 2 of the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR was restricted to the Caucasian subsample, the *p*-value increased
 3 to .45. In order to ensure a genetically homogenous population, every genetic analysis was
 4 carried out in the Caucasian subsample as well. Allele and genotype frequencies were
 5 generally in agreement with the frequencies reported for a mixed European population (see
 6 Introduction), and were very similar in the total sample and the Caucasian subsample.

7 *Freeze-Frame behavioral results*

8 One hundred and two infants out of the 113 infants with genotype data available
 9 calibrated in the Freeze-Frame task (79 in the Caucasian subsample), i.e. they looked to the
 10 distractor on two consecutive trials (6 infants did not calibrate, and 5 infants were incorrectly
 11 calibrated by the experimenter; these infants could not be included in the analyses). Distractor
 12 duration was on average calibrated in 5.53 trials ($SD = 8.13$, ranging from 2 to 64), and the
 13 mean calibrated distractor duration was 324 ms ($SD = 181$, ranging from 200 to 1200). The
 14 average proportion of valid trials was .82 ($SD = .10$). Infants in Cohort 2 had a slightly lower
 15 proportion of valid trials than infants in Cohort 1 (.81 vs. .90), probably due to the session
 16 being a few minutes longer in the former cohort, but the groups did not differ significantly in
 17 terms of calibration data (data not shown).

18 The proportion of looks to the distractors in each phase and trial type is presented in
 19 Table 2. Freeze-Frame results from Cohort 1 have been reported previously (Holmboe et al.,
 20 2008). In the previous study a repeated measures ANOVA indicated that there were
 21 significant main effects of Phase and Trial Type, but no interaction. Results were unchanged
 22 in the sample of infants from Cohort 1 for whom genotype data were available (data not
 23 shown). These results were also replicated in Cohort 2 (Trial Type: $F(1,68) = 79.29, p < .001$,
 24 $\eta_p^2 = .54$; Phase: $F(2,136) = 99.63, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .59$; Phase \times Trial Type: $F(2,136) = 0.63, p$

1 = .53), and in the total sample (Trial Type: $F(1,81) = 105.99, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .57$; Phase:
2 $F(2,162) = 117.42, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .59$; Phase \times Trial Type: $F(2,162) = 0.59, p = .55$). The
3 same significant effects were found when 4 phases were included in the ANOVA of data
4 from Cohort 2 (data not shown). These results indicate that there is a clear main effect of
5 Trial Type on looks to the distractors such that infants look less to the distractors in the
6 interesting trials than in the boring trials. Infants also show a decrease in looks to the
7 distractors during the test session, and this decrease is similar in the two trial types, i.e., no
8 interaction (Table 2).

9 For the genotype analyses we wished to combine the data from the two cohorts to
10 increase power. In order to combine all the available data, it was important to establish that
11 infants in the two cohorts performed the task in the same way. A few minor parameters of the
12 Freeze-Frame task differed between the two cohorts (see Methods). Therefore, the repeated
13 measures ANOVA was repeated with Cohort as a between-subjects factor. This analysis
14 clearly replicated the main effects and lack of interaction (data not shown). Importantly, there
15 was no significant main effect of, or interactions involving, Cohort (all $ps > .30$). Given this
16 lack of significant differences between the two cohorts, it was deemed appropriate to pool the
17 data for the genotype analyses.

18 In all of the genotype analyses reported below the main effects of Phase and Trial Type
19 remained highly significant with no interaction between Phase and Trial Type (data not
20 shown). Furthermore, none of the polymorphisms was associated with basic task parameters
21 such as the calibrated distractor duration or proportion of valid trials after controlling the
22 FDR.

23 *The COMT Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism and Freeze-Frame performance*

1 All 4 phases of the Freeze-Frame task were included in the LMM since this analysis
2 incorporates all available data. The LMM analysis indicated that there was a significant main
3 effect of *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype on the proportion of looks to the distractors,
4 $F(2,564.08) = 3.01, p < .050$. No interactions involving *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype reached
5 significance in the total sample (all $ps > .15$). When the analysis was restricted to Caucasian
6 infants this picture changed. The main effect of *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype was no longer
7 significant, $F(2,418.32) = 2.20, p = .112$, but the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype \times Trial Type
8 interaction was, $F(2,418.32) = 4.38, p = .013$, indicating that *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype
9 affected performance in the two trial types differentially. No other interactions approached
10 significance (all $ps > .70$).

11 Post hoc analyses on the main effect of *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype in the total sample
12 indicated that none of the differences between genotype groups survived the FDR correction.
13 Post hoc analyses of the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype \times Trial Type interaction observed in the
14 Caucasian subsample indicated a significant difference in looks to the distractors in
15 interesting trials both between the Met/Met and Val/Val group ($p < .0001$) and between the
16 Met/Met and Val/Met group ($p < .01$). No other posthoc comparisons reached significance
17 after controlling the FDR. The *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met genotype differences in the Caucasian
18 subsample are illustrated in Figure 1a.

19 *The DRD4 48-bp VNTR polymorphism and Freeze-Frame performance*

20 The LMM analysis of the effect of the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR on performance in the
21 Freeze-Frame task showed no significant effects involving Genotype in either the total or the
22 Caucasian subsample (all $ps > .15$). This indicates that, in the current sample, the 7+ group
23 did not differ from the 7- group in terms of Freeze-Frame performance at 9 months of age.

24 *The DRD2 TaqIA polymorphism and Freeze-Frame performance*

1 The LMM showed no significant effects involving *DRD2* TaqIA Genotype (all $ps > .70$).
 2 This result was unchanged when the analysis was restricted to Caucasian infants (all $ps >$
 3 $.20$). The *DRD2* TaqIA polymorphism did not therefore have any significant effect on
 4 Freeze-Frame performance in the present sample.

5 *The DAT1 3' VNTR polymorphism and Freeze-Frame performance*

6 The LMM analysis of the *DAT1* 3' VNTR showed a significant main effect of Genotype
 7 in the total sample, $F(1,569.52) = 3.98, p = .047$. No interactions reached significance (all ps
 8 $> .15$). When the analysis was restricted to Caucasian infants, the main effect of *DAT1* 3'
 9 VNTR Genotype was only marginally significant, $F(1,427.74) = 2.92, p = .088$. There was
 10 also a marginally significant *DAT1* 3' VNTR Genotype \times Phase interaction, $F(3,191.66) =$
 11 $2.34, p = .075$. The main effect of *DAT1* 3' VNTR Genotype in the total sample was due to
 12 the 10/10 group looking less to the distractors overall than the non-10/10 group. This
 13 difference is illustrated in Figure 1b. No posthoc analyses were carried out since only the
 14 main effect of *DAT1* 3' VNTR Genotype was significant.

15 *Analysis of the combined effect of the COMT Val¹⁵⁸Met and DAT1 3' VNTR polymorphisms* 16 *on Freeze-Frame performance*

17 The genotype distribution of the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met and *DAT1* 3' VNTR, with genotype \times
 18 genotype group sizes between 9 and 26 participants (see legend to Figure 1), allowed us to
 19 investigate the potential interaction between these two polymorphisms. (Genotype
 20 frequencies for the other polymorphisms investigated in the study resulted in group sizes that
 21 were too small to investigate interactions, with n for minor genotype \times genotype groups being
 22 less than 5.) An LMM where both *DAT1* 3' VNTR Genotype and *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met
 23 Genotype were entered as independent variables showed a significant main effect of *COMT*
 24 Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype, $F(2,528.98) = 3.41, p = .034$, and a marginally significant effect of

1 *DATI* 3' VNTR Genotype, $F(1,529.47) = 3.30, p = .070$. In addition to these main effects,
 2 there was a significant *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype \times Trial Type interaction, $F(2,528.98) =$
 3 3.19, $p = .042$, and a significant *DATI* 3' VNTR Genotype \times *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype \times
 4 Trial Type interaction, $F(2,528.98) = 4.09, p = .017$. The *DATI* 3' VNTR Genotype \times Phase
 5 interaction approached significance, $F(3,240.18) = 2.24, p = .084$, as did the *DATI* 3' VNTR
 6 Genotype \times *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype \times Phase interaction, $F(6,241.10) = 1.91, p = .079$.
 7 No other interactions approached significance in the total sample (all $ps > .35$).

8 In the Caucasian subsample alone the results were slightly different. The main effect of
 9 *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype was marginally significant, $F(2,373.00) = 2.82, p = .061$. The
 10 same was the case for the *DATI* 3' VNTR Genotype, $F(1,374.07) = 3.82, p = .051$. Again, the
 11 *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype \times Trial Type interaction was significant, $F(2,373.00) = 4.13, p =$
 12 $.017$. Finally, the *DATI* 3' VNTR Genotype \times Phase interaction was significant in the
 13 Caucasian subsample, $F(3,170.63) = 2.98, p = .033$. No other interactions reached
 14 significance in the Caucasian subsample (all $ps > .20$).

15 Post hoc analyses were restricted to the novel interaction effects involving *COMT*
 16 Val¹⁵⁸Met and *DATI* 3' VNTR because all significant and near-significant main effects were
 17 qualified by a significant interaction, and because other interactions, such as the *COMT*
 18 Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype \times Trial Type interaction, essentially indicated the same genotype effects
 19 as the analyses of the two polymorphisms separately. Posthoc analyses of the *DATI* 3' VNTR
 20 Genotype \times *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype \times Trial Type interaction in the total sample indicated
 21 that within the *DATI* non-10/10 group there was a significant difference in looks to the
 22 distractors in the interesting trials between the Met/Met and Val/Val groups ($p < .001$) and
 23 between the Met/Met and Val/Met groups ($p = .001$). In contrast, no *COMT* genotype
 24 differences reached significance in the *DATI* 10/10 group after controlling the FDR. This
 25 pattern of results is illustrated in Figure 1c. Regarding performance in each *COMT* genotype

1 group across *DATI* genotypes, infants with the Val/Met genotype who also had the *DATI*
2 10/10 genotype looked significantly less to the distractors in the interesting trials than infants
3 with the Val/Met genotype in the *DATI* non-10/10 group ($p < .01$). The other *COMT*
4 genotype groups did not differ significantly across *DATI* genotype groups in the interesting
5 trials (Figure 1c). None of the posthoc tests of the *DATI* 3' VNTR Genotype \times *COMT*
6 Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype \times Trial Type interaction showed significant effects in the boring trials
7 after controlling the FDR.

8 Posthoc analyses indicated that the *DATI* 3' VNTR Genotype \times Phase interaction found
9 in the Caucasian subsample was due to a highly significant difference in proportion of looks
10 to the distractors between the 10/10 group and the non-10/10 group in Phase 3 of the Freeze-
11 Frame session ($p < .001$).

12 Discussion

13 The present study investigated whether performance in a novel task developed to assess
14 frontal cortex functioning in infancy, the Freeze-Frame task (Holmboe et al., 2008), was
15 associated with common polymorphisms in four dopamine system genes. Previous research
16 has clearly shown that dopamine plays an important role in the frontal cortex (Brozoski et al.,
17 1979; Collins et al., 1998; Diamond et al., 1997; Goldman-Rakic et al., 2000; Roberts et al.,
18 1994; Sawaguchi & Goldman-Rakic, 1991; Vijayraghavan et al., 2007).

19 Behaviorally, we replicated previous findings on the Freeze-Frame task (Holmboe et al.,
20 2008). In relation to the polymorphisms likely to impact directly on frontal cortex function,
21 we found a significant association between Freeze-Frame performance and the *COMT*
22 Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism. Given the extensive evidence for an association between the
23 *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism and performance on a range of frontal cortex tasks
24 (Diamond et al., 2004; Diaz-Asper et al., 2008; Egan et al., 2001; Mattay et al., 2003;
25 Sheldrick et al., 2008; Stefanis et al., 2005; see also Papaleo et al., 2008), as well as effects

1 on neural efficiency in the frontal cortex during performance of these tasks (Bertolino et al.,
2 2006; Blasi et al., 2005; Caldú et al., 2007; Egan et al., 2001; Krämer et al., 2007; Mattay et
3 al., 2003; Meyer-Lindenberg et al., 2006), it seems likely that *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met genotype
4 affects dopamine levels in the frontal cortex and thereby Freeze-Frame task performance in
5 our infant sample.

6 Furthermore, it is worth noting that this effect was specific to the interesting trials, at
7 least in the Caucasian subsample (Figure 1a). This suggests that the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met effect
8 is not a general effect impacting on infants' distractibility level in any given situation. Rather,
9 it seems to be the case that infants with the low-enzyme activity Met/Met genotype became
10 particularly focused on the central stimulus compared to the high-enzyme activity Val/Val
11 genotype when this stimulus was engaging. However, it should be noted that the interaction
12 with trial type was significant in the Caucasian subsample only and therefore might not
13 generalize to other populations.

14 We found little evidence that the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR polymorphism affects performance
15 on the Freeze-Frame task at 9 months of age, though the sample was too small to detect
16 subtle effects. In terms of the polymorphisms which are likely to act in the striatum, we did
17 not observe any effect of the *DRD2* TaqIA either. We did however observe an effect of the
18 *DATI* 3' VNTR polymorphism. In contrast to the effect of the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met
19 polymorphism, this effect did not appear to be specific to a particular trial type. Instead, we
20 found evidence of an overall difference in the proportion of looks to the distractors with the
21 10/10 group looking less to the distractors than the non-10/10 group (Figure 1b). The results
22 therefore suggest that the *DATI* 3' VNTR polymorphism modulates overall distractibility in
23 the Freeze-Frame task, though there was a tendency for this genotype effect to be stronger at
24 the end of the test session. Given the fact that the dopamine transporter plays an important
25 role in the striatum (Hurd & Hall, 2005; Karoum et al., 1994), this effect could be due to

1 modulation of general attentional mechanisms mediated by the subcortical dopamine system
2 or frontal-subcortical connections (Alexander et al., 1986; Cummings, 1993).

3 Finally, we investigated the potential interaction between the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met and
4 *DATI* 3' VNTR polymorphisms on Freeze-Frame performance. The results of these analyses
5 broadly replicated the main effects and interactions found in the analysis of each
6 polymorphism separately. However, the analyses also revealed a significant *DATI* 3' VNTR
7 Genotype × *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met Genotype × Trial Type interaction, suggesting that the *DATI*
8 3' VNTR polymorphism modulated the effect of the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism on
9 Freeze-Frame performance. Basically, the effect of the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism on
10 the proportion of looks to the distractors in the interesting trials was strong in the *DATI* non-
11 10/10 group, with particularly large differences between the Met/Met group and the two other
12 genotype groups (Figure 1c, right panel). In contrast, the equivalent effect in the *DATI* 10/10
13 group virtually disappeared (Figure 1c, left panel).

14 Presuming that a lower level of distractibility in the interesting trials is an expression of a
15 higher degree of selective inhibition, these results suggest that infants with the higher *COMT*
16 enzyme activity alleles (Val/Val and Val/Met) actually benefit from having the *DATI* 10/10
17 genotype, whereas this is not the case for infants with the low-activity enzyme (Met/Met).
18 This was confirmed at least for the Val/Met genotype; this genotype showed a significant
19 reduction in looks to the distractors in the interesting trials when combined with the 10/10
20 genotype rather than with the non-10/10 genotype (Figure 1c). Though preliminary given the
21 sample size, these findings are particularly interesting because they suggest that the
22 interaction between a predominantly frontal dopaminergic polymorphism (*COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met)
23 and a predominantly striatal dopaminergic polymorphism (*DATI* 3' VNTR) results in large
24 performance differences on the Freeze-Frame task already at 9 months.

1 It should be mentioned that it would have been ideal to investigate all possible
2 interactions between the four polymorphisms in the study. However, only the *COMT*
3 Val¹⁵⁸Met and the *DATI* 3' VNTR polymorphisms had genotype frequencies providing
4 enough power to investigate interaction effects (see Methods). For the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR
5 and the *DRD2* TaqIA polymorphisms the genotype frequencies involving the minor allele
6 were too low to test meaningful interactions. Future studies should address the question of
7 interactions between all four (and additional) polymorphisms in dopamine system genes in a
8 larger infant cohort.

9 Despite the likely effect of both frontal and subcortical mechanisms in the reported
10 results, it is not possible to establish the exact neural substrate of this interaction from the
11 current data. Previous studies have found additive genetic effects of the *DATI* 3' VNTR and
12 *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphisms on neural efficiency in the frontal cortex (Bertolino et al.,
13 2006; Caldú et al., 2007). However, an interaction between the two polymorphisms has not
14 previously been reported (though see Prata et al., 2009, for a recent study which found an
15 epistatic effect in the parietal cortex). Further research using neuroimaging data will help
16 elucidate the potential role of the frontal cortex and the striatum in these genotype effects.

17 The current study constitutes a snapshot in time at 9 months of age. Future studies over a
18 wider age range may help elucidate which patterns of Freeze-Frame performance are adaptive
19 throughout infancy and early childhood, and how these patterns relate to polymorphisms in
20 dopamine system genes. Some progress has already been made towards this at the behavioral
21 level in the work by Holmboe and colleagues (2008) where performance indices on early
22 frontal cortex tasks showed both positive and negative associations with later performance.
23 Nevertheless, an important conclusion to be drawn from the results of the present study is that
24 polymorphisms in dopamine system genes play an important role already in infancy. Previous
25 studies have found effects of the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR on temperament and relatively broad

1 aspects of attention in infancy (Auerbach et al., 1999; Auerbach, Benjamin, Faroy, Geller, &
2 Ebstein, 2001; Auerbach, Faroy, Ebstein, Kahana, & Levine, 2001; Ebstein et al., 1998;
3 Laucht et al., 2006; Sheese et al., 2007). The current study adds to this evidence by showing
4 that the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism, which is thought to play an important role
5 specifically in the frontal cortex, affects performance on a simple saccadic inhibition task in
6 infancy.

7 In conclusion, the results of the present study further validate the Freeze-Frame task, and
8 demonstrate that variation in dopamine neurotransmission in the frontal cortex and associated
9 subcortical structures can have an impact on infant attention already at 9 months of age. The
10 exact neural substrate and developmental course of these genotypic differences is a fruitful
11 area for future research. This research holds the promise of deepening our understanding of
12 the genetic underpinnings of individual differences in the important functions mediated by
13 the frontal cortex from an early age.

14

15

References

- 1
2 Alexander, G. E., DeLong, M. R., & Strick, P. L. (1986). Parallel organization of functionally
3 segregated circuits linking basal ganglia and cortex. *Annual Reviews in Neuroscience*,
4 9, 357-381.
- 5 Auerbach, J., Geller, V., Lezer, S., Shinwell, E., Belmaker, R. H., Levine, J., et al. (1999).
6 Dopamine D4 receptor (D4DR) and serotonin transporter promoter (5-HTTLPR)
7 polymorphisms in the determination of temperament in 2-month-old infants.
8 *Molecular Psychiatry*, 4, 369-373.
- 9 Auerbach, J. G., Benjamin, J., Faroy, M., Geller, V., & Ebstein, R. (2001). DRD4 related to
10 infant attention and information processing: A developmental link to ADHD?
11 *Psychiatric Genetics*, 11(1), 31-35.
- 12 Auerbach, J. G., Faroy, M., Ebstein, R., Kahana, M., & Levine, J. (2001). The association of
13 the dopamine D4 receptor gene (DRD4) and the serotonin transporter promoter gene
14 (5-HTTLPR) with temperament in 12-month-old infants. *The Journal of Child*
15 *Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 42(6), 777-783.
- 16 Baird, A. A., Kagan, J., Gaudette, T., Walz, K. A., Hershlag, N., & Boas, D. A. (2002).
17 Frontal lobe activation during object permanence: Data from near-infrared
18 spectroscopy. *NeuroImage*, 16, 120-126.
- 19 Barnett, J. H., Jones, P. B., Robbins, T. W., & Müller, U. (2007). Effects of the catechol-*O*-
20 methyltransferase Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism on executive function: a meta-analysis of
21 the Wisconsin Card Sort Test in schizophrenia and healthy controls. *Molecular*
22 *Psychiatry*, 12(5), 502-509.
- 23 Barnett, J. H., Scoriels, L., & Munafò, M. R. (2008). Meta-analysis of the cognitive effects of
24 the catechol-*O*-methyltransferase gene Val158/108Met polymorphism. *Biological*
25 *Psychiatry*, 64(2), 137-144.

- 1 Bell, M. A. (2001). Brain electrical activity associated with cognitive processing during a
2 looking version of the A-not-B task. *Infancy*, 2(3), 311-330.
- 3 Bell, M. A., & Fox, N. A. (1992). The relations between frontal brain electrical activity and
4 cognitive development during infancy. *Child Development*, 63, 1142-1163.
- 5 Bell, M. A., & Fox, N. A. (1997). Individual differences in object permanence at 8 months:
6 Locomotor experience and brain electrical activity. *Developmental Psychobiology*,
7 31, 287-297.
- 8 Benjamini, Y., Drai, D., Elmer, G., Kafkafi, N., & Golani, I. (2001). Controlling the false
9 discovery rate in behavior genetics research. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 125(1-2),
10 279-284.
- 11 Bertolino, A., Blasi, G., Latorre, V., Rubino, V., Rampino, A., Sinibaldi, L., et al. (2006).
12 Additive effects of genetic variation in dopamine regulating genes on working
13 memory cortical activity in human brain. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 26(15), 3918-
14 3922.
- 15 Blasi, G., Mattay, V. S., Bertolino, A., Elvevåg, B., Callicott, J. H., Das, S., et al. (2005).
16 Effect of catechol-O-methyltransferase val158met genotype on attentional control.
17 *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 25(20), 5038-5045.
- 18 Brozoski, T. J., Brown, R. M., Rosvold, H. E., & Goldman, P. S. (1979). Cognitive deficit
19 caused by regional depletion of dopamine in prefrontal cortex of rhesus monkey.
20 *Science*, 205(4409), 929-932.
- 21 Caldú, X., Vendrell, P., Bartrés-Faz, D., Clemente, I., Bargalló, N., Jurado, M., et al. (2007).
22 Impact of the COMT Val^{108/158} Met and DAT genotypes on prefrontal function in
23 healthy subjects. *NeuroImage*, 37, 1437-1444.

- 1 Chang, F. M., Kidd, J. R., Livak, K. J., Pakstis, A. J., & Kidd, K. K. (1996). The world-wide
2 distribution of allele frequencies at the human dopamine D4 receptor locus. *Human*
3 *Genetics, 98*, 91-101.
- 4 Chen, J., Lipska, B. K., Halim, N., Ma, Q. D., Matsumoto, M., Melhem, S., et al. (2004).
5 Functional analysis of genetic variation in Catechol-O-Methyltransferase (COMT):
6 Effects on mRNA, protein, and enzyme activity in postmortem human brain.
7 *American Journal of Human Genetics, 75*, 807-821.
- 8 Christensen, K. (1999). Calculation of Chi-square test for deviation from Hardy-Weinberg
9 equilibrium. Retrieved 19/05/09, from
10 http://www.kursus.kvl.dk/shares/vetgen/_Popgen/genetik/applets/kitest.htm
- 11 Chugani, H. T., & Phelps, M. E. (1986). Maturation changes in cerebral function in infants
12 determined by ¹⁸FDG positron emission tomography. *Science, 231*, 840-843.
- 13 Chugani, H. T., Phelps, M. E., & Mazziotta, J. C. (1987). Positron emission tomography
14 study of human brain functional development. *Annals of Neurology, 22*(4), 487-497.
- 15 Collins, P., Roberts, A. C., Dias, R., Everitt, B. J., & Robbins, T. W. (1998). Perseveration
16 and strategy in a novel spatial self-ordered sequencing task for nonhuman primates:
17 Effects of excitotoxic lesions and dopamine depletions of the prefrontal cortex.
18 *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 10*(3), 332-354.
- 19 Congdon, E., Lesch, K. P., & Canli, T. (2008). Analysis of DRD4 and DAT polymorphisms
20 and behavioral inhibition in healthy adults: Implications for impulsivity. *American*
21 *Journal of Medical Genetics Part B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics, 147B*, 27-32.
- 22 Cornish, K. M., Manly, T., Savage, R., Swanson, J., Morisano, D., Butler, N., et al. (2005).
23 Association of the dopamine transporter (DAT1) 10/10-repeat genotype with ADHD
24 symptoms and response inhibition in a general population sample. *Molecular*
25 *Psychiatry, 10*, 686-698.

- 1 Cummings, J. L. (1993). Frontal-subcortical circuits and human behavior. *Archives of*
2 *Neurology*, 50(8), 873-880.
- 3 Cummings, J. L., & Miller, B. L. (2007). Conceptual and clinical aspects of the frontal lobes.
4 In B. L. Miller & J. L. Cummings (Eds.), *The Human Frontal Lobes: Functions and*
5 *Disorders* (2nd ed., pp. 12-21). New York: The Guilford Press.
- 6 Dehaene-Lambertz, G., Dehaene, S., & Hertz-Pannier, L. (2002). Functional neuroimaging of
7 speech perception in infants. *Science*, 298(5600), 2013-2015.
- 8 Di Martino, A., Scheres, A., Margulies, D. S., Kelly, A. M. C., Uddin, L. Q., Shehzad, Z., et
9 al. (2008). Functional connectivity of human striatum: A resting state fMRI study.
10 *Cerebral Cortex*.
- 11 Diamond, A. (1985). Development of the ability to use recall to guide action, as indicated by
12 infants' performance on AB. *Child Development*, 56, 868-883.
- 13 Diamond, A., Briand, L., Fossella, J., & Gehlbach, L. (2004). Genetic and Neurochemical
14 Modulation of Prefrontal Cognitive Functions in Children. *American Journal of*
15 *Psychiatry*, 161(1), 125-132.
- 16 Diamond, A., & Goldman-Rakic, P. S. (1989). Comparison of human infants and rhesus
17 monkeys on Piaget's A-not-B task: Evidence for dependence on dorsolateral
18 prefrontal cortex. *Experimental Brain Research*, 74, 24-40.
- 19 Diamond, A., Prevor, M. B., Callender, G., & Druin, D. P. (1997). Prefrontal cortex cognitive
20 deficits in children treated early and continuously for PKU. *Monographs of the*
21 *Society for Research in Child Development*, 62(4).
- 22 Diamond, A., Zola-Morgan, S., & Squire, L. (1989). Successful performance by monkeys
23 with lesions of the hippocampal formation on AB and object retrieval, two tasks that
24 mark developmental changes in human infants. *Behavioural Neuroscience*, 103(3),
25 526-537.

- 1 Diaz-Asper, C. M., Goldberg, T. E., Kolachana, B. S., Straub, R. E., Egan, M. F., &
2 Weinberger, D. R. (2008). Genetic variation in catechol-O-methyltransferase: Effects
3 on working memory in schizophrenic patients, their siblings, and healthy controls.
4 *Biological Psychiatry*, 63(1), 72-79.
- 5 Divac, I., Rosvold, H. E., & Szwarcbart, M. K. (1967). Behavioral effects of selective
6 ablation of the caudate nucleus. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological*
7 *Psychology*, 63(2), 184-190.
- 8 Durston, S., Fossella, J. A., Casey, B. J., Pol, H. E. H., Galvan, A., Schnack, H. G., et al.
9 (2005). Differential effects of DRD4 and DAT1 genotype on fronto-striatal gray
10 matter volumes in a sample of subjects with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder,
11 their unaffected siblings, and controls. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 10, 678-685.
- 12 Ebstein, R. P., Levine, J., Geller, V., Auerbach, J., Gritsenko, I., & Belmaker, R. H. (1998).
13 Dopamine D4 receptor and serotonin transporter promoter in the determination of
14 neonatal temperament. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 3, 238-246.
- 15 Egan, M. F., Goldberg, T. E., Kolachana, B. S., Callicott, J. H., Mazzanti, C. M., Straub, R.
16 E., et al. (2001). Effect of Val^{108/158} Met genotype on frontal lobe function and risk for
17 schizophrenia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, 98(12),
18 6917-6922.
- 19 Eisenberg, D. T. A., MacKillop, J., Modi, M., Beauchemin, J., Dang, D., Lisman, S. A., et al.
20 (2007). Examining impulsivity as an endophenotype using a behavioral approach: A
21 DRD2 TaqI A and DRD4 48-bp VNTR association study [Electronic Version].
22 *Behavioral and Brain Functions*, 3, from
23 <http://www.behavioralandbrainfunctions.com/content/3/1/2>

- 1 Faraone, S. V., Perlis, R. H., Doyle, A. E., Smoller, J. W., Goralnick, J. J., Holmgren, M. A.,
2 et al. (2005). Molecular genetics of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder.
3 *Biological Psychiatry*, 57, 1313-1323.
- 4 Forbes, E. E., Brown, S. M., Kimak, M., Ferrell, R. E., Manuck, S. B., & Hariri, A. R.
5 (2007). Genetic variation in components of dopamine neurotransmission impacts
6 ventral striatal reactivity associated with impulsivity. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 14(1),
7 60-70.
- 8 Franceschini, M. A., Thaker, S., Themelis, G., Krishnamoorthy, K. K., Bortfeld, H.,
9 Diamond, S. G., et al. (2007). Assessment of infant brain development with
10 frequency-domain near-infrared spectroscopy. *Pediatric Research*, 61(5), 546-551.
- 11 Fuster, J. M. (1997). *The Prefrontal Cortex: Anatomy, Physiology, and Neuropsychology of*
12 *the Frontal Lobe* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott-Raven.
- 13 Garson, G. D. (2008). Linear mixed models: Random effects, hierarchical linear, multilevel,
14 random coefficients, and repeated measures models *Statnotes: Topics in Multivariate*
15 *Analysis* Retrieved 15/04/2008, from
16 <http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/statnote.htm>
- 17 Gazzaley, A., & D'Esposito, M. (2007). Unifying prefrontal cortex function: Executive
18 control, neural networks, and top-down modulation. In B. L. Miller & J. L. Cummings
19 (Eds.), *The Human Frontal Lobes: Functions and Disorders* (2nd ed., pp. 187-206).
20 New York: The Guilford Press.
- 21 Gerardi-Caulton, G. (2000). Sensitivity to spatial conflict and development of self-regulation
22 in children 24-36 months of age. *Developmental Science*, 3:4, 397-404.
- 23 Glantz, L. A., Gilmore, J. H., Hamer, R. M., Lieberman, J. A., & Jarskog, L. F. (2007).
24 Synaptophysin and postsynaptic density protein 95 in the human prefrontal cortex
25 from mid-gestation into early adulthood. *Neuroscience*, 149, 582-591.

- 1 Gogos, J. A., Morgan, M., Luine, V., Santha, M., Ogawa, S., Pfaff, D., et al. (1998).
2 Catechol-*O*-methyltransferase-deficient mice exhibit sexually dimorphic changes in
3 catecholamine levels and behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
4 *of the USA*, 95(17), 9991-9996.
- 5 Goldman-Rakic, P. S., Muly, E. C., III, & Williams, G. V. (2000). D₁ receptors in prefrontal
6 cells and circuits. *Brain Research Reviews*, 31, 295-301.
- 7 Grandy, D. K., Zhang, Y., & Civelli, O. (1993). PCR detection of the TaqA RFLP at the
8 DRD2 locus. *Human Molecular Genetics*, 2(12), 2197.
- 9 Holmboe, K., Fearon, R. M. P., Csibra, G., Tucker, L. A., & Johnson, M. H. (2008). Freeze-
10 Frame: A new infant inhibition task and its relation to frontal cortex tasks during
11 infancy and early childhood. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 100(2), 89-
12 114.
- 13 Homae, F., Watanabe, H., Nakano, T., & Taga, G. (2007). Prosodic processing in the
14 developing brain. *Neuroscience Research*, 59, 29-39.
- 15 Hurd, Y. L., & Hall, H. (2005). Human forebrain dopamine systems: Characterization of the
16 normal brain and in relation to psychiatric disorders. In S. B. Dunnett, M.
17 Bentivoglio, A. Björklund & T. Hökfelt (Eds.), *Handbook of Chemical*
18 *Neuroanatomy: Dopamine* (pp. 525-571). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- 19 Hutchison, K. E., Stallings, M., McGeary, J., & Bryan, A. (2004). Population stratification in
20 the candidate gene study: Fatal threat or red herring? *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(1),
21 66-79.
- 22 Huttenlocher, P. R. (1990). Morphometric study of human cerebral cortex development.
23 *Neuropsychologia*, 28(6), 517-527.

- 1 Ito, H., Okubo, Y., Halldin, C., & Farde, L. (1999). Mapping of central D2 dopamine
2 receptors in man using [¹¹C]raclopride: PET with anatomic standardization
3 technique. *NeuroImage*, 9(2), 235-242.
- 4 Jönsson, E. G., Nöthen, M. M., Grünhage, F., Farde, L., Nakashima, Y., Propping, P., et al.
5 (1999). Polymorphisms in the dopamine D2 receptor gene and their relationships to
6 striatal dopamine receptor density of healthy volunteers. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 4,
7 290-296.
- 8 Kang, A. M., Palmatier, M. A., & Kidd, K. K. (1999). Global variation of a 40-bp VNTR in
9 the 3'-untranslated region of the dopamine transporter gene (SLC6A3). *Biological*
10 *Psychiatry*, 46(2), 151-160.
- 11 Karoum, F., Chrapusta, S. J., & Egan, M. F. (1994). 3-Methoxytyramine is the major
12 metabolite of released dopamine in the rat frontal cortex: Reassessment of the effects
13 of antipsychotics on the dynamics of dopamine release and metabolism in the frontal
14 cortex, nucleus accumbens, and striatum by a simple two pool model. *Journal of*
15 *Neurochemistry*, 63(3), 972-979.
- 16 Krämer, U. M., Cunillera, T., Càmarà, E., Marco-Pallarés, J., Cucurell, D., Nager, W., et al.
17 (2007). The impact of catechol-O-methyltransferase and dopamine D4 receptor
18 genotypes on neurophysiological markers of performance monitoring. *The Journal of*
19 *Neuroscience*, 27(51), 14190-14198.
- 20 Lachman, H. M., Papolos, D. F., Saito, T., Yu, Y. M., Szumlanski, C. L., & Weinshilboum,
21 R. M. (1996). Human catechol-O-methyltransferase pharmacogenetics: Description of
22 a functional polymorphism and its potential application to neuropsychiatric disorders.
23 *Pharmacogenetics*, 6(3), 243-250.

- 1 Laucht, M., Becker, K., & Schmidt, M. H. (2006). Visual exploratory behaviour in infancy
2 and novelty seeking in adolescence: Two developmentally specific phenotypes of
3 DRD4? *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *47*(11), 1143-1151.
- 4 Li, D., Sham, P. C., Owen, M. J., & He, L. (2006). Meta-analysis shows significant
5 association between dopamine system genes and attention deficit hyperactivity
6 disorder (ADHD). *Human Molecular Genetics*, *15*(14), 2276-2284.
- 7 Lidow, M. S., Goldman-Rakic, P. S., Rakic, P., & Innis, R. B. (1989). Dopamine D2
8 receptors in the cerebral cortex: Distribution and pharmacological characterization
9 with [3H]raclopride. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
10 *States of America*, *86*(16), 6412-6416.
- 11 Lotta, T., Vidgren, J., Tilgmann, C., Ulmanen, I., Melén, K., Julkunen, I., et al. (1995).
12 Kinetics of human soluble and membrane-bound Catechol O-Methyltransferase: A
13 revised mechanism and description of the thermolabile variant of the enzyme.
14 *Biochemistry*, *34*, 4202-4210.
- 15 Männistö, P. T., & Kaakkola, S. (1999). Catechol-O-methyltransferase (COMT):
16 Biochemistry, molecular biology, pharmacology, and clinical efficacy of the new
17 selective COMT inhibitors. *Pharmacological Reviews*, *51*(4), 593-628.
- 18 Mattay, V. S., Goldberg, T. E., Fera, F., Hariri, A. R., Tessitore, A., Egan, M. F., et al.
19 (2003). Catechol O-methyltransferase *val*¹⁵⁸-*met* genotype and individual variation in
20 the brain response to amphetamine. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
21 *of the United States of America*, *100*(10), 6186-6191.
- 22 Meyer-Lindenberg, A., Nichols, T., Callicott, J. H., Ding, J., Kolachana, B., Buckholtz, J., et
23 al. (2006). Impact of complex genetic variation in *COMT* on human brain function.
24 *Molecular Psychiatry*, *11*(9), 867-877.

- 1 Mill, J., Asherson, P., Browes, C., D'Souza, U., & Craig, I. (2002). Expression of the
2 dopamine transporter gene is regulated by the 3' UTR VNTR: Evidence from brain
3 and lymphocytes using quantitative RT-PCR. *American Journal of Medical Genetics*,
4 *114*(8), 975-979.
- 5 Munafò, M. R., Matheson, I. J., & Flint, J. (2007). Association of the DRD2 gene Taq1A
6 polymorphism and alcoholism: A meta-analysis of case-control studies and evidence
7 of publication bias. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *12*, 454-461.
- 8 Nakano, T., Watanabe, H., Homae, F., & Taga, G. (2008). Prefrontal cortical involvement in
9 young infants' analysis of novelty. *Cerebral Cortex*.
- 10 NationMaster.com. (2009). Currency Statistics > Official exchange rate > LCU per US\$,
11 period average (2006) by country Retrieved 24/08/2009, from
12 [http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/cur_off_exc_rat_lcu_per_us_per_ave-lcu-per-us-](http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/cur_off_exc_rat_lcu_per_us_per_ave-lcu-per-us-period-average&date=2006)
13 [period-average&date=2006](http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/cur_off_exc_rat_lcu_per_us_per_ave-lcu-per-us-period-average&date=2006)
- 14 Neville, M. J., Johnstone, E. C., & Walton, R. T. (2004). Identification and characterization
15 of ANKK1: A novel kinase gene closely linked to DRD2 on chromosome band
16 11q23.1. *Human Mutation*, *23*(6), 540-545.
- 17 Nieoullon, A. (2002). Dopamine and the regulation of cognition and attention. *Progress in*
18 *Neurobiology*, *67*, 53-83.
- 19 Noble, E. P. (2000). Addiction and its reward process through polymorphisms of the D₂
20 dopamine receptor gene: A review. *European Psychiatry*, *15*, 79-89.
- 21 Oak, J. N., Oldenhof, J., & Van Tol, H. H. M. (2000). The dopamine D₄ receptor: One decade
22 of research. *European Journal of Pharmacology*, *405*, 303-327.
- 23 Palmatier, M. A., Kang, A. M., & Kidd, K. K. (1999). Global variation in the frequencies of
24 functionally different catechol-O-methyltransferase alleles. *Biological Psychiatry*,
25 *46*(4), 557-567.

- 1 Papaleo, F., Crawley, J. N., Song, J., Lipska, B. K., Pickel, J., Weinberger, D. R., et al.
2 (2008). Genetic dissection of the role of catechol-O-methyltransferase in cognition
3 and stress reactivity in mice. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 28(35), 8709-8723.
- 4 Piaget, J. (1954). *The Construction of Reality in the Child*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 5 Pohjalainen, T., Rinne, J. O., Nägren, K., Lehtikoinen, P., Anttila, K., Syvälahti, E. K. G., et
6 al. (1998). The A1 allele of the human D₂ dopamine receptor gene predicts low D₂
7 receptor availability in healthy volunteers. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 3, 256-260.
- 8 Reuter, M., Peters, K., Schroeter, K., Koebke, W., Lenardon, D., Bloch, B., et al. (2005). The
9 influence of the dopaminergic system on cognitive functioning: A molecular genetic
10 approach. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 164, 93-99.
- 11 Ritchie, T., & Noble, E. P. (2003). Association of seven polymorphisms of the D2 dopamine
12 receptor gene with brain receptor-binding characteristics. *Neurochemical Research*,
13 28(1), 73-82.
- 14 Roberts, A. C., De Salvia, M. A., Wilkinson, L. S., Collins, P., Muir, J. L., Everitt, B. J., et al.
15 (1994). 6-Hydroxydopamine lesions of the prefrontal cortex in monkeys enhance
16 performance on an analog of the Wisconsin Card Sort Test: Possible interactions with
17 subcortical dopamine. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 14(5), 2531-2544.
- 18 Ronai, Z., Guttman, A., Némóda, Z., Staub, M., Kalasz, H., & Sasvari-Szekely, M. (2000).
19 Rapid and sensitive genotyping of dopamine D4 receptor tandem repeats by
20 automated ultrathin-layer gel electrophoresis. *Electrophoresis*, 21(10), 2058-2061.
- 21 Rothbart, M. K., Ellis, L. K., Rueda, M. R., & Posner, M. I. (2003). Developing mechanisms
22 of temperamental effortful control. *Journal of Personality*, 71(6), 1113-1143.
- 23 Sawaguchi, T., & Goldman-Rakic, P. S. (1991). D1 dopamine receptors in prefrontal cortex:
24 Involvement in working memory. *Science*, 251(4996), 947-950.

- 1 Schoots, O., & Van Tol, H. H. M. (2003). The human dopamine D4 receptor repeat
2 sequences modulate expression. *The Pharmacogenomics Journal*, 3, 343-348.
- 3 Sesack, S. R., Hawrylak, V. A., Matus, C., Guido, M. A., & Levey, A. I. (1998). Dopamine
4 axon varicosities in the prelimbic division of the rat prefrontal cortex exhibit sparse
5 immunoreactivity for the dopamine transporter. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 18(7), 2697-
6 2708.
- 7 Sheese, B. E., Voelker, P. M., Rothbart, M. K., & Posner, M. I. (2007). Parenting quality
8 interacts with genetic variation in dopamine receptor D4 to influence temperament in
9 early childhood. *Development and Psychopathology*, 19(4), 1039-1046.
- 10 Sheldrick, A. J., Krug, A., Markov, V., Leube, D., Michel, T. M., Zerres, K., et al. (2008).
11 Effect of COMT val158met genotype on cognition and personality. *European*
12 *Psychiatry*, 23(6), 385-389.
- 13 Slifstein, M., Kolachana, B., Simpson, E. H., Tabares, P., Cheng, B., Duvall, M., et al.
14 (2008). COMT genotype predicts cortical-limbic D1 receptor availability measured
15 with [¹¹C]NNC112 and PET. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 13, 821-827.
- 16 Stefanis, N. C., van Os, J., Avramopoulos, D., Smyrnis, N., Evdokimidis, I., & Stefanis, C.
17 N. (2005). Effect of COMT Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism on the Continuous Performance
18 Test, Identical Pairs Version: tuning rather than improving performance. *American*
19 *Journal of Psychiatry*, 162, 1752-1754.
- 20 Stuss, D. T., Alexander, M. P., Hamer, L., Palumbo, C., Dempster, R., Binns, M., et al.
21 (1998). The effects of focal anterior and posterior brain lesions on verbal fluency.
22 *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 4(3), 265-278.
- 23 Tarnok, Z., Ronai, Z., Gervai, J., Kereszturi, E., Gadoros, J., Sasvari-Szekely, M., et al.
24 (2007). Dopaminergic candidate genes in Tourette syndrome: association between tic

- 1 severity and 3'UTR polymorphism of the dopamine transporter gene. *American*
2 *Journal of Medical Genetics B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics*, 144B(7), 900-905.
- 3 Thompson, J., Thomas, N., Singleton, A., Piggott, M., Lloyd, S., Perry, E. K., et al. (1997).
4 D2 dopamine receptor gene (DRD2) Taq1 A polymorphism: Reduced dopamine D2
5 receptor binding in the human striatum associated with the A1 allele.
6 *Pharmacogenetics*, 7(6), 479-484.
- 7 Tunbridge, E. M., Harrison, P. J., & Weinberger, D. R. (2006). Catechol-*o*-methyltransferase,
8 cognition, and psychosis: Val¹⁵⁸Met and beyond. *Biological Psychiatry*, 60, 141-151.
- 9 Tunbridge, E. M., Weickert, C. S., Kleinman, J. E., Herman, M. M., Chen, J., Kolachana, B.
10 S., et al. (2007). Catechol-*o*-methyltransferase enzyme activity and protein expression
11 in human prefrontal cortex across the postnatal lifespan. *Cerebral Cortex*, 17, 1206-
12 1212.
- 13 van de Giessen, E. M., de Win, M. M. L., Tanck, M. W. T., van den Brink, W., Baas, F., &
14 Booij, J. (2008). Striatal dopamine transporter availability associated with
15 polymorphisms in the dopamine transporter gene SLC6A3. *The Journal of Nuclear*
16 *Medicine*, 50(1), 45-52.
- 17 van Dyck, C. H., Malison, R. T., Jacobsen, L. K., Seibyl, J. P., Staley, J. K., Laruelle, M., et
18 al. (2005). Increased dopamine transporter availability associated with the 9-repeat
19 allele of the SLC6A3 gene. *The Journal of Nuclear Medicine*, 46(5), 745-751.
- 20 Vandenberg, D. J., Persico, A. M., Hawkins, A. L., Griffin, C. A., Li, X., Jabs, E. W., et al.
21 (1992). Human dopamine transporter gene (DAT1) maps to chromosome 5p15.3 and
22 displays a VNTR. *Genomics*, 14(4), 1104-1106.
- 23 Vijayraghavan, S., Wang, M., Birnbaum, S. G., Williams, G. V., & Arnsten, A. F. T. (2007).
24 Inverted-U dopamine D1 receptor actions on prefrontal neurons engaged in working
25 memory. *Nature Neuroscience*, 10(3), 376-384.

- 1 Wonodi, I., Hong, L. E., Stine, O. C., Mitchell, B. D., Elliott, A., Roberts, R. C., et al. (2009).
2 Dopamine transporter polymorphism modulates oculomotor function and DAT1
3 mRNA expression in schizophrenia. *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part B*,
4 *150B*(2), 282-289.
- 5 Yavich, L., Forsberg, M. M., Karayiorgou, M., Gogos, J. A., & Männistö, P. T. (2007). Site-
6 specific role of Catechol-*O*-Methyltransferase in dopamine overflow within prefrontal
7 cortex and dorsal striatum. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *27*(38), 10196-10202.
- 8 Yehene, E., Meiran, N., & Soroker, N. (2008). Basal ganglia play a unique role in task
9 switching within the frontal-subcortical circuits: Evidence from patients with focal
10 lesions. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *20*(6), 1079-1093.
- 11 Young, R. M., Lawford, B. R., Nutting, A., & Noble, E. P. (2004). Advances in molecular
12 genetics and the prevention and treatment of substance misuse: Implications of
13 association studies of the A1 allele of the D2 dopamine receptor gene. *Addictive*
14 *Behaviors*, *29*, 1275-1294.

15

16

17

18

1 Table 1.
 2 *Genotype frequencies in the total sample and the Caucasian subsample (percentages in*
 3 *brackets).*

<i>Polymorphism</i>	<i>Genotype</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Caucasian</i>	<i>Grouping</i>
<i>DRD4</i> 48-bp VNTR	2/3	2 (2.0)	2 (2.5)	7-
	2/4	10 (9.8)	9 (11.4)	7-
	2/7	8 (7.8)	4 (5.1)	7+
	3/4	8 (7.8)	6 (7.6)	7-
	3/7	2 (2.0)	2 (2.5)	7+
	4/4	48 (47.1)	36 (45.6)	7-
	4/5	2 (2.0)	0 (0.0)	7-
	4/7	21 (20.6)	19 (24.1)	7+
	4/8	1 (1.0)	1 (1.3)	7+
	7+	32 (31.4)	26 (32.9)	
<i>COMT</i> Val ¹⁵⁸ Met	Met/Met	28 (27.5)	19 (24.1)	Met/Met
	Val/Met	47 (46.1)	37 (46.8)	Val/Met
	Val/Val	27 (26.5)	23 (29.1)	Val/Val
<i>DRD2</i> Taq1A	A1/A1	4 (3.9)	4 (5.1)	A1+
	A1/A2	29 (28.4)	20 (25.3)	A1+
	A2/A2	69 (67.6)	55 (69.6)	A1-
	A1+	33 (32.4)	24 (30.4)	
<i>DATI</i> 3' VNTR	3/10	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	Non-10/10
	7/10	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	Non-10/10
	9/9	4 (3.9)	3 (3.8)	Non-10/10
	9/10	35 (34.3)	30 (38.0)	Non-10/10

	10/10	60 (58.8)	45 (57.0)	10/10
	10/11	1 (1.0)	1 (1.3)	Non-10/10
<hr/>				
	Non-10/10	42 (41.2)	34 (43.0)	
<hr/>				
Total <i>N</i>		102	79	
<hr/>				

1

2

Note. Only data from infants who calibrated in the Freeze-Frame task are included in the

3

table (data from infants who did not calibrate could not be used in the analyses). All

4

polymorphisms except the *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR polymorphism conformed to Hardy-

5

Weinberg equilibrium: *DRD4* 48-bp VNTR: $\chi^2 = 12.95$, $df = 6$, $p = .044$ (all participants); χ^2

6

$= 5.80$, $df = 6$, $p = .45$ (Caucasians only). *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met: $\chi^2 = 0.63$, $df = 1$, $p = .43$ (all

7

participants); $\chi^2 = 0.29$, $df = 1$, $p = .59$ (Caucasians only). *DRD2* Taq1A: $\chi^2 = 0.18$, $df = 1$, $p =$

8

.67 (all participants); $\chi^2 = 1.37$, $df = 1$, $p = .24$ (Caucasians only). *DAT1* 3' VNTR: $\chi^2 = 0.16$,

9

$df = 1$, $p = .69$ (all participants); $\chi^2 = 0.54$, $df = 1$, $p = .46$ (Caucasians only).

10

1 Table 2.
 2 *Descriptive statistics for the proportion of looks to the distractors across phases and trial*
 3 *types in the Freeze-Frame task.*

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Boring, Phase 1	.69	.22
Boring, Phase 2	.42	.28
Boring, Phase 3	.40	.24
Boring, Phase 4*	.39	.25
Boring, Total	.48	.17
Interesting, Phase 1	.45	.25
Interesting, Phase 2	.19	.19
Interesting, Phase 3	.13	.16
Interesting, Phase 4*	.11	.15
Interesting, Total	.22	.14

4 *Note.* *Only infants in Cohort 2 completed 4 phases.

5

Figure Caption

1
2 *Figure 1.* The effect of the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met and *DATI* 3' VNTR polymorphisms on Freeze-
3 Frame performance. Error bars indicate the 95% confidence interval of the mean.
4 *a*, The mean proportion of looks to the distractors in the boring and interesting Freeze-Frame
5 trials in the three *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met genotype groups in the Caucasian subsample (Met/Met, *n*
6 = 19; Val/Met, *n* = 37; Val/Val, *n* = 23); the asterisk (*) indicates a significant difference
7 from the Met/Met group at $p < .01$.
8 *b*, The mean proportion of looks to the distractors in the boring and interesting Freeze-Frame
9 trials in the *DATI* 10/10 and non-10/10 genotype groups (10/10, *n* = 60; non-10/10, *n* = 42);
10 the overall difference between the two genotype groups (across trial types) was significant at
11 $p < .05$.
12 *c*, The effect of the *COMT* Val¹⁵⁸Met polymorphism on the mean proportion of looks to the
13 distractors in the interesting Freeze-Frame trials in the two *DATI* genotype groups (10/10 +
14 Met/Met, *n* = 19; 10/10 + Val/Met, *n* = 26; 10/10 + Val/Val, *n* = 15; non-10/10 + Met/Met, *n*
15 = 9; non-10/10 + Val/Met, *n* = 21; non-10/10 + Val/Val, *n* = 12); the asterisk (*) indicates a
16 significant difference from the Met/Met group at $p < .01$ within the non-10/10 group, and the
17 triangle (▲) indicates a significant difference at $p < .01$ between the Val/Met group in the
18 non-10/10 group compared to the Val/Met group in the 10/10 group.